

Towards an Avant-Gardist Conception of Gallery Education

Dean Kenning

Introduction

What benefits can art bring to schools? This is a familiar question, asked both in relation to what gets taught in schools, and with respect to the role public galleries can play through their education programmes. It is particularly urgent today in England when we are witnessing such a vicious assault on art provision by the conservative-lead coalition government. Recent and ongoing changes to the structure of compulsory education in England include the mass conversion of comprehensive schools to academy status and the introduction of Free Schools, with powers to diverge from a broad-based curriculum, alongside a new Ebacc certificate which doesn't include art, design, music or drama, therefore rendering these subjects valueless in terms of league table positioning. Access to art classes have been severely diminished at secondary school level, and the proliferation of different types of school, along with plans for a new curriculum, threaten art's survival as a comprehensively available subject.¹ There is no doubt that art in schools needs defending. However, against the prevailing tendency that looks at the benefits art, and in particular 'contemporary art' can bring to schools, I want to consider instead what schools can offer art. How might it be that a genuine encounter between art and compulsory education influences not just what occurs in school, but could affect the values and functions of art itself? In looking at the relation from this perspective I hope to avoid an approach which takes art as a known quantity – a thing which can be delivered in schools, for example – and instead pose art as a question and a possibility: what is it and what could it be? This art perspective will encompass art production (rather than interpretation); the contemporary art museum or public gallery (understood as transcending a primary exhibition function); and the wider art world of which they are a part (which becomes an object of scrutiny). My focus will be on gallery education, as the point of intersection between art and schools.

In order to clearly locate the potential ways in which schools could impact on art more broadly we need to adopt a structural approach which sees the art world as a relational field with various agents, such as artists and gallery curators, occupying various positions therein, and whose visibility or 'fame' is an effect of 'recognition' – that is to say of symbolic validation. According to Pierre Bourdieu's sociological schema, what accounts for *value* in an artwork is not any innate quality but the extent to which it has been 'consecrated' by an agent, such as a museum, gallery or art magazine, with sufficient 'prestige' or 'authority' – a sufficient accumulation of symbolic capital – to invest in the given work, and by extension to 'recognise' the author of the work.² The accumulation of symbolic capital might be a result of ambition to succeed within the system, and the tactical skills to do so, or an effect of family

connections and class dispositions such as know-how, confidence and a sense of entitlement. Symbolic capital can also occasionally accrue to more subversive activities, or else knowledge of how it operates can be the instigation for attacks on the hierarchies and divisions that enable it to function, or the impetus for alternative models of artistic value. Understood in this way as a zone of contestation, with artists and others conforming to or rejecting to varying degrees the hierarchies and exclusions which constitute the artworld of which they are a part, we can dispense with the notion of art as a universal good, and with it the idea that art is a certified gift to be made available to the unenlightened. When schools take on the role of the receivers of the gift, they reflect art's goodness back on itself. Rather than starting from the standpoint of what distinguishes art and education, and therefore how one can fill the lack in the other, we should begin with what they hold in common, as measured from the standpoint of equality and social justice – that is according to a shared emancipatory project. Far from each being a homogeneous field of practice, both art and education are open to internal disputation and heterogeneous and opposed positions, as manifested both practically and theoretically. For example, the radical discourses and practices of the 60s and 70s in the UK around schooling, which built upon and challenged the limitations of the comprehensive system, have been steam-rolled in recent decades by a market ideology which has encouraged a socially divided education through the engineering of consumer choice, a top-down assessment culture which has disempowered teachers, and the promotion of an enterprise agenda in the classroom. The recent history of art likewise reveals *it* to be an internally disputed field of practice. As politics is never absent from either art or education, there is no possible neutral position one can adopt in defense of either one. Rather than equivocal relations based on vague humanistic ideals (who could object to 'art'? or 'learning'?), it is better to form true solidarities in order to directly challenge the reactionary practices and values which can be identified in each. I will conceive of this as follows: the avant-gardist conception of art makes common cause with the tradition of critical pedagogy insofar as they are both tied to a project of collective emancipation.

