

# 2018 Call for Participation



CAA 106th Annual Conference  
Los Angeles, February 21–24, 2018

---

The College Art Association (CAA) seeks paper and/or project proposals for the “Sessions Seeking Contributors” listed in this document. The “Sessions Seeking Contributors” were selected by the CAA Annual Conference Committee from proposals submitted by CAA members. All sessions will take place at the 106th Annual Conference, between February 21–24, 2018, at the Los Angeles Convention Center. This document represents only a portion of the full conference content and does not represent Complete and Composed Sessions that are not seeking contributors.

All sessions are ninety minutes in length. Chairs develop sessions in a manner that is appropriate to the topics and participants of their sessions. Alternate, engaging session formats, other than consecutive readings of papers, are encouraged, and are at the discretion of the session chair(s). On a four person panel, it is recommended that each presentation not exceed fifteen minutes to allow time for questions and discussion as well as transitions between presentations.

Sessions soliciting participation are listed alphabetically by title. Paper or project proposals, sent directly to session chair(s) and not to CAA, must be received by August 14, 2017. The *2018 Call for Participation* content comes directly from session proposals submitted to the Annual Conference Committee for review and has not been edited by CAA.

The deadline for submissions is **August 14, 2017**.

---

## GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR PARTICIPANTS

1. You must be an active *individual* CAA member through February 24, 2018, and must register for at least the session in which you participate. Early conference registration at the discount rate opens in early October. Institutional membership does not confer individual membership status.
2. A paper that has been published previously or presented at another scholarly conference may not be delivered at the CAA Annual Conference.
3. Acceptance in a session implies a commitment to follow the deadlines outlined in this document, maintain active CAA membership, register for the Annual Conference in some capacity (at least a single-session ticket is required; full conference registration is encouraged to take full advantage of all the conference offerings), attend that session, and participate fully in person in LA.
4. You may not participate in more than one session in the role of “speaker” or “presenter,” but you may present a paper or project in one session and serve as a “chair” or “discussant” in another session (i.e. you may only present one paper/project per conference). Because of this, you must inform session chair(s) if you are submitting one or more paper/project proposals to other sessions in the *2018 Call for Participation*.
5. If your Individual Paper/Project proposal was accepted to a Composed Session during the spring open call, but you would prefer to participate in one of the chaired sessions listed here the *2018 Call for Participation*, you must inform the CFP chair(s) of this previous acceptance in your application form. You will **not** be removed from the Composed Session unless your paper/project is accepted by the chair(s) of the CFP session. Upon acceptance to a CFP session, you must inform CAA of your need to be removed from the Composed Session. Note: previous acceptance to a composed session does **not** guarantee acceptance to a chaired session.

## PROPOSALS FOR PAPERS/PROJECTS TO SESSION CHAIRS Due: August 14, 2017

Proposals for participation in sessions should be sent directly to the appropriate session chair(s). If a session is co-chaired, a copy of the full application packet should be sent to each chair, unless otherwise indicated in the abstract. Every proposal should include the following four to five items:

1. Completed session participation proposal form (located at the end of this brochure).
  - a. Make sure your name appears EXACTLY as you would like it listed in the conference program and conference website.
  - b. Make sure your affiliation appears as the official, recognized name of your institution (you may not list multiple affiliations).
  - c. Make sure to include an active CAA Member ID (all participants must be current members through February 24, 2018; inactive or lapsed members will be pulled from participation on August 28, 2017).
2. Paper/project abstract: maximum 250 words, in the form of a single paragraph. Make sure your title and abstract appear EXACTLY as you would like them published in the conference program, *Abstracts 2018*, and the CAA website.
3. Email or letter explaining your interest in the session, expertise in the topic, and availability during the conference.
4. A shortened CV.
5. **(Optional)** Documentation of work when appropriate, especially for sessions in which artists might discuss their own practice.

**POSTER SESSION DEADLINE****Due: August 14, 2017**

CAA invites abstracts for Poster Sessions. Applications for Poster Sessions should be emailed directly to the CAA manager of programs. See page 23 for submission guidelines.

