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The following study is my personal attempt towards "corrective Scholarship" as so eloquently described by President Johnetta Cole of Spellman College in ANTHROPOLOGY FOR THE NINETIES (1988). Just as she has challenged the next generation to reinvestigate current beliefs and practices within scholarship, I have taken this as a foundation for my study. Simultaneously, it paves the way for correct inclusion of other cultures, artistically and academically within the American society while correctly connecting the contributions of my culture to the arts in America and other societies.

I begin my study with a rather lengthy quote from the book UNDERSTANDING AN AFROCENTRIC WORLD VIEW: Introduction to an Optimal Psychology by Linda James Myers because it establishes the foundation in which the reader can settle down and find his or her own personal connection within the following research. According to Myers (1988), it is important that the reader determines this for self, therefore my responsibility as author is to assist in that discovery:
INTRODUCTION

Artifacts, man-made objects, can be found throughout the world within cultures and aggregates of cultures identified as societies. They may be in the form of a tangible object such as a bowl or a painting; or they may be expressions that are not tangible such as dance, drama or music. Wherever artifacts are found, there is someone who is responsible for the object, the final product. The maker is also the first to see, hear or touch the final product. Whether the object is initiated by the maker or someone else, it is the maker who eventually involves the public viewer by making the object to be seen, heard or touched. Such sensual involvement may include an aesthetic as well as a pragmatic appreciation for the object. The responding stimulation of the senses is coupled with practical elements of function, adaptability and durability of the object.

It is possible to consider the aesthetic experience as an event between the viewer and the object and to consider the aesthetic experience as something which happens while the maker is engaged in the creative process from concept to object. Both of these are two way descriptions of aesthetic experience. But in what sense is it possible to consider aesthetic experience as a three way
transaction, that is, as something which includes the conscious participation of the maker, the viewer who perceives the made object and the object, itself? In what ways are the three related and what happens when this three way relationship changes, as when the object moves out of its culture of origin into another culture where it may be perceived by a second viewer not directly linked to the maker by culture, social class or society?

Due to the ease of global mobility, it is quite possible that once the object is made, both the maker and the object may leave the culture of origin - the place of birth of either the maker or the object - and move to one or more cultures. This move, or migration, may happen at different periods of the maker’s life. The meaning found in the work may be influenced by the culture of origin, and by the culture of migration, as well.

This study collects and records interpretations of the maker by himself or herself and by interpretations of the maker by informants. Through observations of makers and literature about makers who are identified as artists within the United States, information has been gathered about the process of making objects. The study includes both the interpretations of six artists and examples of writings by others regarding their work as well. Additionally, it follows the progression of how artifacts, including how objects migrate and are classified, from the moment of their conception to their final destination as works of art within different clusters of people (e.g., cultures, art specialists, viewers).
Traditionally, the classification of artifacts and artists has relied on the interpretations of both social scientists and humanists who, from different disciplines, represent various factions within the Western academic community. Such disciplines as art history, sociology, philosophy and political science have developed different systems for categorizing both makers and objects.² They have also attempted self-correcting revisions within their disciplines when further evidence warranted it. There is little evidence that makers themselves participate in the development of a classification process. Likewise, there is no public policy or law that encourages the endorsement of these interpretations by the maker of his or her art. It appears that some form of "endorsement" that includes methods of cross-validation would be necessary in order to assess the practice and the credibility of the interpreter, simultaneously. Gathering information from diverse sources for the purpose of reporting, would further substantiate the use of descriptive "qualitative" research as an important contributor to a variety of approaches or interpretive methods already in practice.

Many interpreters have limited experience in producing objects, yet their judgments and interpretations influence the professional life of artists and the value of their objects. The criteria of the artist is not considered. Is it possible that the schism between the intentions of the maker and the intentions of the interpreter need to be documented and linked through an exchange of interpretations and endorsements prior to public reviews? If so,
it is possible that the interpreter needs to be cognizant of what is involved and competent in artistic activity so that recognition of such activity is intuitive. Such competence would enable the interpreter to speak and respect the artist's inclusion, in terms of the values from the arts community.

Realizing this, there is tremendous value in including the maker's interpretations of his processes and his public/private activities relevant to the work. This includes his or her participation in developing a classification system for interpretation. To date, artists and their objects have been exclusively interpreted by a small group within the "art world". Some are historians, critics, aestheticians, archaeologists and cultural anthropologists. While there are theorists who suggest that manipulation of materials (making objects) is not necessary in order to interpret and value objects, this is certainly not a commonly shared belief among makers. As a result, interpreters who do not or are unable to recognize the artistic activity of artists are also unable to recognize artistic activity as a method of problem solving that extends beyond the aesthetic segment of a particular culture or society. Influenced by interpreters, the "culture sculptors" within the decision-making networks of a society may restrict the input of artists by not understanding the processes within the artistic activity. The impact of these restrictions and practices may effect the attitudes and decisions of support by patrons, policy makers and implementors of cultural responsibilities within the political, educational and religious institutions of a
society. Without an exchange of information by interpreters who acknowledge the diversity among cultures and include the endorsement of the makers, the interpretations are limited.

The following study is designed to encourage the participation of the maker during the interpretive process and to examine the impact that such inclusion has on public interpretations and classifications of their objects within or outside of the arts community.
Introduction

Endnotes

1. Artifact as defined by Webster is a simple object (as a tool or ornament) showing human workmanship or modification as distinguished from a natural object. I am interested in including objects such as dances and music within this definition. The object is first within the vision of the maker and is completed to the satisfaction or dissatisfaction of the maker before it becomes a public object. This matter will be discussed further in Chapter IV as the process of envisioning.

2. Examples of classification systems within disciplines can be attributed to scholars such as Robert P. Armstrong, Douglas Fraser, Warner L. D'fozenedo, Robert Farris Thompson, Herta Haselberger, Franz Boas...to name a few. For further listings see Hatcher’s bibliography in ART AS CULTURE.

3. During a class a few years ago, students and I attempted to list the members of the art world. The listing included the following:

makers  arts councils  museums
teachers  media (radio, tv, film) agents  government agents
publishers  gallery owners  artist’s agents

This is not an exclusive list but the attempt is to depict membership in order to understand the roles and responsibilities each group has to others within the community.

4. Culture sculptors refers to representatives on policy-making panels and committees who determine which artists and what objects will be accessible to the public. As sculptors, they participate within a decision-making process which is very similar to sculpting (e.g., carving from a large mass of information; chiseling the request of funding needed by artists; piling or adding additional materials (normally in the form of additional reporting and accountability procedures); and exhibiting documents that represent the effort of the panel and guidelines, such as "guidelines", "directories" and "mission statements".
CHAPTER I
THE PROBLEM

There are very few interpretations of artistic activity that include the artist's personal understanding, endorsement and values. A review of current literature between 1955-1988 implies that artists produce works for societal needs as a priority over their individual and cultural needs. McFee's paper to the United States Society for Education Through Art and Canadian Society for Education Through Art Conference (1986) at the University of British Columbia is an appropriate summation of the scholarly view of artists and their activity of this period:

Art as defined in the social sciences may be described as the processes and products of individual artists, who are in a state of moving towards or away from their culture's central modes of thought, of acceptable emotions, of hierarchies of values, of symbolic, stylistic productive tradition, and systems for making order. Art is a mode of knowing as well as communicating.

Art is also the application of knowledge and skill to affect a desired result; skill used to achieve an aesthetic result (Hatcher, ART AS CULTURE, 1985); it is the product of human activity...using the standard of comparison for measurement of relative skill that is used in the society in question (Anderson, 1979:9); it is also skill in performance, acquired by experience, study or observation (Webster's New Collegiate Dictionary, 1959:50); the fine arts
collectively, those that appeal to the taste or sense of beauty as painting, sculpture, music... the special skill required by those who practice these arts...artistic faculty, skill, dexterity, knack, artfulness, cunning, duplicity (The New Webster Encyclopedia Dictionary, 1977).

In the Western tradition, however, the responsibility for communicating and interpreting the societal needs of art has been undertaken by scholars or their students within specialized disciplines. Scholars, who often are the providers of criticism and historical information, have been responsible for interpreting the reasons artists make art, as individuals and members of a society. For example, the work of Jacob Lawrence is considered by Ellen Harkins Wheat, curator of his retrospective exhibition, JACOB LAWRENCE/AMERICAN PAINTER (1986), as the work of an American artist, rather than being considered only as his contribution to his culture as an African-American artist:

Lawrence has manifested a persistent concern with everyday reality and the dignity of the poor, and all human effort toward freedom and justice, and he deals with these themes while extolling the value and diversity of human existence.

Throughout Lawrence's work, however, there is a keen sense of his ideology within it that portrays his culture of origin as well as a personal appreciation for the materials he has been able to obtain throughout his artistic development.

In the past, the cultural reasons artists make art often have been confused or perceived as the same as societal reasons by scholars like McFee and Wheat. One is able to identify scholars who study the arts within disciplines of both the arts and sciences
within the academic community. While some fields of study directly influence the art community (i.e., art history, art education, art criticism, studio production) others may be considered indirect influences (i.e., cultural anthropology, and its subdisciplines like humanistic sociology, political anthropology, aesthetic anthropology). Each of these fields affect the artists, yet a review of historical literature (1889-1964) suggests that once the work is made by the artist, societal needs, not personal or academic ones, take priority and determine the value of the work. The work's value is determined by the art market, galleries, schools, museums, guilds, academies and journals, in other words, social agencies.

What happens to the individual view and values of the work first expressed by the artist? It is possible that artists base their private views and values of an object in ways different from those expected by societal representatives? Is it possible that artists communicate their private views and values only among members of their in-group? Does that in-group extend beyond political, economical and social boundaries of a country? Is that in-group closed to scholars? Do scholars recognize this group as a culture within a society? Do they realize that recognition of this culture may have significant influence on their interpretations of the artistic activity?

**Stating the Problem Within the Study**

This study describes artistic activity—the process of making objects—as it is interpreted and endorsed by the artists. These interpretations are based on the artists' relationships with his or
her culture of origin (African-American, Japanese, French, Jamaican and Chinese) and the amalgamated culture of migration within the United States. The focus is on six artists who are comfortable in representing their cultures of origin within their artistic activity and their objects.

They are:

- Jenny Floch, Jewish-French - Visual Arts
- Noel Hall, Jamaican - Performing Arts
- Ban Kajitani, Japanese - Visual Arts
- Bill McCray, African-American - Performing Arts
- Pheoris West, African-American - Visual Arts
- Shir Lee Wu, Chinese - Performing Arts

For the purpose of this study, it is necessary to specify qualities and activities of the artists that are the focus of the individual biographies.

1. Each has successfully contributed to the specific categories depicted by Maquet in the ideational, societal and production levels of the aesthetic segment of a society.

2. Each has produced (as a maker or manipulator of materials, sounds or movements) a significant record of artifacts that have been accepted by the aesthetic segment of the culture of origin as well as maintained a significant position (i.e., popularity) within cultures, via migration.

3. Each has taught in a variety of environments whether public/parochial schools, other social agencies or non-public (i.e., within a studio).

4. Each has established a position of influence beyond the arts community, such as in the political or economic institutions of her own culture or society.

5. Each has been recognized in the media and in publications such as textbooks, exhibition catalogues, and scholarly citations.
6. Each is identified by his peers as an important artist and a contributor to the community of artists.

7. Each is an exemplar of the societal values of his culture (i.e., kinship, marriage and domestic group practices; accumulation of materials) and is a recognizable/observable example of those values to others.

This study also addresses Western methods that may restrict the interpretation of artists and their objects to stylistic and hierarchical classification systems that do not recognize the artistic activity of artists as members of a closed cultural system. Failure to recognize artists as members of a group that is beyond individual societal boundaries, limits the interpretation, recognition and value of artistic activity. Such limitations may influence the methods of understanding artistic activity and teaching art, cross-culturally.

Assumptions

The Maker -
- is significant in the discussion of his or her work.
- can produce simultaneously, objects that have multifunctions within several societies and within different levels of the cultural segment (e.g., psychological level, social level and material/technical level).

The Object -
- can be exported, via reproductions, to several societies simultaneously.
- can depict symbolic traits or materials of several cultures in addition to the culture of origin.
- is a commodity of exchange within diverse cultures and can facilitate informed dialogue between cultures.

The Culture -
- within the arts community is a closed system that extends beyond societal and geographical boundaries.
The Interpreter -

- is limited by traditional Western methods of research that minimize competence within artistic activity as valuable to understanding of and teaching about, both, the artists and their objects.

The Objectives of the Study

This study focuses both on the migration patterns of the artist and on his objects throughout significant periods of the artists' development within and outside of the original cultures. There are three general questions which raise specific questions for a cross-cultural investigation.

Question A: ARE THERE COMMON, OBSERVABLE CHARACTERISTICS FOUND AMONG THESE ARTISTS?

(1) What are some similarities or differences among the observable behaviors of the six artists-as-makers?

(2) Does the artist depend on the support of a culture - whether it is the culture of origin or migration - in order to make objects? Is it dependent upon encouragement? discouragement?

Question B: ARE THE EXISTING SYSTEMS FOR CLASSIFYING ARTIFACTS, CROSS-CULTURALLY ADEQUATE OR USEFUL?

(1) Does the artist-as-maker identify differences between works of art and other objects?

(2) Who determines the differences between works of art and other objects made by the same artist?

(3) Under what circumstances do objects migrate?

Question C: WHAT ARE THE IMPLICATIONS OF THESE OBSERVATIONS AND CLASSIFICATIONS FOR CROSS-CULTURAL UNDERSTANDING AND TEACHING?

(1) What efforts have been made in the past for classification purposes and by whom?
(2) What are the implications within the academic community of each represented culture?

(3) What impact, if any, can these implications have on the populations served by the academic community?

There are six additional questions that focus on the individual approaches to artistic activity:

1. How are artists typically represented in disciplines of knowledge as sources of scholarly inquiry?

2. How are the artists' personal understanding of their artistic activity included in scholarly inquiry, if at all?

3. How do the interpretations of the scholars differ from the artists' own interpretations of his objects?

4. Is it possible to identify differences between the interpretation of scholars from the culture of origin and scholars from the culture of migration regarding artists or their objects?

5. What is the influence within the aesthetic segment, if any, on the objects and the artists within the culture of migration? (see Figure 4)

Significance of the Study

There are three significant needs that are addressed by this study. First, there is a need for a framework that simultaneously addresses the classification of artists and their objects. While collection, description, inquiry and observation are all major contributors to the interpretation of art within a culture, there remains a need to investigate the impact these have on the final interpretations of issues within the arts.

The use of the model for a cultural system and its aesthetic segment (Maquet: 1979) as a framework, is an attempt to (1) simultaneously recognize the activity of both the artists and the
objects and (2) identify whether there are observable similarities, cross-culturally. Additionally, the use of the classification system developed by the Museum of Anthropology (Ames, 1977) enables a continuous collection of information regarding interpretations and current location of artifacts that have been produced by artists (see Appendix I).10

The second need is for the data to be interpreted by informed observers. Traditionally, observations and interpretations of works of art have been the responsibility of aestheticians, critics and art historians.11 The objects as well as the artists have had to rely on them as links to the rest of the society. Cultural anthropologists and archaeologists influenced by the American Historical Tradition (e.g.: Boas, Herskovits) have also interpreted the artists and the object but they have carefully avoided the aesthetic properties of a culture or an object and have relied heavily on the interpretations of art critics and historians. While information on the artistic activity has been documented through film and interviews with artists from Bearden to Picasso, interpretation of the data has been limited, and without the endorsement of the artist.12 Such procedures by scholars in the past has limited the potential use of the information and ignored that which is significant to the understanding and the teaching of the aesthetic experience of a culture or a society: the artistic activity of the individual artist.
The Need

The need for this kind of study has been expressed by anthropologists, art educators and artists. Their concerns have been publicly addressed at conferences (McFee, "Cross-Cultural Inquiry into the Social Meaning of Art: Implications for Art Education," 1985), in publications (Wangboje, "Cultural Identity and Realization Through the Arts", 1985) and in private correspondence and conversations (Baraka, a response to my letter, 1984). Evelyn Hatcher extends the challenge further by suggesting a new term "ethnoesthetics" as a systematic study of the arts of cultures. In a lecture at Kenyon College, Johnetta Cole, anthropologist and President of Spellman College, addressed such reconstructions as "corrective scholarship".

A review of the literature on artists suggests that the observation of living artists and their objects can provide a significant opportunity for bridging two disciplines: art and anthropology. The cultural backgrounds of the individuals within this study, the recognition of what is equivalent to aesthetics, and the inclusion of the artist's value and view of the object, is vital to the study of art, cross-cultural. This study implements a framework that enables the observer - an emerging artist (see resume, viii) - to observe her peers and classify their objects within a collaborative spirit of endorsement and mutual respect.

The third need is to focus on the vocabulary and language that is used to identify and classify artists and their objects, cross-culturally. A preliminary investigation of the theoretical history of both art and anthropology by this researcher reveals that in the
literature of these two disciplines there is some similarity in
language and interpretations of artists and objects. Yet, art and
anthropology have limited data that is written by informed observers
who are either members of the community of artists or members of the
cultures that produce the artists. This study is committed to the
usage of vocabulary and language that is as "neutral" as possible in
order to provide an academic extension of good will to informed
observers of the culture of origin as well as to the different
cultures that may be a part of the migration pattern of the artist
and his objects. Through direct contact with both the artist and
other informed interpreters within a culture, this study
investigates the practicality of such a linkage and how extensively
it exists, today.

Scope and Limitations of the Study

1. The study is limited to six artists who have migrated to the
United States and continue to represent cultures from their
cultures of origin.

2. The study is limited to artists-as-makers who fulfill the
criteria listed in the Identification of Cultural Competence (see pg. 10).

3. The study is limited to a qualitative theoretical framework
that implements ethnographic research methods based on theories
from cultural anthropology.

4. The study is limited to data gathered from instruments
designed specifically for this purpose; additional information
will be obtained from journals maintained by the researcher or
participation/observation sessions, library searches, media
documentation (news reviews, TV coverage) and examples of
objects (originals as well as replicas).

5. The study is limited to data on the artists and the objects
that are classified within one or more levels of the cultural
segment of their culture of origin/migration and the UBC
classification system.
Summary

This study of artists and their artifacts provides (1) a view of the artist as an individual within a global community, and (2) a framework for inquiry into those values that are maintained by members of the culture. While the power of the interpreter may be a real influence on the support an artist receives within a society, this study investigates the artist's view of this influence in order for the researcher to discover any relationship between what the artist says about an object, what the interpreter says and where the object is presently located and valued within the culture and society.

At this point, it is important to define anthropology and the relevant divisions as it relates to this study. After reviewing several, I have found the following to be the closest to my own:

Anthropology—the study of human beings in the broadest possible context, including the biological and cultural past, recent social and cultural diversity, and the relations of all aspects of human life to each other (Nanda, 1987).

Cultural Anthropology—the study of human behavior that is learned, rather than genetically transmitted, and that is typical of a particular human group. These learned and shared kinds of human behavior (including the material results of this behavior) are called culture (Nanda, 1984).

Aesthetic Anthropology—a sub-discipline of cultural anthropology; it focuses on neutralizing the interpretations of the observer by focusing on the common observable properties of objects and the patterns of behavior of artists based on the terms expressed by the viewing or producing culture, implicitly and explicitly (Maquet, 1986).
Further, it is necessary to have an initial understanding of what is meant by the terms culture, ethnography, and ethnology.

Culture (general)—the learned and shared kinds of behavior that make up the major instrument of human adaptation...(particular)—the way of life characteristic of a particular human society (Nanda, 1984).

Ethnography—the major research tool of cultural anthropology; includes both fieldwork among people in society and the written results of fieldwork (Nanda, 1984).

Ethnology—the study of culture, including the comparison of cultures and theoretical interpretations (Hatcher, 1985).
Chapter I - Notes

1. I found it necessary to pin-point a specific period of time in order to further compare conclusions on the makers within this study. I chose 1955-1988 and the literature written during this period because of the multiple social changes that impacted upon the cultures of origin of the makers. During this period, there was the cultural revolution in China and several political revolutions within the African continent and among its people within the New World.

Also, it is important to define here the meaning of activity:

any similar process (as searching, desiring, learning or writing) that actually or potentially involves mental function; an educational procedure designed to stimulate learning by firsthand experience or observation, experiment, inquiry and discussion.

2. After reviewing the ENCYCLOPEDIA OF EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH (Mitzel, 1982), the discussion about the humanities and sciences include the training and career goals of the professionals of each discipline. The ability to write and interpret data is a major responsibility for writers.


4. The term "comfortable" is one of the criteria for identifying artists who are exemplars of their culture because it was necessary to select artists who had eliminated any ambivalence regarding their heritage and its importance to the qualities of the objects (see the listing within the Appendix).

5. The work of art historians, such as Douglas Fraser, pay attention to the formal elements of an object, with very little data on the artist or maker. Too often the information gained is either historical conjecture or unendorsed interpretations by the historian.
6. Artist is defined for the purpose of this study as one within a society who is a craft man or woman who considers the aesthetic effect in addition to, or instead of, the uses of the product. Also, the artist is capable of participating in one or more of the levels that have been identified by Maquet (1971). While the artist is a maker, a maker may not define him or herself as an artist. Therefore the artists selected for this study identify themselves as both makers and artists.

7. This is based on the triangulation theory (Denzin, 1970) I presented at the Central State Anthropological Association Meeting, Spring, 1987. It becomes very important that the artist is involved in the language that is used by the interpreter in order to understand the objects. Additionally, during preliminary interviews with the six artists, they revealed that their contributions about their objects was a new approach and they would be delighted to participate in the interpretation.

8. The selection of the Maquet model is based on its recognition by both theorists in art (Schwadron, 1975; Messenger, 1984, Spencer, 1985) and anthropology (Fields, 1982; Hatcher, 1985; Cole, 1988). The use of the UBC System is a personal choice based on a visit in 1984 to the Museum in Vancouver. Prior to that visit, I was searching a classification that provided information on an unilateral structure of value rather than a hierarchical one. The use of "primitive" art as a classification of objects was a certain eliminator of a potential system (e.g., Haselberger, 1961; Herskovits, 1948; Armstrong, 1981). The UBC system was linguistically and physically accessible, which is a significant focus within this study.


11. This tradition is confirmed by the separation of art history and aesthetics as separate disciplines from studio and art education.

12. Examples of films on artists include "Paul Robeson; Tribute to An Artist" or "Spirit Catcher: The Art of Bettye Saar". There are many documentaries on artists such as Jackson Pollock, and Raur Shankar of India. These films depict the behavior of artist during the process of creating as well as during public display (exhibiting or performing).
13. In 1986, the JOURNAL OF ART AND DESIGN dedicated its fifth volume to the International Society for Education through the Arts (INSEA). There were several authors (Irein Wangboje, Nick Stanley, Grahame Chalmers) who emphasize the importance of understanding the values of art within the cultures to be studied. The artist, is also recognized as a carrier of those values.

14. In the investigation of terms used by Jacques Maquet (representing cultural anthropology) and Ralph Smith (representing art education), I concluded that both scholars were using the same terminology but in ways that supported their own theoretical view of dualism (Smith) or triangulation (Maquet). Understanding the reality of the theorists is essential to understanding their interpretation of other cultures' reality.
The Theoretical Development of an Interdisciplinary Model

The focus of this study is on the interpretations of the makers as the primary source of information on their objects. The rationale for this focus is based on the premise that the maker art reflects his or her personal, independent standards rather than those determined by societal networks and collective standards. The theoretical model is based on two specific areas of study: anthropology and art education (see pages 37-41). Emphasis is also on the humanistic subdisciplines of both areas (such as aesthetic anthropology is a subdiscipline of cultural anthropology).

Additionally, for the purpose of this study, I refer to the triangulational view I propose based on Jacques Maquet's studies of the visual arts. Maquet's contributions to aesthetic anthropology are similar to those found within "qualitative anthropology" (Mills, 1957), "holistic anthropology" and "ethnoesthetics" (Hatcher, 1985). He is able to develop a structure that recognizes the objects from the perspective of the culture of the maker. The use of a vocabulary that is common to aesthetics also places his work on the arts respectfully with the educator, John Dewey, and the anthropologist Clifford Geertz. Maquet continuously recognizes an
aesthetic experience that includes the object, the viewer/producer and the world/reality of the producing or viewing society. This recognition leads to a triadic view of objects instead of a dyadic one.

My study recognizes that there are three significant viewing positions within the visual arts and I am attempting to determine whether these positions are reliable within the performing arts. I also recognize that there are two observation positions that are possibly transferrable from the visual to the performing arts. One position focuses on the artistic and the other is anthropological. The aesthetic focus is on the triadic relationships; the anthropological focuses on the object as a product of varied levels or segments of a society or a specific culture within a society, as illustrated by Figure 1. Maquet discusses the importance of viewing the object from the point of the viewer (A) to the object (B) within the particular culture (C). The viewer may be considered the original maker or one who is an appreciator (e.g., another maker, a patron or a critic). The object is the original object. It is not a slide, poster, film or replica of the original. The culture may be the culture of origin of either the maker or the object. Or it may be the culture of migration. The value of the object is determined by what is considered reality by either culture and the choice of criteria is determined by the viewer. The informed viewer is one who is cognizant of both value systems and is willing to publicly recognize the interpretations and the criteria.
The Triadic Relationship (Clark, 1987)
from Jacques Maquet’s work in
Aesthetic Anthropology
1979

Figure 1
By recognizing this interrelationship between these three points, students and the general art public are better equipped with information that can assist in their intelligent response to an object, whether it is from their own culture or someone else's.

**Linking Anthropology and the Arts Via An Interdisciplinary Model**

Multi-cultural studies within a specific society and cross-cultural studies between specific makers and specific objects is an important area for further research. The contribution of qualitative orientation and anthropological methods are essential to the development of instruments and interpretation of those techniques is crucial to such research. For example, there is a need for an anthropological viewpoint in art education. The historical information in my paper, "AN ANTHROPOLOGICAL METHOD IN ART EDUCATION CURRICULUM PLANNING" (Spring, 1987), states that there is a significant need to include the theories of anthropology within Efland's study on linkages among philosopxic, aesthetic, psychological, sociological and educational viewpoints (1983).6 By its inclusion, it becomes evident that anthropology has an importance within art education that could provide content for a model of teaching as well as for curriculum planning.

Further research also suggests that the need for anthropological methods and frameworks is already the concern for art educators throughout the academic community, internationally. In 1985, the International Society for Education through Art (INSEA) had as its congress theme, MANY CULTURES, MANY ARTS. Representatives from different countries presented papers that
identified the need for cross-cultural understanding through art and the need for methods that included representation of cultures as contributors to that understanding. In the Introduction of the 1985 special edition of the JOURNAL OF ART AND DESIGN EDUCATION, devoted to papers from this congress, Thistlewood (United Kingdom) writes about art—"while not being the whole of any particular cultural body—is nevertheless its heart and its face, for it nurtures its profoundest ideals and is their most expressive countenance." He continues:

Art may be deeply embedded in a culture; but a culture is the summation of a way of life, including economical, philosophic, social, moral, religious and indeed all other heritable influences (p. 10).

He also states that "the practice of comparing the art of Western children and that of non-Western, mature practitioners as belonging to a single field of enquiry" is erroneous and is due to Western requirement to demonstrate intrinsic value.

The concept of a widespread, informed participation in creative art-making by the mature population is missing in Western societies; and there is an unavoidable temptation to annex as examples those societies in which it is present (p. 8).

Thistlewood explains that this is the reason why Western early learning and the art of so-called "primitive" societies are still theoretically linked, even when many of the original premises have been discredited. Whereas a hundred years ago it was thought that 'primitive' art was evidence of 'early learning' in an inevitable process of civilization, it now offers a model he calls "of integration for disintegrated cultures to aspire to". He cautions, however, that "sound practice carries the dual obligation to know
thoroughly one's own culture while being sensitive to those of others." (p. 10)

By selecting this theme, MANY CULTURES, MANY ARTS, INSEA chose to debate the necessary pluralism which would encourage diversity in a manner that would symbolize national or regional identity and self-esteem. The president in 1985, was Marie-Francoise Chavanne, whose Opening Address focused on man's ability to belong to humanity within both his universality and his individuality. She called the need for cultures to defend their cultural identities "a necessary revolution".

Chavanne's recognition of this rebellion however is not supported within the classroom because of a variety of factors; one being the "ill-preparation of teachers to respond to diversity." For example, a student who identifies with another cultural foundation will hesitate to offer his knowledge about his way of life and his background if there is an atmosphere of resistance, consciously or unconsciously, generated by the teacher or members of the class. Chavanne suggests that students should be allowed to accept responsibility over their own choices of whether their cultural inclusion will include sentiment about their culture of origin or whether they will focus on establishing a new culture built on new values. On a global level, the cultural policy of INSEA and UNESCO continue to affirm the need for "freedom of identification with cultural ideals, and to encourage participation in cultural life."

A current World Council Member, Solomon Irein Wangboje (Nigeria) identifies specific approaches to "opening the way for a
new understanding and respect for the diverse cultures of the world." In "Cultural Identity and Realization Through the Arts", he defines culture as "the totality of the way of life evolved by a people in its attempts to meet the challenges of living in its environment". He continues:

This environment is influenced by the social, political, economic, aesthetic and religious norms and modes of organizations which together distinguish one group from another (p. 23).

This does not appear to be very different from the definition by Tylor (1871), but according to Wangboje, the difference is due to the need for people of today to meet challenges of adaptation, selection and constant changes due to dependence on technological development and application. The problem of identity, globally, is a major concern; without one, "man continues to seek different ways to satisfy our deep perennial hunger for some kind of positive self-image or identity, and therefore some kind of meaning or order, in an otherwise largely meaningless and confused existence. Wangboje states strongly the responsibility of art educators:

It is our duty as members of the human family, particularly in our capacity as artists and art educators, to assist in this search for a new balance through the medium of art (p. 24).