Critical education & avant-garde art

Let us begin by defining our terms. Theories of education as an emancipatory and critical force, and which therefore run counter to the reproductive needs of the state, social power, and the economy, have a long history, in which Paulo Freire's radical ideas of education as a conscious act towards social change have a central place. According to Freire, critical education is not a 'reflection in which explanation of the world signifies accepting it as it is';³ rather it should be envisaged as a '*confrontation* with the world.' Against a pacifying "'banking" concept of education', where students are empty vessels waiting to be filled with predetermined knowledge,⁴ Freire describes an active 'problem-posing method' whereby the students, as 'critical co-investigators in

dialogue with the teacher' can locate theoretical question within the reality of their own lives and social situations, towards consciousness and a committed 'critical intervention in reality'.⁵

We can already sense a connection here with avant-gardist moves against the contemplative reception of artworks, and the reproduction through high culture of the dominant bourgeois order. Peter Burger describes the historical avant-garde not in terms of aesthetic novelty and individual genius but, quite differently, as an *attack* on artistic individualism and a negation of art's social isolation.⁶ Art's self-perceived autonomy or 'freedom', as crystalised in modernist moves towards aesthetic abstraction, is, for Burger, in fact premised on an 'absence of any [real world] consequences' determined not by artists but by social forces,⁷ an effect of the special place assigned to it in the social structure. Against its confinement in the specialised sphere of high culture 'the avant-gardistes demanded that art become practical once again' and attempted to 'organise a new life praxis from a basis in art'⁸ – a basis, that is, in values opposed to exploitation and the pursuit of profit. This grounding of the self-negating function of art in artistic practice itself is essential for bringing about the possibility of a genuinely new collective social experience with which art can be reconciled – a newness which stems from the powers of the imagination, of sensual affect and symbolic production. Art, in other words, cannot, in Burger's terms, short-circuit its way back into life, for example by becoming part of a commercial media machine focused on commodifying the world.

It is my intention to adopt the term avant-garde in the context of gallery education in order to investigate the latter's radical possibilities. If the coupling of the term avant-garde with gallery education seems incongruous then this is entirely the point. I wish to challenge self-identifying 'critical' artistic practices that nevertheless operate safely and unobtrusively according to hierarchical institutional structures, thus effectively reproducing these structures whilst often dismissing artistic attempts to negate these structures as naively and un-reflexively 'romantic'. At the same time, my purpose is to imagine how the goals of the avant-garde, as detailed above, might be brought about *through* institutional apparatus like galleries, rather than in absolute opposition to, and beyond them – even as this implies a simultaneous transformation of those organisations. By maintaining the concept of the avant-garde, I am proposing forms of art that attempt to be impactful and transformative, both in terms of changing what art itself can be, and in a wider cultural and social sense. Rather than an imposition from above by a cultural elite, this can be imagined as a struggle from below, in solidarity with other agents of change. This conception of the avant-garde therefore runs *counter to* persistent masculinist, bohemian notions of the cultural outlaw, existing outside of society and its conventions, and against the idea of an 'advanced' art which is beyond the comprehension of common tastes and morality. It is therefore compatible with the values of the liberation movements of the 1960s and 1970s, including the women's

movement – which Felicity Allen sees gallery education linked to as a radical art practice.⁹ As ‘representatives of the institution’ writes Carmen Morsch, ‘critical gallery educators ... have no opportunity to imagine an uncompromised “outside” for their work, or themselves as heroic figures.’¹⁰ However, in reaching a more tangible ‘outside’ precisely through the public channels the gallery provides, gallery education practices can put the white cube exhibition space, which *appears* as a zone of freedom, under suspicion. The accusation that art is a minority cultural activity limited to an aesthetic realm which has negligible bearing on the world or the majority of people’s lives is a harsh one for a practice whose value resides to a large extent on its progressive or radical credentials and self-image. The alternative image of contemporary art as reflective of our narcissistic celebrity culture; of wealth inequalities, conspicuous consumption and financial speculation; and of branding and marketing instruments, is equally damning.