**NOTIFICATION DEADLINE****Due: August 28, 2017**

Chairs will determine the participants for their sessions and reply to all applicants between August 14, 2017 and August 28, 2017. A working group of the Annual Conference Committee will review and reply to all Poster Session applicants between August 14, 2017 and August 28, 2017. All Acceptance or Decline notices will go out by August 28, 2017. If their paper is accepted into a CFP session, presenters should submit any revisions to their name, abstract, or affiliation to their session chair as soon as possible. Revisions to this content cannot be accepted after September 18, 2017. Session chairs may require final 250-word abstracts at an earlier date to assure that the finalized content for their session appears in the Abstracts 2018 publication.

**FULL TEXTS OF PAPERS/PROJECTS****Due: January 1, 2018**

It is recommended that presenters submit the full text of their papers/projects directly to chairs in early January. Chairs may change this deadline at their discretion.

European Postwar and Contemporary Art Forum (EPCAF)

**'68 and After: Art and Political Engagement in Europe**

Chair(s): Jenevive Nykolak, University of Rochester, jnykolak@ur.rochester.edu; Maria Elena Versari, Carnegie Mellon University, mversari@andrew.cmu.edu

The events that swept Europe in 1968 have, without fail, occasioned successive waves of commemoration and contestation as subsequent generations struggle to articulate their significance under changing historical circumstances. While scholars have begun to look beyond a narrow focus on the student revolts to highlight immigrant perspectives, issues of gender and sexuality, third-world liberation struggles, relations to labor movements, and developments outside of urban centers, art historians have been slow to enter into these debates. On the fiftieth anniversary of these events, this panel seeks to respond to this ongoing reassessment of '68 and its aftermath and to reexamine its legacy within art history. Which artistic currents embodied the protest ethos and political commitments of the time? What were the immediate and long-term effects of artists' engagement with artistic institutions? How were the very categories of "art" and "politics" redefined? And how useful are these positions and formulations today, in light of the political climate in Europe and beyond? We welcome papers devoted to artistic interventions that took place in connection with the events of '68 or unfolded in their immediate aftermath. In particular, we seek papers that address these questions from trans-European and global perspectives by focusing on moments of exchange and transmission or by considering gestures with significant repercussions outside their strict geographical boundaries. We also invite papers that rethink the artistic legacy of this period from the perspective of contemporary movements, from Nuit debout to Occupy Wall Street, to reframe the debate about art and political engagement.

**A Public Art Primer: Expanding Form and Content**

Chair(s): Barbara Bernstein, University of Virginia, and Virginia Center for the Creative Arts, bfb5a@virginia.edu

This panel seeks participation from a wide variety of stakeholders that have a demonstrated commitment to teaching public art. How does a public art curriculum support and enhance the vital need of visual literacy and community engagement? What methodologies are currently used that provide informed participation and responses? Are there 'best practices' from other fields — for example, the social sciences and humanities, — that can be integrated in the pedagogy? What have been the obstacles in developing this integration? How can successful experiences be sustained? Specific examples are sought that encompass the breadth and depth of public art from inception to realization. The goal of the panel is to offer and encourage the teaching of public art as a vital and imperative necessity in living creatively.

**A Second Talent: Art Historians Making Art**

Chair(s): S. Hollis Clayson, Northwestern University, shc@northwestern.edu

The material turn has intensified the call for hands-on studio training for art history students at all levels. It has also increased the pressure on art museums to include highly technologized object analysis in exhibitions. "A Second Talent" seeks contributions from art-making art historians who will scrutinize the connections between their immersion in a medium (making) and the complex particularities of interpretation (talking and writing). The session seeks papers that will actively query and pinpoint the value of an art history of specialized artifact knowledge, focusing specifically upon the benefits of literal engagement in the production of art. Once an art historian (young or old) learns the technical details of an art process and gets her hands dirty by entering the absorptive sphere of art-making, what is the effect on her

practice of art history? Does immersion in art process change art historical interpretation? Should it? It is hoped that contributors will question the self-sufficiency of materiality through the lens of their own experiences of the links between matter and meaning. A consideration of making as research would be welcome. Papers are expected to combine a self-aware narrative ("here's my art") with an interrogation of the hermeneutic gains or losses caused by the acquisition of a second talent.