How artists contribute to this search is also the subject of his paper. While recognizing the many efforts being made to unify the globe (i.e. technology, the International Monetary Fund, the various segments of the United Nations, INSEA), it is important to recognize the problems that also are a part of efforts toward unity so that individual cultures are not "stifled". He states:
It is a fact of history that the countries or nations of the developed economies, by virtue of their technological advancement, material prosperity and military might have often set the standards of behavior, as well as the values that shall be held most dearly, in other cultures of the world as well. As a result of this cultural imperialism, the smaller (and usually weaker) cultures have always had to adjust to the standards and the values of the developed nations in order to survive. Because of having to survive through adaptation, the smaller nations of the world are in real danger of losing their cultural identities, or submerging them within the identities of the more dominant cultures, thereby initiating a trend of cultural development which is as threatening as it is undesirable (p. 26).

Wangboje encourages "unity in diversity rather than unity in conformity". He uses the cross-cultural phenomena of festivals as an example of cultures that perpetuate their cultural sensibility and define cultural identity through techniques, materials, symbols and locations. He uses The Negro Festival (Dakar, 1966), the Algiers Festival of Negro Arts (1969) and the Second World Black and African Festival of Arts and Culture, FESTAC (Lagos: 1977) as examples of countries that have recognized the context of festivals as some of the most potent instruments for defining and reinforcing cultural identity. The cultures of Asia, South America and Caribbean Islands have long recognized the festival for these purposes and have also subsidized festivals as an important forum for the performing arts. In Abraham's, "The Language of Festivals: Celebrating the Economy (1983)", the author defines festivals as transitory celebratory phenomena for the seasonal rituals of cultures. Further, he states:
They epitomize not only the seasonal passage but the history of the culture, a history spelled out in terms native to the group and appropriate to the place and the season. Today, these objects, these carefully stylized products arising out of the work of the community, are collected and put on the wall or in Plexiglas display cases. We call them pretty, striking, interesting, even beautiful, thus translating their spirit into our Western aesthetic notions. (p. 26)

Such an appreciation cannot, however, overlook the importance of the festival to the various segments of the culture of origin, whether economically, politically or aesthetically motivated.

While Wangboje recognizes the responsibility of artists and art educators to assist in valuing each culture, he is also aware that the confidence of a culture remains the responsibility of the people to "rediscover and document forgotten strengths, neglected ideas and abandoned processes, and use these to tackle the challenges of living in a modern world".

Sociologist, Nick Stanley (United Kingdom) specifies the responsibilities of multicultural education to the promotion of mutual understanding between cultures. He states:

Multicultural education ought to ensure not only that all students acquire academic knowledge of the other cultures but also that they learn to interact successfully in more than one cultural milieu. It must not be simply education about multiple cultures, but also education in multiple cultures (p. 173).

To "think multiculturally" is very different from what is taught in schools, today. To study another culture's aesthetic or artistic segment, in-depth, and to compare it with other groups is possible, but it will require a "conversion". Stanley suggests that anthropology can provide some of the direction toward such frameworks, if done judiciously. He recognizes the shortcomings
within and without anthropology and deliberates on its history that is quite similar to that stated within this paper earlier. By recognizing anthropology's tendency to create "cult heroes", such as Geertz, it becomes necessary to explore beyond the interpretations of promoters of previously colonial societies. Instead, it becomes crucial that the cultural nationalists of those societies are identified and heard. Allison (United Kingdom) has identified three areas where the move toward plurality or "eclecticism" has provided positive results: (1) in the provision of resource materials, (2) in the accessibility of relevant knowledge and (3) in the organization of proper responses. But Stanley recognizes this movement as merely "stage one".

In identifying an anthropological model, there are also additional problems. How to apply a model that does not further encourage ethnocentric sentiment is not an easy task. Geertz identifies this problem when he states:

[A universal sense of beauty] does not seem in my experience to enable people to respond to exotic arts with more than an ethnocentric sentimentalism in the absence of knowledge of what those arts are about or an understanding of the culture from which they come...most people, I am convinced see African sculpture as Bush Picasso and hear Javanese music as noisy Debussy (Local Knowledge, p. 119).

In other words, culture contact may not always result in breaking down stereotypes. It may refuel previously little developed social antagonisms by providing detailed knowledge about practices and beliefs that are then rejected even more vehemently. Teachers are aware that introducing art from other cultures risks heightening the likelihood of making that art appear exotic and so reinforcing cultural "xenophobia" in their pupils. Stanley, like Chavanne,
recognizes that asking students of other cultures to contribute to
the knowledge about their origins is risky and that the information
obtained by students who are receiving this information may
recognize the inequity of how cultures are treated and regarded in
most settings. Therefore the use of anthropology and ethnography is
risky if its usage is considered as a vehicle for "justification for
imperialist racism." The importance of recognizing the people from
the culture as primary authorities is indeed significant because
they are the ones with information about the culture,
generationally. While others can indeed contribute to the view of a
particular culture, it is necessary that such a view is not a
primary one. The fusion of the two views, however, is possible and
Stanley defines this as "double fitting". This may include
qualities or views of a culture that are likeable as well as those
that are not liked by the viewer. This also may include imbalances
between what is seen and what is actually happening; such
disjunctures can be remedied if multi-views are invited as equal
contributors. Positioning and negotiation are possibly greater
approaches to obtaining anthropological information about cultures
than the previous approaches that tend towards exclusion.

**Divisions of Knowledge as Contributors to an Interdisciplinary Model**

**The Humanities**

The humanities are the areas of scholarship that provide the
theoretical grounding of this study because of their commitment to
literary and philosophical principles that help explain the
activities and production of human beings. This approach is different from a scientific one, particularly the social sciences, because the humanities focus on the quality of life, the qualitative aspects of human beings. The arts, one of the humanities, involve a search for these qualities. The humanities collectively concentrate on explaining, defining and classifying human beings who are concerned with remembering the past and projecting into the future. The past is remembered through history while the future is projected through art.³

This study also emphasizes the qualitative rather than quantitative aspects of data accumulated. This distinction is an important issue within this study because the particularities of individual artists and their work is different than generalized approaches to explaining the artist and his work within a society.⁴

**Anthropology**

Two of the four major branches of anthropology have contributed to this study: archaeology and cultural anthropology.⁵ Archaeology is important because it utilizes the expertise of contemporary makers in understanding the techniques of traditional production of objects. For example, in the article, "Experimental Archaeology: The Attribute List in Ceramic Analysis" (Tidwell, 1986), the project includes an artist as a major contributor to the findings of the archaeologists who were investigating the techniques of clay and the natural minerals within the clay found at Gould's Mound in Rhode Island. Only one with experience in making could provide that kind of information.
Cultural anthropology is the major contributor to this study because it contributes historical and theoretical frameworks from sub-disciplines (e.g., aesthetic anthropology) and it has contributed to other areas of study such as museum and art education that influence makers.

Art Education

This study also focuses on those aspects of art education that involve studio production and aesthetics. Studio—the environment where the artist makes, researches, teaches, contemplates and studies artifacts—is the Western concept of the maker within his environment that is the model of this study. It is necessary, however, to recognize that many of these activities, such as teaching, may take place in environments other than in the artist’s studio.

Aesthetics is significant within this study because it is an area of concern within Maquet’s work in aesthetic anthropology:

Throughout his writings, particularly those experiences within his book THE AESTHETIC EXPERIENCE (1986), he reminds the reader that responding to an object is a personal one and is based on the needs, values and beliefs of the culture.

The work of Eugene Kaelin (1968) also addresses the concern for including the artist within the viewer’s own perception of an aesthetic response:

Aesthetic categories, when they work, serve to make explicitly the implicit ordering of the artwork’s context—this includes the artist’s ordering and any which succeed in this trick are valid for that experience (from Barkan’s, GUIDELINES: CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT FOR AESTHETIC EDUCATION, 1970).
Art educator, Edmund Feldman is also sensitive to the contributions of artists as makers and attempts to recognize the role of makers within other cultures. In THE ARTIST (1982), he states:

> When we encounter an artist today, he or she is likely to be a modern incarnation of one of the historic types described herein—or if not a reincarnation, then a hybrid of several of them. Even among practitioners of new art forms—photography, cinema, television and industrial design—we can recognize the persistence of old, well-established types. (pg. 221)

Some art educators support the need for knowledge that defines art consisting of makers-as-artists and objects-as-artifacts. Frederick Spratt (1987) reminds us of the concepts and skills uniquely experienced within art production which is just one of the activities that happen within the studio. Identifying the artist and object separately, collectively, and interdependently can be facilitated by using the three-level divisions within Maquet's aesthetic segment of a cultural system. By collecting ethnographic data, such as journal notes, recordings, and photographs, it is possible to date and classify artistic activities and objects according to his three levels. All of this information is valuable to the viewer, appreciator or student because it provides directions for further independent inquiry about a particular maker, other objects or other makers within a culture. Through the comparative method of similar activities and objects of artists, it is possible to identify similarities among artists from different cultures.

Finally, it is necessary to recognize the work of social scientists because makers belong to groups. A sociological view of makers is also important in order to compare their artistic
activity. However, because of societal networks such as the distribution of limited resources, makers must determine how much participation and when withdrawal from groups is appropriate in order to make objects.

The case for the social sciences and the arts ranges from inquiries within the psychological motives of makers and audiences as well as research on varied definitions of support. It is necessary to look at the social bonds that are strengthened by the use of art within cultures and societies comprised of members from diverse cultures.

As expressed by Etzhorn (1982):

...at this very moment somewhere on this globe one can find examples of almost any kind of musical expression in active practice or preference by a social group. This is true within physical and visual expressions as well. There is a continued need for sociological inquiries within the visual and performing arts, particularly within post-colonized countries and oppressed cultures. Each of the makers within this study represent one or both of these categories. Research on how social events—like the Vietnam War or the Chinese Cultural Revolution—have affected our traditional view of objects and their makers is worthy of further investigation by social scientists. Perhaps the more we know about individuals who self-regulate their social behavior the less we will interpret makers as social deviants or anti-social. Through further research in sociology, psychology and political science it can be realized that makers must, out of preference and necessity, spend "non-social" periods of time that do not require involvement or immediate societal benefit.
Geertz and Dewey as Philosophical References for an Interdisciplinary Model

One of the two theorists whose writings have influenced this study is the anthropologist Clifford Geertz. Through such writings as "Art As A Cultural System" (1976), which influenced Maquet (1979), it is understandable how the arts interplay with other segments within a society yet maintain an independence within that culture. The symbolic contributions of the cultural segment are significant and Geertz emphasizes that their purpose is often far beyond the immediate interpretation that is readily available through mere visual comprehension.

The other theorist is John Dewey. According to Collin (1960) in "The Genesis of Dewey's Naturalism," Dewey describes a 'democratization' of culture as the major purpose for introducing the arts to the mass population of Western society. It is possible that Dewey recognized the difficulties of getting large groups of society to become direct viewers of art work. Therefore, through education, he saw the experience of making originals and viewing replicas as a successful substitute. The manipulation of materials becomes another vehicle for similar experiences known to the artist or maker. The connection of humans to the experience of other humans remained a central theme throughout Dewey's work.

Neither Geertz nor Dewey saw nature and humans as antithetical to one another; both found value in approaching the arts from the sciences and the arts. They are both aware of the interdependence between nature and those who live and rely on it. However, Dewey maintains a firm relationship between art and science; Geertz
reluctantly recognizes the involvement of science with its methods of understanding humans as they solve problems with nature and with one another.

It is important to note that both Geertz and Dewey struggled to discover philosophical positions worthy of public support. It is possible that this study focuses on a similar struggle among artists for the same reasons.
Chapter II - Notes

1. My triangulational view of an object developed from an investigation I presented to the Central States Anthropological Association (Spring, 1987) entitled "Aesthetic Anthropology: A Theoretical Framework for the Study of the Visual and Performing Arts, Cross-Culturally". I concluded that Jacques Maquet recognized that an informed viewer was responsible for recognizing and including the interpretation of each object from the perspective of the maker (artist), the culture (the world view and the informed viewer).

2. All three emphasize the visual (what can be seen) and the material (what the object is made from) elements within objects that are comparative. De-emphasis is placed on the language and the values that are culture-specific (although values that are similar remain a part of comparative studies).


4. It is necessary to identify individuals within a culture who make things in a certain way and for certain reasons and that they are identifiable with others within that given culture and beyond it. Granted, it is possible to identify artists who are not consciously seeking any connection with their culture of origin and their work reflects current societal expectations. However, such artists would be unlikely for this study because of its focus on cultures.

5. The American Anthropological Association classifies Anthropology within four major areas: cultural anthropology, physical anthropology, archaeology and linguistics.
CHAPTER III

DESIGN OF THE STUDY IN PRACTICE

Location of the Makers Within the Study

While this study is based on representatives from diverse cultures it is dependent on makers who live within the United States. In order to maintain a flexible record of the makers and their objects, it was necessary to adopt two research methods. For the observation of artists, ethnographic methods were used. For maintaining information on the location of their objects, the University British Columbia documentation method was used. By combining the data from both, the results produced a synthesized ethnological method that has the potential for further inquiries.

The Ethnographic Method

Techniques of Observation

The use of participant-observation was the major ethnographic approach to reporting in this study. Historically, it has been the primary source of information-gathering in anthropology since the writings of Franz Boas. According to Kaplan in THE CONDUCT OF INQUIRY (1964), its use has also been adopted by other social-oriented fields of inquiry particularly within psychology, sociology and education. The ethnographic approach allows the
researcher on-going participation and observation of makers as they live and produce while maintaining membership within communities that may influence their objects.

The data in this study was gathered primarily from interviews and observations (see Appendix, pages 183-260). These activities required hours of field work with the individual artists, their students, colleagues and families. When appropriate, letters and telephone conversations were used as data. Also, information gathered from each observation entry was classified within one of the three levels Maquet classifies as ideational, societal or production.

The following is a listing of specific activities used in order to gather information from each maker:

One - After the final observations, I interpreted the information by analyzing the data from my notes taken during and after the sessions and classified it within the Model.

Two - I presented the data to each maker in order to find out whether my interpretations were either consistent or inconsistent with the maker.

Three - The makers endorsed the written interpretation or added their views.

Four - I wrote a brief on the results in order to design an ethnomology of the makers.

Five - Since each maker had a large collection of objects I selected two of five objects from each maker to be used according to the UBC Documentation Method (depending on how much data was available on the object).

Six - Information on the objects would also indicate the use of Maquet’s model for reporting.

Each, comprises the "Individual Studies on the Makers and Selected Objects" (see Chapter V).
The Documentation Method

Classifying the Objects (Appendix I)

The Museum of Anthropology at the University of British Columbia has devised a classification and storage system that is adaptable to the needs of this study. The documentation system (Ames, 1976) which borrows from Murdock's Ethnographic Atlas (1981) consists of a grid with two intersecting dimensions: one refers to the culture; the other refers to the object. According to Murdock's Atlas, the world is divided into six regions, ten areas and sixty smaller areas. These areas include the 1,264 known cultures throughout the world. The use of the Murdock's divisions is to visually identify the culture of origin and its migration pattern. Identification of an object, from its place of origin to its present location (as of January, 1988) would be possible by tracing its migration pattern. By doing so, it would be possible to identify which cultures influenced or were influenced by the maker. Through discussions with the maker and various owners, verification of such influence would be sought on five objects per maker, initially. Based on how much data was gathered, two would be selected for the final report.

According to the UBC classification system, visual objects generally fit into the categories "representations (6) and media of exchange (11)". Performance objects were often classified as "representations" (6), models (13)—works in progress—or media of exchange (11). "Representatives" for a visual object were different than for a performance object. "Models" for performance objects
meant it was a "work-in-progress" and was not finished according to the maker (an equivalent would be like sketches to visual makers). "Media of exchange" was the most significant category.

It is also important to note that customarily performing artists make visual objects that accompany the performance. Likewise, it is customary for visual artists to participate in an event—a performance—that enhances the visual objects. The instrument, Classification of Artifacts is a method of collecting and reporting data that synthesizes the principles of either an event or an object. By focusing on the specific information, it is possible to compare visual and performing art objects.
The use of the UBC Classification system provides this study with fourteen categories to place the objects:

1. dress and adornment  
2. masks
3. music and noisemakers  
4. toys and games
5. mortuary objects  
6. representations
7. instruments and utensils  
8. containers
9. furnishings and architectural features  
10. transportation
11. media of exchange  
12. records (and objects used to keep them)
13. models  
14. miscellaneous

Figure 2
The Maquet Framework

Both, the ethnographic and documentation methods accommodated the needs within the framework of this study towards developing an ethnological study of makers and their objects. By identifying the artist within the Model for a Cultural System and its Aesthetic Segment (Figure 3) it is possible to observe the influence of the artist throughout different systems and institutions within a culture and under what conditions. By identifying the object according to its previous and current classification within a specific culture, it is possible to follow its current and previous level within the aesthetic segment of its culture of origin and migration.

It is appropriate to recognize the weaknesses within the Maquet's model. As his critics have pointed out (Phillips, 1985; Kobak, 1985) Maquet's language is often "elephantine" and contributes to an already "stumbling jargon". His Model leaves many gaps, also within the categories of each level as well as within the levels. For example, for the purpose of this study, I found the lack of a societal network that addressed religious or educational agencies somewhat awkward. Also, it was clear that level one (productive systems) did not address the needs of the performing arts. It was necessary, therefore, to modify and substitute categories and materials according to individual makers and objects. It was this flexibility that made the Model useful and so appealing to Fields (1982), Schwadron (1975) and to me. Other instruments that were used throughout the study can be found in the Appendix I.
They include:

- the classification of artifacts (the individual object)
- artists I-observation format
- artists II-observation format
- consent for participating in social and behavioral research
- evaluation-criteria for research papers
MODEL FOR A CULTURAL SYSTEM AND ITS AESTHETIC SEGMENT

Maquet/79

Level Three:
IDEATIONAL CONFIGURATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cognitive oriented</th>
<th>Action oriented</th>
<th>Communications</th>
<th>AESTHETICS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>psychology</td>
<td>technology</td>
<td>alphabet grammar</td>
<td>systems of form/styles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mythology</td>
<td></td>
<td>vocabulary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>physics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ethics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Level Two:
SOCIAL NETWORKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kinship</th>
<th>Inequality</th>
<th>Government</th>
<th>Economics</th>
<th>Art</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>family</td>
<td>castes</td>
<td>rulers</td>
<td>exchange</td>
<td>market</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lineage</td>
<td>classes</td>
<td>subjects</td>
<td>market</td>
<td>galleries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dynasty</td>
<td>bour</td>
<td>executives</td>
<td>transfers</td>
<td>schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>geosis</td>
<td>nobility</td>
<td>legislative</td>
<td>museums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>guilds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>academies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>journals</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Level One:
PRODUCTIVE SYSTEMS

Techniques:

- hunting/gathering
- agriculture
- cattle breeding
- mining
- industry

- carving/engraving
- smelting/steel
- steel beams
- acrylic
- multiples

Environmental:

- forest
- desert
- savanna
- ores
- coal
- oil

- soapstone
- marble
- jade

Figure 3
To answer the objectives of the Study in Chapter I, Question A, observations were made of the activities of the six makers who represent different periods of their professional maturity (i.e., student, emerging artist, master). A minimum of five visits with each artist, included gathering data with a prepared packet of instruments (Appendix I) as well as time for observations and interviews. Each interpretation by the researcher was reviewed and endorsed as a satisfactory interpretation by each artist before it is made public. Additionally, interpretations by critics and historians regarding objects were compared with the artist's own interpretations. Finally, all accumulated data was classified according to its relevance to one or more of the three levels identified in the aesthetic segment of the Maquet Model and the classification system used by the Museum of Anthropology, University of British Columbia.

Answering question B also required implementation of the Maquet Model and the U.B.C. Documentation System. Objects from each artist were classified according to both systems. Where the objects were located, how they got there and how they were valued was reviewed by the artist and others who either collected, taught or made art objects. A classification form (Appendix I) was kept on each object and the cards were classified according to the two models. Through the efforts of a longitudinal study, an attempt was made to maintain a record of the migration patterns of at least five objects per artist. This record was also reviewed by the artists.

Question C was answered by identifying the similarities and differences between the artists and comparing them with one another. Results of the study determined whether a classification system can be
a source of ethnological information in identifying the migration patterns of artists and their objects. Migration is defined to include both the flow or contact between cultures as well as the contact between segments within the same culture. Finally, this study determined whether such a system as the Maquet Model can be taught as a framework for further inquiry by students, policy-makers and scholars.

As indicated by Figure 3, Maquet has divided the cultural system into three levels (ideational configuration, societal network, productive systems) and in several segments that include the spiritual and material elements within a culture. This model serves as the foundation for classification and interpretation of data with the full understanding that fieldwork might require additional categories, particularly within the productive systems. Also, recognizing that the model was designed by Maquet to primarily focus on the visual arts, it will be necessary to make adaptations in order to include the performing artists.

Figure 4 is the Aesthetic Segment excerpted from the Maquet Model. As researcher, it is important to identify what is exclusively within the aesthetic segment, what is not, and what is meant by each level (interpretations).
Excerpted from Maquet/79

Level Three:
IDEATIONAL CONFIGURATION

Level Two:
SOCIAL NETWORKS

Art
market
galleries
schools
museums
guilds
academies
journals

Level One:
PRODUCTIVE SYSTEMS

Techniques:
hunting/gathering
agriculture
cattle breeding
mining
industry
carving/engraving
smelting/steel
steel beams
acrylic
multiples

Environmental:
forest
desert
savanna
ores
coal
oil
soapstone
marble
jade

Interpreted by King/88

All cultures have identified forms and styles that depict systems of form/styles their own world view through objects.

While all cultures do not categorize objects within these specific art agencies, there is an equivalent network.

All cultures have methods for making objects. Within the environments, there are also resources that have been historically or currently used by some of the makers. Maquet has suggested possible techniques and natural resources.

Figure 4
Chapter III - Notes

1. The selection of makers was based on the cultural competence criteria listed in Chapter III. I found it necessary to substitute some of the original makers because of my limited funding support and observation time. Fortunately each of the out-of-Columbus makers agreed to "advise-as-needed". Additionally, the makers who became a part of the study were exemplary within their areas, they were also within close proximity to my home.

2. There are several methods used in ethnographic research such as proxemics, life histories, and participant-observations. I chose participant-observation as my major method because the focus of the study is to identify what is needed by the interpreter to be considered competent. Also, it provided a level of trust between me and the maker that focussed on a common interest in making; this, I believe, minimized the distance between me as the reporter and the maker as informant.
Gathering Data Via Fieldwork

Anthropological fieldwork is a process of immersing oneself in a culture or a segment of it. According to Powdernaker (1966), the anthropologist is one who surrounds himself with the people as well as the circumstances of the culture. Historically, this immersion required anthropologists to remain a part of the community for long periods of time. These communities were often unfamiliar to the researcher and required preliminary instructions in survival as well as interpretation (e.g. language). This preliminary training is part of the methods in doing fieldwork.

Anthropologists like Boas, Mead, Herskovits, Hoebel and Hatcher are examples of those who spent months immersed within cultures. Following the tradition of cultural relativists, they collected materials that might have some significance to future reports. There is documentation, however, which indicates that the time in the field was often quite limited. Additionally, data that was gathered was rarely classified while in the field or categorized for scholarly documentation. Reports, such as Margaret Mead's on Samoa, are now being challenged (Freeman:1985) because of allegedly questionable methods of gathering data, her selection of informants and the interpretations of the data. It appears, then, that the traditional
methods of immersion are worthy of closer investigation and a
different interpretation.

Fieldwork may use several techniques for gathering data.
Anthropologists have specified how to collect data from the field.
Rosalie Wax (1971) states:

There is the stage of initiation; there is the
stage after involvement of a variety of
relationships, the fieldworker is able to
concentrate on and do his fieldwork; there is the
post-field stage, when the fieldworker finishes
his report and tries to get back in step with, or
reattach himself to his own people(16).

Anthropologists frequently use the technique of participation-
observation. This technique requires a specific type of immersion
because the researcher becomes a part of the circumstances of the
members she is studying. Collecting materials in the field has been
vital to the work of anthropologists. Franz Boas, the founder of the
American Historical School and promoter of cultural relativity, was
the most eminent of collectors. According to Wax:

Boas insisted that if anthropologists looked at
other cultures with the concepts, categories and
biases of Western culture, they would see nothing
but distortion. What they had to do instead was
collect vast quantities of entirely reliable
materials in the native language. This point was
also raised by Maine in 1861 and, subsequently by
the French 'sociologists' Durkheim and Levy-
Bruhl."

Ironically, endorsement of the data by informants or members of the
community being studied is not a method of traditional data
gathering. For the methodology purist, the collaboration of the
informant and the researcher might be considered "convergent
validation". Yet, such an approach is being used and respected by
such anthropologists as Clifton (1983) and Messenger (1983).
Furthermore, the issue of preparation for fieldwork is significantly important to researchers such as Kopytoff (1982) and Pandian (1985). In my paper to the Central States Anthropological Association (Spring, 1987), I described the value of the "triangulational approach" to understanding objects which required the endorsement of interpretations by the maker. The inclusion of the artist would require different methods of and purposes for collecting data beyond the customary one-way interpretation and random collecting of objects traditionally done by researcher.

After proposing several approaches to fieldwork there were some techniques that were more effective than others. As an informed observer (Clark, 1987) I had access to data that might go unnoticed by one who is not a maker. Due to extensive training in movement and various techniques of visual production, I could identify patterns of behavior of individual makers, especially when it was time to inquire and when it was not. For example, on one occasion one of the artists was very quiet before a performance and appeared aloof even though there were well-wishers insisting on speaking to her and "paying their respects". Later, we discussed the situation and a larger smile came over her face because I recognized her detachment even though others were not aware of her need for space and preparation for the performance. Another performing artist, however responded to pre-performance by becoming very direct and commanding. Instructions to technicians were curt and to the point. After the performance, he was once again a charming and accessible person. Prior to the performance, however he required 'quiet and
detached space' in order to process the entire performance within his head. 5

Visual object makers approached the need for process spacing differently. One, preparing for an international exhibition, was walking down the hall and nearly bumped into me without recognizing me. This was significant because as we approached his eyes were glazed by what I termed "internal preoccupation". I asked him whether he had "gone crazy, yet (a state of mind prior to an exhibition where the maker is obsessed with concern for the objects and nothing else". He responded, "yes" and we chuckled and shook our heads as we departed. This was certainly not a time to inquire about his feelings about the exhibition. Later, I did and my premonitions were confirmed. He was totally preoccupied with concern for the objects and whether they reflected his meanings. 6

I also discovered that while there were advantages there were also disadvantages to being both a fieldworker and a maker. Primarily the biggest hindrance for me was being in the appropriate state of mind while observing the makers. 7 I continuously found that the mental energy necessary for reporting and interpreting conflicted with the kind of energy I needed for making objects.

It became impossible, therefore to focus on making objects while observing the makers. Initially, I thought I could participate and observe by making objects with the artists. I found out, however that it was impossible to do both. I either had to make objects within my own studio (which I resorted to doing) and present them for 'critiques,' by them or attempt to observe makers while they made objects. Surprisingly, I had only one successful observation session
while the maker was actually working; all the others either became discussion sessions (maker-initiated) or were cancelled. I believe that the idea of having someone watch them make—whether the human or electric eye—was unnerving.8

Conclusively, the most successful method of locating objects and collecting materials was when the maker suggested locations and specific individuals who owned objects.

There were unforeseeable circumstances which also influenced the kind of data I would get. Besides cancelling planned observations, some of the artists often had schedules which required my adjusting the design of this study to situations that were not included. For example, the guest lecture sponsored by the educational institution of one artist provided an opportunity for me to observe him as a concerned host, a teacher and an administrator. Another invited me to the dismantling of his exhibition which provided a rich opportunity to see him interacting with sponsors. Another incident, however, caused a tremendous amount of anxiety for one artist regarding rumors about this study. The circumstances surrounding unfounded incidences greatly affected him and it became such a focus during our discussion that it minimized my ability to participate in useful observations. Often, I was unable to address the allegations and participate in the scheduled observation periods with him. Scheduled sessions often digressed to concern for the rumors instead, therefore I found it difficult to focus on the artist. To remedy this situation I minimized the observations and increased the use of data that had been reported by other sources on his work. To
document my interpretations, I discussed and received endorsements during the taped interview.

It was important that I also recognize my own biases. As stated by Maquet, the reality of the world that is interpreted by the observer will invariably influence the aesthetic response of the observer. Of course, I would not be an exception. My observations would be sympathetic to the makers because of my being one and choosing to identify as a maker. Also, my interpretations would focus on the activities of the makers based on my knowledge of their activities from my own past experiences. Because my experiences were positive, I interpreted the activities using language that I recalled from past experiences.  

I also recognized that my choice to interpret the makers and their objects would be influenced by my Afrocentric perspective. My purpose would be to report what I saw and tell it so that information could be used in other cultural segments, like schools, funding organizations and research institutions. Afrocentricity - unlike - ethnocentricity is not viewing the world according to the values and ways of one's own group as superior (Hatchers, 1981, 1985). Afrology is the science or study of all modalities related to people of African descent from an Afrocentric perspective. An Afrologist is a person who supports many diverse points of view provided by scholars within the cultures. He may recognize and support the work of those within the culture or he may change his perspective by altering his conditions, view of existing, or because of some external influences on the object perceived. But, the perception remains uniquely his.
Asante uses the following examples of an Afrological perspective:

For example, whereas a white communication scholar may define speech 'as an uninterrupted spoken discourse given before an audience, an Afrologist looking at the same object— a speech— would possibly derive a different definition. . a highly interrupted spoken discourse. This definition would reflect his experiences and Afrocentric point of view.

While the former may have been the intentions of colonization, this interpretation is merely one from an Eurocentric world view. According to Asante (1988) from the Afrocentric world view, overt activity manifesting African heritage was denied or suppressed by a dominating colonialists. Interestingly, however, expressions were still very African and consequently the tradition has been changing with efforts to teach these "new" eyes a different way of seeing.