By contrast, practices that take place in the context of gallery education tend to be peripheral and low status, and are often dismissed as little more than a funding requirement, worthy at best, but lacking the autonomy that ‘real’ art requires and thus hardly to be taken seriously. In describing this particular activity in terms usually applied to conventionally recognised, high status forms found in galleries or modern art museum, I want to estrange us from usual notions of significant and progressive art and direct the questions of access and social function towards art in general. Thus my purpose is not merely to defend gallery education as equal to high profile exhibitions as a valid space for critical artistic interventions, but to propose it as a model for critical art practice more generally.

For the purposes of this essay I will take the following three factors as definitive of an avant-gardist or radical art practice: 1. That art *becomes social*; 2. That art *brings about the new*; and 3. That art *transforms the field*. The three aspects in operation here are not separable in practice, but occur simultaneously. Hence, in becoming social, art brings about new values and forms; the subjective power to bring forth new worlds implies a transformation of the field beyond existing coordinates of ‘recognition’; and a challenge to existing values and relations of the art world may be both a cause and an affect of art moving beyond its defined boundaries. Before I examine these factors in more detail, I would like to suggest ways in which emancipatory education makes common cause with an avant-gardist conception of art in each of the three cases outlined. In the case of *social function*, Henri Giroux calls for a political project which ‘connect[s] educational struggles with broader struggles for the democratisation, pluralisation, and reconstruction of public life.’¹¹ He raises the need for a ‘critical public pedagogy’ to operate against the ‘corporate public pedagogy’ which dominates cultural discourse via the mass media, thus linking teaching practice – usually viewed as a non-political and subject/curriculum-specific activity – to wider social concerns.¹²

In the case of *the new*, we can turn to Gilles Deleuze. Responding to the obsession with solving problems as designating what thinking is – as we can witness, for example, in school tests and examinations – Deleuze writes (and he is close to Freire here): ‘As if we would not remain slaves so long as we do not control the problems themselves, so long as we do not possess a right to the problems, to a participation in and management of the problems.’¹³ Here the act of thinking, and the possibility therefore of bringing about something new, is stifled by a lack of ownership over thought, and the infantilising relation to a ‘powerful authority’ who can accredit our ‘solutions’ as either true or false, according to what is already known.¹⁴

In the case of *transformation*, a short essay by Walter Benjamin entitled ‘A Communist Pedagogy’ (1929) gives an example of how such a thing might be conceived. Whilst the bourgeois conception of education, for Benjamin, operates to enable the ‘natural disposition’ of the child to become the naturalised ‘ideal citizen’ of bourgeois adulthood, the disinherited view their own children ‘not as heirs’, but as ‘helpers, avengers, liberators.’¹⁵ Benjamin’s language may seem outdated, but the sentiment expressed is nothing other than that education should aim to bring about a more just social order, not to reproduce the world as it is – to the detriment of the majority of its citizens.

Gallery education has a peculiar double nature, standing Janus-like at the border of the institution, facing both in and out. From within, gallery education is afforded a comparatively low status compared with curated exhibitions and high-profile public events. From without, it is afforded a comparatively high status, as representative of the cultural institution. It is this peculiar position of being both subordinate and dominant that allows gallery education to manifest more general tensions in the gallery institution, and in the wider field of art; and to suggest, and potentially bring about changes. In posing the problem of what schools can offer art, I will not focus on specific examples of artists’ work with schools,¹⁶ but I will instead take a more speculative approach, examining in turn each of the three aspects which define an avant-gardist conception of art from the perspective of certain discourses and practices around gallery education.