**A System of Systems: Cybernetics and Play in Postwar Art**

Chair(s): Maibritt Borgen, Yale University, mbborgen@gmail.com; Susan Laxton, University of California, Riverside, susan.laxton@ucr.edu

This panel explores a shifting tenor around games and play in post-WWII art. Theorists such as Johann Huizinga, Roger Callois, and Karl Groos, writing in the first decades of the twentieth century, defined play as "pure" activity uncorrupted by everyday life, effectively aligning play with autonomous aesthetics and art-for-art's sake. This anti-instrumental view has been increasingly difficult to maintain in a postwar context determined by the burgeoning global discourse of cybernetic systems and technological networks. Theories and practices that explored the parameters of chance under the auspices of technology spread across the globe as early as the 1950s, testing new and nearly invisible relations between bodies and machines. If, from that moment, the exchange of information between machines and humans began to structure social worlds, then play, as a chance-based "system of systems," emerges as the dominant model of our time: an all-encompassing game condition of everyday life. We welcome proposals that extend these propositions into our own complex present, when, for example, algorithms on the stock market gamble with the world economy without human agents. Suggestions for topics include, but are not limited to: fresh explorations of experiments in art and technology (and other works at the nexus of chance and technology, including photography); systems and process art; ludic engagements with site through public performance or architectural interventions; mind-independent or automatic art practices in the postwar context; and assessments of surveillance and its attendant paranoia.

**A Way/s from Home: Blackness across Nations**

Chair(s): Julie L. McGee, University of Delaware, mcgee@udel.edu

In 1964, African American writer and artist Allen Polite, living then in Stockholm, organized "10 American Negro Artist[s] Living and Working in Europe" for Copenhagen's Den Frie, one of the oldest venues for contemporary art in Denmark. Polite included work by Harvey Cropper, Beauford Delaney, Herbert Gentry, Arthur Hardie, Clifford Jackson, Sam Middleton, Earl Miller, Norma Morgan, Larry Potter, and Walter Williams. Polite's justification for the grouping was poetic if not opaque: "In short, apart from their distinguishing racial features these exhibitors have only this in common: they are all living in Europe at present. And that is natural enough when one considers the unwritten tradition in art history that makes the artist a wanderer, an observer and digester [sic] of cultures; a restless soul in search of the images and symbols." Many black artists took up residence in Europe after WWII to study or to live on a semi-permanent basis. Many found both camaraderie and exhibition opportunities with other African American artists living abroad. To what extent they escaped racial discrimination or exchanged one kind for another is debatable: personal, conceptual, and artistic freedoms and external perceptions of blackness are codependent. Disputes over artistic freedom and both real and hypothetical homefront responsibilities haunt this history and artistic practice. Europe's inconsistent place within a "freedom narrative" illuminates the complexity of blackness

and artistic agency on both sides of the Atlantic Ocean. This session encourages presentations that revisit, revise, or otherwise creatively engage the problematic of the “expat.”

Arts Council of the African Studies Association (ACASA)

**Abstraction in Africa: Origins, Meaning, Function**

Chair(s): Kevin Tervalva, Harvard University, ktervala@gmail.com

Africa has long been associated with abstract artistic expression. Indeed, the story of African art’s entrance into the art historical canon is so well known that it scarcely needs to be repeated. Yet, despite the voluminous scholarship on European interest in African abstraction, there is much we do not know about the history of abstract form on the continent itself. Most basically: What does abstraction mean in Africa? Why did it develop in some places and not others? And where it did emerge, what prompted its genesis? Indeed, in what ways did abstract form play a role in the use and efficacy of an object? This panel seeks to answer these questions in order to better understand the origin, meaning, and function of abstract form on the African continent. This, of course, is not a singular narrative. The history of abstraction in Africa is one that must be spatialized, temporalized, and most importantly, historicized. As a result, this panel presents case studies on localized histories of abstraction anywhere within continental Africa. And while it is particularly interested in historic and historically-resonant forms of artistic expression, it may also feature scholarship on more contemporary modes of creativity.