As I stated, it was necessary that I recognize and understood my biases and the influences they would have on my interpretations. It was also important that I inform each maker of this realization and rely on their endorsements as a means of controlling my personal influences on the interpretations. To minimize by biases, however, was easy if the validity of this study relied on the endorsement of the makers. They would be able to determine how true my observations were to their meanings and would also be able to correct my interpretations.

Removing Rigidity from the Design of the Study

It became clear that a rigid format would serve no purpose in this study, or alleviate the inevitable culture shock (the period of adjustment) that accompanies fieldwork. As stated earlier, I found it necessary to adapt to situations that were not planned and to
adjust to incidences that occurred during the data-gathering period of this study. Telephone conversations which were not proposed became essential to obtaining information. The use of the phone emphasized information gathering and eliminated travel and scheduling concerns. If information was not immediately attainable, the maker was able to contact me later. Likewise, if other circumstances became a priority (he had to take his son to the basketball game), the call could continue later.11 Another significant determinant would be based on the kind of relationship I established with each maker. Earlier, I thought it was necessary to approach this study in a systematic manner. I found that the personalities, dispositions and 'chemistry' between each maker and me would influence how often and how close I would get to their private space, where objects were made. I mentioned earlier that my concern for my own mental fatigue limited when I thought I was in the most professional condition to observe and participate. Equally, what the maker thought of what I was doing became a major determinant. There were times I felt as if this study had been done before and that the makers expected me to behave in a certain manner. For example, I was often introduced in the classroom as "an observer"; this recognition became uncomfortable because I often found students observing me which limited my opportunities to candidly observe them. Also, one maker would leave his teaching and come over to me and explain why he did a certain activity...which limited my immediate interpretation and a later opportunity for discussion of that interpretation. On another occasion I took slides of my work to a maker who was unfamiliar with my work and I thought it important for him to assess my relationship
as a maker (see further discussion in Chapter I, regarding Cultural Competence, Number 2). Instead, he asked me to discuss my work with the entire class, which focused attention on me and made it difficult for me to return to a "shadow position" of observer. I later decided to exchange examples of my work during the interview of trust. This worked much better. I also asked the maker not to introduce me in the beginning. My focus was to observe the maker within his environment with the minimal amount of intrusion by me as an observer. This was not easy on any of us. I could better understand the interpretations of anthropologists as possibly "staged". I also became more convinced that detached interpretations done by scholars without any contact furthered the possibility for interpretations based on conjecture.

Each relationship had its own uniqueness. My relationship with some of the makers had developed over the past four years since the early designing of this study. The strongest relationships were those where situations required both of us as solvers. For example, the need for me to contact another source for clarification of a funding decision on the behalf of one maker, provided a significant development in our relationship. When I needed the assistance of another maker because of my loss of transportation, it provided an opportunity for both of us to disclose concerns for our objects as well as our futures as makers within the Columbus community.

The weakest relationships were those where distance became a problem for regular observations or where there was no genuine reason for interaction. It became impossible for me to travel to the locations of some makers because of my lack of financial support.
Without that source, one relationship became one of support (see Acknowledgements); the others outside of the Columbus area became references for specific sections of the study (see Chapter IV).

Establishing a reciprocal relationship was also helpful in assuring reliable and on-going opportunities for information. On several occasions I was able to exchange my objects for theirs. The discussion around the objects provided a wealth of information about the specific object as well as the experiences of the maker when the object was made. I was the guest choreographer for one maker and this was an exchange that provided me with bodies (his students) for my object as well as a dance and teaching experience for his students. It was an appreciated exchange. It also provided problems that needed to be solved without my focusing on him or him being concerned with my focus on him.

The weakest relationships were also those where there was no tangible exchange. I could not force my work on a maker and I could not afford to purchase any work from them. Without the "ritual of exchange", I found it difficult to talk about the objects without it sounding clinical or abstract. The "exchange" provided a congenial atmosphere as if two countries had exchanged diplomats or "hostages": in good faith and within an atmosphere of trust. This exchange is different from the accumulation of materials which is commonplace within fieldwork methods. Rather than gathering authorized or unauthorized materials, this exchange required the giving by the maker. Rather than an object purchased or commissioned by someone else as a symbol of power, wealth or influence, these objects represented time and energy that the maker used and which each had
determined the value of the object based on such personal criteria.

Adapting to the variables often required spontaneous solutions. There were other circumstances which required more time and thought. The impact of rumors on one maker required a period of decision-making beyond an immediate response. At first, I thought it might be necessary to remove the maker from the study; then, I thought it might be necessary to bring the necessary authorities into the issue. After three months, I decided that this was a golden opportunity to report the kinds of distractions and misinterpretations that were also a part of fieldwork. This revelation was further supported by the experiences of Rosalie Wax (1971), Robert A. Georges (1980), Michael O. Jones (1983), Hortense Powdermaker (1967), Bronislaw Malinowski (1944), Margaret Mead (1954) and Franz Boas (1955). During my study of Eurocentrism and its traditional patterns of influence within American scholarship, ethnographies by these anthropologists provided additional clarification of incidences and how such interferences were commonplace as part of early fieldwork.12

Admittedly, there were times when my self-realization required that I reassess my initial interpretations. My first reaction to the rejection of one maker from an exhibition was one of loyalty and certainly was reflected in my interpretation of the event. Later, I was able to recognize my disposition and also correct what I thought were clearly loyalist interpretations; this happened before I presented the information to the maker.

There were also interpretations I made that clearly reflected an afrocentric perspective. The dance objects of one maker were so full of symbols and values within the African-American experience (and I
was starved for such high level of execution of that experience) that my interpretation was far from being impartial. I recognized this and explained it to the maker as well, who graciously provided me with information that was more academic and focused on his meanings.

I was delighted to find that my study could be conducted within the Columbus area. Surprisingly, Columbus was the residence of several makers who qualified for this study. Many were affiliated with institutions of higher education, therefore they moved to Columbus to be near their place of employment. The majority had past or current contact with the New York art community; they also maintained some communication with the arts community of their culture of origin. Each was finding it difficult to gain on-going recognition and support within the Columbus area. If it were not for college employment with the institutions it would have been impossible for most of them to remain in the area. Therefore, maintaining contact out of Columbus was vital to their creative energies as well as for opportunities for financial support.

One of the problems appears to be that the Columbus arts community does not focus on its cultural diversity. Instead, it focuses on diversity among disciplines that have been defined by a western tradition of art. Additionally, what is determined within this definition of diversity is also evaluated by standards from a western view of art. It appears that objects that do not fit within these standards receive limited recognition for support. Instead, there is generally a "special category" for makers with diverse objects (e.g. black artists exhibition) or no recognition at all (e.g. no reviews of exhibitions or performances).
In spite of this discrimination, the makers continue to produce objects. Often, they were able to establish advocates who would support specific objects, but their commitment was generally short-lived. For example, one maker had three different Boards of Directors (a necessity for non-profit organizations) within one year because he was challenged over the artistic direction of his company.

I read the exchange of letters between the maker and two board members. The board members were condescending and clearly wanted to usurp the privilege of the maker to determine the direction of his company. They did not think it was necessary for him to know how much money the company had in its budget! The maker was at a disadvantage because applications for funds were due and the funding organization could not allocate without the endorsement of the Board of Directors.

The question of confidentiality became an important ethical issue because of the impact inaccurate gossip had on the data I collected from one maker. I decided to adhere to the strictest codes of confidentiality published as "Protection of the Individual as a Research Subject" (Crane and Agrosino, 1984). This included the ethnographer's duty to make and to honor promises of maintaining the anonymity of informants, to present the material as honestly and completely as possible but to bear in mind that the informants or their children and neighbors may read the ethnography someday.

By seeking the endorsement of the maker as an important part of the study, I was avoiding future embarrassments and discrediting for any of us. Also, I was minimizing the influence of conjecture and gossip on the maker's participation in the study. This is not a simple task but it is a necessity for any responsible piece of research. My own
experience with such interference made me realize the potential
detriment to makers that revealing information prematurely could
cause. It also made me aware of the potential threat unethical
practices by others could have on this study and on future work. As
most methods texts suggest, I decided to keep a copy with a reliable
security source: my attorney. 15

Adaptation of the Ethnographic Method

Ethnography includes fieldwork and the written interpretation of
the fieldwork. In order to get information anthropologists go out
into the field to observe their subjects in a natural setting. From
the results gathered, the ethnographies are written (Nanda, 1984, pg.
12). According to Chagnon’s work among non-western cultures, the
people very often do not trust the fieldworker:

In distant cultures, the anthropologist must learn
a new language or face the possibilities of missed
communications when a translator is used...The
culturally-based foundations on which people make
judgments in everyday life are removed, and the
anthropologist my easily experience bewilderment,
loneliness, alienation and vulnerability.(p. 14).

According to Nanda, there are problems when working within one’s
own culture—personal, theoretical and methodological. The question
of identity, being of the same community and guilt can present
disadvantages as well as rewards. M. N. Srinivas interprets the
advantages of observing one’s own culture as being "thrice-born":

First, we are born into our original, particular culture.
Then our second "birth" occurs when we move away from this
familiar place to a far place to do our fieldwork (temporary
migration). In this experience, we are eventually able to
understand the rules and meanings of other cultures, and the
"exotic" becomes familiar. In our third "birth", we again
turn toward our native land and find that the familiar has become exotic. We see it with new eyes. In spite of our deep emotional attachment to its ways, we are able to see it also with distance and minimal ethnocentricity. (Nanda, p. 16)

This study identifies makers as a culture—the learned and shared kinds of behavior that make up the major instrument of human adaptation (Nanda, 1984). According to Hatcher’s definition, makers would comprise a culture that extends beyond geographical or societal boundaries because of their ability to use symbols as a means of adapting to the accumulation of learned ways of behaving, whether within their culture of origin or migration (see Chapter VI for further discussion on cross-cultural communities).

This study requires the use of several ethnographic techniques. In addition to participation-observation, it is necessary to rely on one-way observations (by the researcher), recorded audio/video interviews and incidental situations. In some instances, like those experienced by Messenger in Inis Beag, Ireland (1959), the incidentals were opportunities for the observer to remain professionally dormant and to participate as a compassionate person. This was Messenger’s situation during the shipwreck off the coast of Inis Beag. It also provided an opportunity for him to create a ballad that proved to be a significant tool in his research of the behavior patterns of the villagers.

Participant-observation requires that the fieldworker live with temporarily the group being observed. There were many opportunities for me to move with makers as well as make objects, but this was not the most rewarding technique. For example when one artist had his students collect raw materials for a class study, I thought it might be helpful if I did the exercise along with them. Upon my reaching
the site I found they had already begun collecting near the river bank. Unfortunately, I was not familiar with the site or where the natural materials might be found so I ended up in another part of the site. Later I met them at the school and explained that my absence was due to my lack of experience. I was able to stay for further observations, but this time I paid attention to what others did. When given materials to work, I decided to take the materials home and integrated them into an object I was already working on in my studio. Later I showed the slides of the work to the artist. (Ode to Josephine/The Killing of Aunt Jemima).

Participation-observation in movement was easier because I was either the student or the teacher. My informed interaction with the artist allowed both of us to solve choreographic problems on-the-spot. Also we were able to see whether the results were successful, immediately. Bill had taught a series of movements to the students and had used sound that was "funky (strong, repetitive instrumental with voices)." I changed the tempo of the sound by using another song and the series of movements looked very different. He noticed how closely the new movements reminded him of a work he had seen done in Haiti. From there we talked about other movements from that culture.

Again, observations were difficult because I was often identified as an observer and so became the target of distracting attention. It is my belief that this recognition influenced the behavior of the maker and others at least part of the time. I was able to redirect their attention by either leaving the room and returning after activities were underway or by moving to another part of the room. I was able to observe one artists student without his awareness of my
being there. He was so absorbed in his work that he did not see me enter or exit.

The classes where I introduced myself were the hardest to observe because it took time for me to refocus my attention on the makers and to not be concerned with what I presented or how I presented it. Earlier observations took longer to make the adaptation. During later observations, it became easier.

While interviews were resourceful, there were often delays. I wanted to observe normal activities of the makers rather than planned situations and sometimes these situations were cancelled due to personal matters or the cancellations of others. The most reliable observations were those within the classroom. But the most resourceful ones were the incidentals. Incidentals involved talking to one artist while attending the exhibition of another. They also involved correspondences or news articles that discussed internal and public problems of the maker. The discussion about the Board Members of Shir Lee could not have been planned; nor the decision to collaborate with another maker. Both were generated from the results of the maker's decision to express a concern or assist a fellow-maker. I knew of them because I was there; no one called me to tell me of situations. I found them out by "being there." These unexpected situations were quite significant and provided spontaneous opportunities for both participation and observation.

Gathering supportive materials, however, was often like a study where pieces had to be fitted within a specific period of the artist's life. I did a great deal of digging among personal files, catalogues and bookshelves. Material research also required shifting through
the public files on each maker. There were some articles in the local newspapers but, as stated before, these makers were not supported through the media a great deal. Some data were found at the Ohio Arts Council where makers had served on funding panels or were recipients of awards. The best records were kept by the makers. The initial interview or meeting was significant because it established a pattern of behavior that would hopefully lead to mutual trust and respect. I was particularly careful to avoid overt expressions of appreciations for the maker's work or past achievements. Primarily, I concentrated on the immediate visit and followed it up with a note of thanks for the visit. This, I believed, minimized a sense of obligation on the part of the maker. Each interview required different approaches although I provided the same beginning. I presented the purpose for the study and later followed it up with a copy of the introduction letter. Makers who had been contacted during 1987 were able to watch my preparation for the general examinations along with keeping a schedule of exhibitions. They attended my exhibitions and I attended theirs; the level of trust was high among these makers.

The makers who were not in the Columbus area were the hardest to establish a workable level of trust. Their daily activities required immediate decisions and I was unable to maintain close enough contact with them to see how they or their objects were effected. Makers beyond the Columbus area, therefore, became a part of the study in an advisory capacity. Those who were included in 1988, however, had long term relationships with me as a teacher or student. They had
assisted me with "works-in-progress"; we had also assisted other makers, together.

Methodological purists anthropologists who readily dismiss the contributions of the humanities to the discipline or art educators who minimize the process of making for the substitution of quantitative measurements—might find the use of uncontrollable, unpredictable techniques acts of "convergent validation". It is to the purist that the experience of making objects is so alien or lacks equal substance with commitment to written scholarship. Play as a research technique is so foreign to this kind of academician that unexpected opportunities go devalued. It is the purist who does not recognize that incidentals within the process of production are what makes art objects. Instead of precise measurement, it becomes critical that the interpretation includes this exercise. As Alexander Alland (1983) recalls:

Play is a more general term referring to any activity that is not directly involved in survival...it provides a controlled and protected situation for environmental manipulation...there is a connection between "word play" and literature, particularly poetry. Writing may be a painful experience even for some professionals, but it is certainly also an autotelic activity, at least for those who write to express themselves. Almost no poets make a living from poetry yet they go on writing it...(p. 27)

Without this recognition of play among writers and makers, the purist is often left within the confines of a classroom, with texts, replicas and illustrations that an environment that perpetuates misleading and uninformed discussions on makers and their objects.
Implementing the Documentation Method of the University of British Columbia, Museum of Anthropology

Classifying the objects of each maker according to the UBC system was quite helpful, initially. The purpose was to focus on the objects as examples of possible acculturation—those produced for export by the descendants of colonized societies—or diffusion, the blending of cultural traits.

Examples were easy to obtain, especially since the location of the study was centrally-located. I found objects within the Columbus area as well as information on those that had migrated. Also the exchange of objects between the makers and myself provided me with long contemplation periods with specific objects.

Visual objects could be found within collectors’ homes, galleries, the studios of makers, schools, public buildings (churches, corporation headquarters, etc.). I asked each maker for examples of objects and where they thought they were located. I visited the locations and looked at them. On occasion, I was able to speak with someone who knew about the object or they provided me with viewer reactions to the objects. I maintained this information on cards for further discussion with the maker.

Performance objects also required a modified approach. The time movement objects would be available was predetermined; performances were scheduled and would not continue beyond that time. I attended many performances and was able to view some objects on different occasions. For example, I had seen the object of one maker during its "sketchy period (work-in-progress)". Two years later I saw how the object had matured; the decisions of the artist had included changes in the energy of many movements, the choices of costumes and
the ability of the dancers who were professionals and students. I had maintained data on the object since its first public viewing, and I had also listened to the maker as he groped for meaning and purpose within the content of the movement. The most recent viewing was significant and the artist was pleased with its growth. In a later discussion, he said he was interested in identifying an entire group of professional dancers to "place" the object on them.

It is important to acknowledge the use of visual objects by performance makers. Objects like costumes, properties (props) were carefully selected by each maker so that the adornments complemented the original object. The initial choices did not require input of a specialist of visual objects, although later viewing might have allowed such inclusions. Also, during this study, it seemed visual makers and movers relied on sound. While I saw some of the makers of visual objects at performances, there was not a significant amount of exchange between these two groups of makers.

**Implications for Using the Maquet Framework—Advantages and Disadvantages**

Identifying the artists according to the Maquet Framework was very useful. Each was easily identifiable within categories of the three levels. For example, most of the makers consciously include memories, techniques or symbols that were related to their culture of origin. By recognizing a consistent symbolic vocabulary, such as the use of the Grahame technique in the dances of one artist, I was able to gain information about the maker's ideological view (Level III). The observation format and the information format (see Appendix I)
were also useful in focusing on the artist as the producer of specific objects, the time period and relevant events.

Each maker had a symbolic vocabulary of visual or physical patterns and these patterns were quite often traits from the culture of origin. They were manifested primarily in content of the visual and physical objects. For example, one artist choreographed a work that depicted a piece of folklore from his culture of origin. While the technique (or execution) of the object was influenced by his western training, the story was from a real situation within his culture of origin. A visual artist depicted views of scenes that derive from within parts of his contemporary cultural community. He states that they are memories of his days in an urban environment, but they also reflect stories told to him by his mother. He also includes symbols from his culture of origin based on experiences gained in three trips to his birthplace.

The makers were exceptionally competent with the materials of their objects (Level I). For makers of visual objects who used materials from the culture of migration, some were able to secure authentic materials from the culture of origin. Makers of visual objects, often returned for visits to the culture of origin. For example, Noel returned to his culture every two or three years. He had family there and it was important for him to participate in the activities of the property holdings owned by his family. While there he also performed in local events. These were not always prepared class situations, therefore he was able to gain information from people who danced because it was "thing to do" at private gatherings. These were not tourist attractions, either; rather it was going home.
in a way that tourist or scholars rarely have privilege to participate in or observe. This kind of movement returned to his classroom as current movements as well as possibilities for new choreography. Each maker indicated varied strengths and weaknesses in understanding, implementing and succeeding within the societal networks within the aesthetic segment (Level II). All complained that the funding institutions within the aesthetic segment (e.g., Ohio Arts Council, National Endowment for the Arts, the Columbus Foundation) were insensitive to the content of their work. While some had received some financial assistance, the biggest complaint was the inconsistency of the support and the tremendous amount of energy one needed to expend in order to receive so little monetary reward.\textsuperscript{17} One artist is not a proposal writer, yet it became necessary to write a proposal in order to obtain funding. Throughout my observation period, he was concerned with maintaining rapport with his Board as well as the coordinator of the funding institution. It was difficult because he also had to maintain rapport with his dancers, students, parents, children, spouse on a daily basis. All of these people constituted some influence on the survival level of the maker. At this time the Board was questioning the direction of his artistic objects and wanted to influence that direction. The most consistent complaint was that the work was "too ethnic". Additionally it was felt by the Board members that the maker was incompetent of making artistic decisions that required such a burden on the Company's financial existence. I watched the maker struggle with the question of rapport because of the funding needs, but I also heard him struggle for control of his objects. To date, the issue
has not been resolved; it remains at the level of correspondence and indirect communication. Throughout all of this the maker had scheduled four performances and was also bringing a guest choreographer to Columbus to "place" a work on his Company.

One of the visual makers refused to participate in what he terms "the politics of the arts community". A chapter of a national organization is starting within Columbus and we were to attend two of the meetings. During one of our sessions the maker admitted hesitancy in getting involved with another group. Based on his resume it was clear that this maker had served in several capacities with various representatives of the societal network (Level II). Yet, the biggest complaint was that such participation robbed him of time that was necessary for making objects. Also I gathered from several makers that the enthusiasm that was generated at such meetings often made them join in activities that later they would not have considered. This "vulnerability" was the most consistent reason why makers did not attend meetings. The meetings they did attend were primarily those that provided potential financial support or connections with people who were makers of similar objects.

In spite of the conflicts with funding organizations, each artist maintained consistent popularity with his students and was a respected teacher based on the high expectations of the students, a consistent schedule of exhilarating public objects and in varied levels of participation in activities outside the cultural segment.

The most challenging aspect of using the Maquet Framework was in maintaining a consistent account of what organizations within level two were actually within the aesthetic segment and which ones were
outside the segment. While the mandates of institutions expressed a commitment to the "art disciplines" and "artists", there was very little evidence that the ideologies, activities (including the process of making) and materials of the makers were of any concern by these organizations. There is certainly a need for further research and investigation pertaining to social agencies ideals and their real relationship and connection within the arts community.

Unfamiliarity or limited tradition within the societal network was often considered a disadvantage. As first generation members of the local arts community, the makers felt a sense of disadvantage which also increased the frustration in utilizing the institutions within the network.

Also, the influence of segments outside of the aesthetic segment were often given more support than the maker or object. On many occasions, political, business and religious affiliations outside of the aesthetic segment determined the decisions of organizations within the aesthetic segment. The makers were not able to have access to these institutions because of time constraints, professional intermediaries, or simply a lack of information about the influence of these institutions on their well-being. The most consistent interaction with the procedures of an institution outside of the aesthetic segment was with the institution that employed them as teachers. Attending Faculty meetings, Board meetings and filling out applications for tenure, sabbatical, leaves of absences and travel allocations were the closest to institutionalized policy and procedures that the makers chose to participate with on a consistent basis. Again, time became a significant factor because such meetings
were during periods of the most physical and mental energy outputs of the makers. The choice of attending a meeting or making objects required each maker to manage his time and make concessions with his preference to make objects. This time debate appeared to be critical; some makers had accepted the need to manage time according to the schedule of the aesthetic segment. Others had difficulty with the internal conflict such decisions produced. Contact with institutions outside of the aesthetic segment received little or no time. This also explains the additional need for support by other members of the family, the arts community and friends.

In "Museum Anthropologists and the Arts of Acculturation on the Northwest Coast", Michael Ames (1986) urges that research in material culture include the reality of why the object exists and that can only come from the people who produced it:

Anthropologists sit in judgement about what constitutes a proper artifact, a proper price, a proper potlatch and by implication, a proper Indian...Meanwhile, Indian communities in cooperation with established museums are beginning to develop their own museum ideologies and to establish their own museumification programs...

Both anthropologists and Indians extol the moral and museumological virtues of repatriation of museum collections and of staged authenticity in displays and programs. It would seem that for some people at least the line between museum anthropologist and Indian has blurred...(p. 13).18

Ames' assessment is significant because of its honest concern for authenticity that includes the culture of origin as well as the culture of migration. While he maintains a "discipline versus culture" approach to interpretations, there is a commitment within his writings to establish a framework that can accommodate cultural
ideologies. The visible storage concept at UBC is an example of developing a classification that complements such a framework.

Also, Ames' work recognizes the importance of collaborating with knowledgeable members of cultures that produce objects. In MUSEUMS, THE PUBLIC AND ANTHROPOLOGY, he discusses the importance of acceptance by the scholars of the culture. During the academic year 1983-84, he was invited to the Department of Anthropology, Ranchi University, where he presented six lectures. In his Introduction, L. P. Vidyarthi, Director of the Centre of Advanced Study in Anthropology endorses the work of Ames:

Professor Ames, an eminent scholar of Indian anthropology and...has done a valuable service to anthropology in general and Indian anthropology in particular by delivering the series of talks on our request and given us such a remarkable manuscript meticulously prepared and carefully edited, for wider readership of the specialists and enlightened laymen.

As a scholar recognized within his culture, Vidyarthi is an example of cultural inclusion. He has endorsed the work of a scholar outside of his culture. Both strive for inclusion, which is one of the objectives of this study.
CHAPTER IV - NOTES

1. According to Rosalie Wax (1971) funding rarely permitted anthropologists field trips of more than a few weeks. Boas himself made thirteen trips to the Northwest Coast. These trips rarely lasted more than two months.

2. See DOING FIELDWORK, pages 30-31.

3. Ibid.

4. Ibid.

5. I call this process "envisioning" whereby the creator of an object is able to see it mentally prior to it becoming tangible or transferrable to others.

6. For further discussion, see page six in Chapter III.

7. An appropriate state of mind required adequate rest prior to the session as well as a full stomach. It was important for me to be calm and removed from other distractions such as personal matters or other concerns related to this study. It was very much like preparation of contemplating a painting or dance; only this painting was movable and the dance was unrehearsed. Therefore, I had to remain flexible in order to adapt to unknown circumstances (like an improvisation).

8. According to Bunzel this kind of observation however never seemed to "bother" the Pueblo or Hopi makers. Wax (1971) differs with this assessment.

9. Learning to both choreograph and paint required repetitive use of movement and technical terms. Whether the movement was across a dance floor or across a piece of paper, it was necessary to repeat it over and over. As I watched each artist, I recognized their ease in movement because I knew how much discipline and energy was required to handle each of their artistic decisions. This was not the case however with artists who worked in clay and I often felt overwhelmed, intimidated and underprepared and tentative when discussing their objects.

10. This is a direct quote from Asante’s book, AFROCENTRICITY.
11. The time lapses did not cause significant problems in observations other than the need for re-establishing courtesies at the beginning of a session. Actually, the lapses helped to keep a focus on the specific objects. Regarding events that involved the maker, I was able to benefit from interpretations an artists made of an event which reduced my need to assess it and get back to her about it. This was quite beneficial if an object was being included in an exhibition that I was unable to attend but had seen some phase of its production.

12. For a view of what happens when afrocentric and eurocentric scholars attempt to exchange viewpoints, please read, "Responsibilities of the Black Scholar to the Community in THE STATE OF AFRO-AMERICAN HISTORY, Past, Present and Future, 1986 (author’s name). Other authors such as George James (STOLEN LEGACY), Hake Madhubuti (ENEMIES: The Clash of Races) and Molefi Kete Asante (AFROCENTRICITY) have developed position papers on the responsibilities of Black scholars in the academic community. Their consensus is that focused attention in writing for and teaching in the Black community is the priority since it is that cultural group (African-Americans) that produces the primary ideational configuration.

13. For example, the OHIO DANCE, a service organization for individual dancers and companies within the State, held its annual conference in Columbus this year. According to its program, dancers and companies outside of the tradition of ballet or modern dance were categorized as "ethnic". Even companies that were within the western classical traditions of ballet and modern, but comprised of African-Americans or Asians were either overlooked or had difficulty getting within concerts outside of the ethnic or amateur categories.

14. In his preparation for fieldwork class, John Messenger emphasizes the importance of sending a copy of the preliminary ethnographic notes to someone outside of the immediate culture being studied. This practice is for safety purposes (more than one copy is available of conversations and correspondences). Many anthropologists also maintained uncensored journals that revealed specific emotional interpretations of situations they experienced during their fieldwork. Due to the four month long concerns of one of the artist with the rumors about the progress of my work, I felt it would be appropriate to submit a copy of my work to a legal advisor in the event of future questioning and challenges to my own civil rights to pursue this study.

15. This category was the most significant because each maker interpreted it to mean either an exchange of an object for money or an exchange of an object for another object. Either appeared to have equal importance.

16. This depended solely on financial support.
17. "Museumification" is a term used by Ames that illustrates what happens to objects as they enter the formal institutions within the aesthetic segment. Briefly, museums have their own practices and terminology that is usually closed to the public. This exclusion is also directed to the artist, therefore he must view his work from a perspective which may not include his interpretation at all. For more information, read Ames MUSEUMS, THE PUBLIC AND ANTHROPOLOGY (1986).
CHAPTER V

INDIVIDUAL STUDIES ON THE MAKERS AND SELECTED OBJECTS

The following six studies consist of information gathered over the two years, 1986-88. Each study has been condensed by using information that is applicable to the three levels of the Maquet Model and the UBC Classification System.

The descriptions are based on information that can provide general statements about the maker for ethnological purposes.
Figure 5

Photograph: Lawrence Jasud
Ideational Configuration

Jenny explains her work as functional and spiritual. Many of her objects are commissioned to depict figures and symbols that are relevant to Christianity. At one time, however, her work reflected her exploration of Judaism, such as the menorah that has been selected for this study. In identifying her within the Maquet Model, her ideational configurations fit within mythology and technology. Within the aesthetic segment of level three, Jenny is concerned with the classical forms of western sculpture and functional objects, particularly those of Europe. She refers to the work of Georgia O'Keefe as examples of inspiration and the Aeolian Harp. Jenny has chosen anthroposophy as her ideological foundation.

According to Jenny, anthroposophy is the study of man and wisdom. It attempts to connect the spiritual within man to that within the cosmos.

Societal Network

Jenny has successfully contributed to several segments of the American society. Her work has been purchased by corporate executives through exchange and markets of the economic segment. In the aesthetic segment, her objects are represented at major midwestern museums as well as through galleries and in art publications such as Ceramic Monthly.
Productive Systems

The making of clay objects deals with heat transforming materials (smelting). Also, Jenny uses carving as a technique.

Jenny uses an Ohio clay that is especially made to her specifications (see the contents of the two objects selected for classification).

She also makes her own glazes.

Selected Object #1
The Minorah (see Figure 5)

Level One

Different parts of the object are made on the potter’s wheel and then assembled by the maker. The object is very large and heavy. The large arc is supported by a sculpted pedestal. The arc is glazed; the pedestal is textured. The combination of the glazed and the textured is a part of Jenny’s visual vocabulary.

