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This thesis discusses the relatively new approach of art education, by paralleling it to Marxist ideology on art. The Dallas Arts District is one example of a city where museum art education is in conflict: being adopted more vigorously by some and with less acceptance by others. In order to provide a glimpse into the museum ideology of downtown Dallas, previous schools of thought regarding the role of curators and the introduction of educators into museums will be detailed, as well as conflicts between these two factions. The following questions will be addressed: Is museum art education truly a movement which strives to infuse the American culture with a greater appreciation of art? Is there a link to overcoming Marx’s key issue of class? How is the movement affecting the Dallas Arts District and to what extent is museum art education being utilized within this forum? Is the emphasis toward museum art education greater in Dallas than in other large cities across the United States, and if so, how has that affected the cities’ patrons?
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INTRODUCTION

If there were no art, I’m not sure there would be a life, a civilization…. A normal lifestyle without art is really very rarefied [because] it doesn’t give anyone that sense of inspiration or interest…. Art basically next to air and water and the utilities per se is the most important thing.

Raymond Nasher

The expression of art is ancient, dating back thirty-three thousand years to prehistoric times. Art is one expression that truly represents one person’s consciousness, be it visual or mental. Every art form transcends boundaries of class and/or color. Indifferent to its viewer, art simply exists as an expression of its creator’s inner-self, placed into the public domain for all to see. It is a way by which the viewer can truly begin to comprehend another person’s mindset. For many people, both creator and viewer, art is a necessity of life.

This expression encompasses many forms: painting, drawing, sculpture, photography, music, theater, and numerous others. Art is omnipresent; it is in the beauty of nature, a dessert presentation or a dazzling forward pass. Art can be found in a painting hung in the Louvre or a drawing in a toddler’s classroom. However, art, and all that it encompasses, has for many years been viewed as an elitist activity, with critics placing it into a category above popular culture. While art should be accessible to everyone, the reality of the situation is that few individuals are provided the chance to spend time appreciating and learning about art. Moreover, the environment in which the art is displayed can prove to be daunting; the experience can be a bit overwhelming, especially for the novice viewer.

Marxism

Karl Marx sets forth this issue in his statement concerning his beliefs about the bourgeois and their elitist attitudes that deliberately overlooked the working class. The majority of
European art audiences were made up of the higher levels of society, those who had the background and education to understand what they were viewing and those whose finances had provided much of the funding for the artwork on display. Many Americans desired that the United States would provide museums open to all levels of society. Unfortunately, the individuals responsible for the initial museums in the United States followed in the footsteps of their predecessors, again with museum audiences clearly representative of a higher level of education and wealth. However, within the last several years, a new model called *museum art education* has been introduced. Educators felt the need to raise awareness within museums to build exhibits that help patrons enjoy and understand the art, as well as make the surroundings more welcoming. It is this new movement which leads us to ask if museum art education can truly help to infuse the American culture with a greater appreciation of art, connecting it to Marx’s key issue of class. Is it a necessary device used in order for museums to remain fiscally sound?

The ideas of Marx remain valid and for many essential, yet unrealistic, considering the economic status of the majority of people living in the world. Marx, rarely spoke on art, but did write on aesthetics. Dupré (1983) stated, “Marx’s sporadic observations do not amount to a theory of aesthetics nevertheless, they reveal a keen awareness of the complexity of the aesthetic process…Aesthetic activity is not a pastime left to a few, ideal moments; it forms an integral part of all human activity” (p. 258).

A major issue of Marx’s ideology lies with the distinct differences between the classes and the abuses by the Bourgeois. Marx wrote on the natural division created by a capitalist society, whereby some individuals profit from the work of others, leaving the work-group with minimal gains for their efforts. This situation is prone to incite jealousy, anger and ill-will
towards wealthier counterparts. Many believe Marx defined this problem accurately, raising the
levels of consciousness throughout society.

As controversial as Karl Marx remains, certain aspects of his writings have maintained
their potency, such as his writings on aesthetics.

While Marx’s economic projections may have lost much of their credibility after having
been repeatedly adjusted to ever-new recoveries of the capitalist economy on its
purported road to decline, his evaluation of the bourgeois superstructure has gained
greater acceptance. In fact, there seems to be an inverse proportion between one and the
other. The less the economic development of bourgeois society followed the course of
Marx’s predictions, the more its cultural attitudes seemed to justify his critical judgment;
the less people were inclined to dispense with the benefits of a capitalist economy, the
more they found its culture “alienating”. Thus the attention shifted from Marx’s critique
of economy to his critique of capitalist ideology. (Dupré, p. 216).

Many noted academicians have indicated that by creating art, the artist “works,” thus placing the
world of art into the realm of Marxist thought.

With the development of the social classes in Europe, the bourgeois engaged artists to
produce work for them and decorated their homes with self-portraits, or, in many cases, art that
incorporated strong religious iconography. However, not all individuals felt the same essential
need to incorporate aesthetics into their surroundings, whether that aesthetic is art or any form of
the humanities. Specific levels of incorporation logically depended upon amounts of previous
exposure to a particular aesthetic, which is dependent on one or several issues: the amount of
knowledge one has about an item(s), and/or familiarity via proximity (living near/with art or
other aspects of humanities).

Once - and still - seen by many as an elitist endeavor, art is collected by the wealthy and
appreciated for the most part by the educated. The appreciation of art is looked upon as an
extravagance by the working class who is afforded little opportunity to broaden its knowledge
and subsequent appreciation for art, due to the necessities of daily living. Both economic and
social barriers limit people in their ability to enjoy and appreciate art. Economically, art education is costly, targeting it as one of the first activities eliminated from budgets, by both schools and households. Art has been identified for years with higher education, which from the onset again leads back to class division: those able to attend college and those who cannot (Hooper-Greenhill, p. 121). Socially, psychological barriers tend to build around those less fortunate, because without exposure to art, how can one understand it? All people can easily look at a work of art and have a personal opinion; however, the experience is enhanced by a broader knowledge which learning provides.

The scholar, Pierre Bourdieu writes on the need for education in his article, “Distinction and the Aristocracy of Culture”:

…[S]cientific observation shows that cultural needs are the product of upbringing and education: surveys establish that all cultural practices (museum visits, concert-going, reading, etc.)…are closely linked to educational level…A work of art has meaning and interest only for someone who possesses the cultural competence…. (Bourdieu, p. 6-7).