**African Americans and US Law in Visual Culture**

Chair(s): Jody B. Cutler, St. John’s University, jbcutler111@gmail.com

From the Revolutionary period to the present, visual representations across popular, journalistic, and fine art images and monuments have reflected the participation of African Americans in civic life, with topical legislative issues and events often broached directly or indirectly. The view through this socio-historical lens starts with dichotomous abolitionist efforts that established, variously, stereotypes of victimhood and inferiority as well as evidence of the public agency and patriotism of African Americans in achieving American Democratic ideals. An abundance of visual material linked to legal landmarks addressing the founding racial divide — for example, the Fugitive Slave Act, Plessy v. Ferguson, Brown v. Board, the Voting Rights Act, and post-millennial verdicts in decades-old racial violence cases — has been and continues to be uncovered or further explored in interdisciplinary contexts. An expanding documentary turn in art since the 1980s, of which many African American artists across diverse mediums have been at the forefront, has yielded an abundant resurfacing and reshuffling of archival or primary visual and literary records, relative to both past and pending legal reforms. This session seeks several fifteen-minute papers on case studies, any era or cross-chronological, on (not necessarily limited to) individual or serial works and imagery that illuminates the connection to legislation addressing racial equality for people of African descent in the United States. Collectively, the papers will also bring attention to the evolving dialogue and fluid relationship between African American and American art lineages and image history.

**Against Algorithms (Or the Arts of Resistance in the Age of Quantification)**

Chair(s): Kris Paulsen, The Ohio State University, kris.paulsen@gmail.com

“Algorithm” first appeared in an English language dictionary in 1658 with the poetic definition, “the art of reckoning by cyphers.” Today, more and more of our lives are “reckoned by cyphers,” parsed by software, sorted in databases, and “crawled” by AI. We

are increasingly understood and identified as data. Neoliberal culture seems to require that all experience be tallied, quantified, and eventually monetized. Since the revelations of Edward Snowden, it has become clear that the government collects and uses our private data in myriad ways, but there are less nefarious ways in which we give ourselves over to surveillance and quantification: our phones store and transmit our physical movements and coordinates; we demographically pinpoint ourselves by posting, “liking,” and generating content for corporate websites; we pay for biometric trackers, smart homes and appliances, and for background checks and fingerprinting to avoid long TSA lines. Big Brother, it seems, has come in the form of an end-user license agreement. This panel seeks to examine these systems and their operations via the work of artists, activists, and theorists who have tried to articulate how society has changed in the era of quantification. This session seeks papers that explore strategies of exposing state and corporate surveillance, and work to undermine the effectiveness of the algorithms that seek to make us knowable. How can we model modes of resistance, plot to become invisible, or disappear into noise? Is it possible to regain some of the poetic potentials of the algorithm?

**Agnology of Contemporary Middle Eastern Art**

Chair(s): Samine Tabatabaei, McGill University, samint@protonmail.com

When the first exhibitions of contemporaneous art from the Middle East were presented to North American and European audiences in the last decades of the twentieth century, the absence of knowledge about Middle Eastern art on the part of those educated in North American and European schools became obvious. This panel is an attempt to systematize the gaps in our knowledge. The aim is to delve into the blind spots and obstacles to learning and engaging with, and writing about, contemporary art of the Middle East in local, regional, national, and transnational projects of archiving, writing, and mobilizing art historical knowledge. The term agnology was coined by linguist Iain Boal and historian of science Robert Proctor for the study of culturally engendered ignorance; this panel probes the absence of knowledge of contemporary Middle Eastern art in the West, the cultural factors that induce it, and its effects on art practice and history. We invite contributions that explore (but are not limited to): subjection to trials and tribulations of the market, the canonizing efforts of European and North American art institutes, the instability of governments, competing ideologies, the uneven distribution of resources and disparities in infrastructures, the unquestioned biases of tradition, systematic amnesia, impractical regimes of preservation, outdated educational systems, cultural revolutions, negligence, arbitrary and unsustainable attempts at preservation, strategic funding priorities, parochial counter-histories, homophobia, and logistical limitations, among other forces that have arrested, delayed, prevented, and overshadowed our access to knowledge.