It is stoneware made of Missouri fire clay (50%), red art clay (15%); blackbird clay (10%) gray (5%) and Tennessee #4 ball clay (20%). The glaze is EPK-kaolin (300) flint (450), spodomeuse (300) whiting (300), felspar 1050, barium carbonate (600) and bentarite (30). The slip is cobalt oxide (5%), gerstley borate (15%) and black bird clay (80%).
Level Two

The Minorah was made for exhibition purposes. It won an award in a liturgical exhibition shortly after it was made. It has been exhibited on several occasions in galleries with the objects of other makers. Currently it is within my home as an exchange of goodwill (Jenny selected an object made by me "Aristophanes Found" as a reciprocal gesture).

Physically, the Minorah has nine candle holes that support a candle representing the miraculous continuous lighting of the perpetual lamp at Bima.

For the viewer within the culture it is a collective reaffirmation of its strength as a culture is celebrated annually. For the viewer outside of the culture, similar objects can be found such as the five candleholder used for advent among Christians or the seven candleholder used by African-Americans for Kwanzaa.

Level Three

This object does not have a formal title but it functions as a Minorah (a ceremonial candleholder within Judaism). The maker saw a piece of pottery that used this technique in the Dayton Museum of Art. The maker was influenced by the memory of the Aeolian harp which remained on her mind while making the object. The reason it is being left behind is that the objects is acceptable to her personal standards (all other objects are destroyed).

Jenny has done several objects that are used as altar furnishings such as chalices (goblets), pattens (plates), and flagons (pitchers).
While she was born Jewish, she was not raised in the Jewish culture by her parents. She was an adult when she explored her roots as a member of the Jewish culture. During that period she made chalices (Kiddushes), candle holders (menorahs) and an altar (bima). She has since chosen to identify as anthroposophy (see Ideational Configuration).

Selected Object #2

The Goblet (see Figure 6)

**Level One**

The formula for the clay and the glaze is the same as object #1. Initially, chunks of clay are measured by the maker according to a previous size and formed on a potter's wheel. It is made on a potter's wheel and hand textured. Glaze is dripped on the outside. It is bisque fired and mishima wax resist technique. Then glaze is poured on the inside and glaze fired.

**Level Two**

The goblet is made for drinking by an individual or a group. It is used when dining or for ceremonial events. Goblets are shared by others as gifts, sales, reciprocal exchanges and exhibitions.

As part of the aesthetic segment the goblet is a social event when seen or used. The handling of the goblet is also comfortable to the touch.
Primarily, the goblet is found within a variety of domestic groups although replicas are a part of exhibitions at museums and galleries. There are modifications that are chalices found in churches and temples (kiddushes).

Level Three

Like the minorah, the maker is leaving it behind because it has achieved her standards of excellence. She refers to a Jewish term, "seliminara", which means if it gets to the kiln, there is a responsibility [taken on by the maker].

At some point, the maker thinks she may have been influenced by Scandinavian examples of pottery use at Alfred University where she received her training (see resume).

Conclusion

Jenny Floch has consciously chosen what her objects represent to her and what she thinks is important within society. The choices of technique/material and the societal networks she has selected for exhibitions are very deliberate. They support her commitment to spirituality and the intelligent level of mankind. Her expectations of her work serve as patterns of living for her and those within her environment.
Notes - Floch

1. Jenny has done several objects that are used as altar furnishings such as chalices (goblets), pattens (plates) and flagons (pitchers).

2. While she was born Jewish, she was not raised in the Jewish culture or religion by her parents. She was an adult when she explored it. During that period, she made chalices (kiddushes), candle holders (minorahs) and an altar (bima). She has since chosen to identify as an "anthroposophist" (as described in the text). Also, she currently is a member of the Episcopalian religion.

3. I was able to follow the migration pattern on one pod vase which was purchased from the OF THE HEART gallery/shop, by an executive of an international bank. The piece was then given as a wedding gift to friends outside of Ohio but within the U.S. I found it very difficult to track objects because records were not kept once the object was purchased by the maker or the gallery.

4. Jenny provided me with a list of collectors that included several churches, some museums and personal collectors throughout the United States. She has maintained a working friendship with her agent Rne Steidel, who is responsible for her primary exhibitions within the Columbus area.
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Noel Hall
(see Figure 7)

**Ideational Configuration**

Noel seeks perfection in the movement expressed by groups as well as individuals. Whether the object (dance) portrays human relations (Consummation) or sociopolitical concerns (Distant Voices-Familiar Echoes) he remains committed to clear movements and strong design. He believes the movement of traditional African dances must be taught as authentically as possible within the study of dance in the United States. This includes his culture of origin's contributions (Jamaica) as well as those that have migrated to the United States and are found in modern and popular dance.

**Societal Networks**

As a dancer, Noel has had significant experience in developing a variety of movement variations. His international tours have provided him with many opportunities to exchange ideas and movement patterns with other dancers and choreographers. As a choreographer he has transferred these ideas into movements that depict social concerns primarily related to African people.

Noel's work is currently found within the educational segment of the American society. In the United States he has taught in Ohio, Wisconsin, Mississippi, Connecticut, New York, Alaska. Outside of the U.S. he has taught in West Africa, Germany, East Africa, West
Indies and Jamaica. As part of the aesthetic segment, however, he has contributed a significant portion of his work to the theatre (dance).

His students have been of different technical and experiential abilities from children to adults. His classes have been taught in studios as well as recreation/community centers.

Noel has been documented on film internationally. He has also had his poetry published in the United States. As a scholar, he has written over 25 articles relevant to his work. Noel is also a painter. Many of his ideational images are depicted in paint (orlon acrylic). All of his visual art exhibitions have been in New York City.

**Productive System**

Noel fuses traditional movements historically of black African (gravity influenced) with the traditional movements of modern european modern dance. The fusion of the two create objects that are familiar to the viewer irrespective of their training and dance experience.

He selects steps that are often repetitive so that the dancer is able to develop it to her own senses and physical preferences. He encourages such participation by both professional dancers and students.

Some of his work is strictly for professionally trained movers and students. Other objects can be enjoyed by a participating audience at any level of capability. His objects are conducive to the industry of dance, meaning that he successfully collaborates with
lighting technicians, musicians, costumers, publicists and others affiliated with the industry.

Selected Object #1
"Distant Voices—Familiar Echoes"

Ideational Configuration (Level Three)

The ideology of the dance is the maker's view of apartheid. It is transformed into a visual and physical object for viewers and participants who will either do or see the object, interpret it and determine its value to them. Noel wants to communicate his concerns about apartheid.

There are several statements made by the Maker regarding apartheid. One is that the object is dedicated to Nelson and Winnie Mandela, Sicelo Dlomo and freedom fighters everywhere. Another, is in the title of each movement such as "A Vortex of Deceased Souls" or "Hope in God, our children, and Our Ancestors We Trust".

Additionally, Noel has excerpted a portion of James Weldon Johnson's, "Black Manhattan" of the Niagara Movement's an address to the Country (U.S. 1906).

Societal Networks (Level Two)

This object has been seen within the educational segment. It premiered as part of a faculty concert in May, 1986 and the revision was seen in 1987. The Maker intends to premiere it within the aesthetic segment in New York City (Noel has moved back to New York in order to complete his studies for the Masters in Dance Education).
Noel wants to communicate with both his audience and his dancers. By teaching the movements to professional dancers and students, he is also able to get additional physical reactions to his ideas. Through journals, the students maintain written impressions of the dance as well as their experiences with Noel.

The issue of Apartheid is a controversial one in the United States. Throughout the dance community, many artists have addressed the problem of apartheid. The influence of many dancers and performances are primarily western and interpreted through the anti-apartheid position of the western arts community. The viewing of the dance is also within the informal studio/theatre which is a western custom.

**Productive Systems (Level One)**

Noel’s idea is rehearsed, initially, for himself and eventually the most successful movements (determined by him) are transferred to other dancers. The movements are a part of both modern dance technique and African technique.

The dance is also a collaboration with others in the industry of dance (music by Keith Fleming; lighting by Van Tinkham; Box Office Manager is Laura Munson and Ushers are Jennifer Paige and O’Neal Wilson. There are also non-art members who are participants. They represent members of the community who have little or no dance experience but identify with the ideology of the dance or the maker, Noel Hall (e.g., Reverend John Jackson, Director of Black Studies, Denison University).
Selected Object #2
"Consummation"

The Ideational Configuration (Level Three)

The artist is interested in depicting the various levels of a relationship between two people (a man and a woman). Love is the centrifugal force between the two although both are effected by other forces outside of their relationship.

The Societal Network

This dance was first sketched out and performed at East Stroudsburg State College (see article, Appendix M). It involves movements that force the dancers to rely heavily on each other's strength to lift, swing, and hold one another as well as repel and strike out against each other. There are tender, nurturing movements as well as violent striking ones. These kind of movements are popular within western modern dance when depicting closeness and conflict.

The dance is done by the maker and requires a professionally trained partner.5

The dance has been seen by viewers within the educational segment and reviewed by the aesthetic segment of the American society. Aesthetically, the theme is used by many other choreographer's such as Shir Lee Wu in "Venice Dreamer". To date, the performance of the dance has been in auditoriums on stages and before dance-informed audiences.
The Productive Systems (Level One)

The dancers must have extensive training in ballet and modern dance technique (dramatic training is also necessary). A rigorous rehearsal schedule prior to the performance is also a necessity. The dance requires collaborating with others who contribute the lighting, sound and costumes.

Conclusion

Noel's dances are a fusion of movements that are familiar to him from his culture of origin. As well as the culture of migration. His significant career as a dancer has prepared him to make dances that depict his ideas and challenge his dancers.

As an educator he has brought to that segment of American society, the quality and high expectations that are a part of the aesthetic and economic segments of the American society.
Notes - Hall

1. This does not include the review of critics.
2. Denison University is a liberal education institution.
3. Woza Albert," the play by Mbongeni Ngemi and Percy Mtwa addresses the nature of apartheid by these two South African artists.
5. When I saw it Shirley Rushing was Noel's partner.
6. This reduced the time the dancers can commit to other activities.
"The Light of the Earth,"
Ban Kajitani
(see Figure 9)

Ideational Configuration

Ban’s work is respectful to both Japanese and Native American cultures which has identified as having similar cultural symbols and heritages. Throughout his objects, he emphasizes the return of clay to its original state: back to the earth. "The work of a maker is temporary", he states. Through the use of traditional clay firings as well as continued respect for the 'will' of clay, the maker is in harmony with the material and is able to depict images that are a part of the maker’s beliefs and values. Ban also enjoys the unpredictability of clay and he feels comfortable with its choices to develop. Nevertheless, he thoroughly recognizes formulaic approaches and is committed to depicting the excellence of Japanese and Western techniques.

Societal Networks

Ban is a muralist, sculptor, designer and educator. The choice of these titles reflect the networks that influence and transfer his objects, internationally. His work as a muralist can be found within the economic segment (e.g., Headquarters Ltd; Capitol South, Columbus, Ohio) where he has been commissioned by corporations. As a sculptor, his objects are exchanged between Japan and the United States, annually; through galleries. His technical knowledge is made available to students through classes at the Columbus College of Art
and Design and through publications (e.g., Ceramics Monthly). Also, his objects and purchased, exhibited and sold through museums (see resume). Therefore, Ban's work is found within the government segment (e.g., executives), the economic segment and several agencies within the aesthetic segment of the United States.³

Productive Systems

As stated, Ban's demand for excellence is also reflected in an accurate formulaic understanding of the clay making process. At C.C.A.D. he teachers specific aspects of the process such as Ceramics FA 327(II) "Ceramic Glaze Calculations". His assignments involve selection of natural materials, the research and discovery of those materials under various firing and atmospheric conditions and testing individual glaze formulas.

Ban combines technical knowledge with practical wisdom. His tools involve technical instruments of specialists as well as practical instruments that can be found in discount stores. His technical vocabulary is extensive and is not determined by the language of Japanese or American.

Ban often uses the environment as a part of his work materially. This includes clay from Ohio as well as water sites and parks for location of his work. As his ideational philosophy supports, the use of materials within his environment enables the materials to return to their natural state with a minimum of human obstacles.
Selected Object #1

The Installation, "Light of the Earth" (see Figure 8).

Ideational Configuration (Level three)

The installation has been influenced by "the ancient designs left by Chilean Indians in the Atacama Desert." The paintings and sculptures are small replicas (maquettes) of what he wishes to do. The work is displayed for aesthetic responses by the viewer.

Societal Networks (Level two)

The installation was exhibited at the Columbus Cultural Arts Center. Members of the arts community and the Japanese community were invited to the opening. The exhibition has been documented by several local publications (e.g., Downtown Alive) as well as through local Japanese publications (see Association of Japan-Ohio Industries, Appendix K).

Productive Systems

The installation consists of clay bricks (see photos, Figures 8-9), drawings, paintings, large totems and small sculptures. The materials involve natural tree limbs and fired clay and pigment. Also, Ban uses paper, wire and glass for display purposes.

Selected Object #2

"The Great Wall" (see Figure 9).
Ideational Configuration

As an architectural enhancement, the mural represents symbolically the mission of the Columbus College of Art and Design. As other great walls (e.g., China, the crying/wailing wall) the power of its presence demands immediate respect and humbleness upon entering the front doors of the institution.

Societal Networks

The Great Wall required the organization of a master ceramicist, Ban, and a group of dedicated, competent students. It was commissioned and therefore financially supported by CCAD. Visually, the wall must share aesthetic space with the Columbus Museum of Art.

Productive Systems (Level One)

Ban and selected students have cemented diversely colored and textured slabs (rectangles) of clay into a wall that withstands natural elements and human living within an urban setting.
Notes – Kajitani

1. Culturally, migration to Asia has also been traced to the migration of North America. It appears that symbols were also transferable, therefore similarities might be found within both cultures. For more information on the question of diffusion see Anderson’s Art in Primitive Societies.

2. Ban has two fine arts degrees. One is from Asagaya Art Academy, Tokyo, Japan (BFA); the other is from Utah State University (BFA and MFA).

3. Ban returns to Japan at least once a year. There, he has gallery exhibits (workshops, lectures, periodical articles about and by the artist).

4. This study does not thoroughly investigate his position within Japan. Such information would require travel to Japan as well as interviews with gallery owners and patrons. For this study, that is impossible.

5. This is a quote from Ban. He saw examples of the cultures land sculptures in books. He also saw an affiliation with the land he saw while studying at Utah State University.

6. At the opening, Ban had lit candles throughout the bricks and the sound of music by Kitaro, a contemporary Japanese musician.

7. It is continuously used as a part of the College’s public relations materials. The dedication of the wall was recognized by USA Today, newspaper, December, 1984.
Bill McCray
(see Figure 10)

At the Ohio State University, Bill is appointed to two departments, the Black Studies and the Theatre Department. He teaches a course Introduction to Black Dance, which is populated by a culturally diverse student body. While the course is for beginners, it is also a forum for seasoned choreographers to place "works in progress" on people.¹ He introduces students to the procedures of dance training, the language and the physical and mental preparation that is needed for any form of movement.

Productive Systems

Bill's technique includes traditional and derivative African movement, modern, Jazz (especially broadway-stage) contemporary African-American dances. He teaches Martha Graham, Lester Horton, and Katherine Dunham preparation. His classes are generally held outside of European-American environments for dance, although his classes are located at white institutions.²

Bill advises choreographers who have a variety of dance training and ideas. By allowing them access to his students, he provides in-depth understanding and variations of the basic training he provides to be experienced and interpreted in different ways.

Final objects are performed as an event at the end of each quarter. An audience is invited to view the work. There is no need for costumers, lighting technicians or box office managers. The
focus remains on the students and on the movements they perform. Bill uses this opportunity to evaluate the growth of individual students.

Selected Object #1
"Yon Vanou" (a videotape is available)

Ideational Configuration
"Yon Vanou" is a dance with traditional movements from Africa. This particular derivative is done in Haiti. The concept is to encourage the mover to take on the movements that are similar to the snake who is a very important symbol with African religions. If the dancer is able to move correctly, the mover may possibly become a vehicle of expression for some ancestor or a specific deity.

Societal Networks
The dance connects the religious, aesthetic and educational segments of the Haitian culture. While taught to Americans for the educational purposes, it would be difficult to ignore the other segments. Students learn the movements in order to receive credit for taking the class.

Productive Systems
The object consists of spiral movements of the torso as well as the appendages. Foot patterns also make circular images on the ground. The accompanying sound is a drum.
Selected Object #2
"Purlie" (see Appendix N)

Ideational Configuration

The concept of this choreography is to recognize and preserve the contributions of African-Americans to the broadway interpretations of dance. Choices of movement and traditional stage presence are for the benefit of an audience that expects, appreciates and supports this type of movement.

Societal Network

This choreography is part of a collaboration with other segments of a production that are commonly needed in order to execute a completed object for the industry or an informed audience. The dancers, however, are of varied level of technical ability or experience. Therefore, Bill's objects must be flexible in order to adapt to his dancers.

Productive Systems

Primarily, the movements are Jazz and West African. A great deal of the movements rely on syncopation and accommodation to the music. The dances require extensive rehearsals, including isolated studio and stage practices.
Conclusion

Bill's objects are secondary to his involvement in providing experiences for those who come in contact with him. His quiet presence is valued by those who need an outlet for expression, which is often embedded with obstacles and deterrents to creativity. Bill quietly supports the work of students with diverse ideas and ability. He consistently attends the efforts of organizations within the Columbus community and encourages the continual growth of students who pursue careers in either the commercial or academic agencies within the aesthetic segment. Likewise, he continues to travel and bring to the multi-purpose rooms of OSU, some of the most authentic and elegant movements of the African continent and the Diaspora.
1. Since living in Columbus, I have found Bill's guidance invaluable in maintaining the approach to dance training that is familiar and valuable to me. Likewise, he has allowed me to place new works or "sketches," on his students which has been a mutual exchange for the students and me. I have videotaped documentation of "Evokation," available as an example.

2. This remains a major criticism for me. Bill's classes are held outside of the Dance Department at OSU. Politically, he is never invited to use the dance facilities. Instead, his classes are held in the multi-purpose rooms of dormitories. Taking in consideration his tenured status and the popularity of his classes by students, such treatment is inexcusable by the Dance Department at OSU. Not only is this treatment to a colleague an implied signal to students regarding the appreciation of Black dance with the dance world (which is an untruth!), it also provides a pattern of disrespect (I call it a characteristic of aesthetic apartheid) to a professor.

3. The choices of movement that Bill has selected can be traced to work from "Shuffle Along," a very successful production in the earlier part of this century. "Shuffle Along" continues to influence the path of dancers and choreographers who are interested in the economic gains that are attached to the market agencies within the aesthetic segment.

4. This includes a staff of specialist in theatre (e.g., director, producer, set designers, costume designers, etc.). Bill's work must support and enhance the collaboration.

5. The stage practices are particularly important because they involved adapting to the available space as well as the presence of properties (visual objects) that should enhance the quality of the dances.
Figure 12
Pheoris West
(see Figure 11)

Ideational Configuration

Pheoris is committed to making objects that celebrate segments of the African-American as a member of a specific culture and a general society. His philosophical foundation is Afrocentric and he is referred to as a Master painter by scholars within Afrology.

Pheoris' work, however, approaches European-derived concepts of painting as well. He remains challenged by the work of European painters who explore and celebrate the dignity of their cultures. His belief is that dignity and appreciation for beauty is available to all peoples, therefore, his life and work documents his many explorations within his culture and others. Therefore, as he re-enacts the works of non-African object makers, he re-interprets them to his own reality and belief systems of Afrology.¹

Pheoris' work depicts African Mythology, grammar and vocabulary. Borrowing from African systems of form and styles, he reinterprets them to accommodate messages to the American viewer. He explores western technological discoveries within painting, however, he also consciously maintains a respect for tradition used by Master African painters of the caves and of totems.
**Societal Networks**

Pheoris depicts a variety of subjects for a variety of reasons. His paintings address the adaptation of Africans within the American society and its impact on family, lineages and dynasties. He also depicts inequality (a primary source for work during 1968-73) and the results of it that produces a bourgeoisie. He is concerned with those who become the subjects of nobility, particularly those within American society. His work is quite successful within the national and international art market and exchange. Through the efforts of an agent and several galleries, his work is often promised to collectors once notice is available that he is working on a particular series.

Pheoris is represented within agencies of the aesthetic segment. Additionally, he is referred to by scholars who study black aesthetics. He is sought for research projects, internationally within Africa as well as Europe. He is also sought by painters who wish to further their technical development or exchange ideas as peers. Pheoris' studio is considered one of the "places of respect" that is visited by both visual and performing artists when they visit Columbus. As a teacher, he provides these opportunities to his students and other artists/teachers.

**Productive Systems**

Pheoris incorporates European interpretations of painting and the materials of traditional African painting. He sees the portability of both paintings and totems (wood carvings) as similar and require the same approach to the materials by the maker. He uses
oils, acrylics, sand, stone, resins, inks, cotton canvas, woods as regular materials. His tools includes a variety of brushes, knives and cloths. He purchases pigment as well as incorporates the natural pigment of materials such as dyes from ores, oils, stones (or fossils).

Technically, his work is to depict tension visually. The use of colors as well as the "X" within the composition provides the image of continual movement and motion throughout his objects.

Selected Object #1
"Black Woman in Blue Reading a Letter"

Ideational Configuration

The idea in making this object is to represent a Black figure in a traditionally-regarded European painting. "Years from now, someone will see them both, and like mine better (a quote from the artist).

The maker and object that was studied is "The Letter", by Vermeer, a Dutch painter.

Societal Networks

The painting is seen in both the agencies of the educational and aesthetic segments within the American society. It has been reviewed by critics, locally and has been the source for valuative assignments by students. It has also been videotaped for television coverage (WBNS-Columbus).
**Productive Systems**

The object is portable. They represent the use of materials and techniques that are familiar to all forms of painting (e.g., the need for a two dimensional surface, some form of application, the arrangement of symbols that represent a cultures vocabulary, whether it is societally accepted or not.

The object consists of wood (stretchers), cotton duct canvas (size 10), acrylic gesso, a variety of pigments in linseed oil and varnishes. Application of oil, based pigments are applied to primed stretched canvas.

The technique used by makers who paint on canvas, bark, raffia, or other types of cloth are all related. The techniques are ancient and can be traced to ancient dynasties of Kimet (Egypt) and Nubia.

**Selected Object #2**

Two Sisters—Who’s There?

(see Figure 12)

**Ideational Configuration**

The object is to depict an idea that provides a solution to the question of how action is depicted. The issue of women, particularly the relationships between African-American women is also the source of inspiration. Tension is an important issue within the object. Polarities and deviations (a physics concept) is explored.
Also the makers on-going interest in movement is represented through the composition of verticals, horizontals, crossings (X) and geometrical divisions of space.

As dualities, the Sisters are different aspects of the same spirit. They are equals (the images are the same height and depict the same age). There is an interdependency between the two that is shared and respected irrespective of position (up/down) or morality (good/evil).

Societal Network

The object has begun its migration pattern. It was sold in New York by an art agent. It returned, however, for a recent exhibition and is scheduled for a tour, next year. Reproductions have been made as posters and post cards, by the maker and a printer. The posters are available through galleries. The postcards were sent as announcements to the opening of an exhibition.

The maker sees the object as an example of balance, an important educational element for students. (Note: This object is an example of the kinds of objects that could be used for general art appreciation that also have been done by African-American painters.

Productive Systems

The object consists of oil, cotton canvas, wood stretchers, turpentine, paint thinner, oil pastels, pastel chalk, charcoal, pencil, varnishes, ink, and wax. Application of these materials to the primed canvas (stretched) is the primary technique.
There are a variety of application techniques used such as washing (the use of turpentine, pigment and water that are applied with a brush or a cloth).

Conclusion

As a master painter—one who is capable to depict his mental images successfully, technically and according to societal expectations—Pheoris' work is important to his African-American culture as well as the American society. He has consistently remained a preserver of an Afrocentric belief system that is seldom interfered with by external cultural influences. As a maker, he is quite adaptable to circumstances that require his attention away from his work, however, he uses the energy of distractions as sources for further objects.

His societal relationships also follow this belief. Primarily, he is absorbed in the activities of others within the global arts community (including his family; his wife is also a painter). Those who are not artists, are generally members of the African-American or African cultures. Others, are students of all cultures who gravitate to him because of his status as a master painter.
1. Afrology is the study of knowledge that begins its point of discipline-divisions based on African divisions and time periods. The significance of this approach to knowledge is that it enables the student to encompass the span of knowledge available over a longer time than which is customarily taught by scholars who begin studies with the Greek and Roman scholars.

2. His "street scene" series depict images of African-Americans in situations that are not valued within American society (e.g., bars, street-walkers, etc.), however within traditional African and Asian images, such depictions reflect the values of strength (particularly in women) and the harmony of community life. For a comparative analysis, compare Pheori's work "Terry's Loveseat" to the East Indian statue "Bodisattva Avalokitesvara".

3. Within American society African-Americans are consistently expected to remain a source of artistic objects rather than the recognized initiators and makers of societally accepted representations. This, I believe, is another characteristic of aesthetic apartheid that is practiced in America.

4. For example, earlier pieces of the "Sister's" series were sold before the completion of the series (which is still in progress).

5. I found information on him in the dissertation of Mile. Boligon of Paris (1980). She was researching the work of Afrocobra painters of which Pheoris was a member.

6. I was able to bring Kenyon students to his studio for an in-depth discussion and observation of his work. The students were members of my "Art and Anthropology" course, therefore, they were prepared to see and ask informed questions of him. For further information, I recorded the session and have it available.
Figure 13
Shir Lee Wu
(see Figure 13)

Ideational Configuration

Shir Lee immediately feels the presence of others and she responds by either withdrawing to her own quiet self or with an electrifying smile of reception. She values friendships and maintains them in her culture of origin as well as Europe and the United States.

Her objects depict relationships (Madame Butterfly) or searches into emotions (Winter Journey). Her movements are comfortable to a variety of body types although she prefers the classical body recommended for ballet by Balanchine. Her objects, however appeal to African-American dancers as well as Asians. Her teaching, is primarily ballet although the Academy offers jazz and modern. She believes a dancer should be capable of executing the dances of different choreographers, irrespective of cultural differences.

She is critical of her work, her dancers and the work of others. As one who has seen and performed for others, her eye for excellence is an instinct. Her frustration, however, is in her lack of daily opportunities to talk with and share ideas with artists of her experience, training and calibre.
Societal Networks

Shir Lee is the sixth generation of ballet students from the China Beijing Academy. She also studied at the Martha Graham School of Dance. She has placed dances on companies in China and the United States (see Appendix D).

Since being in Columbus, Shir Lee has been puzzled by the interpretations of her work. While the interpretations have been favorable they do not extend enthused or informed knowledge of her work (see news articles in Appendix Q). This is very different for her because the attitude and environment in which she trained and developed as a choreographer was receptive and supportive in China. That remained the circumstances until the Cultural Revolution of the 1960s. It was at that point, Shir Lee experienced the kind of oppression that would motivate her to leave China. Since she was not a natural citizen (she was born in Indonesia), she was able to leave.4

Shir Lee desires to avoid governmental influences and constraints on her work.5 She has the desire to see her work globally.

Productive Systems

Shir Lee borrows from her classical ballet training (Vaganova Method) as well as classical Chinese opera movements.6 Her students take six days a week of classes consisting of two pointe classes, one pirouette class and three technique classes. Additionally, Shir Lee commissions new music compositions for her work (which is very
difficult to find in Columbus). Her students must study music and understand the mathematical divisions of time.

The notes (Appendix G) are from observations and conversations with Shir Lee Wu. After reviewing them for condensed ethnographies, I have chosen to include them as examples of how an observer/interpreter must have an active knowledge and experience in making dances in order to interpret the maker of dances.

Selected Object #1
Madame Butterfly

Ideational Configuration

Butterfly is an animal with the personality of a human and an animal spirit neerhemwa*. The couple cannot marry because of cultural differences and reasons. The two attempt to disrespect the culture which leads to tragedy. The idea of Madame Butterfly is from the opera. The maker leaves it as a universal and is relevant to any generation.

Societal Network

The work is viewed within the aesthetic segment of the educational segment of American society. To date, it has not been seen internationally. The music is contemporary and is familiar to the audience (if not the specific work, the audience is familiar with the contemporary sounds, timing and instruments via the radio).
Productive Systems

"Madame Butterfly" requires a stage lighting and costuming. The movements are a combination of modern, jazz and classical technique. The costumes are gender relevant (the woman is dressed like a woman; the man is dressed like a male dancer).

*Note: The second selected object was "Ode of Plum" however it is not included because the author's notes were not endorsed.

Conclusion

Shir Lee has had an extremely rich career within her culture of origin. She has continued to maintain the same standards within the United States but has met with a variety of censoring resistances. From Board members to students, Shir Lee has been confronted with a society comprised of individuals lacking a true sense of commitment to work through dance. This has been very painful for her because she has believed she could recapture the excellence and support for it in the United States. Instead, she has met with an insidious arrogance from residents of Columbus who have no idea of the sacrifices and commitment of this fragile appearing fortress which encases the spirit of Shir Lee.
Notes - Wu

1. "Red Shoes" is her interpretation of a European ballet. "Ode of Plum" has both ballet and Chinese movements that require training in order to achieve excellence.

2. Traditionally, the ballerina is expected to be very slim (borderline anorexic) and is to have a very small "delicate" skeleton encased in white (caucasian) skin.

3. The teaching of modern and jazz classes are usually by someone else.

4. Shir Lee's mother who once owned a dance studio in Indonesia, was instrumental in getting her daughter released.

5. Recently, she was asked to perform in China, if she denounced communist China. She is a Chinese, therefore, she decided not to be placed in such a predicament. Nevertheless, she never received the final agreement.

6. Vaganova Method is a Russian ballet technique.

7. The opera was seen by the maker in Japan, China, Lincoln Center and the Columbus Opera.

8. Neerhemws is a traditional concept within China explaining the process when artists make art. It is a synthesis of mathematics and imagining.