Bourdieu wrote about the clear-cut division which existed simply due to the fact that a person was able to identify and discuss various works of art. “To the socially recognized hierarchy of the arts, and within each of them, of genres, schools or periods, corresponds a social hierarchy of the consumers. This predisposes tastes to function as markers of class” (Bourdieu, p. 2). Thus, if a consumer did not have the good fortune of exposure to the arts, their social status more than likely reflected this deficiency. Of course, the bourgeois faction was defining these levels of division. Had the power structure been more diplomatic, the classes might have been defined, if defined at all, by a broader measure. However, numerous societies have a definite class structure, with many adopting this issue of art as a major means of distinction.
Defining Museum Art Education

The various ways art can be displayed have an enormous effect on the viewer’s reception of the piece. For example, if a large work of art is displayed in a cathedral, the viewers’ impression is far different than if the same piece of art were displayed in a room that barely accommodates the piece. The mere setting of the cathedral adds a level of respect, grandeur, and association with religion. In a smaller setting, the same work might appear oppressive. The viewer is unlikely to see all of the nuances of the piece, because of the enormity of the work in a small space. If there is not room for the eye to grasp all of the either direct or subtle nuances of an individual piece of art, the viewer is unable to process the artists’ objectives. Additionally, if a work is not displayed as was initially conceived by the artist, the artist’s intentions can become moot. This is not to say that in the proper setting, such as a museum, spectators will be denied a fulfilling visual experience, but nonetheless, the viewer is unlikely to experience the same effect as if the work of art is displayed as the artist originally intended.

It is also true that works of art can be manipulated by their placement to purposely create a negative response. A specific example of this is the show “Degenerate Art” sponsored by the Nazi party in 1937. The show was comprised of expressionist artists who Hitler felt were a threat to the Nazi party. The show was, for all intended purposes, a trial to demonstrate the level that society would sink to if the Nazi party did not ban such art. “Expressionist art was a symptom of societies problems… [t]he art was a symbol of the problems” (source: Degenerate Art, videotape).

The venue for this show was a dilapidated building, with tight entranceways, poor lighting and little other aesthetically pleasing attributes. Moreover, the sponsors hung the art on the walls in most cases so closely together that the viewer was inundated with the art; they were
unable to process the images separately. Graffiti was placed above, below, beside and behind many of the pieces of art with derogatory phrases such as: “Art as seen by sick minds” and “Crazy at any price.” Additionally, some of these expressionist paintings were hung upside-down and without frames, making the audience feel “outraged, shocked and bewildered” (source: Degenerate Art, videotape).

If expressionist artists were revealing the inner-self, which was far different modality than realist art, the assumption was that there must be something wrong with them, something vile. To that portion of brainwashed German culture, art revealing the inner self, then, equated with that which is bad. This style of art was placed in a horrible setting, poorly displayed, manipulated, and with the additional graffiti, was accepted as questioning Hitler’s authority and absolutely could not be tolerated by the German culture as a whole. Unfortunately, this exhibit toured for four years and was seen by over three million people. Very few contested the showing, knowing what the consequences would be.

In conjunction with the topic of Degenerate Art, the concept of art and how it is perceived constantly changes as art moves from venue to venue. Here, the issue of semiotics becomes quite relevant. Roland Barthes has extensively written about semiology, which “studies significations apart from their content” (p. 110-111). To reiterate a previous example, the perception of a piece of art can change drastically if placed on a wall upside down, or with derogatory graffiti written all around it. Semiology is made up of three components: the sign, the signifier and the signified. From the viewers’ perspective, the sign is the work of art, a tangible item. The signified is the personal interpretation of that work and the emotions that the work arouses in the viewer. The signifier is the location of the art, as well as the viewer’s past experiences, which can change and shift an individual’s perspective. With regard to the curator
or educator’s position, the sign would be the art itself. However, the signified becomes the artist’s intent/perspective. Finally, the signifier changes and becomes the overall concept and the appearance of the venue and/or museum display.

A brief example would be a painting of a tree, which conjures up numerous images inside of the mind. The work of art is a display of that particular artist’s rendition of one specific tree(s). The viewer adds their own vision of representation, turning the sign into a signifier. The environment of the museum and the signifier equals the signified, or the effect of the artwork within a specific environment. Thus, it is easily demonstrated how the display of art and its environs can effect a viewer’s perception, opening the door to the topic of museum art education.

Museum art education facilitates an open arena by which the general public is welcomed into a facility where specific efforts have been taken in order for the public to be able to access the art, understand the art, and appreciate the environment without a significant learning challenge. When we help an individual who has had less exposure to art, we can also help to make a once daunting experience not only pleasant, but one which may create the desire to repeat the experience. One problem is the need to accomplish this effect without the direct appearance of doing so. If an audience is aware of the expended effort, the educator themselves become the elite because they are “dumbing down” the museum experience.

As far as educational opportunities, museums have included them for years. However, the opportunities were classified as teaching within the museum, not in specifically aiding the visitor’s understanding and comfort level. Museum art education opens up a previously pristine place and changes the dynamic by considering its public as well as the art. Curators for the most part have been concerned with art exclusively. Only in recent times have the public who view and, eventually, help to subsidize the museum taken a key position in decision-making.
Interestingly, the number of museums across the U.S. has exploded since the late 1980’s. Those within the field of education have become a significant contributor to the use of museums and how they are viewed. The movement of museum art education is truly promoting and providing people of all ages the ability to learn in an environment once regarded as pristine and unavailable.

Lisa Roberts states that while there have been programs dedicated to educating the public in some institutions, the inclusion of an educator in the preparation of an exhibit did not occur until 1988. This previous exemption of one whom some see as an invaluable team member has raised numerous questions throughout the art industry, pitting curators against educators. While curators have indispensable knowledge about art as a whole and, specifically, the types of collections in which their particular museum specializes, educators have a real connection with the public and ways to make what they are experiencing within the museum world more invigorating. “Educators’ success in making museum collections more appealing to potential users gave them a solid political foothold in the institution. It also raised old tensions between the two extremes of reaching a general audience and producing scholarship” (Roberts, p. 6).

The model of museum art education strives to reach out to different audiences to demonstrate inclusion versus exclusion. The expansion of the ways in which museums are utilized demonstrates that people can be entertained while still maintaining levels of respect for the artwork. Moreover, more respect comes to the museum as an institution because of the flexibility and desire to allow access to more individuals.