Historians of Netherlandish Art (HNA)

**All in the Family: Northern European Artistic Dynasties, ca. 1350–1750**

Chair(s): Catharine Ingersoll, Virginia Military Institute, ingersollcc@vmi.edu

In early modern northern Europe, many artists followed fathers, uncles, brothers, sisters, and spouses into the family business of art-making. From the Netherlandish brothers Herman, Pol, and Jean de Limbourg, to the Vischer family of sculptors in Nuremberg, to the Teniers dynasty of Flemish painters, artists all over the North learned from and collaborated with family members over the course of their careers. For a young artist, family associations helped ease entry into the profession and art market and provided a built-in network of contacts and commissions. However, these

connections could also constrict innovation when artists were expected to conform to models set by preceding generations. This session welcomes papers that deal with questions of artists' familial relationships, in all their rich variety of forms. Some issues that may be explored in the panel include: Did artists seek to differentiate themselves from their pasts, or integrate themselves into a dynastic narrative? What kinds of dynamics were at play when family members collaborated on projects or commissions? How did familial ateliers organize themselves? In what ways were family traditions valued in the marketplace? To what extent did working in a family "style" (evident for example in the work of Pieter Brueghel the Younger) benefit or hinder artists? Where in specific artworks do we see artistic debts to previous generations or deliberate breaks with the past?

### **Alt-Aesthetics: The Alt-Right and the New Turn in Appropriation**

Chair(s): Hayes Peter Mauro, Queensborough Community College, The City University of New York, hayes.mauro@gmail.com

With the election of Donald Trump to the American presidency, there has been much discussion of the "alt-right" in academia, on social media, and in the mainstream media. The alt-right, a previously fringe and ill-defined white nationalist movement in the United States and Europe, has taken center stage in the digital circus that has been the Trump campaign and the early stages of the Trump presidency. This is partially due to the fact that its most well-known proponent, Steve Bannon, has seen a stunning rise in Trump's inner circle. This panel seeks to address the rise of the alt-right in terms of its deft appropriation of imagery and rhetoric associated with academia and the radical Left. For instance, many alt-Right leaders like Bannon speak of the "end of America," a thesis that echoes one initially put forth by German philosopher Oswald Spengler in his book "Decline of the West," during the apocalyptic era of World War I. Further, they often lay claim to a folkish cultural "authenticity" and assert a sort of victimhood in the wake of the homogenizing effects of corporate globalization and its perceived cultural mechanisms, such as "political correctness." This panel welcomes critical scholarly explorations of specific instances in which the alt-right has appropriated the cultural aesthetics/discourses of the Left in seeking cultural and political legitimacy. Conversely, papers may address instances in which artists have critically engaged the alt-right in their own work.

New Media Caucus

### **Alternative Beginnings: Towards an-Other History of Immersive Arts and Technologies**

Chair(s): Gabriela Aceves Sepúlveda, Simon Fraser University, gacevess@sfu.ca; Matilda Aslizadeh, Independent Scholar and Artist, matilda@infigo.ca

Immersive technologies have a long history. As Oliver Grau puts it, our current desire for immersive experiences did not make its first appearance with the invention of computer-aided virtual realities (Grau, 2014). Following Grau's seminal study on virtual art, significant advances in the history of immersive technology have led to a broader understanding of our current fascination with techniques and practices of illusion. Currently, the critical history of immersive technology tends to focus on a) genealogies of increasingly sophisticated systems of display that impact the affective senses of the individual viewer and b) the recasting of the Eurocentric art historical canon as providing instances of immersive experience, thereby extending the definition of technology. While the above are interesting approaches, we want to bring in more examples that further expand the field of study. This panel seeks to explore alternative pathways to contextualize our current obsession with virtual environments and to question our conceptions of what counts as immersive technologies. Bringing together recent insights by media archaeologists

(Parikka and Huhtamo, 2011) and decolonial thinkers (Mignolo, 2011), we seek presentations that explore suppressed, neglected, and forgotten histories and alternative conceptualizations of immersive technologies that break with the Eurocentric canon as well as contemporary expressions that address such gaps through new media practices.