1. Social function

An important function of the public art museum or gallery is that it allows art to be made accessible to a wide public. Whilst various motives underlie the formation of public galleries as an institution – the building of national character, for example, or the global ‘cultural capital’ accruing to a host city – a democratic ideal informs the ability of galleries to make the work of artists available, including art of a controversial or dissenting nature. This availability goes not only for audiences who can view works, but also for artists who require a public platform for their work and ideas. The democratic and distributive function of the gallery is however compromised, firstly by

persistent limits to access, and secondly by the problem of inconsequentiality that Burger raises as the fate of art under capitalism.¹⁷ To make art practical by extending its critical autonomy beyond a delimited realm can be understood in terms of finding channels where its influence may take effect in an extended and mutual situation. As Grant Kester puts it, it is about 'openness to the specificity of the external world.'¹⁸

The top-down provision of art has its roots in Victorian philanthropy. Here an assimilating logic designed to prevent political ferment and social change underlies a progressive language of public access. As Andrew McClennan writes, 'For [Matthew] Arnold, the purpose of culture was "to do away with classes, to make all live in an atmosphere of sweetness and light," which in effect entailed the eventual "embourgeoisement" of society.'¹⁹ Education departments – staffed then, as now, mostly by women – began in such circumstances where outreach was a central focus,²⁰ only to be increasingly sidelined and detached from exhibition display as the dominant modernist ideal of art which 'speaks for itself' took hold in the mid twentieth-century – an ideology manifested in the 'white cube' aesthetic of artistic display.²¹ Felicity Allen describes gallery education practices from the mid-1970s onwards undercutting such top-down practices, perceiving them as a radical strategy 'to shift art from a monolithic and narcissistic position into a dialogical, open and pluralist set of tendencies that renegotiate issues of representation, institutional critique and inter-disciplinarity.'²² Allen develops her arguments in the context of persistent misrecognition, by exhibition curators and critics, of what gallery educators do, and mentions the way education became the target for objections to government instrumentalisation. 'It seems sometimes there is a failure to identify how gallery education, like other artistic practices, questions or negotiates a route around government objectives, as opposed to simply implementing them.'²³ Carmen Morsch, following on from what Allen writes, demonstrates how gallery education, through its capacity to engage a wider constituency, is in a position to challenge the assumptions and self-image of so-called cultural 'institutions of critique.' According to her, 'critical' voices from exhibitionary practices (artists and curators), who subject gallery education to 'disregard or contempt' for supposedly being 'insufficiently radical',²⁴ enact a form of 'sanctioned ignorance'²⁵ designed to maintain status differentials between exhibition curating and education. In fact, as Morsch points out, audiences for typical art events organised by artists and curators are 'far more delimited than groups accessed by gallery educators. The many "academies", "schools", "seminars", "workshops", "sessions", "encounters" and "lessons" initiated in the course of the "educational turn" are largely attended ... by people who are similar in habits, lifestyle and attitudes to those of the curators.'²⁶ For Morsch, critical gallery education is sidelined within contemporary art institutions so as to maintain glamour: 'the collectively produced preservation of the aura and exclusivity through the peer group.'²⁷

The now familiar sight of groups of school pupils at places like Tate Modern – bemoaned by some conservative defenders of ‘autonomy’ keen to maintain art’s exclusive allure, and under threat now due to the shrinkage of art and pressures on teachers’ time in state education – is a necessary, although insufficient condition for making art available as a possibility for more people. The simple act of physically occupying the space of public galleries gives a degree of ownership over them – a sense that such places exist and one is entitled as a citizen to enter them. The gallery’s progressive reproductive capacity in fact extends beyond audience development to include the reproduction of artists, curators, and other actors in the field of art, who will go on to change the institutions from within. Inclusiveness will ultimately be a matter of who the artists and curators of the future are, how the population as a whole is more adequately represented.