Museum art education encompasses many facets, truly restructuring the purpose of the museum in current times. This idea was not unheard of prior to the late 1980’s, but rarely utilized. As widespread as museum art education is today, the wheels of progress are still slowly
turning. While a complex subject, the major emphasis behind museum art education is to address and undertake these issues:

- The evolving role of the museum in relation to the neighboring society.
- Restructuring the museum experience so that it encompasses social and family learning, both physically and mentally.
- Bridging the gap between curators and educators, allowing educators to intervene in order to make a more fruitful experience available to the public.
- Utilizing education as entertainment, empowerment, experience, and ethics.
- Utilizing the museum as education, public forum, community center, provocateur, and catalyst (Falk and Dierking, p. 16-17).

In theory, this movement is a positive statement toward expanding what was once, and still is, perceived as a pristine arena to more public friendly venue. By encouraging an audience made up of all demographics, this movement appears to be advocating Marxist ideology. Facilities are becoming more user friendly: they are utilized for experiencing art as well as for social events, music, exercise and a range of other purposes.
BACKGROUND

While the majority of European museums concentrated on the “scholarly” visitor, American museums in their infancy were open to the entire public. Museums were thought to be for all people; they were of a true democratic spirit. However, once established, the “entire public” quickly became aware they were not welcome. Patrons who were “unclean” were not admitted into museums. Yet again, the division of classes became readily apparent.

“Exhibitions,” which were similar to State Fair sideshows, became the entertainment frequented by the lower classes, while museums and other “artistic” activities remained fairly exclusive with the higher classes (Low, p. 26). Reinforcing Marx’s separate and not equal philosophy, exhibitions were perceived as being without merit and the “traditional” museums were seen as elitist, thus supporting the ideology they were initially trying to avoid.

As the museum world began to mature, the main contributors to these institutions were philanthropists, who,

support[ed] only those forms of art and culture that they believed would strengthen people’s spiritual nature: paintings, symphonies, museums. A fierce distinction was made between popular art, made to amuse, and Art proper…. [A]rt should ennoble, not entertain (Roberts, 28).

Basically, the decision concerning who would or would not attend the museum was at the discretion of the financiers. Moreover, many of the exhibits came from these same philanthropists, who graciously allowed their private collections to be displayed.

Many individuals were opposed to the vision of these generous contributors. In Jane Horowitz’s *Culture and the City*, she identifies several groups who struggled to broaden the opinions of the philanthropists: the settlement house reformers, the artists, and the institutional administrators and curators. All three of these groups had very different protests, yet each quite valid. The settlement house reformers critiqued not only the distance of the museums in
comparison to the location of the lower classes, but also raised questions on the validity of the experience for the working class once inside of the museum. Many artists were disgruntled with the treatment of their contemporary peers, whose works were not “appropriate” for many museums. The administrators and curators felt as if their talents were superior to those of the financial obligators, again causing friction between those who personally had the ability to acquire the art versus those who were interested in acquiring it for an institution.

Museums themselves have encouraged, perhaps consciously or unconsciously, an “elitist” standpoint. While all museums were not closed off to the public, “[p]rivate collections were opened to the public but continued to be administered as if they were private, marked by restricted entry, jumbled presentation, and persistent visions of grandeur” (Hendon, 24). One of the most specific examples is the establishment of the Smithsonian Institution, where by decree of the Smithsonian’s first secretary, “…the Institution’s overriding commitment should be to the advancement of knowledge and not to popular education or entertainment” (Roberts, p. 27).

Additionally, the types of collections and their contents bred a sense of inferiority. Alma Wittlin traces the history of collections, from economic-hoard collections to collections that highlight inquisitive natures. The majority of motives that explain this desire to collect appear to be a display or banding of wealth, kinship, the collection of objects that are supernatural in nature, or simple curiosity. However, the sheer ability to own these works directly correlates to the wealth of the individual who had amassed such a collection.

Many individuals, from civic leaders, to curators, to educators desire the ability for the public at large to have access to art in all forms, whether at a museum or another venue. However, there are problems that ensue when coping with large groups. Some examples of this are the flow of the building and the subsequent movement of foot traffic, the manner in which
the art is displayed, the level of knowledge of the patron, protection of the art, and providing an environment which is not daunting, to name but a few. The mere exterior design of a museum can predispose a visitor’s opinion. “[M]useums became symbolic of the community’s rise to prominence and sophistication. The architecture of these museums was predominantly Graeco-Roman, further symbolizing the presence of something sacred, art housed in a civic sanctuary” (Hendon, p. 25).

Many Europeans make art an essential element of their children’s curriculum, a fact which relates directly back to Marxist thought. In the United States, however, the focus has been significantly less for the children of this country to become educated in the arts, be it painting, sculpture, theater or dance. The possibility exists that the rationale for this thinking is directly correlated to some of the Pilgrims and their roots of Puritanism. The Puritans cast off all ideology of the Roman Catholic Church, including iconography and rituals. After the Christian era began, the subject matter of art was influenced almost totally by the Church (Minor, p. 49). The early puritan ethic was not one that embraced the frivolity of art. Extraneous matters not necessary to survival and minor entertainment were seen as a worldly extravagance and looked down upon (Ripley, p. 101).

For many, art is a non-revered aesthetic. Numerous individuals look upon artistic endeavors as trivial. This is not to say that America is deficient in the supply and venues of art. The United States has many fine museums, which display a variety of forms of art. Although each is unique, whether by building design, installation or collection, they each have a similar mission. However, the difference between American and European thought differs vastly. In Europe, art is incorporated into the European culture and is apparent in numerous forms, from
the museum, to theater, to architecture. Although the U.S. is obviously much younger, there has been less of an impetus to promote this basic need of incorporating art into everyday life.

The Dallas Arts District

When proposing districts in the United States dedicated to the arts, it becomes a challenge to understand the many complexities that are involved, such as goals, economics and perceptions. Numerous people must agree on the same end goal and, hopefully, their passion and excitement will encourage others to do the same. This is no easy task when dealing with an ideology that is not universally accepted. Add into the equation economic issues, such as amount of funds necessary to build an arts district and the subsequent issue of profitability after completion. Moreover, there is great difficulty in changing the perceptions of an audience when, for the most part, they are not taught the relevance of a subject.