### **Alternative Visions: The Photograph, Self-Representation, and Fact in Contemporary Art of the United States**

Chair(s): Natalie Zelt, The University of Texas at Austin, nzelt@utexas.edu

As the editors of "Aperture" recently reminded their readers, "The need for artists to offer persuasive, alternative visions is more urgent than ever." In response to that need for creative dissent, this panel investigates the ways contemporary artists use the photograph and self-representation together to craft alternative visions and selves. The photograph's tangled relationship to truth and identity make it a potent conceptual and compositional tool for artists to challenge the limits of both art historical and social categories. Designed to delineate and define, the photograph continues to circumscribe the visual limits of identity categories, including nationality, race, class, gender, and sexuality, well after art historians and cultural critics such as Allan Sekula, Martha Rosler, Sally Stein, and John Tagg called its documentary "truthiness" into question. Additionally, a swell of "post-photography" discourses, ranging from Geoffrey Batchen to Robert Shore, confound the boundaries of the medium, while curators and museums struggle to adapt. "Alternative Visions" examines the many ways contemporary artists in the United States disrupt the photograph's master narratives and traditional roles to create subversive, subjective, and contradictory representations of themselves that resist prevailing visual modes. Presentations will consider an array of questions including: What is the relationship between the photograph and the self in a "post-identity," "post-fact," and "post-photography" environment? What methods of dissent are evidenced in self-centered photographic practice and what might be their limits? In a contemporary cultural landscape untethered from conventional arbiters of fact, what spaces of resistance can artworks that deploy the photograph create?

### **Ariadne's Thread: Understanding Eurasia through Textiles**

Chair(s): Mariachiara Gasparini, Santa Clara University, chiaragasparinistudio@gmail.com

Textile can be perceived as an indecipherable code included in the field of material and visual culture. It is not only a two-dimensional screen that reflects a known common imagery "indigenized" in different geographic areas, but it has also a three-dimensional surface — created by the fibers interwoven in its structure — which follows an acquired technical grammar in the weaving process, and which could sometimes affect the "two-dimensional" pattern register. Especially during the Middle Ages, the material and visual nature of textile enabled its transcultural circulation among Eurasian societies. Today, polychrome and monochrome fragments can disclose cultural and artistic similarities between centralized and provincial areas. A technical and stylistic analysis can indeed lead us through the comprehension of the universal aspect of this medium which can be easily and generally perceived as functional or as aesthetic, but rarely as a medium of human interaction and sharing. The universal aspect of textile challenges the idea of stable and fixed cultural boundaries especially arose with the concept of the modern nation-states. This panel aims to clarify similar or identical artistic developments among ancient societies of Asia and Europe. Ariadne's thread would investigate transcultural entanglements of a maze currently recognized in the academic world as an ancient form of "globalization," which might rather be reconsidered as a universal form of kinship. Papers may investigate case studies in specific visual art and material culture

topics and archeological sites or take a broader, comparative approach. Particularly welcome are papers from the digital humanities.

### **Art and Criticism in the Anthropocene**

Chair(s): Giovanni Aloï, School of the Art Institute of Chicago, galoi@saic.edu; Caroline Picard, The Green Lantern Press, caroline@sector2337.com

Art criticism is currently at the forefront of a global revolution — the demise of art history as the central epistemological optic on art, combined with the critical fragmentation brought by visual culture, has enabled speculative realism to reshape art criticism as a new, politically charged tool. At present, posthumanist subjectivities appear indissolubly intertwined with capitalist forces and biosystems that are perceived from non-anthropocentric perspectives. Therefore, the reconfiguration of methodologies, approaches, and optics demanded by this new ontological turn situates art criticism as a productive, multidisciplinary forum by which to address challenges posed by the Anthropocene. This panel seeks to gather a number of original submissions from scholars and artists whose professional engagement revolves around the sociopolitical dimensions defining art in the current stage of the Anthropocene. This pivotal concept is leading artists, as well as art historians and art critics, to reconsider the roles played by capitalism and ecosystems in the reconfiguration of non-anthropocentric positions. More specifically, this panel will gather global perspectives on art criticism's new political implications, showing how experimentation and multidisciplinary map out new aesthetic territories; how new anthropogenic perspectives can help reconfigure concepts in art as a non-anthropocentric means to explore human/non-human relations; examining the effort and trajectory of criticism as an interface that can flex beyond its traditionally linguistic focus, thereby surpassing the acknowledged strategies of Western aesthetics; and exposing the ethical implications of cultural production by unpacking networks of material and socio-economic accountability as the imperative dimension which art criticism must attend.