9. I have seen a performance of it in a restaurant and it was quite disturbing. It was not conducive for the kind of dance and it was dangerous for the dancers. This performance was initiated by Shir Lee's now-defunct Board. She has also chosen to resign from her own dance company.
CHAPTER VI

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA – MAKERS ARE A CROSS-CULTURAL COMMUNITY

The Private Processes of Artistic Activity

Primarily this study focuses on the arts community’s members who have full membership. They limit contact with those outside full membership status because of the need to work. There is a felt need to make which will determine how much time is allotted for other activities within the arts community and beyond. Full members interpret time, symbols, distance and movement according to the needs of the object. In this manner, interpretation implies a substantial degree of subjectivity. When it is a feature of social interaction, subjectivity clearly suggests the possibility of imprecision, of inexactitude of match, of ambiguity, of idiosyncracy. In other words, different people oriented to the same phenomenon are likely to differ from each other in certain respects on their interpretations of it. They may not be aware of this difference, especially if the phenomenon is a common feature of their lives. Their disagreement is not necessarily, then, an impediment to their successful interaction; indeed, often the contrary is the case. People can find common currency in behavior while still tailoring it subjectively (and interpretively) to their own needs. For example, both Noel’s "Consummation" and Shir Lee’s "Venice dreamer" deal with the dynamics
within a man\woman relationship. The symbols within the duets' depict the partners dependency and resistance to this physical dependency. Yet both dances have reached interpretations differently because Noel has selected gestures and movements that represent percussive athletic contact while Shir Lee's movement are subtle and suggestive (see the article, "Dance Theatre Concert Shines" because the critic never understood the intent of Shir Lee's dance).

These interpretations are not random. They tend to be made within the terms characteristic of a given society, and influenced by its language, ecology, its traditions of belief and ideology, and so forth. But neither are they immutable. They are, rather, responsive to the circumstances of interaction, both among individuals, and between the society as a whole and those across its boundaries. The vehicles of such interpretations are symbols. By their very nature symbols permit interpretation and provide scope for interpretive maneuver by those who use them. According to Cohen (1985), symbols are to perceive meaning, in or attach meaning to social behavior. Behavior does not 'contain' meaning intrinsically; rather, it is found to be meaningful by an act of interpretation: we 'make sense' of what we observe. The sense we make is 'ours' and may or may not coincide with that intended by those whose behavior it was. Thus, in so far as we 'understand' the behavior which goes on around us and in which we participate, we make and act upon interpretations of it: we seek to attach meaning to it. Social interaction is contingent upon such interpretation; it is, essentially, the transaction of meanings (p. 17).
The individual maker as a micro-culture is capable of fulfilling the needs of making the object, independently or at least from a leadership position. As chairman of the board, the maker is responsible for the decisions regarding the object. He is also responsible for its interpretation to the public. This leadership position was observable in both visual and performing artists. While Pheoris' agent could identify new clients, she remained responsible to him by informing him to whom his work was being sold, the schedule of other exhibitions and the progress made for future exhibitions. Likewise, both Bill and Noel demonstrated control of concerts by providing direction for musicians, technicians, and managers.

Time is divided differently by full members. Years are divided as if they are hours. Seasons are divided as if they are days. Time is also distributed for most makers according to their creative process. This is generally not a 9 to 5 time schedule a condition which often conflicts with the common workday of patrons, critics and educators. Flexibility of time allows for a variety of lifestyles among makers. The maker chooses to focus on members within the arts community who provide inspiration and clarification of the work, first. Next are those who support the work financially or emotionally. Ultimately the work is the "time thief" because there is no schedule for when an object will be completed or finished. For this reason family and friends as well as professional associates must determine their amount of time and commitment they can give to the maker.

Shir Lee begins her day with 2-3 hours of stretching exercises. Her teaching begins at 1 p.m. and continues until 8 p.m. daily. When
there is a public event, the schedule is revised and adjusted to meet the deadline.

Noel had to arrange the rehearsal schedule for the winter concert, "Sojourn II", according to his vacation time from Denison. This also meant coordinating schedules with his guests, who were both in New York City.

Currently, Pheoris has begun re-ordering his time commitments according to his need to work within his studio for the summer, 1988. He has decided not to teach at the university; instead, he will give individual instructions within his studio to emerging artists. Emerging artists are students. They may or may not have formal training yet they seek further information and experience that will increase their knowledge of object making.

This kind of readjusting of time and activities happens over and over with each maker who has to teach or prepare for exhibits. During my observation period Shir Lee agreed to have members of my class from Kenyon come to a rehearsal. This was three weeks before the performance. She was a composite of energy, inspiration and super-human demands on her students. My students were amazed at how positive the dancers responded to her commands and leg hits. Because they were not dancers themselves, they were unable to comprehend the vision Shir Lee had within her mind of what to expect at the recital based on what she saw from the students' level of competence at this rehearsal. She had calculated that based on their present effort and the amount of time remaining for rehearsals, the predicted performance was going to be less than what she had seen done previously by other students who had performed "Red Shoes".
This was unacceptable by Shir Lee, hence it was necessary to reach each student's point of discomfort and develop more ownership for the part of the dance that was her responsibility as well as to increase the technique needed to execute the movements.

One day I saw Pheoris coming down the hall in Hopkins two weeks before his work was to be shipped to Japan. I asked him whether he had gone "crazy" yet (My question meant whether he had mentally thought through each phase of the object's pilgrimage to Japan). This mental checklisting included several reviews of the work as a completed object. Often the paint is still wet because the most complete phase of the work may not get an interpretation from the maker until it is actually being packed for shipping or on view at the exhibition. When realization happens prior to the objects public entry, the maker may add the new information to the object or mentally file it for the next object. Pheoris responded that it was too early to be concerned yet but he felt the time was quickly approaching.

On another occasion I did watch and heard him talk to himself about his plan of action, which included the delivery of a painting to the faculty exhibition. The work was due at the gallery on this particular day and he was still not satisfied with the present stage of the work, and the work was in his studio drying. He was on his way to teach when I saw him and he was trying to reorder his day so that he could meet his responsibilities to his class, the exhibition committee, and get home by the time his oldest son got home from school. Although he felt comfortable expressing his multi-approaches to fulfilling four hours of activity at three different locations
with a one hour timespan, I realized that it was not necessary for me to offer any suggestions. That was not the time. Actually, my advice would have been a possible deterrent—an intrusion—to the mental process and an absorption of focused energy he would need in order to independently solve the problem. He was talking himself through the process he envisioned, accepting those images that harmonized with what he could physically complete and discarding those possible solutions that lacked enough information or minimized his control of the solution. He was able to get the object to the gallery.

The ability to "envision" an object before it is tangible also requires time. Creative disturbance penetrates the mental process. One who is mentally active and is attempting to solve a problem using cognitive skills cannot effectively focus on external activities, simultaneously. Therefore, envisioning goes on during waking and sleeping hours. I asked Shir Lee, Pheoris and Noel if they saw parts or all of their objects before they became tangible. Each responded by talking about what they saw. Shir Lee mentioned how her interpretation of "Madame Butterfly" was prompted by the music that triggered visions for her. Noel mentioned the visions he saw while listening to a news report on South Africa; he wanted to recreate those visions in "Distant Voices". Pheoris remembers the way the hot sun made everything bright during his first trip to Africa; it influenced his bright palette of reds, yellows and oranges during his graduate exhibition at Yale.

Regarding distance, community is not just in terms of locality, but more in the sense of belonging. For example, Jenny's adaptation
to the United States came early in her life. She was influenced by her father's painting experience, but she developed a commitment to clay instead. She speaks of her life in France as difficult because of the prejudices towards her Jewish heritage. Yet, her early work reveals a concern for her Jewish heritage although she has distanced herself from it by becoming a Christian. Her connections with France remain also through her friendships and her fluent use of the French language.

As stated before, I was very concerned with not being perceived as an intruder. I recognized the importance for isolation when making objects and I would not become responsible for loss of creative time. For some, this might seem odd but there are significant concerns I have about the creative process that must involve total isolation (like writing a dissertation!). I have found it necessary to differentiate most of these times so that there remains an order (some of the most chaotic studios or living spaces I have visited are the homes of makers who have spotless "mental order").

When I knew a maker had a major challenge, I stayed away. For example, Jenny knew in January that she had a major exhibit scheduled for April. She was beginning to have "blocks" as well as self-doubts about objects that she had not yet produced. I felt this would be a difficult time for her and that my observations would be an invasion of time that was needed for creating the objects. I called her on two occasions and she needed to cancel our appointments; instead, I sent pictures of what I thought might be helpful to her. But I did not observe as I had planned. I knew that that time was important to
her creative process. Also, I realized that she had family and friends who knew how to support her and assist her through the momentary blockage. Likewise, I did not visit any artists when I was physically or mentally unprepared. This was particularly apparent to me after I had spent hours teaching in a classroom setting or in discussions about the dissertation with members of my committee. I found myself usually exhausted and unable to focus on the artists quiet making process. I could however, focus if I had left my studio or had visited an exhibition or seen a concert.

Each artist values the need for time in New York City. All of the makers had some rite of passage in New York. Also each had access to other cultures there. Noel left Jamaica in order to concentrate on his dance training and to join Rod Rodgers Dance Company (1972-80). Recently, he returned to New York in order to complete his Masters in Education degree at New York University. Likewise, Shir Lee continued her training with Graham and her performance experience with the Chiang Ching Dance Company. Bill fulfilled his doctoral studies at New York University. Pheoris became established with an agent in New York who maintains the painter's visibility among major collectors and curators. Jenny taught and studied in New York for 8 years. She exhibits and maintains close contacts with peers, there. For all, the need for contacts beyond Columbus is very important.

By coming to New York each maker also had to adapt to unfamiliar living conditions in order to pursue their work. This was at a critical period within their maturing as makers and required personal sacrifices for them and their families. Nevertheless, the
need to migrate was enough motivation because of the internal need for further study. Each maker believed in the image of the U.S. as an environment that allowed opportunity for all. What they found, however, was a U.S. that did not necessarily include makers from other cultures as seekers of opportunity. They found that it did not include makers from the U.S. either, who identified or were identified with another culture, even as representatives of cultures that were older than those from Europe.

To remain in contact with friends within the culture of origin is very important, also. Whether there is or is not physical distance between these makers and others from their culture is not important. For example, Jenny’s friend is also from France. On two occasions, I listened as they spoke in French about a circumstance within their relationship. Out of respect, I left the room because the conversation was private (I could understand their conversation). Later, Jenny told me that she appreciated my leaving but also disclosed the matter to me in American.

Shir Lee was called by a friend on the phone. She also discussed the matter in one of her languages, I did not leave because I was not familiar with the language, therefore their conversation remained private. Later, she expressed her concerns over the matter with me.

In order to complete the necessary work by April, Jenny had to prioritize her social commitments. On many occasions, she invited me over with the clear understanding that she knew where she would be for the next three months during the day: in her studio. This also is Jenny’s reason for teaching in the studio. She can teach but also
maintain the mind of familiar climate that supports her creative needs. She can also learn from past objects created in the same environment by remembering the movements it took and the experiences.

This was also the case for Noel. He had the students travelling across the floor and based on his visual and audible approval of one of the students movements, I asked him if he might use the movement later. He smiled and said "possibly".

The Public Processes of Artistic Activity

The opening reception is an event for many types of viewers to see and be seen. For the maker, however, it is that rare opportunity to get away from his own work and celebrate, learn from and support the present accomplishments of a kindred spirit. It is a rite of passage.

Makers know what it takes to get an object to the public that is why the opening reception is an important event for them to support. Each maker empathizes with the private and public struggles one must endure in order to get the object to the viewer. The public reception is a celebration by makers as a rite of accomplishment and a moment of celebration with other makers. Receptions are not the time for educating the public which is generally the position taken by non-makers. It is a moment of healing for some makers and a source of ideas for others. Dancers become demanding of self or others prior to an important exhibition. The day of the event is generally much calmer, however. Just before a performance, some makers are withdrawn or, if they are seen publicly, appear very quiet.
Prior to Bill's class performances he is found quietly checking the sound equipment. Since I was an invited performer in his class, I was generally withdrawn, as well. At my first performance with his class, however, I became concerned with the technical coordination of the props for "Evokation" and the movers and the videotaping of the dance. Because I needed reassurance, I followed him around; we laughed at things which reduced the pressure of anticipation for me. It also allowed us opportunities to solve last minute problems and enjoy the surprises that were provided by the students (all of the women in the beginning of the object decided to wear red tee shirts). Bill calmly reassured me that ownership had taken place by the students during one of my absences; he rehearsed the work, himself (which meant he also became a partial owner; later during a taping, Bill told me that he had revised the dance in order to use it for a movement class for theatre majors). The class performance was successful (a videotape is available).

It appears that makers who exhibit their two or three dimensional objects also have moments of doubt and need time to sort through the process that returns them to a confident equilibrium. I have found this difficult within my own capabilities. I cannot address the needs of others when I am committed to solving or following a thought. In order to pursue an idea and maintain some semblance of social contact, I have found it necessary to allot time for total thought absorption (private) and other time for total social interaction (public).

It appears that the arts community to which each maker within this study belongs, extends beyond the boundaries of one culture or
one society as stated earlier. Clearly, each maker maintains dual membership within a "culture of origin"—the place of birth and/or training—while simultaneously assimilating the "culture of migration"—the United States. The specific community of assimilation is also within the global arts community, therefore it is necessary to recognize the similarities between makers, irrespective of their original cultures. In my opinion this is a significant point because the impact and period of migration is often misinterpreted or ignored by reporters. Once a maker leaves his or her culture of origin, he maintains his membership by becoming a part of the global arts community which includes the culture of migration. As a full member, it is quite likely that makers will maintain ideological, societal, or material resources that connect both cultures. Cohen attributes to Hamilton (1985) the recognition of this duality of the concept of community as the heart of the confusion in defining it:

The reality of 'community spirit', the sense of belonging which people exhibit to a small-scale social and cultural entity which is bigger than the 'family' but yet less impersonal than the bureaucracy of work organization, has sat uneasily alongside the attempts of sociologists and anthropologists to locate a structural dimension to communities (p.8).

According to Cohen, community continues to be of both a practical and an ideological significance to most people and that their contravention would identify the perpetrator as an outsider or as deviant. He states:

Learning to be social is not like learning grammar or the Highway Code. It is not reducible to a body of rules. Of course, one can identify rule-like principles...however, they differ from more objective rules, however, in that they are not associated unambiguously, nor even obviously, with a fixed and shared relationale (p. 16).
Community, as it is symbolically constructed, is a system of values, norms, and moral codes which provide a sense of identity within a bounded whole to its members. Community is an entity, a reality, invested with all the sentiment attached to kinship, friendship, neighboring, rivalry, familiarity, jealousy, as they inform the social process of everyday life...community is more than oratorical abstraction: it hinges crucially on consciousness (Cohen, p. 13).

The symbolic repertoire and visual vocabulary collects the individualities of makers, the similarities and differences found within the community. Recognition of their continuous use provides the means for their expression, interpretation and containment within the community. It provides the range within which individuality is recognizable and it continuously transforms the reality of difference into the appearance of similarity with such efficacy that people can still invest the 'community' with ideological integrity. It unites them in their opposition, both to each other, and to those 'outside'. It thereby constitutes, and gives reality to, the community's boundaries (p. 21).

The makers within this study occupy different social stratas within their cultures of origin, yet they all have full membership within the arts community. For example, Ban's father was a public official for years; his mother is a teacher. Also, Shir Lee's parents owned their own business and her mother owned a dance school. Once they enter the United States, their status becomes complicated because of the limited understanding of ethnoesthetics (Hatcher 1985) and ethnoscience by policy makers, thereby limited funding supports
artistic diversity in the U.S. The consciousness of race as a determinant and the unwritten practice of European culture as interpreters of others also limits the individual rights and privileges of members from diverse cultures within the American arts community. Finally, there is a limited awareness by non-members on funding Boards of Directors that makers of the arts community overlook language and distance as barriers to membership within the arts community and are in communication with one another regarding the supportive climate. The exchange of objects does not require language; distance is also not an insurmountable deterrent. It is worth noting that none of the makers came to Columbus because of aesthetic or artistic reasons. Each, however, has found a comfortable niche within the local arts community, in spite of the lack of knowledge or understanding by others regarding their often rich heritage and status.

Initially, Noel made his entry into the American arts community by studying with Martha Graham in New York City. Shir Lee decided also to study with Graham once she arrived in New York City. Ban decided to attend the Utah State University because he felt a need to depict in clay innovation that would have been contradictory to traditional Japanese approaches. Pheoris's adjustments were different because he remained somewhat an "open vessel" to multi-cultural explorations during his training period. But his objects remained primarily influenced by his choices based on what he saw within his African-American culture of origin.

Cohen states that it is not necessary to specify boundaries of
communities although, quite often, members live or work within close proximity of each other or in similar types of communities. I found three of the makers within this study lived within the same community as I do, Victorian Village. A small community within the city of Columbus that lies between the University to the north and the center of the city to the south. This was not part of the design of the study and they were not chosen for this reason, but it certainly points out how makers might select certain areas for living and working over other locations.

As newcomers to the United States, most of the makers had to continuously identify and recognize the diverse stratification of classes within American society and its continual redefining of symbols, boundaries and members. According to Cohen, rather than being the sign of the traditional and outmoded social structure, the cultural experience of community as bounded symbolic whole is something virtually universal in both non-industrial and industrial societies, transcending even the macro-social forces of capitalism and socialism in their many variations (p. 9). The symbolic connection between arts communities of different cultures is in the ability of makers to transcend social forces and stratifications. For example, Pheoris maintains close ties with "adopted family" who are friends he met while in Nigeria. One of the sons is currently living in Philadelphia and is a painter and when he comes to Columbus, Pheoris extends his home and studio in order to accommodate his needs. Shir Lee also made accommodations for her friend and guest choreographer, who placed an object—a dance—on her dance
company in 1987. Accordingly, Shir Lee was treated famously when she reciprocated by placing a dance on the National Dance Company of China. These human exchanges that are intermingled with the making and exchanging of objects among makers is a significant characteristic of the global arts community.

Regarding the kin of makers, however, the arts community may or may not include them. This does not minimize the importance of their support, but according to articles like Nelson’s in AMERICAN ARTIST (1987), the lives of the family are heavily influenced by the needs of the maker. Nelson discusses the lives of wives, husbands and children of artists and the sacrifices of normal patterns of life that must be made by family members. His conclusion is that family members must maintain a strong sense of self-worth and individual identities.

Michelle Hoff-West, Pheoris’ wife, is also a painter. After teaching for ten years in the public schools, she is currently focusing on the education of her triplets and older son. Jenny’s husband, is an art educator who also was a painter. Both of these couples have maintained a supportive communication that encompasses their growth as professionals. They have developed independently but have also contributed to each other as informed viewers.

One maker’s family, Ban, has returned to its country of origin, Japan. The reason for the departure was to raise the children in the traditional culture. He visits them and his parents at least twice a year.
The husband of another, Ben Wu, is not a maker of objects but he contributes by supporting and maintaining her two studios and their home. At the time of this study, he was working in Texas and contemplating a position within the Columbus area.

The other makers are single, but they maintain close relationships with significant others. Bill has established close friendships within the arts community, particularly within both the dance and the African-American community. Also, he and Noel are close professional and personal friends. Their common interests in Caribbean rituals and movement is also a common bond within their friendship. On several occasions, I have participated in workshops sponsored by one of them which featured the other. Also, Noel has placed dances on Bill such as in parts of "The Haitian Suite". One such dance was a rendition of "Yon Vanou". Both, however, maintain contact with friends outside of the area. Noel is returning to his apartment in New York (as of May, 1988) and will begin his studies at New York University. He will continue to dance and hopes to attract some of his friends to joining a dance company. Annually, Bill returns to his home in Memphis for 'rest and recuperation' as well as to nurture family connections.

Symbols are often defined as things 'standing for' other things. But they do not represent these 'other things' unambiguously; indeed, if they did so they would be superfluous and redundant. Rather, they 'express' other things in ways which allow their common form to be retained and shared among the members of a group, while not imposing upon these people the constraints of uniform meaning. Because
symbols are malleable in this way, they can be made to 'fit' the circumstances of the individual. As Cohen states: They can thus provide media through which individuals can experience and express their attachment to a society without compromising their individuality. So versatile are symbols they can often transmute into these idiosyncratic shapes of meaning without such distortion becoming visible to other people who use the same symbol at the same time (Cohen, p. 18). Quite easily, makers can attach their own personal meanings to symbols without informing the society. In this respect, the symbols become less rules of society than influences on society.

When we speak of people acquiring culture, or learning to be social, we mean that they acquire the symbols which will equip them to be social. Needham (1979) states:

Within categories of knowledge, a sub-genus...social knowledge, we find that all such categories are marked by symbolism. The symbolism may be explicit as, for example, in rituals which discriminate among roles, between life and death, between stages and statuses in the life cycle, between gender, between generations, between the pure and the polluted...But much of our symbolism does not have a special vocabulary or idiomatic behavior; it is part of the meaning which we intuitively ascribe to more instrumental and pragmatic things in ordinary use - such as words (p. 14).

Artistic Activity Defines the Boundaries of the Arts Community

Community is just such a "boundary-expressing" symbol. As a symbol, it is held in common by its members; but its meaning varies with its member's unique orientations to it.
The symbols of community are mental constructs; they provide people with the means to make meaning. In doing so, they also provide them with the means to express the particular meanings which the community has for them (p. 19).

Symbols do not tell us what to mean, but give us the capacity to make meaning. 8

The community itself and everything within it, conceptual as well as material, have symbolic potentialities which exist as something for people to think with (Cohen, p. 19). The makers had identified a vocabulary of symbols that reflected their heritage, their material and technical choices. While the materials often reflected their western influence (or their culture of migration), the content (subject) of the objects often reflected their culture of origin. For example, Noel's work in "Feline Feelings" combines Graham's suspended angular contractions with the subtle hip rotations common to African movement. Visually, Pheoris extracts the European model in Vermeer's "The Letter" and Ingres' "Odalisque" and replaces them in his paintings with an African-American model.

There were symbolic images within the home and work environment that prompted thinking and ideas for the maker and other full members within the arts community. In each maker's working environment, the studio, I found visual posters, postcards, video recordings of their own work, of objects made by peers within the community and objects from their mentors, culture of origin and other cultures. I also noticed that within classrooms, there were examples of their own objects intermingled with the work of students. The maker's work was displayed "with respect"—meaning the students were expected to make
an effort to see the work, contemplate it and ask questions about it.

The home is where prized collections are maintained of work by others, often objects that are made from materials and techniques used by the maker. I often found objects that represented the cultures of origin. There were objects that focused on materials such as samples of Kajitani's student's work. Some samples were explorations of possible materials to be used in clay; others were samples of techniques such as neriage (see article by Kajitani in Appendix L). In Jenny's home, there were gifts from other artists as well as a significant collection of African artifacts from the collection she inherited from her father.

Learning words, acquiring the components of language, gives one the potential capacity to communicate with other people but does not tell one what to communicate. Cohen concludes the issue to be faced in the study of community is not whether its structural limits have withstood 'the onslaught of social change', but whether its members are able to continuously infuse its culture with vitality, and to construct a symbolic community which provides meaning and identity. The use of words and the manipulation of their meanings is an important activity within the community. Words as symbols can identify perpetrators and deviants; they can determine common ownership; they can sanction appropriate behavior as well as the appropriate entry into the locations of full members.

Within the arts community, words are continuously being redefined by full members, therefore it is necessary to maintain contact with makers in order to be informed of the changes and the
events that prompted the change. Redefinition is a means of maintaining the boundaries of the community and to identify perpetrators. It is also a form of communication that notifies full members of the need to reclassify previous data and objects and to continue studying (seeing) and analyzing (critiquing) their objects for the purpose of making more objects.

The commonality which is found within a community need not be uniformity. It does not clone behavior or ideas. It is a communality of forms (ways of behaving) whose content (meanings) may vary considerably among its members. The triumph of community is its ability to contain this variety so that its inherent discordance does not subvert the apparent coherence which is impressed by its boundaries. If the members of a community come to feel that they have less in common with each other than they have with the members of some other community then, clearly, the boundaries have become diffused and the integrity of the "community" they enclose has been severely challenged. The important thrust of my argument is that whether there is relative similarity or difference within the community, it is not a matter for 'subjective' or empirical assessment, by non-members or those on the periphery. It is a matter of feeling, a matter which resides within the minds and the boundaries of the members themselves. Thus, although they recognize important differences among themselves, they also suppose themselves to be more like each other than like the members of other communities. This is precisely because the meanings they attach to the symbols may differ, however, they continue to share the symbols.
Indeed, their common ownership of symbols may be so intense that they may be quite unaware or unconcerned that they attach to them meanings which differ from those of their fellows. The symbol can function quite effectively as a means of communication without its meanings being rigorously tested.
1. My definition of full membership identifies makers as the 'nucleus' within the arts community. Without objects, there would not be an arts community, therefore makers remain the primary source of objects. There are other members whom I have termed "peripheral members". They include those who do not necessarily have a commitment to making objects, but are responsible for interpretations to others. Publishers, critics, educators (including teachers) are peripheral members.

2. Full membership means that makers prefer to commit all of their professional energy and time to the process of making objects. Like inductive thinking, the stages of making the object begin long before the tangible evidence of the process. The full member is continuously involved with this process even though other activities such as teaching and writing may require intellectual attention, the process of solving the problem of making the object, continues until it is tangible or discarded at some state of the thinking or making process.

3. Each maker accumulates preferred symbols which are often repeated within several objects or a specific series of objects. For example, Pheoris has used a symbol of the face within his objects over several years and the symbol is recognized as a part of his visual vocabulary. This symbol is often found with other repeated characteristics such as a range of colors that are repeated within a series of objects. The combination of these characteristics establish a visual vocabulary and a repertoire of symbols.

4. Ethnoesthetics is the comparative study of the theories of artists. Ethnoscience is the way people classify the phenomena of the natural world. All peoples classify and their classification both reflects and forms their view of the natural order of things.

Failure to understand and support the theoretical foundation of makers of other cultures is one of the practices I have termed, aesthetic apartheid. For more information on aesthetic apartheid, see the Appendix. Too often the ideational configuration of makers from other cultures are not classified
comparatively. Instead, they are classified as "primitive," or "folk" which implies a different kind of attention or support should be "set aside" for makers and objects of cultures outside of the western interpretation of art.

5. Each of the members reside in Columbus because of reasons that are outside of their object-making. Employment is the primary reason for their being in Columbus.

6. Even makers who were natural citizens recognized the never ending American societal characteristics of invention and experimentation as deterrents to learning and promoting cultural tradition and societal structure.

7. The "placing" of a dance or movement on dancers or movers is a choreographic term which means to transfer the creative object from the maker to those who will perform it or teach it to others.

8. The capacity to make meaning is similar to the placing on of a dance on dancers. The choreographer selects movements that provide the dancer with the capacity to define the idea of the choreographer. Whether this happens, however, is what critics and reviewers base as their "raison d'être."

9. Commonality and communality refer to the social expressions and sentiments of a community.
CHAPTER VII
IMPLICATIONS FOR THE FUTURE

As a visual and performing artist I find the development of this framework (model) exciting because it has the potential for acknowledging the importance of the artist as a vital contributor throughout the various levels of the arts community. It also recognizes the influence of the artist within the institutions that are interconnected within the societal segments, including the aesthetic segment. Through the use of competent viewing and observation skills, the informed viewer is able to record the reality expressed by the artist and include it with the realities expressed by others who have participated with both the producer (the artist), the product (the art object) and the larger society (the cultures of origin and migration).

Review of the Problem and the Results

Based on observations and the gathering of material objects, the original questions have the following answers:

Question A: Are there common observable characteristics found among the selected artists?

There were common observable characteristics found among the artists.
such as the need to travel to stimulating environments and to maintain a visual stimulating working environment. Further, the artists were dependent on the support of both cultures but for different purposes. For example, while Pheoris was financially supported by grants and employment within his culture of migration (for African-Americans, it is generally called "mainstreaming"), his dependence on his culture of origin is the ideological source for his paintings.

In Chapter VI, this study identified some of the personal approaches to artistic activity that are relevant to each of the artists:

The ability to Envision
Individual Problem-solving Techniques
A Personal Manipulation of Time
Selection of Symbols for the Objects From Both Cultures
A Need to Travel to Stimulating Environments
A Need to Maintain a Personal Stimulating Environment
Personal Critiquing of Objects Prior to Public Exhibition or Performance

Question B: Are the existing systems for classifying artifacts, cross-culturally, adequate or useful?

The Maquet model and the UBC classification system enabled the researcher to focus on comparative characteristics (e.g., similarities of materials; functions within specific agencies). The Maquet model revealed the location of objects and relationships with members of agencies outside of the aesthetic segment. Following the pattern of migration of specific objects, such as Kajitani's work to Japanese galleries, revealed the impositions that both governments make on the artists through tax and import laws. The migration pattern of objects was inconclusive, however, because of the lack of
records that was kept by the maker or by agents. It was possible to follow one object—a pod vase—that left Jenny, was sold at Of the Heart Gallery in Columbus and was shipped to Harrisburg, PA to be given as a gift to newlyweds. Other objects were difficult to follow therefore the migratory patterns of objects has proven inconsequential, to date.

The UBC classification system, however, revealed the possible categories that the maker produced objects that were not considered before as ways of viewing or interpreting the object.

Question C: What are the implications of these observations and classifications, cross-culturally?

It is essential that the academic segment of the arts community correct the traditional approach to reporting artistic activity that arbitrarily includes the endorsements of the artists. With the same kind of commitment to accuracy that is sought in other fields of inquiry, it is necessary that such endorsements are clearly a part of reports. As the challenge expressed by Johnetta Cole in ANTHROPOLOGY FOR THE NINETIES (1988):

A growing emphasis on studying others and ourselves encourages anthropologists to reexamine existing theories and methodologies, to question anew the most fundamental notions about the purpose and indeed the responsibilities involved in studying all the folk of the world. (p. 4)

Cole encourages the study and understanding of our own culture as a means of countering ethnocentrism, the assumption that one's own way of life including the objects that are made according to one's own way of life is superior to all others:
And just as studying other cultures can increase an understanding of our own (including the arts: author's inclusion) studying phenomena in our own way of life can help us to understand certain attitudes and behaviors among other peoples. (p. 9)

Regarding the six additional questions that were identified within the problem: The responsibility to teach an accurate view of artists as they relate to their society must also include information on their individual world views, their diverse interrelationships within that society, their global relationships and their technical and material approaches to problem-solving. Once this focused view of information is made available to students, it is possible that the student is able to see the similarities that are comparative for cross-cultural interpretations and view the objects as an informed viewer.