For this study, Dallas, Texas, was chosen because the downtown Arts District has a unique balance of people involved in development, finances, and curating. These individuals include philanthropists who currently control and own two of the major museums, curators who have long been a part of the Dallas Museum of Art, and two individuals with prominent positions that embrace and promote the philosophy of museum art education.

Dallas, Texas, is the location of the largest downtown district dedicated to the arts in the country, covering seventeen city blocks and over sixty-one acres. Established as an arts district in 1983, over twenty-five years have lapsed as this district has slowly come into its own as an established and progressive neighborhood, appealing to all people and all cultures.

The combination of the slow progress of building the district and the “moderate” level of art available to the city’s patrons appears to manifest itself in the form of a lukewarm public
perception toward the arts. Shifting this attitude could take as long as the length of time the district has been in existence. Impressions can be made in an instant and take far longer to overcome, creating a marketing nightmare. However, the city is slowly building its reputation and vitality, and concerted efforts are bringing about positive change within the neighborhood. All of these elements make Dallas a good candidate for analyzing the art education movement in the United States.

Recently, the district has begun to take the form that all the founders desired. As of 2004, there existed many opportunities. The types of art within the district range from one of the United States’ finest sculpture centers to a cathedral that conducts the second largest Sunday mass in the country. Additionally, the area is home to the Meyerson Symphony Hall, often sited as one of the optimum music venues in the world. The Dallas Black Dance group, whose worldwide acclaim places them amongst the premiere dance troupes in the country, also resides in the district. The Crow Collection of Asian Art boasts the world’s second largest rock crystal sphere as part of its permanent collection. The Dallas Museum of Art just celebrated its 100th birthday. Finally, laying almost at the edge of the district, Booker T. Washington High School of the Performing and Visual Arts nurtures the artistic endeavors of students who continually garner upwards of $5,000,000 annually in college scholarships.

As this district moves toward further advancements, such as building an opera hall and a center for the performing arts, the leaders of the neighborhood are constantly struggling with public perceptions. Dallas has not been viewed by many to be a fine regional art city, never garnering the attention that its sister city, Fort Worth has with its major museum, the Kimball. Obviously, the opening of the Nasher Sculpture Center in October 2003 brought great esteem to the city. This building is a tribute to the art of sculpture, designed to display pieces with natural
lighting and open areas allowing the patrons to view the art with ease. Launching the facility with his own collection of sculpture, a collection known for being the best private collection of sculpture in the world, Raymond Nasher has established a venue that will continue to exhibit collections of esteem and notoriety.

Several of these major contributors of the Dallas Arts District are so passionate and devoted to the arts that they have not only provided a means to enjoy art, but have also supported the incorporation of art into the realm of work and pleasure. By surrounding people with art, these founders hope that it will become “an integral part of all human activity”. 
LITERATURE REVIEW

The necessary texts for this research come from three different areas: Marxist writings on aesthetics, a brief history of museums – concentrating on American museums, and the development of the museum art education model. Literature from these various topics are available, although not in great quantities.

While the amount of Marxist writings on aesthetics is limited, *Marxism & Art*, edited by Berel Lang and Forrest Williams, compiles essays by numerous authors which specifically deal with the ever-present theme of aesthetics within Marx’s writing. “… [I]n Marx [,] art is not only taken seriously as object and activity, but also underlies the general philosophical categories which operate in his system as a whole” (p. 4). Another key reference is Lee Baxandall and Stefan Morawski’s book, *Marx & Engels on Literature & Art*. This text details the context of Marx’s development and how Marx’s thoughts either agreed or varied from his peer, Frederick Engels. Even with a good portion of the text dedicated to literature versus art, the invaluable perspectives put forth were essential in helping to convey the themes of this thesis. Additionally, *Marxist Esthetics*, (Arvon, 1970), delves into applying Marxist criticism to four topics. These are probing into the general status of art and literature, the explanation of political function and the political tasks of art, tackling the literary works of the past to establish what a Marxist perspective on those works should be, and, finally, the process of “demystifying ideological analysis” (p. xii). One text in particular was helpful in connecting Marx’s perspective on aesthetics to his thoughts on culture. *Marx’s Social Critique of Culture* by Louis Dupré discusses Marx’s issues of class division. “… [The text] assumes that Marx’s critical analysis of the intricate web of interdependence between production relations and all other social and cultural expressions also implies a theory about culture in general” (p. 5). Although not dealing
specifically with aesthetics, *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, (Nelson and Grossberg, 1988), combines essays that speak more towards a slant on culture as a whole.

Several books are fundamental in supplying the basis for the evolution of the American museum. *Analyzing an Art Museum*, (Hendon, 1979), describes early museums and their role in society. Additionally, the text details the various types of collections and what they represented. *Cultural Excursions*, (Harris, 1990), takes less of an economic thrust as did Hendon, yet revisits the topic of the development of the American museum. Harris writes about both museums and exhibitions and their effects on the urban culture. Finally, *Civilizing Rituals: Inside Public Art Museums*, (Duncan, 1995), discusses museums as “ritual structures”. Also, Duncan describes “ritual features” of these museums, as a protected place specifically to provide an experience far removed from a viewer’s daily life, and addressing the interaction between a visitor and the art as a “script”.

The last group of texts are those on the topic of museum art education. As previously stated, museum art education is not simply about teaching patrons, but providing an environment which is more understanding of the public as a whole, thus enabling viewers to have a more productive experience. *Art and its Publics*, (McClellan, 2003), includes an essay on a history of the art museum public, as well as another essay discussing the movement of the public away from the bourgeois toward an audience that wishes to be entertained. *The Museum Experience* (Falk and Dierking, 1992), outlines four key areas that appear essential when not only creating a viewer’s environment but in anticipating his or her desires. *The Art Museum as Educator* (Newsom and Silver, 1978) supplies reports and case studies on museum education. The text aims to broaden understanding of the educational aspect of museum operations, to stimulate thought about it, to encourage new kinds of thinking, and at the same time to improve the ways in which museums help all of use to perceive the world around us… (p. 5).
From Knowledge to Narrative, Roberts (1997), directly addresses the model of museum art education, the relatively new role of art educators within the museum, and summarizes the various ways that education can be utilized within the realm of the museum. The Educational Role of the Museum, (Hooper-Greenhill, 1996), is a comprehensive text designed to enlighten the reader on the various ways that museums can be effective educationally and why. Topics such as styles of communication, designs of collections, ways to measure collection effectiveness, developing exhibits and numerous others are detailed from a large group of individuals, working in many locations to provide a comprehensive study of approaches which have worked and approaches which need revising. Presence of mind: museums and the spirit of learning, (Pittman, 1999), is a collection of essays from the recipients of the Award for Excellence in Practice and the four recipients of the John Cotton Dana Award. The framework for the text evolved from a series of discussions with the award recipients that focused on two questions: 1) What do you see as the two or three critical issues facing professionals working today to make museums effective educational institutions; 2) From whom are you learning from today, and where or what are the future directions and sources of your ideas.