### **Art and Fiction since the 1960s**

Chair(s): Luke Skrebowski, University of Manchester, luke.skrebowski@manchester.ac.uk

Fiction has been and continues to be prevalent in contemporary art. Most evidently this has taken the form of a number of novels written as art by figures including Bernadette Corporation, Mai-Thu Perret, David Musgrave, and Seth Price. In a different register, however, the strategy of producing “real fictions” (Hal Foster) has been adopted by both Hito Steyerl and Trevor Paglen to rehabilitate the documentary mode after postmodernism. Reciprocally, Walid Raad has transfigured documentary material into art by fictional means and this has been understood to reveal the “fiction of the contemporary” itself as a critical category (Peter Osborne). This session sets out from the position that contemporary art engages with fiction in historically distinctive and formative ways, yet it acknowledges that we do not currently have a critical history of the role of fiction in art since the 1960s and that this is needed in order to understand the genealogy of our artistic present. Consequently, the session will begin to construct just such a history, starting from the destabilisation of the traditional system of the arts that was consequent upon the collapse of medium-specific modernism. Papers are invited on salient, theoretically-informed aspects of the relationship between art and fiction since the 1960s.

### **Art History as Anti-Oppression Work**

Chair(s): Christine Y. Hahn, Kalamazoo College, chahn@kzoo.edu

What would an anti-racist, anti-oppression art history curriculum in higher education look like and how might it be taught and implemented? Working from Iris Young's five categories of oppression — exploitation, powerlessness, marginalization, cultural imperialism, and violence — how might art history be used as a liberatory methodology for dismantling these categories? More specifically, how can we use art history's methodologies to address those “structural phenomena that immobilize or diminish a group”? This panel seeks papers from practitioners of art history who have used innovative approaches in the discipline as tools for addressing and dismantling structural oppression. Particularly of interest are examples of: successful introductory survey courses in this regard; department-wide commitments to anti-oppression work that have driven curricular decisions; student activism through art history; and effective community collaborations.

### **Art in Middle Eastern Diplomacy**

Chair(s): Zahra Faridany-Akhavan, Independent Scholar, zfaridany@aol.com

Artistic expression in the Middle East has undergone a revolutionary renaissance in the last two decades. This increasingly dynamic movement of the contemporary art of the Middle East is often produced in contexts fraught with political, social, and military conflict, or at the crossroads of tradition and modernity. In this time of particular discord and disconnect with the Islamic world, this panel examines the contemporary art of Iran and the Middle East as the “soft power” that can build creative links between the past, the present, and the future while communicating knowledge and promoting cultural diplomacy through a variety of platforms. Forging relationships where politics cannot, the arts increasingly engage governments through artistic dialogue and exchange. Highlighting the diversity of expression, this panel seeks to examine the multi-faceted and complex development of the contemporary art of Iran and the Middle East through its artists, influences, and politics.

### **Art Journalism and Political Crisis**

Chair(s): Dushko Petrovich, School of the Art Institute of Chicago, dpetro1@saic.edu

As the current administration presents us with various vexing and intertwined assaults on culture, arts journalism faces ever more difficult questions about its own relevance and survival. By looking carefully at the past, and at the present moment, this panel will consider possible ways forward. From a historical perspective, the questions are: What kind of precedent can be relevant to us now? What role has cultural reporting played in past political shifts? What can we learn from historical case studies, both in the US and internationally? From a practical perspective, the questions are: What kinds of changes can and should be made to our current practices? As we shift from the crisis of the election to the more prolonged crisis of governance, what are the tactics that would help us best address the attendant cultural questions? Given the financial climate around arts writing in particular and journalism more generally, a related question is whether a more investigative or robust mode of criticism is even possible. What would be the viable models for this? Which platforms seem best equipped for the current dynamics? How do we best organize ourselves? This panel invites papers that address any of the above issues and welcomes viewpoints from journalists, critics, art historians, and artists themselves.