In reviewing the information written by others on the makers within this study, it became clear that the makers often did not see the published articles until they were sent published copies. In a particular article on Shir Lee (see notes from March 17, 1988) a critic from THE COLUMBUS DISPATCH had totally misinterpreted the meaning of "Madame Butterfly". In an article on Pheoris in ACCLAIM (Winter, 1988), the writer interpreted the African quality of the use of the spiral within some of his work and related it to Duchamp. But there is no attempt to relate the qualities of Africans within the life of America (African-Americans) as a source of stimulation and motivation for his work.
It is important to note that both of these reports are done by European-Americans for "mainstream" publications. Both artists are reported quite differently in articles that have been done for their cultures of origin (see Wu, CHINA POST, 1/31/86, pg. 277; also see West, ACE, Spring, 1988 in the Appendix, 273). It appears that there is a significant difference in the interpretation and promotion of the artists and the objects by those who are members of the culture of origin from those who are from the culture of migration. The influence within the aesthetic segment on the objects and the artists within the culture of migration has been one of continually proving each maker's identity as an artist as defined by whatever standards may be in vogue within the mainstream culture of migration. Such criteria do not take in the credentials achieved in the culture of origin.

Another influence within the aesthetic segment is the location of the objects or where they are exhibited. The resumes show that most of the objects are within the educational agencies (schools) rather than within agencies identified within the market (galleries, market). While there is some activity within the markets, there is still not enough to support the artist. Jenny was the only artist who was able to support herself solely on her objects that are exhibited beyond the education segment. Her affinity and support of the Western tradition (see journal notes, November 20, 1987) may explain her acceptance within the market, especially in small galleries and museums. As resumes indicate, each of the makers have a wealth of performance or exhibition records in and outside of the
aesthetic segment. Nevertheless, comparative review indicates that the more the artist identifies with the culture of origin, the less support is received from the market.

Further research is needed, however, particularly in addressing specific influences on support or lack of it by the cultures. For example, it appears that the practices that determined successful support within the mainstream culture rarely recognized the form, styles and ideologies from the maker's culture of origin. For example, it has taken ten years for Pheoris West to receive an Ohio Arts Council Individual Artist Award and it happened when there was an informed representative of his culture of origin as a member of the selection panel. This raises concern regarding the practice of panel selection which determines who receives support within the mainstream culture. Selection by race rather than by ideologies and aesthetics continually influences decision-making by funding agencies.

This study successfully reveals that each artist maintains dual membership within the culture of origin and the culture of migration. Primarily through the use of titles of work and contacts with members of the arts community, each maker was able to continue artistic activity within both cultures. Additionally, each maker is also able to affiliate with several segments within both cultures in addition to the aesthetic segment. This would include the involvement with different classes of a society as well as various agencies within segments.
Finally, this study suggests that the boundaries of the arts community are not necessarily limited by the geographical boundaries that have been defined by specific societies. Instead, it is suggested that makers are identified as the only 'full members' of a global arts community that selects its members based on the continued production of objects. Through the continued practice of making objects, the makers maintained their primary relationships with other members of the arts community based on the amount of time involved in researching, making and exhibiting objects of art. While each maker had relationships outside of the arts community, it appeared that family and friends would accommodate the need for private time and relationships with other makers.

The involvement of the artists during the interpretation of objects was critical to the understanding of the object. While I thought I knew what was being expressed by Shir Lee Wu's "Madame Butterfly" it was not until I showed her my interpretation that I received the full understanding and the depth of the work (see Appendix). There were occasions, however, that I saw something else within the object such as in West's "Two Sister's". While his interpretation as well was different from mine it is my opinion that both are important to the reader. Therefore, both need to be included in any report on the art object.

The Value of a Qualitative Theoretical Framework for Further Study

There is a continued need for a systematic qualitative approach to studying the artistic activity and the making of objects in order
to focus on what is essential and what is embellishment. First, it is essential to identify the physical principles (instrumental elements) of artistic activity. Once these principles have been identified, it is possible to interpret the aesthetic principles (noninstrumental elements). After identifying and classifying them, it is possible to make conclusions that may or may not lead to further ethnological comparisons. This is extremely important to cross-cultural studies because through such specific comparisons the researcher is able to determine whether or not specific objects are comparable. Additionally, it becomes apparent to the researcher what information is essential to the study of the artist or the object. While such an approach may appear sterile, it is an effort to reduce the romantic notions that Western interpretations have previously attached to art objects and to the makers of the objects. It also increases the opportunities for inclusion of embellishing information on objects and makers who have not been interpreted with the care and language that is used when describing the work of Western artists, especially European descendants.
An Ethnological Study of Makers (use of the Maguet Model)

Culture of Origin $\rightarrow$ Culture of Migration (U.S.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Floch, J.</td>
<td>Hall, N.</td>
<td>Kajitani, B.</td>
<td>McCray, W.</td>
<td>West, P.</td>
<td>Wu, S.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anthroposophy</td>
<td>Culture</td>
<td>Color</td>
<td>Caribbean</td>
<td>Tradition</td>
<td>Diaspora</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>European</td>
<td>Folklore</td>
<td>Zen</td>
<td>Hinduism</td>
<td>African</td>
<td>Genne</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function</td>
<td>Rituals</td>
<td>Innovation</td>
<td>Theatre (American)</td>
<td>Technology (American)</td>
<td>Ancient</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(American)</td>
<td>Modern</td>
<td>Technique (American)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>II</th>
<th>Market</th>
<th>Market</th>
<th>Market</th>
<th>Market</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>Galleries</td>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>Galleries</td>
<td>Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Societal</td>
<td>Texts</td>
<td>Journals</td>
<td>Texts</td>
<td>Journals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Networks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>III</th>
<th>Clay</th>
<th>Gravity-defined</th>
<th>Clay</th>
<th>Aerial-defined &amp; Gravity-defined</th>
<th>Oil</th>
<th>Aerial-defined</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Figure 14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Towards An Ethnological Study of Makers
(see Figure 14)

The comparative listing of each artist according to the three levels of Maquet's model has removed the embellishments of the artistic activity of the artists as it relates to cultures. Each maker's ideologies is identified and can be used for further comparative interpretation. Therefore, one maker's ideology will not be overlooked at the exclusion of another. This is important to the way information is presented to students. For example in the Brommer book entitled, DISCOVERING ART HISTORY there is one chapter devoted to the ideology of cultures outside of the Western tradition while the entire book reinforces the ideology of the Western values. Although the text gives an impression of addressing the needs of diverse cultures, the underlying framework remains Eurocentric.

The comparison of essentials also reveals the similarities among the makers regarding the use of the societal networks. Each maker is simultaneously involved with agencies in and outside of the aesthetic segment. This is very important in reporting in order to give a clearer picture of the competence of makers to interact with a variety of individuals who represent divergent world views and ways of problem-solving.

Finally, the comparison of materials and techniques of manipulating the materials enables the reporter to identify any similarities or differences. For example, through interviews and observations, I was able to see the emphasis of working with the ground (gravity-defined) in Noel's work and the defiance to the
ground (aerial-defined) of Shir Lee’s work. While the movement might appear the same to an uninformed viewer, the motivation was different.

It is important to emphasize that the weakest interpretations within this study were those that addressed the artistic activity and objects of clay. To date I am still intimidated by the material although I have a deep appreciation for the objects and the makers. My experience with the material, however, has been less than successful and it is my conclusion that my interpretations of makers and their objects reveal this lack of confidence and keen sense of focus that is needed in reporting artistic activity. As an appreciator, I can purchase and assist those who work with the material; however, my understanding of the artistic activity of painting or dance is far more informed and my reporting revealed the difference.

This study revealed the need for continued assessment of the interpretive instruments that were used in gathering the data. While the Maquet model served as a reasonably successful theoretical model and the University of British Columbia classification system provided the objective classification structure I needed, I found that my fieldwork required adjustments to the specific interviewing procedures and questions that I developed in the beginning of the study.

Reconstructive anthropology (MacCannell, 1981) also contributes practical experiences that are relevant to contemporary understanding of cultures. Reconstructive anthropology, defines current
understanding about the makers and objects within a culture, by first recognizing the historical biases of Western interpretations. It is possible, therefore, to move beyond the historical practices and develop models such as the Triangulational Model (Denzin, 1970) that can assist in establishing comparative understanding of makers and objects. The use of it is valid because it can also consistently pinpoint periods of time when migrations, or exchanges, take place. It is with this understanding that contemporary policy-makers and educators can teach art. Aesthetic anthropology recognizes the need for dismantling traditional interpretations of objects and makers. For example, in "Establishment Images and Elite Adornments", a book review on the book AFRICAN ART AND LEADERSHIP by Douglas Fraser and Herbert Cole (1972), Maquet applies the levels of the aesthetic segment as a basis for critiquing the book. The use of the Maquet model clarifies a writer's interpretation so that it is comparative with other objects. While the Maquet model does not specifically identify the religion and educational segments within the societal networks, they are recognized as segments within cultural anthropology.

The Maquet model is also useful in identifying the specific segments within a culture for whom the maker is making the object. By separating the different levels it is possible to recognize similarities between objects, makers or cultures. For example, there is similarity among the makers in the use of titles for objects that represent folklore or traditions within their culture of origin.
Also, the sub-disciplines of cultural anthropology, such as aesthetic anthropology (Maquet), "qualitative anthropology" (Mills) and "holistic anthropology" (Hatcher) can contribute to a theoretical framework and model for cross-cultural studies of both visual and performing makers and their objects. The compilation of theory and practical application of these sub-disciplines of anthropology have contributed to the belief systems of this study. They have assisted in the recognition of the impact of other cultural segments on the makers and their objects based on societal events and individual conflicts. As the data on makers within this study indicates, it is impossible to ignore the influence of societal events on the decisions made by makers and their objects to acknowledge their environment. The Cultural Revolution in China, the era of Hitler in Europe and the Disturbances of the 1960's in the United States did indeed influence the experiences and the maker's choices of instrumental or non-instrumental symbols for the objects. There remains, however, within each of the makers a need to continue to make objects and to continue to learn in spite of societal atrocities. One way of assuring continued growth and support is to maintain full membership within the arts community.

Knowledge of this kind is essential for those who are responsible for interpreting the maker or object to a specialized community such as a community within the educational segment of a culture. While interpreters may have full membership within their community, such as within the academic or media community, it is important to recognize that their affiliation within the arts
community is temporary or peripheral. It is necessary to have the acceptance of makers, based on the production of objects to maintain full membership. It is necessary to maintain the experience of production in order to interpret the experiences and events that comprise the objects and their purpose by the maker and for a specific audience. Materials and techniques (Level I) change and the informed interpreter needs to be aware of these changes and how they may affect the individual ideological, physical and mental attitude of the maker.

While each maker is a full member within the arts community, each serves other societal networks within the culture of origin and migration. For example, each of the makers within this study have objects within the economic segment (e.g., tourism) and have had some level of experience with governmental support (e.g., QAC or NEA). All have served as representatives of the aesthetic segment within other cultural segments (e.g., the educational segment or the religious segment). The recognition of the inter-relationships of segments is critical within interpretations because they identify the social involvement of makers that is similar and valued by the public outside of the arts community. This is also important within the training of students who will become makers and educators.

In societies like the United States, it is essential to identify specific linkages between segments. It is essential that art educators identify these linkages in order to increase a practical appreciation of makers and their objects. There are no global generalizations about makers, their objects or their cultures.
Each has discovered a unique approach to making objects and existing within a complex society. Still, each has remained loyal to traits of a culture of origin and to the traditions of technique and materials of a particular expression of objects. This kind of information is worthy and teachable. It also bridges diverse cultures.

Art educators risk their peripheral membership within the arts community when interpretations are embraced by interpreters who do not recognize the inclusion of the maker as essential to the understanding and teaching about art, specifically within the United States. It is necessary to minimize the teaching of art as a currency of exchanges within the economic segment and increase the teaching of art as a representation of the aesthetic segment within a culture. Also, it is essential that art is taught as a basic entry to inquiry. This approach to learning and transferring information is significant to the educational segment of any culture. It reminds all students that the arts are significant to all human activity whether it relates to a tangible object within the aesthetic segment or to the recognition of symbols from another culture.

Cross-cultural approaches to inquiry are important areas for further research. Methods that emphasize quality that are practiced by individual makers can lead the interpreter to the general reasons people make things in different parts of the world. It helps differentiate between those reasons that are individually-initiated and those that are societally-motivated. It is important to recognize that makers do not deny their cultures of origin.
Representation can be found within their choices of titles, symbols and oral descriptions.

Implications for Future Research

How does one prepare for entry within the arts community? Based on this study, it is recommended that part of the training of interpreters include recognition of traits, habits, traditions and courtesies within the arts community. This is essential prior to the interpretation of makers as well as their objects. Prior to entering the community, it is necessary for students to know what they expect to see and say to the maker. It is important to have some personal knowledge of the level of competence an interpreter might have with a particular material or technique (this is important to admit to the maker, as well).

The student should also have an assessment of his own competence (as defined in Chapter I) within the aesthetic segment of his culture. Competence in writing is not necessarily going to allow access to a maker who is competent with clay. The ability should be within similar areas of expression (e.g., an interpreter of clay should be competent in clay). It is also important that the interpreter has been accepted by the specific members under investigation. Exchanges of objects is an important reciprocating ritual among those who make. Establishing a personal collection of objects and recognizing one's abilities and limitations with a particular material or technique is essential in establishing a line of communication with a maker. Also, what is expressed by one maker
about his ideology or materials is not necessarily transferable to
other makers. It is important to write about individual makers and
specific objects in order to maintain a perspective that is
comparable. This is essential for cross-cultural studies. By doing
so, interpretations will include the processes beyond the aesthetic
segment that are also essential to the object and the inter­
relationships of the maker beyond the arts community.

Preparation for similar field work requires that:

1. the researcher understands that the arts community is not
limited to specific geographical boundaries.

2. the researcher can differentiate between interpretations of the
individual needs and the societal needs of an object. This will
require a significant amount of time once data has been gathered
and comparative charts like Figure 14 have been developed.

3. the researcher understands and experiences making objects in
order to interpret the artistic activity of artists. As this
report reveals, it is limiting to report that which has not been
experienced. It certainly limits the understanding by those who
must be introduced to the maker, second-hand (through books,
films, recordings, etc.).

4. the researcher must be prepared for continual reassessment of
ethical questions such as when to approach the artist without
intruding upon artistic activity or when not to report specific
situations that might jeopardize the confidentiality of the
artist or the relationship between the researcher and the arts
community and the academic community.

These findings also revealed that parts of this study can be
repeated. According to Mill's study, "qualitative anthropology is
proposed in order to record the process of experience and the
events." The process can be quantified if the researcher is capable
of repeating the process that the maker uses in making the object.
By the researcher (or interpreter of data) living the basics of the
experience over and over again, it is possible to develop a more accurate interpretation. In other words, if a larger population of makers were available within each of the six cultures the structure could expand in order to accommodate the additional inclusion of artists. Also, additional cultures could be accommodated in the comparative charting (Figure 14).

I believe that the makers within this study have reached a personal understanding of their interrelationship with societies that is worthy of inclusion in the interpretations of objects. While there is recognition of their dependency on some societal institutions, there is an understanding that one society cannot totally fulfill the needs of a maker. It is the responsibility of the individual maker to determine what she does that can be of benefit to the society and at what cost to her time, education, spirit, and energy. Allocations of these four elements that are necessary to creating must be considered and redistributed by the maker each time an object is made in order to include further interaction with members who are outside of the arts community.

As Cohen so aptly states it:

...we have a long way to go until we...feel that the only determining feature of our social lives is our relationship to the means of production and membership of a social class (p. 8).

The community of makers must be maintained across geographic boundaries. Culture, as defined earlier, has a richer purpose when the racial criteria is removed and they are replaced with commonalities such as membership which is determined by identifying those who have experienced, with some measure of competence, the
process of making objects. This process requires extensions into several micro-cultures, defined within the aesthetic segment of Western scholarship known as fine arts, visual and performing arts, painting, oil painting, to name a few. As the questions in Chapter I raise the issues of community, and Chapter VI provides answers, as researcher, I state the following:

Makers comprise a global community; gallery owners, publishers, critics and educators have memberships in the arts community but it is my opinion that it is peripheral and is pending on the primary commitments each has to other segments of the geographical society. Hence, the nucleus of the global arts community is comprised of the makers, relatives (kin) and the friends who make objects.

I would like to further the study of each maker and the objects each has made throughout his or her lifetime. It is through this kind of in-depth investigation that I believe an understanding of artistic activity, the global arts community and comparative research relevant to artists and their objects can unearth information that is worth teaching.
Chapter VII- Notes

1. Kajitani has two equivalent degrees, one from a university in Japan and one from the United States (see resume). During an interview with Wu, she told me that in order for her to teach at a certain university, it was necessary for her to obtain a degree in dance education.

2. I thought it expressed the value of kinship as a Western influence; Pheoris did not agree with my interpretation and stated that the West influenced the "use of stretched canvas" however the "application of oil paints is different" (see Appendix).

3. For further explanation of the terms "instrumental elements" and "noninstrumental elements", read "Critical Review of Jacques Maquet's Framework" located in the APPENDIX.

4. Interesting, however, both makers studied dance with Martha Graham. Nevertheless, each has chosen to emphasize her technique differently and focus on their cultures of origin for dance themes.

5. The classification of artifacts forms and the interviewing questions, however, are currently being evaluated by my students at Kenyon as they use them for comparative studies of specific objects and artists.

6. Throughout my fieldwork, I always felt I might jeopardize the study by being misunderstood or misinterpreted by members of either community. Such a sensitive position is familiar to anthropologists and it required continual reassessment of my own interpersonal skills as well as the politics within both communities.
EPILOGUE

A Personal Historical Background of My Study

In retrospect, I admit that I set out on this trek with a personal chip on my shoulder! After reading collections of data for the past twenty-five years that seemingly divides the arts into two different educational systems and for two kinds of readers—I had had enough! This dual burden so appropriately identified by W. E. B. Dubois as part of the plight of "Negroes", was certainly getting in the way of discovering methods of inquiry that would prove relevant to the twenty-first century.

As sensitive and methodological as Melville Herskovits is in MYTH OF THE NEGRO PAST (1941), he still remains unfamiliar with the making of objects by "Negroes" and does not indicate any particular experience with his making objects. Therefore, his reporting is limited to that which has been written by those outside of the arts. Also, he does not include the wealth of data from the academic community of the "Negro" such as that by Alain Locke.

Even after further readings of Herskovits such as MAN AND HIS WORKS and ANTHROPOLOGY, I kept returning to the same puzzling questions: where are the contributions on the visual and performing arts of James Porter or Ira Aldridge who were both influential at
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Howard University prior to or during Herskovits' tenure? Where is DuBois, Pearl Primus or even his peer-colleague, Zora Neal Hurston, who was also a literary artist?

Thirsty for evidence of African-Americans in the arts, I resorted to articles that dealt with the entertainment segment within published American society. Data on artists-as-entertainers quickly revealed that Africans in America were at the mercy of critics such as John Martin, author of BOOK OF DANCE (1963), who considered "Negroes" in ballet as social novelties and physiologically ill-equipped. Fortunately, a more sensitive treatment was being done by a scholar, Lynne Fauley Emory, BLACK DANCE IN AMERICA (1970), but she also followed the traditional classification of dance by "Negroes" as it led to the entertainment segment of American society.

I decided that the only other source of information open to me was to identify African American artists within educational institutions. Through introductions to research by Samella Lewis (1970), it appeared that African-American artists were often teachers at historically-black colleges. Why? Why weren't they viewed as contemporaries in local galleries? Also, why didn't I see Robert Stuart Duncanson's paintings among the nineteenth century Illuminist when I visited the National Gallery Art? The irony was that I certainly had seen reproductions of Henry Tanner and Edward Bannister on the walls of the academy of dance where I studied ballet for ten years of my life. We also had original paintings of Lois Mailou Jones and we danced to the classical music of Scott Joplin. Why wasn't Jones recognized within texts like Janson's HISTORY OF ART?
Why is it that many students had never heard of Joplin's serious work like TREEMONISHA?4

Two months before graduating from George Washington University, I attempted to seek some method of inquiry by discussing these urgings with the chairman of the art department. Without ever looking up from his book, he responded to my concerns by suggesting that I transfer to Howard University...I recall mumbling to myself, "Herskovits was at Howard and he did not see us there, either." Over the years, after transferring from different schools, different disciplines, different departments and even different parts of the United States, I have concluded that invisibility is not exclusively geared to only African-Americans. Seeking information written by other cultures equivalent-to-scholars, particularly those classified as "primitive", has proven to be as difficult.

Therefore my personal attempt toward "corrective scholarship (Johnetta Cole, 1989)" is this study that attempts to include what I have discovered about my culture's contributions to American arts, while simultaneously paving the way for other cultures who wish to remove the possible chips from the shoulders of those within who seek inclusion, artistically and academically.

(From "'Fessin' Up - A response to a conversation with Kenneth Marantz," February 18, 1989)
EPILOGUE – Notes

1. For the past twenty-five years, I have learned from and taught with data that seemingly represents two different educational systems within the American society. One system includes the research, scholarship and educational needs of African-Americans. The other, addresses the same needs, but from an assumed position of "American" which does not necessarily include the research, scholarship and educational needs of African-Americans. It became even more perplexing because the arts—my primary academic concern—divided and often denied or ignored the contributions of the African-American educational system, quantitatively and qualitatively. For example, I would receive references that included authors like James Port (HISTORY OF NEGRO ART) and Samella Lewis (ART: AFRICAN AMERICAN) from professors of my culture; but when I asked other professors, they knew very little or nothing about them. As a reader, therefore, I was faced with the dilemma of embracing that data that was readily available about one system while simultaneously resisting the comfortable position of accepting the accessible as representative of that which was inaccessible.

2. While sensitive to the misinterpretations of Blacks prior to his writings, Melville Herskovits remains an interpreter from the outside of the culture in general (MYTH OF THE NEGRO PAST, 1941) and outside of the arts, specifically (MAN AND HIS WORKS, 1947). He is unfamiliar with making objects and is equally unfamiliar with "Negroes" who make or interpret such objects.

3. Each, contributed tremendously to the scholarship of African-Americans at historically Black colleges and communities, yet their work was not cited in the so-called "melting pot" scholarship within American education, such as in Janson’s HISTORY OF ART (1962) or Arnason’s MODERN ART (1968).

4. At that point, it appeared to me that whether data was available via literature or personal interaction among scholars, the recognition of that data if it were written by and for African-Americans, was generally excluded from the American educational segment. Likewise, data on African-American artists was challenged, ignored or classified outside of the arts community (e.g., the commercial/entertainment segment).
LISTING OF RECORDED INTERVIEWS

Tape recordings:

Jenny Floch November 20, 1987
Noel Hall May, 1988
Bill McCray May 6, 1988
Pheoris West May 7, 1988
Shir Lee Wu May 7, 1988
Ban Kajitani June 3, 1988

Videotape recordings:

Shir Lee Ode of Plum
Bill McCray Yon Vanou
Maquet's structural extensions towards aesthetics, art history and the public are an intellectual challenge to the preservers of segregated fields of thought and thinkers. Who gives this man the right to trespass the hallowed ground of aesthetics? There are no weaknesses within this framework. There are, however, misinterpretations.

For example, there are critics of his book AESTHETIC EXPERIENCE: An Anthropologist Looks at the Visual Arts (1986), who finds it difficult to understand Maquet's recognition of aesthetics as one of many forms of contemplation. Schier (1979) interprets Maquet:

he claims that artworks engender a peculiar consciousness in the onlooker...his argument is haunted by an inappropriate model of aesthetic experience...finally, his claim that aesthetic experience is concept-free cannot be reconciled with his view that it constitutes a mode of attention.

Phillips recognizes the value of Maquet's work, yet he admits to a failure to understand, in entirety, the position of Maquet's views:

somewhere in the middle of Professor Maquet's writing there are honest, modest, interesting insights about art and its audience; but more often than not in this most elusive subject he is over-extended: his thoughts fly up, his words remain below.
In another review, Kobak of KIRKUS REVIEW (1985), finds Maquet's work, "a disappointment all around". He states, that his work does not add 'anything new' to an already familiar territory among knowledgeable aestheticians:

Maquet addresses the question of how art is perceived, suggests there is a linkage between the aesthetic experience and certain forms of Far Eastern meditation, speculates on the meanings and messages to be found in works of art and investigates the intellectual, natural, cultural and technical elements that shape aesthetic forms - all familiar territory.

Kobak adds that Maquet's writing style is "elephantine"; that his need for "neologisms" bogs an already stumbling jargon and that the effect is annoying that finally rises to "soporific."

That is not, however, the position of scholars who have used the framework and have found his interpretation of artists to be valuable, cross-culturally. Field (1982) implemented a study that compared the artist archetype in western Liberia and the United States. She found that six major similarities emerged regarding wood carvers in Gola culture and artists within the United States, (1) to be hostile to the dominant values of their culture; (2) to be 'unreliable' or 'unstable'; (3) to be 'conceited' or 'arrogant'; (4) to encounter and endure some form of 'suffering' an integral part of their vocation; (5) to show little interest in, and little aptitude for, making and managing wealth; and (6) to have access to insights and inspirations outside the realm of normal human experience engendering both wariness and awe.
By implementing the Maquet framework, she states:

Maquet suggests that an anthropological analysis of the 'aesthetic segment' begins with the 'limitations' imposed by productive techniques on the other levels of a culture. To explain why artists in both cultures are thought to be hostile to dominant values (p. 720).

Her approach was to first examine the economic structures of the two societies, and the ways in which they shape majoritarian goals and values. Her findings do show similarities between the two cultures. In discussing the United States, she recognizes the dilemma of the public in understanding the artist:

In a culture whose dominant values revolve around self-aggrandizement, the pursuit of non-material goals requires some sort of explanation. The belief that artists (and carvers) are 'meant to suffer' and 'don't care about wealth' renders such behaviour more comprehensible.

Except for a brief period in the 1930's (WPA), over supply of labour has made the artist's occupation difficult to organize. Also discriminatory tax laws work against the artist; participant-observation in art schools revealed to her that professional socialization does tend to inculcate the value of non-materialism. Therefore, these and other factors contribute to the behaviour choices of artists. Field's choice of categorizing these issues was by utilization of the Maquet framework.

Another example of his influence was a comparative study of music aesthetics and music education. Schwadron (1973) explores the methodology within the diversity of ideas, systems, and values in Western and non-Western traditions. In the inaugural issue of a new journal on interdisciplinary studies to music, MUSIC AND MAN, he and
other scholars within music/music education have identified eight major purposes of studies in comparative music aesthetics:

1. To test and refine personal aesthetic sensitivities, responses, understandings, values, and descriptions.

2. To examine comparative aesthetic condition and attitudes which tend to influence musical production, consumption, and concomitant behavior.

3. To develop a feeling for aesthetic sensibility in both form and expression as sources of meanings in world music.

4. To consider attitudinal (egocentric and ethnocentric) tendencies, both personal and cultural, which are obstacles to a pluralistic aesthetic reference.

5. To consider such far-reaching problems as revision in Western aesthetic theory and the impact of acculturation on both Western and non-Western music cultures.

6. To understand the need for and problems in the development of a conventional universe of discourse and description in world music.

7. To analyze prevailing and derived generalizations about music and man, in a global sense, and to attempt processes of selective cultural synthesis.

8. To consider not only theoretical and speculative aspects, but also the potential aesthetic implications of global music for education, musicality, new audiences, mass media, an artistic communication.

Schwadron recognizes Maquet's contribution to the field of comparative studies within the arts. The following is an example of his interpretation of Maquet:

He (Maquet) concurs that (1) aesthetic sensibility is understood as the capacity to be aesthetically aware, but not necessarily to respond the same way to the same stimuli; (2) aesthetic perception function "in the physiology of the human organism" and (3) arguments between language and experience are moot (p. 101).

Schwadron concurs with Maquet that aesthetic sensibility, rooted in the human condition, is universal and attested to by noninstrumental forms visible in artifacts coming from everywhere. In music
education, the need for "careful inquiry" is being incorporated within teacher preparation. At UCLA, music education includes an innovative track merging graduate studies in the field with intensive courses in ethnomusicology. The purpose is to prepare teachers with unique expertise in the merged fields:

those who - as an outcome of study and research - will be most qualified to generate and to realize effective classroom settings (p. 106).

The recognition of Maquet's aesthetic perception to music is the beginning of my realization of the potential this "way of thinking and inquiring" can benefit cross-discipline as well as cross-cultural research and teaching.

Support of Maquet's work is found, however, throughout book reviews of his most recent publication. John Spurling of THE NEW STATESMAN recommends the book "warmly...to anyone who has ever stopped to look at a work of art and wondered why." N.C. Greenberg, in CHOICE, recommends the book for its "extensive bibliography as well as a significant compilation of questions relating to each chapter that can be used for classroom and seminar purposes. Greenberg suggests that it is useful for upper-division undergraduates, graduate and general readers. Lambrecht, in LIBRARY JOURNAL, supports Maquet's "reflective, insightful account of cross-cultural perceptions." He warns anthropologists:

the intricate connections between the cultural level and the universal and singular levels cannot be ignored, thus careful observations of our inner life should not be banished from the anthropological realm.
The most thorough, empathetic review of Maquet's work has been written by Norris Brock Johnson in AMERICAN ANTHROPOLOGIST. First, there is an identification of Maquet's theory by recognizing earlier work such as the INTRODUCTION written in 1979. Johnson brings to the review a sense of continuity of Maquet's focus:

That book (INTRODUCTION) made valuable distinctions between aesthetic (contemplative) and cognitive experience and defined "primitive art" as a category of phenomenon artificially created, by metamorphosis, in the museum context.