These are only a sampling of the texts from which the background of this thesis is derived. Other sources include a comprehensive study of the economics of art museums, as well as the social history of art.
RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The ideological base for the establishment of museums as well as an arts district remains divided between several major groups: those who have the finances (power), and those who have the vision (passion). When looking at a particular city’s programs, it is essential to relate the political and economic climates. Additionally, it is necessary to try to gain some notion of the social atmosphere of a city, as well as establishing the fundamental importance of art to the citizenship. In an environment that has for the most part been seen as elitist, the addition of educators places another facet into this challenge.

Museum art educators as well as curators ask the questions, “How can we broaden the audience for art outside the art world? How can our cultural institutions find ways to relate to multiple audiences and varied communities and develop sustained relationships with these audiences? How can the arts become a meaningful part of everyday experience?” (Jacob, Brenson and Olson, p. 60). Art is an essential way of thinking for many: the curators, the educators, and a portion of the public. Trying to expand the realm of thought within the museum setting is a topic that should be addressed, but understanding the psychology of the curator and the educator is a subject matter which many times goes unchecked, leading to a clash of egos as well as a clash of intelligence.

The educators and curators essentially both desire the same thing: an engaged audience who supports the museum. If the educators bring to the table different avenues of learning which in effect make the patron more comfortable and at ease within the museum environment, then a logical conclusion would be that these patrons would frequent the museum more often. If patrons visit more frequently, then a logical conclusion would be that box office dollars would rise, and hopefully profits would increase. Thus, these programs designed toward comfort and
familiarity appear to be one of the most effective forms of advertising – advertising by participation, thus creating a buzz via word of mouth. Advertising’s key purpose is to inform and persuade, which appears to be the same purpose of museum art education, a movement designed to broaden the mindsets of visitors in order to enrich their experiences.

Moreover, how does a museum administrator quantify the concept of a “value added” experience? While one group might see value in one entity, another group sees the complete opposite. This is the case with the museum art education movement. The measuring of the effectiveness of this movement is but one of the major difficulties. Educators are and have been struggling with models to help support their worthiness in the museum world.

On the one hand, the scientific study of visitor learning and behavior has given educators an important boost in the museum establishment. It has validated many of their positions and has given them credibility in an institution that has been largely governed by scientists and scholars. On the other hand, this scientific voice has revealed aspects of visitor experience that are less readily subject to its examination. While experiences such as social interaction, private reverie, fantasy, and play are hardly new, their role in the learning process has begun to be examined more closely by researchers. In so doing, they have raised questions about what is museum education’s rightful arena and whether scientific inquiry is the best way of continuing to promote it (Roberts, p. 7).

Not only are the inroads hard to create, but also the essence of the thought process behind art education needs to be validated in order for its significance to be relevant in a world governed for so long by the intellectually rigorous and scientific curator.

Another major difficulty is the curators of the museums, the numerous adversaries of this application. Many of these individuals look upon museum art education as behavior that will chisel away at the prestigious nature of art. Curators are essential in their knowledge and expertise to assess exhibits and choose wisely, thus maximizing the viewer’s experience once inside the museum. However, how can the museum boards be convinced that museum art
education proves beneficial for all parties involved? This topic has plagued the museum world and created a divergent opinion between educators and curators.

Two tasks – one political and one scientific – dominated museum education’s coming of age in the 1980s and set the stage for understanding its current state. Educators’ success in making museum collections more appealing to potential users gave them a solid political foothold in the institution. It also raised old tensions between the two extremes of reaching a general audience and producing scholarship. From a marketing standpoint, education department’s activities made for terrific public relations. From a scholarly standpoint, they left something to be desired. Many curators, long the executive authorities over museum corridors, resisted activities that they felt threatened to trivialize the collections (Roberts, pg. 6).

Museum art education has not as yet been seen as a redeeming feature of the museum world. The world of the curator has for many years remained unchanged. Only since 1988, have the curator and the educator come together (some willingly, others not) in order to maximize the potential of both (Fischer, p. 31).

This thesis took a closer look at understanding the movement of museum art education and its influence on the public within the Dallas Arts District. Opinions from several of the key personnel within the district helped to gain perspective as to whether museum art education was helping to expand the museum world or if it was hindering the foundations of museum thinking. The questions below were asked of the interviewees who were made up of three groups of individuals: philanthropists, curators and educators.

1. Please describe the museum art education model.
2. Can you see a correlation between museum art education and the goal of overcoming the elitism that has clouded museums for the majority of their existence?
3. Is museum art education being embraced within the Dallas Arts District, and if so, by whom?
4. What are the main areas of conflict between curators and educators?
5. Is there political support for museum art education?
6. How has museum funding shifted from private to public or vice versa within the last twenty years?

7. How is museum art education benefiting these establishments financially?

8. Has museum art education risen out of a direct need to keep these institutions financially secure?

9. Is a higher level of advertising one proponent of museum art education or does museum art education take a more grass roots approach?

10. Is the essence of museum art education a movement that strives to infuse the American culture with a greater appreciation and accessibility of art?

11. Does a conflict arise if the movement produces not only art open to all publics but also promotes capitalism or the profit motive?

12. How essential are these additional funds to maintaining a venue for the arts, and if heavily reliant on these funds, then is the art sacrificed in order for the museum(s) to benefit as a whole?
METHODOLOGY

Museums in the United States began with attitudes reminiscent of Marx. As discussed by Joshua C. Taylor, “U.S. museums were primarily founded by associations of citizens and artists, to provide an educational base of culture to a local society cut off from the larger European society” (Hendon, p. 23). However, William Hendon counters:

[f]ew art museums developed in a different manner than the larger science and history museums. Not taking a broad approach to learning and knowledge, art museums did not integrate knowledge, but created a world apart; they arose to display the fine arts in a distinctly limited sense (p. 23).

