

articipates in
tulate, illu-
culture pro-

TEACHING TO LEARN
(A CONVERSATION ABOUT 'HOW' AND 'WHY')

Don't, for heaven's sake, be afraid of talking nonsense! But you must pay attention to your nonsense.

Ludwig Wittgenstein

It seems we begin with two points: an institution and a conversation. An art school, simply put, is a representative of the institutionalization of art. It represents the world as a collection of rules, practices, traditions, habits—about art—that are organized within a social order. The presumptions and prescriptions that are taught there are a *de facto* description of what art is. When you describe art, you are also describing how meaning is produced, and subjectivity is formed. In other words you are describing

ART AFTER PHILOSOPHY AND AFTER

first lesson, taught by example, is that what is to be learned is a process of thinking and not a dogma in craft or theory.

The teacher is not the representative of the institution, but one artist among several sharing a conversation. What is said has its own weight. If a teacher is any good he or she learns as much as the students. The 'answers', if there are any, are formed by all of the participants in the conversation within the context of their own lives, and their practical effect only within that larger conversational process; the shared discourse of a community. It is in the making of meaning—art—as a discourse that art students experience themselves as they begin the process of making the world. The concept of art shared by such a teaching process has institutional critique basic to it, but, by necessity it must avoid that as its sole description. Because art is the teaching of art (although the format changes), description quickly becomes prescription. What this concept of art really reflects is the responsibility of the artist to be a whole person: a political being as well as a social and cultural one.