Johnson also supports Maquet's concern that art historians and aesthetic anthropologists should be familiar with each other's subject matter. Like Robert Plant Armstrong, Edmund Carpenter and George Mills, Maquet continues to reject the dichotomy between (art historian) "civilized art" and (anthropologist) "primitive art". Maquet's writings illustrate that contemporary aesthetic anthropologists also must be competent art historians, able to discuss the iconographic fora and meaning of aesthetic objects and experiences occurring in a wide range of socio-cultural settings. Maquet's work bears witness to the continuing demise of "primitive art".

Finally, the most significant example of using the framework is done by Maquet, himself. In a book review ("Establishment Images and Elite Adornment, 1983) Maquet discusses the book, AFRICAN ART AND LEADERSHIP by Douglas Fraser and Herbert M. Cole. Immediately, Maquet identifies the differences between what the authors "say" they will discuss the topic and "how" they actually discuss it. For example, Fraser talks about art but never identifies a definition of what art is for the purpose of his book. While the focus is on the
relationship of art to leadership, Maquet states:

I have not found a single sentence in the book that indicates what is meant by "art in a traditional African context...In the European tradition, 'art object' has come, during the last three centuries, to designate artifacts whose primary usage is to be looked at (p. 298).

But, this is not necessarily the tradition of African art that is expressed by Africans. Maquet continues to ask questions:

On what basis did the authors choose some ritual, dynastic, or funerary objects and attribute to them the artistic qualification?...For our authors sculptured forms and elaborately decorated items are thus art, whereas stones and plain clothing are not, even if usage and meaning are the same (p. 298).

Throughout the review, Maquet identifies the limitations of the author's willingness to extend beyond their own cultural competence. He blames "the lack of an analytical and conceptual framework common to the editors and the contributors" as the source of the problem. He states that the importance of aesthetic anthropology is to:

concentrate its efforts on the forms of the artifacts belonging to its field of research...(by doing so) there is a bridging of the intellectual gap between the functionalist and the formalist approaches, revealing more clearly how and why art is used to promulgate a culture's fundamental values" (p. 300).

Maquet concludes that there is a need for better conceptual and theoretical tools rather than other monographic studies. The significant value of the SLM study is in addressing concepts and theory.
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or his/her authorized representative has explained the purpose of the study, the procedures to be followed, and the expected duration of my (my child's) participation. Possible benefits of the study have been described as have alternative procedures, if such procedures are applicable and available.

I acknowledge that I have had the opportunity to obtain additional information regarding the study and that any questions I have raised have been answered to my full satisfaction. Further, I understand that I am (my child is) free to withdraw consent at any time and to discontinue participation in the study without prejudice to me (my child).

Finally, I acknowledge that I have read and fully understand the consent form. I sign it freely and voluntarily. A copy has been given to me.

Date: August 2, 1977

Signed: [Signature]
(Participant)

Signed: [Signature]
(Principal Investigator or his/her Authorized Representative)

Signed: [Signature]
(Person Authorized to Consent for Participant - If Required)

Witness: __________________________
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CONSENT FOR PARTICIPATION IN
SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL RESEARCH

I consent to participating in (or my child's participation in) research entitled:

[Anthropological Framework for Interpreting
Contemporary Children from Diverse Cultures]

(Principal Investigator) or his/her authorized representative has

explained the purpose of the study, the procedures to be followed, and the
expected duration of my (my child's) participation. Possible benefits of the
study have been described as have alternative procedures, if such procedures
are applicable and available.

I acknowledge that I have had the opportunity to obtain additional information
regarding the study and that any questions I have raised have been answered to
my full satisfaction. Further, I understand that I am (my child is) free to
withdraw consent at any time and to discontinue participation in the study
without prejudice to me (my child).

Finally, I acknowledge that I have read and fully understand the consent form.
I sign it freely and voluntarily. A copy has been given to me.

Date: January 1980

Signed:

(Signature)

Signed:

(Principal Investigator or his/her Authorized Representative)

Signed:

(Person Authorized to Consent for Participant - If Required)

Witness:
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THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

CONSENT FOR PARTICIPATION IN
SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL RESEARCH

I consent to participating in (or my child's participation in) research entitled:

Explanatory Framework for Contemporary Artists from Diverse Cultures

(Principal Investigator)

or his/her authorized representative has explained the purpose of the study, the procedures to be followed, and the expected duration of my (my child's) participation. Possible benefits of the study have been described as have alternative procedures, if such procedures are applicable and available.

I acknowledge that I have had the opportunity to obtain additional information regarding the study and that any questions I have raised have been answered to my full satisfaction. Further, I understand that I am (my child is) free to withdraw consent at any time and to discontinue participation in the study without prejudice to me (my child).

Finally, I acknowledge that I have read and fully understand the consent form. I sign it freely and voluntarily. A copy has been given to me.

Date: February 1, 1989
Signed: ____________________________

Signed: ____________________________
(Principal Investigator or his/ her Authorized Representative)
Signed: ____________________________
(Person Authorized to Consent for Participant - If Required)

Witness: ____________________________

HS-027 (Rev. 3/87) — (To be used only in connection with social and behavioral research.)
THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

CONSENT FOR PARTICIPATION IN
SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL RESEARCH

I consent to participating in (or my child's participation in) research entitled:

An Anthropological Framework for Interpreting Contemporary Artists From Diverse Cultures

or his/her authorized representative has

(Principal Investigator)

explained the purpose of the study, the procedures to be followed, and the expected duration of my (my child's) participation. Possible benefits of the study have been described as have alternative procedures, if such procedures are applicable and available.

I acknowledge that I have had the opportunity to obtain additional information regarding the study and that any questions I have raised have been answered to my full satisfaction. Further, I understand that I am (my child is) free to withdraw consent at any time and to discontinue participation in the study without prejudice to me (my child).

Finally, I acknowledge that I have read and fully understand the consent form. I sign it freely and voluntarily. A copy has been given to me.

Date: February 20, 1979

Signed: [Signature]

(Principal Investigator or His/Her Authorized Representative)

Signed: [Signature]

(Person Authorized to Consent for Participant - If Required)

Witness: ______________________
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THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY

CONSENT FOR PARTICIPATION IN
SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL RESEARCH

I consent to participating in (or my child's participation in) research entitled:

An Anthropological Framework for Interpreting Contemporary Artists from Diverse Cultures

Sharon Lee Young
(Principal Investigator)
or his/her authorized representative has explained the purpose of the study, the procedures to be followed, and the expected duration of my (my child's) participation. Possible benefits of the study have been described as have alternative procedures, if such procedures are applicable and available.

I acknowledge that I have had the opportunity to obtain additional information regarding the study and that any questions I have raised have been answered to my full satisfaction. Further, I understand that I am (my child is) free to withdraw consent at any time and to discontinue participation in the study without prejudice to me (my child).

Finally, I acknowledge that I have read and fully understand the consent form. I sign it freely and voluntarily. A copy has been given to me.

Date: July 25, 1988
Signed: [Signature]

Sharon Lee Young
(Principal Investigator or his/her Authorized Representative)

Signed: [Signature]
(Person Authorized to Consent for Participant - If Required)

Witness: ________________________________

HS-027 (Rev. 3/87) — (To be used only in connection with social and behavioral research.)
I consent to participating in (or my child's participation in) research entitled:

ARTISTS FROM DIVERSE CULTURES

(Principal Investigator)

or his/her authorized representative has explained the purpose of the study, the procedures to be followed, and the expected duration of my (my child's) participation. Possible benefits of the study have been described as have alternative procedures, if such procedures are applicable and available.

I acknowledge that I have had the opportunity to obtain additional information regarding the study and that any questions I have raised have been answered to my full satisfaction. Further, I understand that I am (my child is) free to withdraw consent at any time and to discontinue participation in the study without prejudice to me (my child).

Finally, I acknowledge that I have read and fully understand the consent form. I sign it freely and voluntarily. A copy has been given to me.

Date: 8/10/98  Signed: John L. Wright (Participant)

Signed: (Principal Investigator or his/her Authorized Representative)  Signed: (Person Authorized to Consent for Participant - If Required)

Witness:
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NOEL NANTAMBU HALL

Born: Kingston, Jamaica, West Indies  June 26, 1945

Naturalized: American Citizen  1980

Address: 345 Clinton Avenue #12D
Brooklyn, NY  11238
(718) 857-4643

Social Security Number: 055-48-0735

Height: 5'8"
Weight: 145 lbs.
Hair: Black
Marital Status: Single
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Noel Nantambu Hall

EDUCATION:

Academic

1983
Master of Arts Candidate
New York University, SEHMAP

B.P.S. (Bachelor of Professional
Studies), Empire State College,
Saratoga Springs, NY

1954 - 60
St. Francis, Kingston, Jamaica
West Indies

Dance

1969 - 73
Martha Graham School of Contemporary
Dance, New York

1969 - 71
The Dance Theatre of Harlem, New York

1964 - 67
Soohih School of Ballet,
St. Andrew, Jamaica

1962 - 65
Summer Schools, Extra Mural Department
University of the West Indies

1961 - 63
Ivy Baxter Creative Dance Group

1960
Junior Center, Institute of Jamaica

SCHOLARSHIPS AND AWARDS:

1967
Professional Development Grant,
Denison University

1986
Two Professional Development Grants,
Denison University

1985
Professional Development Grant,
Denison University

1972
Full Scholarship, Martha Graham School
New York

1964 - 67
Anatoly Soohih Memorial Scholarship,
Kingston, Jamaica

1966
Outstanding Progress in a Male Dancer,
First Award, The Soohih School,
Kingston, Jamaica

1966
Jamaica Festival Award for Choreography
Kingston, Jamaica

PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYMENT:

Teaching

1981 - 88
Denison University, Granville, OH;
Full-Time Faculty

1981
New York University, New York City;
Part-Time Faculty

1979
Connecticut College, New London, CT
Part-Time Faculty

1973 - 75
The Brooklyn Muse -
Civic and Educational Center

-1-
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Noel Nantambu Hall

Performing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Company and Location</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1979 - 80</td>
<td>Ibo Dancers, USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1972 - 80</td>
<td>Rod Rodgers Dance Company, USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974 - 77</td>
<td>Choreo-Mutation Dance Company, USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973 - 77</td>
<td>All Nations Dance Company, USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Yuriko and Friends, USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1974 - 76</td>
<td>Seiko Ichinoe and Company, USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1975</td>
<td>East-West Contemporary Dance Company, USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968 - 72</td>
<td>National Dance Theatre Company of Jamaica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Fred Benjamin Dance Company, USA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962 - 69</td>
<td>Little Theatre Movement, Jamaica</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Productions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Production and Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>Sojourn II: An Evening of Dance Works by Noel Hall and Friends (Mickey Davidson and Shirley Rushing), Denison University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>&quot;For Colored Girls...&quot;, Choreographer, Denison University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td>&quot;Ceremonies in Dark Old Men&quot;, Character-Mr. Jenkins, Denison University Theatre II production</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>Garcia Lorca's &quot;Yerma&quot; Speaker of the Dance, Actor, and Choreographer, Denison University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1985</td>
<td>&quot;Eden&quot; (A Dramatic Play - Director)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Sojourn: A Collection of Works by Noel Hall, Denison University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>&quot;Alice Trippin' Thru the Looking-Glass&quot; Choreographer and Assistant Director, Black Arts Festival, Denison University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>Noel Hall Artist-in-Residence in Concert, Denison University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>Negro Ensemble Company - THE DREAM ON MONKEY MOUNTAIN (actor/lead; dance/singer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962 - 69</td>
<td>Annual Productions of Pantomimes, Jamaica (principal dancer)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962 - 69</td>
<td>Dramatic Productions, Kingston, Jamaica</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>The Tempest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>The Merry Wives of Windsor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Once Upon a Mattress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td>Finian's Rainbow</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Teaching - Master Classes (Highlights)

1981 - 1985
1983 Miami University, Oxford, Ohio; Mini-Dance Festival
1983 Ruumba Na Mia Dance Company, Columbus, Ohio
1983 Association of Ohio Dance Companies
1983 Festival, Cleveland, Ohio
1981 Olympic Academy of Gymnastics & Dance, Newark, Ohio
1981 - 85 Steps Dance Studio, New York City
1979 Iowa Public Schools
1978 Barbados School of Dance - West Indies
1978 Mudra Afrique - Dakar, Senegal, West Africa
1977 University of Wisconsin - Milwaukee
1977 Galudet College for the Deaf and Mute - Washington D.C.
1977 Pensacola Jr. College - Florida
1975 University of Anchorage - Alaska
1975 Wayne State College - Detroit

Teaching - Workshops

1985 Ohio State University, Black Studies Department Workshop
1984 International Dance Workshops - Bonn, Germany
1983 - 84 Cleveland Modern Dance Association
1983 International Dance Workshop - Aachen, Germany
1980 Alvin Ailey American Dance Center, Assistant to Madame Lavinia Williams

Guest Artist

1986 The Dance Gallery in Concert, Denison University
1986 Les Danseurs Noir in Concert, Columbus, OH
1985 Ko-Thi Dance Company’s Ruumba ’85 Dance Festival, University of Wisconsin, Milwaukee
1983 Association of Ohio Dance Companies, Dance Festival, Cleveland, Ohio
1983 Les Danseurs Noir’s “Gala III”, Columbus, Ohio
1982 Choreographer: Danz Inc., New York City
1981 Ko-Thi Dance Company, Inc.
10th Anniversary Gala, Milwaukee, WI
Resume

Noel Wantambu Hall

Teaching - Residency

1980
Stephens College - Columbia, MI

1978
Youth Theatre Interactions -
Yonkers, NY

1973
Jackson State College - Mississippi

1971 - 72
Illinois State University

Television, Radio, and Film (Highlights)

1983
WDR Koln, "Hier and Heute" West Germany

1982
Independent Production
Basket Case Productions
Title: "Basket Case"

1978
Paramount Productions
Title: "Striking Back"
A Dino DeLaurentis Film

1978
Nairobi/Kenya T.V. East Africa

1978
Kinshasa/Zaire T.V. East Africa

1978
Public T. V. Damascus, Syria

1978
Public T.V. Dakar, Senegal, West Africa

1978
CBS Channel 2 "The People" New York

1975
TTV Taipei Republic of China

1973
Channel 7 T. V. Detroit USA

1973
Channel 5 "Black News" New York
Carribbean Corner, Kingston
(radio interview)

J.I.S. T.V. Jamaica West Indies

Cable T.V. Brunswick, Maine

WAGM Channel 4 - Presque Isle, Maine

NBC "Positively Black" New York

WNOV Radio Milwaukee, Wisconsin, USA

CHOREOGRAPHY:

1988
"Distant Voices - Familiar Echoes",
(Renamed and Revised), Denison
University

1987
"For Colored Gills...", Denison University

1987
"Hepzibah", Denison University

1987
"Distant Voices" (revised),
Denison University

1986
"Distant Voices" Denison University

1985
"Homage", Denison University

1985
"Time/Space" (Revised),
Denison University

1985
"Requiem--For Missing Children and
Others", (Revised and Renamed,
formally "Canon in D"), Denison
University

1985
"Yorma", Denison University Theater
Mainstage Production

1983
"Danse Congo", Denison University
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Noel Nantambu Hall

ADMINISTRATIVE RESPONSIBILITIES:
Direction of Faculty, Student, and Guest Artists' Productions at Denison University
Co-Founder Choreo-Mutation Dance Co., New York
Assistant Artistic Director Rod Rodgers Dance Company, New York

PUBLISHED WORKS:
1980
"Snapshots in Transit", produced equity approved showcase; adapted from book "Thoughts, Reflections, and Poetry".
1974
"Thoughts, Reflections, and Poetry", a book of original poetry
ART EXHIBITS: (original paintings)

1982  Clinton Hill Artists Exhibit
      Higgins Hall-Pratt Institute,
      Brooklyn, New York
1980  Theatre of the Riverside Church
      122 and Morningside, New York
1979  The Alonzo Players Theatre
      33 Flatbush Avenue, Brooklyn, NY
1979  Studio Museum - Sponsored by
      Sigma Gamma Rho Sorority, New York
1979  Community Unitarian Church,
      Whiteplains, New York

COMMUNITY SERVICE:

1988  Common Hour Choreographer, "Remembering
      the Harlem Renaissance," in
      Celebration of Black History Month
1986  Facilitator, Black Student
      Orientation/Retreat
1984  Adjudicator, Showstopper National
      Talent Competition, Columbus, OH
1983  World Wide Day of Prayer -
      lectured and performed
      St. Paul's Church, Newark, OH
1982 - 83  Served on the Dance Advisory Panel of
      the Ohio Arts Council
1977 - 79  Dance Auditor for the New York State
      Arts Council's Special Programs
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Vita

William E. McCray (334-410-30-3725)
367 W. Sixth Avenue, Apt. B
Columbus, Ohio 43201
(614) 421-2625

Date and Place of Birth:
9/20/30, Memphis, Tennessee


Marital Status: Single

Forwarding Address: 1651 Roselle Cove, Memphis, TN 38114, (901) 946-5454

Areas of Specialization: Dramatic Arts & Dance
Research Interests: Black Theatre History

Education

BA (Elem. Ed.), 1955, LeMoyne-Owen College, Memphis, TN
MA (Dramatic Arts), 1957, New York University (School of Ed.), NYC
PhD (Speech Ed.), 1963, New York University (School of Ed.), NYC
MA (Dance Ed.), 1971, Columbia University (Teachers College), NYC

Teaching

Assoc. Prof. of Black Studies & of Theatre, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, 1972 - Present
Assoc. Prof. of English, Grambling State University, Grambling, Louisiana, 1963 - 1972
Instructor of English & Drama, St. Paul's College, Lawrenceville, Virginia, 1958 - 1959
Instructor of Speech & Drama, Mississippi Valley State College, Itta Bena, Mississippi, 1957 - 1958

Courses Taught: Black Dance, Theatre Dance, Acting Fundamentals, Theatre Practice, Stage Movement, English Composition, Shakespeare, World Literature, Contemporary African-American Culture, Black Drama, Black Theatre History

Additional Training, Experience, Activities

Valentine Littvinoff Studio of Dance & Drama, NYC (1957 - 1963)
University of Ghana, Legon, West Africa (Summer, 1973)
University of Geneva, Switzerland (Summer, 1974)
Trenton (NJ) State College, NEH Institute on Africam-American Culture (Summer, 1987)

Travel: Ghana, England, France, Denmark, Netherlands, Hong Kong, Thailand, Japan, Switzerland, USSR, Peoples Republic of China, Jamaica, Brazil ("The First New World Festival of the African Diaspora"), and Haiti ("The Second New World Festival of the African Diaspora")

Have worked closely with the development of two performing arts companies in Columbus, Ohio: UHURU Dancers and KUUMBA NA NIA Dance/Theatre Co.

Have choreographed and/or performed in numerous productions: Purline, Your Arms Are Too Short To Box With God, For Colored Girls etc., Runaways, The Me Nobody Knows, You Can't Take It With You, Livin' Fat, Home, Forest of a Thousand Demons, Shaker in Turks, To Be Young Gifted and Black to name but a few.

Have worked with many community based civic and arts organizations serving on boards, conducting workshops, serving as consultant, adjudicator and the like: Columbus Theatre Ballet, Columbus Light Opera, Handy Contemporary Dance Co., Les Danseurs Noir, Veuve-Villites, Act-So (NAACP), Center Stage Theatre, etc.

Professional Memberships

American Association of University Professors
National Council of Black Studies
Association for the Study of African-American Life and History
National Conference on African-American Theatre
National Alliance Against Racist and Political Repression
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VITAE

PHEORIS WEST
756 Seymour Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43205

B: August 17, 1950
Albany, New York

EDUCATION:
Yale University, Graduate School of Art and Architecture    MFA 1976
Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts, Professional Certificate    1974
State University of New York College at Brockport    1968-1970

AWARDS:
Popular Prize in the "Young, Gifted and Black" Exhibition sponsored by the Philadelphia Museum of Art 1971
James A. Porter Grand Award, National Exhibition of Black Artists 1971
First Prize in Oil Painting, Chautauqua Art Festival 1971
Alexander Prize, Awards Show, Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts 1973
Wm. E. Cresson Memorial Travelling Scholarship, Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts 1973
Henry Scheidt Travelling Fellowship, Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts 1974
Teaching Fellowship, Yale University 1974
Artist-in-Residence, Connecticut Commission for the Arts 1976
Project Grant, Connecticut Commission for the Arts 1976
Mini-Grant, Ohio Arts Council, Columbus, Ohio 1978
Award of Recognition, Ohio House of Representatives 1978
Award of Recognition, Milo-Grogan Boys Club 1978
College Direct Research Grant, Ohio State University 1986
University Direct Research Grant, Ohio State University 1987
Award of Recognition, Ohio House of Representatives 1988
Ohio Arts Council Artists Fellowship 1988
PHEORIS WEST

TEACHING EXPERIENCE

Assistant Professor of Art: The Ohio State University, Columbus, OH
Regular appointment to Painting and Drawing faculty. Duties consist of teaching at least two sections of painting and/or drawing per quarter. Duties also include participation on various committees, advising, individual critiques, as well as personal research.

Director and Instructor: Summer Arts Program, Educational Center for the Arts, New Haven, Connecticut
Connecticut Commission on the Arts funded project concerning Summer Art study for inner city youths between the ages 13-18. Project consisted of two directions in contemporary art personal expression and community art (painting murals). Staff included myself and four art instructors.

Artist in Residence: Hillhouse High School, New Haven, CT
The purpose of the program was initially to provide a model for the students of an active image-maker and present a concept of the kind of effort put forth by working artists in general. I used the studio as an open studio for the students instruction as well as a model to observe.

Teaching Assistant: Yale University, New Haven, CT
Aided the professor in providing students with basic concepts of color and color theory as well as other practical uses in aesthetic organization. One semester instructed at a very elementary level, the second semester at a more advanced level emphasizing practice of color usage in painting and three dimensional design.

Art Director: Inner City Cultural Enrichment Program, Philadelphia, PA
Instructed students in design and construction of a set for a play in Summer youth theater, students ages ranged from 6-16.
PHEORIS WEST

EXHIBITIONS: GROUP SHOWS:

Brockport University 1970
University of Pennsylvania 1971
Smith-Mason Gallery, Washington, D.C. 1971
Trenton State Museum, Trenton, N.J. 1971
Philadelphia Civic Center, Philadelphia, PA 1971
Studio Museum in Harlem, New York, NY 1971
Lee Cultural Center, Philadelphia, PA 1972
Ile Ife Afro-American Center, Philadelphia, PA 1972
Delaware Museum of Art 1972
Washington County Museum, Maryland 1972
Empire State Black Arts Exhibit, Albany, NY 1972
Silvermine Annual Exhibition, New Canaan, CT 1972
Erie Festival of the Arts, Visiting Artists, Erie, PA 1972
Revaun Art Gallery, Philadelphia, PA 1972
"Milennium" Philadelphia Civic Center, Philadelphia, PA 1973
Holy Cross College, Massachusetts 1973
Sam-Eric Theater, Philadelphia, PA 1973
Cosmopolitan Club of Philadelphia, PA 1973
Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts Awards Show 1973, 1974
Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts Fellowship Show 1974, 1975
Earth Art II Exhibit, Philadelphia Civic Center, Philadelphia, PA 1974
Yale University, Student Exhibition, New Haven, CT 1974
"Living American Artists and the Figure", Penn State University 1974
Pen Gilston Arts, New York, N.Y. 1975
Black Enterprise Inc., New York, N.Y. 1975
"Jubilee" Boston Museum of Fine Arts, Boston, MA 1975
Yale University, Graduate Show, New Haven, CT 1976
Yale University, Afro-American Center, New Haven, CT 1976
"Kindred Spirits" Balch Institute, Philadelphia, PA 1976
Ohio State University, Faculty Show, Columbus, OH 1976
Harlem State Office Building, New York, N.Y. August, 1977
PHEORIS WEST

EXHIBITIONS:  GROUP SHOWS, continued

CAV Building, New York, NY  April, 1977
Florida International University  October, 1977
Stingray Club, Philadelphia, PA  August, 1977
Canton Art Institute, "All Ohio Show"  October, 1977
Ohio University, "Ten Ohio Artists"  February, 1977
Ohio State University, Faculty Show  September, 1977
Gallery 7, Detroit, MI  December, 1977
Cleveland State University, "Afrohio", Cleveland, OH  February, 1978
Columbus Institute of Contemporary Arts, "Black Artists Together", Columbus, OH  February, 1978
Eastside Y.M.C.A., Columbus, OH  April, 1978
Ohio State University, Faculty Show  September, 1978
"Aspects of the '70's", Museum of the National Center for Afro-American Artists, Boston, MA  June, 1980
Columbus Cultural Arts Center  August, 1980
Ohio State University College of the Arts Faculty Exhibit  September, 1980
"Retour aux Sources", La Galerie Mitkal, Ivory Coast  October, 1980
"Approaches to the Figure", Ohio State University, Newark  January, 1981
Ohio State University Faculty Exhibit, Hoyt Sherman Gallery  September, 1981
Purdue University, West Lafayette, IN  February, 1982
Jazzonia Gallery, Detroit, MI  Spring, 1982
Group Show-Artbag, Hoyt Sherman Gallery, OSU  June, 1982
Faculty Show, OSU, Hoyt Sherman Gallery, OSU  January, 1983
Columbus Chapter of the Links Professional Art Exhibit  May, 1983
A.G.C.A.M. Members Exhibit  July, 1983
Near East Area Art Invitational, Broad Street Presbyterian Church  November, 1984
Two Flights Up Gallery, Syracuse, NY  February, 1984
Gallery One, UCC Columbus, OH  February, 1984
Near East Area Art Invitational, Broad Street Presbyterian Church  November, 1984
OSU Faculty Exhibit "Georg Heimdal & Friends", OSU  January, 1985
"Group Exhibit" Bell Laboratories, Columbus, OH  February, 1985
"Neighbors" Marble Gang Restaurant, Columbus, OH  February, 1985
EXHIBITIONS: GROUP SHOWS, continued

"Contemporary Aspects of American Art", Ohio Historical Center February, 1986
"Contemporary Aspects of American Art", University of Louisville April, 1986
"Contemporary Aspects of American Art", University of Massachusetts at Amherst June, 1986
"Ohio Black Artists", Central State University 1985, 1986
"Drawing" Columbus Cultural Arts Center July, 1986
National Conference of Artists Annual Exhibit, Pennsylvania Academy of Fine Arts April, 1986
Albert Einstein Medical College, Forchheimer Building February, 1986
"Faculty Exhibit", Hoyt Sherman Gallery Ohio State University November, 1987
"Art for Community Expression Members Show", ACE Gallery, Columbus, OH February, 1988
"Ohio Artists", Dillard University, New Orleans, LA Jan/May, 1988
National Conference of Artists - International Exhibit Salvador da Bahia "Brazilian/Afro-American Artists" May, 1988
PHEDRIS WEST

LECTURES: continued

Central State University, Wilberforce, OH
Studio Presentation Techniques, Materials for Black Studies 290N Instructor: S. Pruitt
Panel Moderator
"African American Art", United Christian Center
Albert Einstein Medical College, New York, NY

February, 1983
October, 1983
February, 1984
1986
PHEORIS WEST

LECTURES:

Glasboro State College, Glasboro, NY 1974
Dartmouth Learning Center, Jersey City, NY 1974
Tyler School of Art, Philadelphia, PA 1974
Yale University, New Haven, CT 1975
Dartmouth College, Afro-American Center, Hanover, NH 1976
Ohio State University, Columbus, OH 1976
Ohio University, Athens, OH 1977
DeSales High School, Columbus, OH 1977
Bethune Center, Columbus, OH 1977
Stingray Club, Philadelphia, PA 1977
Blackburn Recreation Center, Columbus, OH 1978
Berrick Recreation Center, Columbus, OH 1978
North Carolina Central University, Durham, NC 1978
Ohio University, Athens, OH 1978
Miamii University, Oxford, OH 1978
Philadelphia Community College, Philadelphia, PA 1978
Ohio State University, O.M.A., Columbus, OH 1979
Ohio State University, Mansfield Campus 1979
U.S. Department of H.U.D., Buffalo, NY 1979
Craftery Gallery, Hartford, CT 1979
Ohio State University, Newark Campus 1980
Ohio State University, O.M.A. 1980
Columbus Cultural Arts Center, Columbus, OH 1980
Mifflin Middle School, Columbus, OH 1980
Worcester Polytechnic Institute, Worcester, MA 1981
Bexley Art Guild, Bexley, OH 1982
"Aesthetics and Philosophical Foundations of Afro-American Art"
Panel and Presentation, Center for Afro-American Studies, Athens, OH June, 1982
PHEORIS WEST

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY:

Hubbard, Scott - "Museum Previews 5 Phases Exhibit"
Wilmington (Delaware) Evening Journal 1972

Donahue, Victoria - "Black in Beautiful at Civic Center"
Philadelphia Inquirer, September 9, 1973

Cullinan, Helen - "Nova Shows Regional Black Artwork"
Plain Dealer, February 23, page 7c. 1978


Cawthon, Brenda - "Pheoris West Paints More Than Meets The Eye; Buffalo Courier-Express, February 20. 1979

Carroll, Sarah - "West Upcoming Painter", Columbus Dispatch, June 24 - 1-5. 1979

Donaldson, Jeff - "Black Art" The Black Collegian, October, November, pg. 102. 1980

"Un Pont Entre L'Afrique et L'Amerique Noire" -Fraternite Matin LaCote d'Ivorie (Ivory Coast), October 23, pg.1. 1980

"Interview - Pheoris West" -In The Arts Magazine, Ohio State University, December, pp. 21-24. 1980


Miller, Kim Marcum - "Life Experiences and Auras Inspire OSU Artist's Paintings", Ohio State University Lantern, November 12, pg. 10. 1982

Hall, Jacqueline - "Artists' Co-op Effort Classy Cohesive", Columbus Dispatch, July 24, pg. C-10. 1983


West, Pheoris, "Raymond Saunders Paintings and Drawings 1974-1985"
The Ohio State University Hopkins Hall Gallery, Columbus Art, April/May 1987

PHEORIS WEST

COLLECTIONS:
Museum of African and African-American Art and Antiques, Buffalo, NY
Lower Washington Heights Health Center, New York, NY
North Carolina Central University, Durham, CA
Howard University, Washington, D.C.
Black Enterprise, Inc., New York, NY
Peg Alston, New York, NY
Arthur and Florence Clark, Los Angeles, CA
Robert F. Thompson, Hamden, CT
Mr. & Mrs. Samuel Meyers, Newton Center, MA
Harlem State Office Building, New York, NY
Robert & Bettye Stull, Columbus, OH
Don-Nita's Restaurant, Columbus, OH
Central State University, Wilberforce, OH
Studio Museum in Harlem
PHEORIS WEST

**FOREIGN STUDY AND TRAVEL:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Countries</th>
<th>Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Europe</td>
<td>Belgium, France, Spain, Italy, Switzerland, Austria, Denmark, the Netherlands, Great Britain</td>
<td>Summer, 1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>Ghana, Togo, Benin</td>
<td>Summer, 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summer, 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summer, 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summer, 1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ivory Coast (Africa)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td></td>
<td>Summer, 1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>Salvador Da Bahia, Rio DiJaneiro</td>
<td>Spring, 1988</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PHEORIS WEST

EXHIBITIONS: SOLO EXHIBITIONS:
Glassboro State College, Glassboro, NJ 1974
The Studio Museum in Harlem, New York, NY 1974
Peg Alston Arts, New York, NY 1976
Universe Group Inc., New York, NY December, 1977
American International College, Springfield, MA October, 1978
Ohio University, Athens, OH May, 1978
O.S.U., Marion Campus December, 1979
C.R.T. Craftery Gallery May, 1979
O.S.U., Newark Campus February, 1980
Central State University February, 1983
Peg Alston Arts, New York, NY April, 1987
Garret Gallery, Fairfield County Public Library, Lancaster, OH February, 1988
Appendix E

Shir Lee Wu
837 Park Street
Columbus, Ohio 43215
614-294-7522

DANCE EDUCATION

Ballet training began at age of five with Ms. P. Mayer (formerly of Royal Dutch Ballet) in Indonesia and Ms. Elsy Jick Lin (Royal Ballet, currently principal teacher of ballet in Hong Kong Academy for performing Arts)

1960 - 1971 China Beijing Ballet Academy
(Russian, Vaganova method, complete all the courses in classical ballet, pointe, variations, partnering and character dance)

1972 - 1974 The Royal Academy of Dancing
(earned Advanced Certificate)

1975 - 1977 Came to United States and studied on Advanced Scholarship with:
Joffrey Ballet
Martha Graham School of Contemporary Dance
Alvin Ailey American Dance Center
Dance Theatre of Harlem (apprentice)

Studied with Madame Darvash, Jeany Malikova, David Blair, Linda Hodes, Pearl Lang, Kazuko Hirabayashi, Armard Von Bardeleben, John Barker, Jody Hogan, Alwin Nikolaus, Murray Louis, Ruth Carrie, Luigi and Lar Lubovitch.