This topic is a multi-layered one, and this thesis by no means attempted to provide one clear-cut solution. However, it strove to provide a forum through which the viewer can begin to understand the complexities that affect museums as well as the overall districts that house them. As a supplement to this thesis, a twenty (20) to thirty (30) minute video production provided an alternative format that addressed this topic. The outline for the production video is listed below:

- A brief introduction to the district and the social and political climate surrounding the area.
- A description of the movement of museum art education.
- Interviews detailing perspectives from both educators and curators, emphasizing the differences of each occupation and the problems/benefits of museum art education.
- Conclusion, which discusses the future of the movement as well as consequences for the Dallas Arts District.

The individuals who were initially selected to be interviewed were:

- Trammell S. Crow, Son of Trammell and Margaret Crow
- Amy Lewis, Director of the Trammell and Margaret Crow Collection of Asian Art
- Lisa Lombard, Assistant Curator of Education, SMU
- Ellen Key, Public Relations Manager, Dallas Museum of Art
- Jed Morse, Assistant Curator, Nasher Sculpture Center
- Raymond Nasher, Owner, Nasher Sculpture Center
Documentary Outline

*Introduction*: Visuals begin the video to demonstrate the many forms of art. A brief explanation of art education is provided to establish the topic. Before the video begins to delve into various opinions, a brief excerpt from *Museum Highlights: A Gallery Talk* (1989) is shown. This movie is a sarcastic look at the institution of the museum and plays well toward the topic of this thesis.

*Section 1*: Presentation of the Dallas Arts District, the focus of the thesis, with voice over narration to help identify visuals.

*Section 2*: Distinguishing the movement of museum art education.

*Section 3*: Interviews with curators and art educators who work within the district. These individuals are associated with the three major museums of the Arts District: the Dallas Museum of Art, the Nasher Sculpture Center, and the Crow Collection of Asian Art.

*Conclusion*: Discussing the future of the museum art education movement as well as the planned future advancements of the district. Finally, the thesis question about the purpose of museum art education was addressed. Is it simply to offer the arts to a broader audience or is it a movement of re-purposing in order to help an institution financially?
RESULTS

The list of potential interviewees was finalized, the questions were re-evaluated, and scheduling the interviews began in earnest. Within this timeframe, the individuals who were to be interviewed from Southern Methodist University asked to see the list of questions that would be posed to them. After receiving the questions, Ted Pillsbury, Director of the Meadows Museum, had a very adverse reaction to the word, “elitism,” used in the second question. His response (via his assistant Lisa Lombard, another prospective interviewee) was quite demeaning, and both he and Ms. Lombard indicated that they did not feel as if they could be of help to this project.

In order to maintain good relations, an e-mail was sent back to them once again explaining the general ideas behind the thesis. The response was not as negative; they decided that a “brief” interview could be conducted. However, it was thought that the interview would be to “correct” the previously presented way of thinking. A decision was made at that time to not interview these two individuals in order to be fair to the editing process, not as an editor, but as a person who becomes far too emotionally charged by a situation like this. Additionally, Mark Roglán, Senior Curator for the Meadows Museum, who had agreed to be interviewed initially, became quite unresponsive after this incident had occurred.

Thus, without three interviewees, the list was restructured with much help from Amy Lewis and Lee Papert. Furthermore, Lee was instrumental in providing a call of introduction in order to make the scheduling process go smoothly. The final list of interviewees is listed below:

- Gigi Antoni, Director of Big Thought, a children’s advocacy group for the arts
- Carolyn Clark, Collector and board member for the Booker T. Washington High School for the Visual and Performing Arts (BTWHHSVPA)
- Trammell S. Crow, Son of Trammell and Margaret Crow
- Gail Davitt, Senior Educator, Dallas Museum of Art
Nash Flores, Collector and Director of Ceres Financial, board member for the Dallas Museum of Art, additionally heads up the capital campaign for the BTWHSVPA improvement project

Dorothy Kosinski, Barbara Thomas Lemmon Curator of European Art, Dallas Museum of Art

Amy Lewis, Director of the Trammell and Margaret Crow Collection of Asian Art

The Honorable Veletta Forsythe-Lill, City of Dallas councilwoman

Jed Morse, Assistant Curator, Nasher Sculpture Center

Raymond Nasher, Owner, Nasher Sculpture Center

Lee Papert, Director of Arts District Friends

Bonnie Pittman, Deputy Director of the Dallas Museum of Art

Howard Rachofsky, Collector and Philanthropist

Betty Switzer, Director of the Office of Cultural Affairs

Out of these fourteen individuals, all but two were interviewed. One was Bonnie Pittman, who did not respond to initial inquiries for an interview. The second was a very busy Trammel S. Crow, and after conducting the interviews with the other collectors/philanthropists, the decision was made that enough material had been obtained, and that interviewing Mr. Crow would not be necessary.

Each interviewee was given the choice of location and time for their interviews. Some chose their work location; others preferred the quiet of their homes. All interviews were conducted with existing light, a lavalier microphone, and a Sony PD150 camera.

With the first interviewee, Amy Lewis, the list of questions worked well. Amy has not only received a masters in art education, but is the director of a museum as well. As the second interviewee, Lee Papert, began, the issue became readily apparent that the questions did not take into account people who had not been exposed to museum education. Immediately, a broader set of questions was devised which would encompass both people who were well versed in
museums (either educational or curatorial) as well as people who had less direct museum experience, yet had a broad interest in the arts.

These additional questions are provided below:

1. What is your role within the Arts District?
2. Are you familiar with the movement of art education?
3. When did you become aware of this movement?
4. How do you feel Dallas ranks nationally as an art city?
5. Are the museum institutions trying to take an active role in bringing more patrons to the venues through art education?
6. Do you feel that the culture as a whole is growing with knowledge of what the Arts District has to offer?
7. What problems do you see existing between art educators and curators?
8. What is the biggest obstacle facing museums today?
9. Can people structure exhibits to make them more appealing and more non-threatening?
10. Do you feel that art museum education is a revenue generator, a break-even, or not cost effective?
11. Do you feel that art museum education is necessary to the success of future audiences?

Additionally, for the political interviewees: Veletta Forsythe-Lill and Betty Switzer, additional questions were posed such as:

12. What is the amount within the city budget that is dedicated either to the preservation or acquiring of art?
13. How often is the budget amended in order to accommodate changes in the arts community?
14. Does the city have an art collection and if so, what is the size?