Gallery education is also able to instigate a shift away from a sometimes evident emphasis on artists playing a *reactive* role in response to the existing collection or exhibition, and towards a primary *active* role as producer. Artists who have direct contact with groups of students in a gallery environment, or within schools via gallery education placements, are able to demonstrate the activity of art as a normal activity rather than a fetishised object attached to a name. Rather than mediators to the official art who are put in a position of performatively re-inscribing that art’s consecrated status, these ‘unofficial’ artists can appear as the demystifying exemplars of art and artists in action. These are the conditions of equality which allow art to be a liberatory activity. It again shows how gallery education departments may act to bring down the hierarchies which limit art’s capacities to act progressively in the world, even whilst the low quota of symbolic capital afforded to gallery education makes these practices vulnerable to an instrumental use according to the realities of the art world, for example as a stepping stone to more prestigious gallery projects. Whilst such subsuming effects are reaffirming of normative hierarchies of the art world, the maintenance of prevailing borders also highlights the way alternative arrangements sometimes witnessed in gallery education could have a more general transformative effect on the field as a whole.

2. The new

If capitalism, for the historical avant-garde, reduces humans to a ‘partial function’²⁸ then freedom needs to be extended beyond a sanctioned limit zone of aesthetic experimentation, sensual affect, and critical perception, so that these things may become features of life in general. In this way, art should become the basis from which to organise new forms of life. In crossing the border from institutionally sanctioned art into the everyday world however, artists must beware of subsumption into the dominant logics of commodity fetishism, profit and publicity. By operating in the area of formal education, art workers enter a minefield of potential compromise, amidst forces dedicated to

passivity and obedience to the existing order as enforced, for example, through the business instruments of predetermined targets, grades and outcomes. This, of course, is precisely the reason why artists have a critical potential here for social impact, in solidarity with teachers whose own autonomy is denigrated through the managerial and monitoring strategies employed. According to John Roberts, Theodore Adorno's concept of 'the new' 'does not mean the faddishly latest, or novel, but the subjective agency by which art is compelled to retain its critical independence from the forces of instrumental reason, social and aesthetic.'²⁹ In a more affirmative register, Deleuze gives us the following definition: 'the new ... calls forth forces in thought which are not the forces of recognition, today or tomorrow, but the powers of a completely other model, from an unrecognised and unrecognisable *terra incognita*.'³⁰

As the place where the value of art must now be defended more than ever from those who do not consider it a beneficial or necessary element of education, going back to school may help us to articulate what the real values of art are and what they could be. Art as a school subject, after all, has the potential to do a number of things which may be a threat to the smooth reproduction of the crude corporate, economic agenda of the present government. For example art classes help to produce confident, autonomous, thinking subjects capable of challenging the notion that there is a correct outcome, or an authoritative way of doing something – art is one of those subjects where there is clearly not a 'correct' answer predetermined in advance. It also allows an imaginative and discursive space where the widest range of concerns, materials and subjects can be synthesised in form. Crucially it can transform students from consumers of culture into its producers of culture, through the expression of personal feelings and interests, and the manipulation, subversion and re-engineering of mass mediated visual and verbal signs. It also hands students control over the technical means of production and introduces them equally to symbolic and imaginative resources in the shape of other artists' work – often of an idiosyncratic and non-conformist persuasion. And it allows students precisely, in the spirit of Freire's radical pedagogy, to connect personal experience to wider social and structural realities through narrative and other forms of expression. It is the critical aspects of art in the broadest sense, learnt and practised both in and outside of the classroom, which can then be carried over to further and higher education, usually taken not with a career in mind but something more like a sense of critical self-discovery. There is enough in all this to enable us not to fall back on familiar economic arguments for art's contemporary relevance at the heart of education – a tactic which is always liable to backfire – but to assert the radical value of art provision according to an avant-gardist insistence that art is ultimately seductive because it produces a real difference which is a threat to the social order.