PROFESSIONAL PERFORMING EXPERIENCE

Performed with Beijing Ballet Academy and Central Ballet of China's productions "Swan Lake", "White Haired Girl", "The Red Detachment of Woman" "Le Corsaire".

1972 - 1975 Soloist dancer with Hong Kong Ballet for All Company
1974 Margot Fonteyn's "Coppelia" production in Hong Kong
I dance "Prayer" (Soloist)

1975 Greater Bridgeport Ballet Company
Apprentice with Dance Theatre of Harlem
Kazuko Hirabayashi Modern Dance Theatre (Soloist)
Chiang Ching Dance Company in N.Y. (guest artist)

1977 - 1985 Cincinnati Opera Ballet (guest artist)
Soloist performer at:
Dance Cincinnati
Wilmington College Fine Arts Department

1986 Guest artist with:
Hong Kong City Contemporary Dance Company
Alliance for Dance and Movement Arts choreographer's Showcase in Columbus

1987 - 1988 Taipei Chamber Ballet (guest artist)
Columbus Contemporary Dance Theatre (Soloist)

1988 Performed for the Ohio Arts Council's Minority Arts program Leadership Roundtable meeting
BALLET AND CONTEMPORARY ROLES PERFORMED

- Swan Lake act 2 - Odette pas de deux
- Giselle act 2 - pas de deux
- Sleeping Beauty - Bluebird pas de deux
- Don Quixote - Kitri's pas de deux in act 3
- Coppelia - Prayer solo
- Serenade for Strings in E Major - Solo and pas de deux
- White Haired Girl - White Haired Girl's solo
- The Red Detachment of Woman - Solo and pas de deux
- Yang Kwan - solo (Chiang Ching Dance Company N.Y.)
- The Stone Garden - solo and pas de deux (Kazuko Hirabashisu Modern Dance Theatre in N.Y.)
- The Nutcracker - Tea dance
- Song of Appalachian Spring - solo bride
- Bach Concerto - solo
- Landscape - solo
- The Venice Dreamer - pas de deux
- A day in the Imperial court - solo
- (both with Columbus Contemporary Dance Theatre)

PROFESSIONAL TEACHING EXPERIENCE

1972 - 1975 Jean W. School of Ballet (Hong Kong)
      Hong Kong R.T.V. Company (Choreographer)
      Chiang Ching Dance Studio (N.Y.)
1977 - 1984 Founder and Artistic Director of Hillsboro School of Dance in Ohio
1984 - 1985 Faculty member of School for Creative and Performing Arts in Cincinnati, Ohio
1986 - 1988 Founder and Artistic Director of Columbus Youth Ballet Academy
1987 - 1988 Founder and Artistic Director of Columbus Contemporary Dance Theatre
      (Teaching Ballet, Pointe, Variations and Graham modern classes)

GUEST TEACHING POST

Taipei International Institute of the Arts in Taiwan
Cloud Gate Taipei Contemporary Dance Theatre
Taipei Theatre Ballet Company
Hong Kong City Contemporary Dance Company
Hong Kong Dance Company
Columbus Dance Ensemble
Tim University (Jakarta, Indonesia)
Farida School of Ballet (Jakarta, Indonesia)
Taipei Chamber Ballet Company (Taiwan)
Marjorie School of Ballet (Columbus)
Columbus Fort Hayes Performing High School
Professional Dance Teacher Association
CHOREOGRAPHY

* Landscape * Contemporary 1984 (7 min)
* On Golden Pond * Contemporary 1984 (12 min)
* Journey of the Seven Moons * Contemporary 1985 (10 min)
* Quasar * Contemporary 1986 (15 min)
* Braham's Waltz * Contemporary 1987 (7 min)
* The Garden of Rama * Contemporary 1987 (17 min)
* The Venice Dreamer * Contemporary 1988 (8.05 min)
* Scapino * Contemporary 1988 (9 min)
* Madame Butterflay * Contemporary 1987 (9 min)
* The Girl in the Magnesium dress * Contemporary 1988 (15 min)
* Ode to the Plum * Contemporary 1988 (7 min)
* The Red Shoes * Ballet 1986 (17 min)
* Shell Discovery * Children's ballet 1987 (14 min)
* Dream of the Red Chamber * 1986 Ballet (27 min)
* (for Taipei Theatre Ballet Company)
* The Sketch of Taipei * Ballet (30 min)
* (for Taipei Chamber Ballet)

STAGINGS

* Giselle * Act 2 pas de deux (for The School for Creative and Performing Arts Dance Ensemble in Cincinnati)
* Swan Lake * Act I pas de trois (for Columbus Dance Ensemble)
* Variation from Sleeping Beauty * Act I
* Rymonda Variations * Act I
* Pas de quater *
* (for Columbus Youth Ballet Ensemble)

SELECT PROFESSIONAL ACTIVITIES

1. Hong Kong International Dance Conference and Hong Kong 1st International Dance Academy Festival (July 1986)
2. Attended teacher workshop with Mr. John Barker (Nov. 1986)
5. Attended the Paris Opera Ballet School demonstration and performance in N.Y. (June 1988)
6. Gave premiere performance for Columbus Contemporary Dance Theatre on Nov. 20/21 87 in Denison University, Ohio
7. Gave Gala performance for Columbus Contemporary Dance Theatre on June 2/4 at the Roth/Ressler Theatre in Columbus
8. Taking both Company (C.C.D.T. and C.Y.B.E.) to performed at the 1988 Ohio Dance Festival
FIRST SESSION WITH KAJITANI AND STUDENTS

Today at about 8:30 am, I got to CCAD where Kajitani was teaching his first class of glaze analyzation. There were three students, all upperclassmen (later, I saw two of them in the hall: names: Ako and Amy; Ako from the Orient; Amy from Columbus). The class was orientation of activities expected throughout the semester. He also set up a time to meet at the Park of Roses next week (I'll attend because it will be selecting found objects from the earth...interesting).

After class (see notes), Ban invited me for coffee. We went to the cafeteria (very pleasing downstairs in another building). There, he spoke to a gentleman in a black suit (odd dress for an art school?) They chatted about his breakfast selection; the man asked him what he would eat in Japan. Ban's response was possibly an egg, seaweed, rice and a piece of fish. The man was eating a piece of apple, peach, coffee and I think milk.

We sat down and began talking about the class. How he felt about teaching; he liked it and spent most of his day at the school because students may need him. He had a studio area (I saw later) where he could work out small problems while being available to students; I saw his prototype for a line of simple stoneware that would be sent to Japan at a later date. He had been contacted by a company who would then send his prototype to
Korea, to be mass-produced by a potter in Korea.

In the class, he had mentioned that high firing had never been as successful in Europe as in China (it began in tenth century in China; in Europe, century).

Back in the cafeteria, I asked him more about the taxation of his work when he went to Japan, this summer. The objects are taxed in the United States, based on the price set before it is exported. Once it gets to Japan, it is again taxed, therefore the price is raised. If the artist wants to bring the work back to U.S. it is then taxed by Japan and maybe taxed by the U. S. again.

Ban decided to leave the work that was not sold, with galleries in Japan. He sold several pieces to a gallery, there. The others will remain "on loan" at another college.

We talked about religion because he told me his family believed in two religions: shintoism and buddhism. Shintoism is an emic religion but buddhism was forced on the Japanese at a particular time in history (more investigation). Shintoism has remained very important to the people; it is a religion based on nature as the source rather than a particular person (like Jesus). He prefers this religion and his work is an appreciation that probably stems from his religious perspective.
His family consist of a mother and father who are both teachers (that is why he feels a generosity to students... "being there"). He also mentioned that some of his family was in politics... (interesting). He also mentioned that his friends thought it was strange that he felt it necessary to come to America. They have all become 'established' and felt that if he had remained, within a couple of years he would have been established. For some reason, it was necessary for him to leave. He said he needed to find out how committed he was to his work.

At Utah State, he discovered his commitment. He said the terrain was conducive to his needs and that he found the landscapes influenced his "vocabulary of symbols" (I asked him if he felt he had a vocabulary, which prompted this discussion). He asked me if I had the time... we went to the Columbus Museum of Art, where they had a piece of his work in their permanent collection. The Museum was closed, but since he was an instructor at CCAD, he was able to present his identification card... that is until we met up with one guard who wanted to hold us to the rules. We were twenty minutes before the official opening and she wanted us to leave. Ben kept walking and talking until we got to his work. There, he explained the purpose of the installation (showing the technological
advancement of clay... I will have to go back at another time to "see" it). He said that the work was ceramic sculpture, rather than pottery. It was at this point that he became "passionate". The guard insisted that we leave, but we were done; I mentioned that gatekeepers were everywhere; he responded that they sometimes really try to interfere with art, but "we saw what we came to see".

We were just a few seconds ahead of the telephone (the guard was calling to the guard downstairs as we walked out). Dan stopped at the gift shop, which had been closed before. We went in and he showed me a large bowl that was for sale ($800). We also looked at other people's work (a man who has done cardboard boxes, trompe l'oeil); he also focused on a covered pitcher that has been done the same way by a man for ten years. At this point, he spoke about ceramic sculpture and the difference between it and pottery. There are only three people, according to him, who are committed to raising the aesthetic consciousness of pottery to sculpture. There is a significant difference that is initiated by the intent of the artist. Mary Frank (New York) and Arneson (California)
NOTES ON ARTISTS - OBSERVATIONS

PHEORIS WEST - 3/15/88

Pheoris had to pick up his work at the Public Library in Lancaster, Ohio. He had been the featured artist there for the Black History Month celebration. Lancaster is an eurpean-american city that has been considered the capital of "Klan country" in the past; but for the past three years, they have had an exhibition of african-american art (Bins Davis, Ed Colston and Pheoris).

We had to pick up a Ryder truck because his van was not working. We left early afternoon because he had meetings at the University and "other responsibilities, there". Pheoris had just received notification this past weekend that he was going to receive his Assistant Professorship as of October, 1988. This had been quite a demanding time for him because of the process at OSU which meant a series of justifications (meetings among his peers) for his professional work. Ironically, this promotion was about "seven years late" because he had been at OSU for twelve years and when he sought it before, he did not receive all of the necessary information. This time, however, he received the support of several, including the Chairman of
the Art Department. He also maintained strong communication with the Office of Minority Affairs and the President's Office.

Pheoris was picking up the truck from another friend, Tommy, who was manager of a furniture warehouse. Pheoris has been loyal to Tommy for years. Pheoris has been helpful to him during Tommy's personal and professional development, therefore it is no surprise that Tommy would not hesitate to reciprocate.

We headed for Lancaster. Upon arrival, we found that the work had been taken off of the walls. The show had closed on
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Sunday (it was now Tuesday) and they were getting ready for another exhibition. Entering the third floor gallery was quite surprising. It consisted of large walls with few obstacles, other than support columns (they did not deter the viewer from seeing the objects, however).

We loaded the truck with the help of an employee of the Library. "Grace" was the liaison for outreach representing the Library. Upon our arrival, she provided Pheoris with printed data, articles, brochures and the list of visitors. Pheoris reviewed the list and found the name of two of his OSU students had come to the exhibition.

We left Lancaster and stopped for lunch. By then, we had begun a discussion of the conflict among the cultures, European/African-Americans. We also discussed the quality of students at OSU; so many were there in the art department because they had failed in other departments and had inferior complexes. These complexes centered around their lack of ability to survive within the OSU system (i.e. huge introductory courses, limited contact with professors). We discussed the poor relationship with the art education department and how it appeared to him that art ed. received students who failed twice: in their original choice of a major and in art. I expressed my
own observations of students, even on the graduate level who appeared to be extremely defensive about studio ability and responded through aggressive behavior or denial of its importance. He said that this was certainly not the case at Yale because the idea of a challenge, no matter how great it appeared, was received and taken. His students at OSU, however, appeared to be crushed by challenges (this was my experience, there, as well).

We returned to Columbus and unloaded the paintings at his studio (thank goodness I had work with Mary Wolfe at Bowling Green!). I got a chance to see his most recent works; one, is a painting that had been at Peg Alston's gallery (New York, manager). It was painted in 19__. One interesting quality about Pheoris is that his commitment to his work is on-going as if they are works-in-progress. He does not finish a work, particularly those that he can maintain access to. The other works appear to have the same visual quality of the Sister's series. I had not seen this work before and I was first surprised by his palette as well as the looseness of his brush. Prior to this, I had only seen a watercolour approach to oils in his work done on paper about two years ago (see slide). I felt then that his well-defined images were beginning to take on non-representative forms and I was hoping he would release them.
From the Sister's series, it appears that this is what has happened. The palette is dominated by transparent blue, instead of the usual opaque. He mentioned that each stroke is now deliberate so he thinks before stroking. He is also aware that he wants the colors to remain transparent and that previous work is seen, underneath. He thinks that the study of Vermeer's work (OSU grant) has influenced his own somewhat (The Letter). I also saw another object, The Black Hand, which was also new and part of the Vermeer-study influence. But this time, I saw how Pheoria had returned to his own work, seemingly a little wiser for the diversion, yet fully committed to expressing the black female image with the dignity of his own ideals as well as his capacity to borrow from a 17th c. European technique.

Our final discussion centered around what he saw as the "black image". He explained:

I see black people differently. I have never seen their image, spirit captured in other people's work like mine. And this does not take away from others (like Bartley Hendrix or Romare Bearden); it just simply says to me that I have a responsibility to portray what I see, since I'm the one who sees it...
He continues:

In looking at the depictions by makers from other cultures, particularly Whistler or Copley, they continue to make stereotypical images that do not express the dignity of the people as full human beings. Even Ernest Barnes (an African-American painter) seems to maintain a stylized stereotype that does not reflect the fullness of the black image.

I made the statement that often African-American art is perceived as being too political. He responded:

What could be more political than the mindless images that are portrayed by European artists of African-American. The appearance is that the black image is mindless, empty or one-dimensional. My work refutes such an image.

(Note: Romare Bearden died Friday March 11th).
March 17, 1988

I met her at her home; I had asked her for any brochures, new reviews and other materials she thought might be helpful. Upon my arrival, she asked me what I thought of the African Bushwomen concert. I expressed my concern about the work being dated but that it was quite entertaining. I tried not to speak too long (aware of unnecessary chatter) but I did feel it was necessary to give her some idea of how I thought and a little about why I thought the work was dated. Primarily, it was due to my involvement with African-American movement for at least twenty years and that I had seen work like Zollar's, even hers before the Company, many, many times before. While it was fun to support, it also made me realize that many in the audience had not seen such work before and that for maker's it was not a challenge. This was also expressed by another maker, a playwright who had used similar performing techniques during the 1970s.

Shir Lee seemed quite sympathetic to my concerns and it gave me the opportunity to ask about the Dino Anderson concert. She asked me whether I had seen the review (I had not) but she had a copy of it. The interpreter was on special assignment and his review was not one
that could be considered beneficial to either Dino or Shir Lee. Actually, it did not say a great deal about the dance; there was more concern about the enthusiasm of the audience (he had difficulty bracketing them out, I guess) and a misinterpretation...maybe limited interpretation of the work done by Wu. She was confused by what he meant in regards to Venice’s Dream:

The sharpest contrast of the evening was the contribution of guest artists Brian Smith and Shir Lee Wu of CCDT. Wu’s Venice’s Dream starts as two consecutive solos and evolves into a passionate interaction, avoiding any hint of sexism.

She asked me what he meant by the last part, "avoiding any hint of sexism". I asked her what did she think he meant. It was quite puzzling to her because she felt that the relationship portrayed by the work was definitely one that depicted a man and a woman’s attraction and that it did not discount the understanding of their sexes. Later, I sought a definition of sexism, "the economic exploitation and social domination to members on one sex by the other, specifically of women by men."

Now, I am confused because the interpreter has not given any reason for this interpretation. Why he saw the question of sexism was beyond the realm of thinking by either Shir Lee or myself. If it was "contrast" to the work by Dino Anderson, it is certainly unclear in his article.

I have seen the work before, at the fundraiser in the restaurant
Mark Pi's China Gate (Feb. 28). First, I did not realize that the work consisted of two consecutive solos, although there is a long introduction by Brian in the beginning. He is sitting on a chair. Shir Lee enters with another chair and the four objects become very important in the use of space, form and moods. At one point, Brian swings Shir Lee in a swirl that places her gently in his chair. The piece is done to music by George Winston and is a view of two people who are in tune with one another and behaving like typical lovers, flirtations, playfulness, withdrawal, return...

Shir Lee was puzzled by the term sexism and could not understand where it fit in describing the piece. She had mentioned before how difficult it seems for people to "see", here. As the choreographer, she described the story:

It is about two lovers. The man is having a dream about the woman who was once his love. He recalls her actions so vividly that he forgets it is a dream and becomes caught in it. They are happy...they withdraw...they return...all of the usual behaviors.

We watched a video of the work; it was done on Mershon stage and while the quality of the video was poor, it captured the work, satisfactorily. I viewed the videotape with as an objective and conscious view possible. I was unable to understand the interpreters focus as I paid attention to the sequence of movements and the interplay between the two.

I think the interpreter was deeply influenced by opinions he might have had about Anderson's work. Why he did not express it can
be left to conjecture. What he did state within this review left, both the maker and another interpreter, with more questions of what he saw and why. This distracts from the object, the dance and certainly does not provide information to the reader of the DISPATCH.

Another concern was about the fundraiser, itself. I mentioned to her that I noticed immediately that her audience was entirely European-American. "Where is the Asian community," I asked. She said that they found it difficult to support her work because they do not value the arts and they do not understand ballet. She said their emphasis was on getting an education for their children and focusing on improvements for their own lives; this did not include the arts, necessarily. She had offered to do a piece entitled "____________" for New Year's, but it was declined. Someone asked her if she was going to do Swan Lake and if so, they were not interested.

The concern for her Board is still another issue. This is the second time within the past four months that Shir Lee has had to address her Board members regarding decision-making, administratively and artistically. She put in writing her concerns because of a recent Board meeting (she still does not know how much was made from the fundraiser). She wrote a letter to the president, who responded the next day with a reprimand letter. Another board member did the same thing. I was shocked at the tone of the letters and the avoidance of the issue, who has responsibility and control of the dance company. After reading the letters, she asked me what I thought. Before responding, I thought about how my answer would influence; I decided I needed to give it. I suggested that an arbiter would be helpful at a meeting in the near future. But, since they had a deadline to meeting for funding, it was critical for her
to focus on that deadline; this would give both her and the president to focus on another issue rather than their differences. Perhaps afterwards, they would either find a way to solve their differences or the issue might disappear.

I said this, understanding that the issue was a major one. It seems that the president has had similar problems with other organizations. As the founder of her own business, she feels that arts organizations can be managed the same way. She has been asked to resign from two other dance organizations in Columbus, prior to this one. From the tone of the letter, she chose to write in a very patronizing language. She accused Shir Lee of not writing her own letter and implied that she was being dishonest about her wanting the help of a Board. Shir Lee showed me another letter from another Board member who had said she had not spoken to the president. My reading the letter revealed a similarity in choice of language as well as tone.

It will be interesting to see what happens.
Appendix I

August 9, 1988

One of the finest experiences is attending the work of an artist with the artist. Jenny, Arthur and I went to OF THE HEART to see some of her recent work. Most of it had been done during the spring and summer; there were two pieces that were over a year old, however. The work was displayed by the owner in the front window and on the farside of the door. It was in an excellent spot for attention.

I immediately spotted my favorite piece...a bowl that was two years old but I listened to Jenny and Carol, the owner, exchange courtesies. Carol was still preoccupied with an incident from last night. A man had knocked over several pieces of work that were on the shop on consignment. They had been broken and she was concerned that he would return to pay for them. Her insurance would not pay for them because she did not want to file for fear that they would increase her premium. I listened and Arthur asked, then what is the point in having insurance? Carol did not have an answer.

Back to Jenny. We sat down and looked closely at pieces. The three bowls in the window were new. One had a new glaze (we laughingly called it Jenny's denim blue; she makes all of her own glazes). There were also some pods in the window. On the wall were two small lidded jars, more bowls, her goblets and her
birds. We talked about the birds because they were good moneymakers as well as curiosities for people (how does she do that?). Carol expressed a particular fondness for a bowl that had a pattern inside. I gravitated to the older pieces like the bowl that looked like petals unfolding. I also enjoyed a work that looked like two bowls in one. Jenny explained in detail the process and the use of wax as a resistant to give the bowl the impression of high glaze and the natural look of clay as an insertion. Actually the natural part was added to the original pot.

Two bowls were recent but they were an evolution from a technique she had used fifteen years ago. At her exhibition in Zanesville, she delivered the new work and discovered some objects she had done years ago. It was the seeing of the old work that prompted the new.

I asked Jenny if she listens to clay. She looked at me with a look of surprise that I even had to ask and said, "of course".

During our return to my home, we discussed the contemporary tendency of work by other makers in clay to be influenced by tastemakers who have little or no experience with making art. There was a lot of such work in the shop and it looked so very busy. I asked Jenny if she felt her work was social conscious and she said "no". "Art is beyond the concerns of society...at
Arthur aptly commented, "Jenny's work is about how society should be. Not the way it is".

She was also concerned that one set of tea pots was heavily glazed with lead which would fuse with the acid in tea. She suggested to Carol that she investigate the matter. Carol was very pleased to hear this and said she would pursue.
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*LISTING OF ACTIVITIES AND MATERIALS*

from

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM/ACTIVITY</th>
<th>DATE/S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LETTER OF INTRODUCTION</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBSERVATION #1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBSERVATION #2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBSERVATION #3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANALYSIS OF OBSERVATIONS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECORDED INTERVIEW</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBMISSION TO THE ARTIST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENDORSEMENT BY THE ARTIST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVIEW OF THE DATA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PUBLICATION OF THE DATA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRINTED MATERIALS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REVIEWS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATALOGUES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BROCHURES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESUME</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TEXT/S</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBSERVATIONS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STUDIO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOME/FAMILY</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OPENINGS/PREMIERES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PERFORMANCES</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TELEPHONE CONVERSATIONS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECORDING SESSIONS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VIDEO</td>
<td>AUDIO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBJECTS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
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I acknowledge that I have had the opportunity to obtain additional information regarding the study and that any questions I have raised have been answered to my full satisfaction. Further, I understand that I am (my child is) free to withdraw consent at any time and to discontinue participation in the study without prejudice to me (my child).

Finally, I acknowledge that I have read and fully understand the consent form. I sign it freely and voluntarily. A copy has been given to me.

Date: ___________________ Signed: __________________ (Participant)

Signed: ___________________ Signed: __________________ (Principal Investigator or his/her Authorized Representative) (Person Authorized to Consent for Participant - If Required)

Witness: ____________________

HS-027 (Rev. 3/87) — (To be used only in connection with social and behavioral research.)
ARTIST - I

OBSERVATION FORMAT

NAME ____________________________________________ DATE_____________________

LEVEL (MAQUET) I ______ II ______ III ______

LOCATION ____________________________________________

TIME ___________________________

OBSERVATION:


## Artist II

### Information Format

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 1. Training

- **A. Formal**
- **B. Informal**
- **C. Non-Formal**

### 2. Why Did You Become An Artist(*)?

- **A. Individual Selection**
- **B. Social Influence**
- **C. "Other World" Selection**

### 3. Current Classification/Status

- **A. Young Artist/Student**
- **B. Emerging Artist**
- **C. Mature Artist**

### 4. What Keeps You Making These Objects (Motivation)?

### 5. Do You Belong To Non-Art Related Groups?

### 6. Do You Work At Another Occupation?

### 7. Do You Sell?

### 8. Do You Receive Recognition (Awards)?

### 9. Do You Receive Money (Grants)?

---

*The definition of "artist" for the purpose of this study is found on page 21, note 23.*
CLASSIFICATION OF ARTIFACTS

UBC/MA 71

REGIONS

North America
South America
Circum-Mediterranean
Africa
East Eurasia
Insular Pacific

OBJECT

1. Dress and Adornment
2. Masks
3. Music and Noisemakers
4. Toys and Games
5. Mortuary Objects
6. Representations
7. Instruments and Utensils
8. Containers
9. Furnishings and Architectural Features
10. Transportation
11. Media of Exchange
12. Records (and obj. used to keep them)
13. Models
14. Miscellaneous

COMMENTS:

Pages 10-20 will be reduced to filing cards.
CLASSIFICATION OF ARTIFACTS

1. KIND OF OBJECT ________________________
2. NAME ________________________________
3. MATERIAL ____________________________ 4. CONTENT

5. HOW IT IS USED: (subsistence, aesthetic, medical, recreation, etc.)

6. HOW PEOPLE MAKE IT:

7. WHY IT IS MADE:

8. WHAT PHYSICAL PRINCIPLES UNDERLY ITS PRODUCTION:

9. HOW IT IS SHARED WITH OTHERS:

10. AESTHETIC DETAILS (social arrangements in the society, social changes, social themes, psychology of the people):

11. WESTERN INFLUENCE (if any):
235

EVALUATION - CRITERIA FOR RESEARCH PAPERS
Utilizing the Comparative Method

1. Point of Entry (datee)
   a. Maker____
   b. Object____
   c. Culture____
   d. Other____

2. Cultures to be Compared ________________

3. Location of Cultures
   a. Continent________________
   b. Culture of Origin______________
   c. Culture of Migration____________

4. Kinship/Affiliations:

5. Examples of work (a. origin/ b. migration/ c. current location of the work/ d. commissioned by...) I. II. (a) (b) (c)

6. Influences (people, other cultures, events)

7. Maquet Framework
   a. The Ideational view:
   b. The Societal institutions served/how?
   c. The Materials used (from the environment/imported?)
12. WHICH AREA OF THE CULTURE IS IT STORED (education, religion, politics, business, economy, domestic group)

13. OTHER CULTURES (non-western) WHERE IT IS FOUND:

14. HOW IT IS MODIFIED:

15. ARTIST

16. BIRTHPLACE

17. CURRENT HOME

18. TRAINING:

19. PERIOD OF ARTIST'S LIFE WHEN CREATED (student, emerging, master):

20. WHY THE ARTIST IS LEAVING IT BEHIND:
B. Personal Conclusions

9. References:
   9. Writers
      1. Writers Culture
      2. Writers Culture
      3. Writers Culture

10. Other Factors (5 pts: Strong/1 pt: Weak)
   a. Quality of Reproductions____
   b. Due date met____
   c. On-going communication with Instructor____

11. Comments:

Evaluation Level
   1. Presentation Level____
   2. Publication Level____
   3. Further Research Needed____
   4. Grade Submitted____

Reported _________________________ Instructor ________________________

Date _____________________________
PLEASE NOTE:

Copyrighted materials in this document have not been filmed at the request of the author. They are available for consultation, however, in the author's university library.

These consist of pages:

238-240, The Thrown Chuck
241-242, Association of Japan-Ohio Industries
243-248, Neriage and Nerikomi Techniques
249-252, Appendix N
253-254, Appendix O
255-258, Traveling in Circles
259-260, Appendix Q
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