As might be expected, everyone was hesitant when the camera appeared. They were told to look at the videographer, who was seated at eye level, instead of directly into the camera.
Every individual was able to give several cogent and interesting responses, and with only one exception, each of these busy professionals was courteous and receptive.

The one exception was that of Dorothy Kosinski. Again, as with Ted Pillsbury, this curator took offense with the use of the word “elitist” in regard to museums. Even before the interview began, Dr. Kosinski made the power structure of the interview quite apparent by questioning whether or not the videographer knew the definition of a curator. However, the interview was an interesting one, with several very valid and interesting comments made by Dr. Kosinski.

As a further note, the other curator who was interviewed, Jed Morse of the Nasher Sculpture Center, was very amiable to discussing the problems existing between the curator and the educator. Furthermore, he did not take offense to the word “elitist” when discussing both museums and curators. He indicated that he is very aware of the public’s impressions of museums and the need to help bridge the “art” gap of appreciation as well as use of language, which is becoming far more apparent in current society.

As the process of editing began, the piece needed to address four major areas:

A. The definition and scope of art museum education and the conflicts that have occurred by bringing in an educator into the museum world.

B. Understanding why there is a need for an educator and the perceptions of society towards the museums.

C. The financial challenges and needs of museums as well as the political issues that affect the arts.

D. The use of art within the schools and the importance of art in life.

The first essential question that needed addressing was “What is art?” The introduction establishes that anything and everything can be art. For the purpose of this thesis, art encompassed that which is held within the Dallas Arts District. Examples are provided of many
various types of art, both performance and still. Next, Amy Lewis, who received her masters in art education from the University of North Texas, establishes the definition of museum art education. Because of the director’s desire to not only impart knowledge, but also to create an entertaining film, a humorous subtext is begun with an excerpt from Andrea Frazier’s film, *Museum Highlights: A Gallery Talk*. The piece makes light of the museum’s mission statement, the works of art and most importantly the use of language by the curators, which appears to perpetuate the perception of elitism within the museum environment.

Part I, “To Educate or Curate, That is the Question” begins by defining the curator’s role within the museum. Not surprisingly, the collector/philanthropists as well as the curators were well versed in the hierarchy of the museum world. Curators are the ones who continuously maintain the level of expertise and authority, a level well above the educators. Dr. Kosinski actually suggests that the movement of museum art education was an effort on the part of educators to simply take advantage of a political moment in order to further their cause and break into a world which had remained pristine for so long. Additionally, she stated that perhaps the educators were jealous. There was no indication on her part that perhaps the curators had turned a blind eye to the lack of support for the arts in education that had been occurring for roughly the last forty (40) years.

Even though the first educator sat down with curators to be a part of the process of planning an exhibit in 1988, the practice has been a slow one in becoming commonplace. Even now, at the Dallas Museum of Art, where museum art education has taken hold and is fairly accepted, the educators still struggle with the curators in order to achieve a balance between the two worlds. For example, the educators would like to provide more benches in the galleries, so that people can sit and enjoy the works of art. The curator argues that the benches then become a
piece of sculpture within the exhibit, and they do not want to distract from the art. The text cards are another major issue since curators want to speak to everyone at the level of an art historian. They do not want to take away from the complexity of the art by “dumbing down” the experience. The educators have to continuously point out that not only the education of art has dwindled, but the level of education has lowered over the last several decades as well. The educators stress the word “accessibility” and the perception of accessibility, which opens the doors providing a wider path for larger audiences. However, this accessibility does require more flexibility in the museum’s approach.

Part II: “Through the Looking Glass: Overcoming Perceptions” discusses why people feel so intimidated in a museum setting and what can be done to help put those anxieties to rest. Museums have traditionally been considered pristine and “temple-like”, and in their grandiosity, they can easily intimidate. They are spacious – to hold the art; they are cold – to maintain the proper environment for the art; and they impose a silence – that stifles any uninhibited expression toward art by the viewers. While intimidation can be a good thing in some circumstances, perhaps at an art museum, intimidation can be easily overcome. The key problem is that some curators are not concerned with helping their publics become more secure in the museum environment. Thus, a disconnect follows, becoming more and more apparent with memberships and box office totals.

The DMA offers late night hours at least one weekend each month, serving a wide cross-section of demographics: from married couples, to singles, to children, and families. Furthermore, programs are available on a variety of platforms: music lovers, film lovers, yoga, painting, art appreciation, lecture series on particular types of art or by a particular artist(s) and much more. The components the staff of the DMA has put together assuredly makes a marked
difference in the patron’s visit. The audio guides (which do cost a nominal fee) do have different applications, so a child visiting the museum would be listening to a child guide them through the exhibit, or a seasoned visitor might prefer the audio guide narrated by an art historian.

These venues are seeing visitors from a wide variety of backgrounds, and the staff’s success can be seen by the growing amounts of individuals who are becoming more conscious of the art that is offered within this city. The Crow Collection of Asian Art is free at all times, subsidized to a great extent by the Crow family. The DMA has nights where they provide discounted tickets in order to be conscious of individuals who cannot afford a full price admission. Moreover, the DMA’s board of regents man the doors for certain events to help direct the public as well as to provide the public with a more intimate connection with the people who provide the art as well as govern the museum. This one factor had the most positive response at the DMA’s 100 Years/100 Hours celebration.

Utilizing this impetus, the museums are able to become more relevant to society. The entire Arts District tries to open up its doors by having outdoor events where people can meander through the district in order to discover new experiences available to them within the various museums and cultural venues. Each of the museums knows the importance of working in tandem with the other in order to make the district stronger and more appealing. As the Winspear Opera House and the Wiley Theater for the Performing Arts move from concept to reality, the Dallas Arts District is moving towards the direction of an arts campus which is inviting, invigorating and available for all to enjoy.

Part III, “Filigree or Filibuster: Financial and Political Issues” details the economics behind the arts as well as the political support (or lack thereof) within Dallas. The arts are “big money” as more people attend art functions than they do all sports events combined
(Councilwoman Valetta Forsythe-Lill, personal interview). Moreover, businesses weigh the arts as one of the major components in choosing their locations. Dallas was ranked sixth in the nation as far as U.S. art cities, but the funding that Texas as a whole provides for the arts is virtually non-existant, ranking near the bottom of the nation.