3. Transformation

The measure of any art's true criticality will be the extent to which it affects its own framing conditions. By raising issues of status, function, access, power and visibility, gallery education can offer a model of transformation of the field from below. This ground up possibility is however tied to its ability to overcome its subordinate position in relation to exhibition curation *within* the gallery, whilst relinquishing its dominant position in relation to school art *outside* the gallery. These are really two sides of the same coin insofar as the school, as a practical and comprehensive arena where the principle values of art must be justified in terms of social necessity, re-enters the gallery and, as an actor with low cultural status, challenges the exclusions and social divisions which account for the gallery's higher status: its aura of non-instrumental, contemplative and critical 'freedom'.

There is a world of difference between the institutionally recognised 'relational' artist or curator who, through the discursive frame of the 'pedagogical turn' equates their practice with education, and identifies themselves as an educator, and the alternative case of gallery education where the artist enters the unglamorous periphery of the art institution to claim it as a legitimate place for an artist to exist. In the first instance the artist takes the mantle of 'critical' educator whilst remaining firmly within the dominant modes of exhibitionary production (exhibitions or high profile events). The second instance of the artist who works *within* education and insists on being an artist is calling for visibility on new grounds, not according to the modes of recognition that currently pertain within the institution.

From the perspective of the school, where artists, or those who have art degrees work as art teachers, the term 'artist-teacher' has been proposed. Whilst this can be an assertion of the value of teaching for or as an artistic practice, there are problems with the term. Both James Hall and Alan Thornton frame the benefits of adopting the artist teacher identity in terms of a deeply personal resolution, or management, of inherent tensions between formal education teaching on the one hand, and art practice on the other. Tensions arise to a large extent because of 'a common perception that teaching is no more than a safety net for those who cannot find employment in other fields or professions.'³¹ However the danger is that a language of personal empowerment tends to reinforce ghettoisation and fails to cut across borders in ways which may expose and challenge institutionalised power relations. By bringing art and education together at the level of the self, the designation 'artist teacher' operates to divide the real artist from the teacher artist.

Against the current dominant ways of thinking, we should oppose at a political level the insistence that working as an artist will have no discernable benefit to students in the art class, and may in fact be detrimental by diverting teachers from their professional responsibilities.

Asserting the value of artists teaching in schools may seem like a modest act, but it starkly contradicts the prevailing art world ethos of exclusionary networks, luxury commodities and competitive individualism. Moves towards transforming the field could precipitate broader changes.

Conclusion

What the new writings from within the field of art education appear to draw attention to and build on is a new mood, one which promises a more social role for the public gallery in enabling different audience relations with art and new types of practice. This can be witnessed in institutional moves outward, both beyond the singular art object and towards communication, together with the recent popularity of participatory and dialogical practices, and a more central role for education curating departments in the primary production of art. However it is equally apparent that powerful institutional forces operate against the development of such potentialities. Foremost amongst these is the determination to maintain existing hierarchies. A paradox of status is in operation: as learning situations are increasingly instituted within exhibition practices, the reaction may be not to bolster the scope of education departments as equal players within the gallery, but, on the contrary, to keep the 'real art' separate from what goes on in an arena considered low status and peripheral to the primary function of the gallery. This quarantining of education-based practice in order to retain status differentials suggests an aestheticising impulse, the effect of which is to turn the activity of learning into art, in the sense of diminishing its pedagogical usefulness. If this is indeed the case then rather than approaching the hegemonic gallery practices in a spirit of deference or compromise in the hope of accruing some of their prestige or of gaining institutional equality, educational practices might do better to persist as a challenge to the status quo. It may be that the difficulties and objections are a sign of how existing art world structures and values have become an impediment to the further progressive development of the public gallery's function. In this respect shifting from a secondary mediating role to a primary productive role is about more than education departments gaining autonomy within the gallery or museum; it is about art itself gaining autonomy by becoming free from the institutional structures that hold back its ability to act critically in the world.