Several groups promote awareness of the opportunities found within the district, with the Arts District Friends leading the way. As an advocate for the arts in Dallas, this group manages to promote the district through mailings and events on a shoestring budget. The individuals who run this organization believe that the arts are essential to life, convincing numerous others each year to contribute either financially or with in-kind donations to help their cause. Excess funds to help promote the arts are virtually non-existant, with few museum budget dollars going to advertisement and awareness. If marketing dollars are available, they are usually utilized to help promote a blockbuster exhibit or a new acquisition.

Dallas passed a public art ordinance in the early 1990’s that states one percent (1%) of the capital budget will be spent on art in public spaces. This equates to roughly six to seven million dollars once every four years, or each bond program. While this may seem like a reasonable amount, the breakdown equates to one and a half million every year across a huge city with twelve (12) districts. Each district would then receive one-hundred and twenty-five thousand annually, less the salaries for the Public Art Committee, the Public Art Administrator and the conservator, who not only preserves the new acquisitions, but the art within the cities’ twenty million dollar plus art collection. However, it would be futile to believe that each district receives an equivalent amount every single year, as certain projects will end up costing far more than the allotted one hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars.
Politically, Texas as well as Dallas has been categorized Republican for the last several decades. Many of the individuals who were interviewed were Democratic in their political party affiliation and did discuss the Republican’s lack of concern toward the arts in general. An often-heard comment was, “Just wait until the tide turns, and then the complexion will be more amenable toward the state of culture within this country.” While that may be true for the country, Texas will likely be behind that shift.

Part IV: “Is the learning curve really linear?” deals with the availability and incorporation of art within the schools. The delineation between public and private schools truly stands out when the subject of art is addressed. Within the private schools, art is traditionally offered as part of the program; whereas, public schools have for the most part cut art from their never-ending dwindling budget.

However, the non-profit organization, Big Thought, inspires and empowers children with art, from preschoolers to teens in order to help them become successful and productive adults. Working in tandem with the Dallas Independent School District, this organization makes sure that every single child enrolled within the district has the opportunity to experience art in one form or another. With a budget that comes from 50% public support and 50% private support, they offer seven distinct initiatives that address different community needs: Dallas ArtsPartners, North Texas Wolf Trap, Library Live!, Creative Solutions, Make a Connection Thru Art, Young Audiences of North Texas, and the Kennedy Center Imagination Celebration at Dallas. Nowhere else in the United States exists a group who promotes as well as a partnership that is dedicated to utilizing art to influence children as well as the community.

As Amy Lewis states, “vocabulary, sentence structure, and math scores all improve if the arts are utilized within the process of learning.” Children’s lives can be radically changed when
exposed to the arts. Case after case has been proven to Gigi Antoni, Director of Big Thought, whose desk is filled with letters of appreciation and gratitude of the experiences they have been given through their exposure to the arts. However, even as this holistic approach has been substantiated many times over, a mandate has been placed on the public schools to be concerned with testing schedules and test scores. In certain instances, funding is directly correlated with the progress each school makes in regard to test scores. This tragedy does nothing but harm the children that the experience of art could perhaps help the most.

As the video began to come together, the addition of comic “art” jokes were used as transitions to the next section. While this piece is rather serious in nature as far as the topic, the decision was made to lighten the subject matter so that it did not become stagnant. As with every decision, one would hope the use of comedy does not take away, but will add to the overall “likeability” of this piece.
CONCLUSION

Throughout this experience, the major question has been whether museum art education helps to promote a Marxist ideology of art for ALL people. The subsequent question would be: if museum art education’s purpose is to bring a larger public into the institution, then is it not capitalist in nature, or anti-Marx? The initial logic would rule that trying to provide a wide avenue for many demographics to appreciate, learn about and understand art is a wonderful and unifying experience, the capitalist side would profit all the same. However, in this instance, the conclusion is not that museum art education is a vehicle for gaining more profit. To the contrary, museum art education does not inherently add to the museum’s bottom line. Many times it is more of a financial drain on the institution than a profitable one. However, in this time of dwindling support for art in the public school system, (specifically elementary schools where the foundation for a student’s life is made) the audiences are waning. Children of today do not have art incorporated into their curriculum as it once was in the United States. Unfortunately, this has been true for several generations. While it is a short-term financial drain, the long-term gain is one that gives our children a wider education and an appreciation for all things aesthetic, which greatly improves the quality of their lives.

Within Dallas, Texas, there are small contingencies of individuals who are dedicated to the philosophy of museum art education. Bonnie Pitman’s work at the Dallas Museum of Art is achieving national recognition, and museums are working toward becoming more of an integral part of an individual’s learning experience. The key is knowing that one avenue does not allow all segments of society to participate. Unless the museums begin to work in tandem with the educational system, they could (and in all probability will) alienate a large potential demographic that might perhaps provide the United States with the next Gauguin, Chagall, or Kandinsky.
With the necessary incorporation of educators within the museum world, the public is given the tools to help overcome the lack of art education within our schools that has occurred over the last several generations. This movement is invigorating segments of society which have previously been dispassionate about the arts and the positive influence that art can have within an individual’s life. This movement has not been readily accepted by all involved and for some, Museum art education has tarnished the agenda set forth by the museum through speaking down to its public. In opposition, Museum art education has opened the doors for many visitors to become more familiar, more comfortable, more enlightened and uplifted by the experiences they have had within museums.

What does a society have to represent itself if not for the cultural arts? Again, art is indicative of the times and of the emotions and is one of the most personal expressions that humans offer. Howard Rachofsky stated: “[Art] is the most private viewing into another person’s mind that one will ever experience” (personal interview). If exposure to the arts is limited to only the privileged and available, are not entire portions of viable and willing audiences being left behind? Will the United States as a culture be remembered only for its capitalism and dominance? The obvious answer is yes, even if changes are made towards nurturing the appreciation and creation of art. Art for art’s sake is not considered a vital part of American culture. Instead, art has been pushed to the periphery, and until the political climate changes, appears to maintain that position.

As Dr. Kosinski stated, “We are the only first world country that does not have a Secretary of Culture…People just simply don’t give a damn.” While that may be true for the majority, there is a small but strong contingent that does give a damn and would like to believe that this situation can be rectified. However, if this position is not reversed, the audiences will
not grow, but certainly decline, leaving only the privileged to participate in and support art. In other words, art will only appeal to an elitist audience, which is definitely anti-Marx.
WORKS CONSULTED


*Degenerate Art*: video recording