¹ Dean Kenning, *Refusing Conformity and Exclusion in Art Education*, Mute, 22 March 2012, <http://www.metamute.org/editorial/articles/refusing-conformity-and-exclusion-art-education#sdfootnote38anc>, accessed December 17th 2014.

² Bourdieu, Pierre, 'The Production of Belief: Contribution to an Economy of Symbolic Goods', in Randal Johnson (ed.), *The Field of Cultural Production: Essays on Art & Literature*, Cambridge 1993, pp.75 – 76

³ Paulo Freire, *Education: The Practice of Freedom*, London 1976, p.98

⁴ Paulo Freire, *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, NYC 1970, p.53

⁵ *Ibid*, p.54

⁶ Peter Burger, *Theory of the Avant-Garde*, Minneapolis 1984

⁷ *Ibid*, p.50

⁸ *Ibid*, p.49

-
- ⁹ Felicity Allen, *Situating Gallery Education*. Tate Encounters [E]-dition 2, February 2008, p.2, http://www2.tate.org.uk/tate-encounters/edition-2/tateencounters2_felicity_allen.pdf, accessed December 17th 2014
- ¹⁰ Carmen Mörsch, *Alliances for Unlearning: On Gallery Education and Institutions of Critique*. Afterall, Spring 2011, p.6, <http://www.afterall.org/journal/issue.26/alliances-for-unlearning-on-the-possibility-of-future-collaborations-between-gallery-educa>, accessed December 17th 2014
- ¹¹ Henry A. Giroux, *Border Crossings: Cultural Workers and the Politics of Education*, London 2005, p.14
- ¹² Ibid
- ¹³ Giles Deleuze, *Difference & Repetition*, NYC 1994, p.158
- ¹⁴ Ibid
- ¹⁵ Walter Benjamin, 'A Communist Pedagogy' [1929], in Michael W. Jennings, Howard Eiland and Gary Smith (ed.), *Walter Benjamin, Selected Writings, vol. 2, 1927 – 1934*, London 2001, p.273
- ¹⁶ For an examination of the work of two artists in school settings see Dean Kenning, 'The Artist as Artist', *Art Monthly*, June 2010
- ¹⁷ An interesting exemplification of this problem was the cynical praise with which a government backbencher greeted Mark Wallinger's installation *State Britain* – a reconstruction of an anti-Iraq War protest set up on Parliament Square: 'This is *exactly* where the protest belongs!' – i.e. within the authorised confines of the Tate gallery, rather than opposite the Houses of Parliament.
- ¹⁸ Grant H. Kester, *Conversation Pieces: Community and Communication in Modern Art*, Berkeley 2004, p.13
- ¹⁹ Andrew McClennan, 'A Brief History of the Art Museum Public', in Andrew McClennan (ed.), *Art & Its Publics. Museum Studies at the Millenium*, Oxford 2003, p.12
- ²⁰ Ibid, p.9
- ²¹ Ibid, pp. 24–25
- ²² Allen, 'Situating Gallery Education' (2008), p.2
- ²³ Ibid, p.12
- ²⁴ Mörsch, 'Alliances for Unlearning' (2011), p.8
- ²⁵ Ibid, p.9 (the term comes from Gayatri Spivak)
- ²⁶ Ibid
- ²⁷ Ibid, p.10
- ²⁸ Peter Burger, 'Theory of the Avant-Garde' (1984), p.48
- ²⁹ Roberts, John, *Avant-Gardes after Avant-Gardism*, Chto Delat 17 (2007). <http://chtodelat.org/b8-newspapers/12-57/avant-gardes-after-avant-gardism/>, accessed December 18th 2014
- ³⁰ Giles Deleuze, *Difference & Repetition*, NYC 1994, p.136
- ³¹ Thornton, Alan, 'The Artist Teacher as Reflective Practitioner', *JADE* 24, no. 2 2005, pp.166–74.