### **Art of Haiti, 1940s to the Present**

Chair(s): Lizabeth Paravisini-Gebert, Vassar College, liparavisini@vassar.edu; Terri Geis, Fowler Museum, University of California, Los Angeles, terrigeis@arts.ucla.edu

The art of Haiti and the Haitian diaspora in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries has been the subject of multiple exhibitions and accompanying publications over the last six years, including “Kafou: Haiti, Art and Vodou” (Nottingham Contemporary, 2012), “In Extremis: Death and Life in 21st Century Haitian Art” (Fowler Museum at UCLA, 2013), and “Haiti: Deux siècles de création artistique” (Grand Palais, 2015). Significant historic works of Haitian art have been exhibited outside of a geographical framework in multiple international contexts, including Vodou flags within the Encyclopedic Palace of the Venice Biennale in 2013, and the work of André Pierre in documenta 14 in 2017. With this increased dialogue around and international exposure of Haitian art, new opportunities exist for long-needed advanced scholarship, as well as critique of display strategies and international circulation. This panel seeks proposals that deepen the genealogical work on Haitian artists from the 1940s to the present, examine their historic and contemporary connections to international art movements, and explore historic and recent exhibition strategies. Papers that examine significant themes within the art of Haiti, such as colonial and imperialist histories and environmental critique, or offer analysis of the production and consumption of religious objects within contemporary market economies are also welcome.

### **Art on the Nature of Data about Nature**

Chair(s): Mark A. Cheetham, University of Toronto, mark.cheetham@utoronto.ca; Diane Burko, Independent Artist, burko@dianeburko.com

We live in a paradoxical time in which information is available as never before but also rendered suspect in new and often troubling ways. Across a multitude of contemporary art practices, artists are deploying and interpreting the plethora of specifically scientific data about the most pressing global issues of our time, including migration, disease, and agricultural practices. The anthropologist Philippe Descolas wrote recently that “One does not have to be a great seer to predict that the relationship between humans and nature will, in all probability, be the most important question of the present century.” Information about climate change and extreme weather has compelled an especially large number of artists to explore and interpret such data in new ways and to a range of purposes. Art historians and curators are also examining the veracity and efficaciousness of environmental data in both historical and contemporary art practices and striving to present eco art effectively to an expanding audience worldwide. For this panel, we ask for submissions by artists, curators, and art historians — from any region and tradition — who are concerned with the modalities and uses of climate data and its evidentiary and affective status. By canvassing these three interlocking disciplinary perspectives, we seek to develop a wide-ranging conversation that will spur new insights and observations about the sources, stakes, veracity, effectiveness, and prospects of climate change data in the visual arts.

### **Art, Agency, and the Making of Identities at a Global Level, 1600–2000**

Chair(s): Noémie Etienne, Bern University, noemie.etienne@ikg.unibe.ch; Yaelle Biro, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, yaelle.biro@metmuseum.org

Circulation and imitation of cultural products are key factors in shaping the material world — as well as imagined identities. Many objects or techniques that came to be seen as local, authentic, and typical are in fact entangled in complex transnational narratives tied to a history of appropriation, imperialism, and the commercial

phenomenon of supply and demand. In the seventeenth century, artists and craftspeople in Europe appropriated foreign techniques in the creation of porcelain, textiles, or lacquers that eventually shaped local European identities. During the nineteenth century, Western consumers looked for genuine goods produced outside of industry, and the demand of bourgeois tourism created a new market of authentic souvenirs and forgeries alike. Furthermore, the twentieth century saw the (re)emergence of local “schools” of art and crafts as responses to political changes, anthropological research, and/or tourist demand. This panel will explore how technical knowledge, immaterial desires, and political agendas impacted the production and consumption of visual and material culture in different times and places. A new scrutiny of this back and forth between demanders and suppliers will allow us to map anew a multidirectional market for cultural goods in which the source countries could be positioned at the center. Papers could investigate transnational imitation and the definition of national identities; tourist art; the role of foreign investment in solidifying local identities; reproduction and authenticity in a commercial or institutional context; local responses to transnational demand; as well as the central role of the makers’ agency from the seventeenth to the twentieth century.

### **Art/Data**

Chair(s): Kyle Parry, University of California, Santa Cruz, parry@ucsc.edu

The word “data” entered the English language in the seventeenth century under a religious guise: a “heap of data” referred to a list of theological propositions. Several centuries removed, what we now refer to as data — roughly, values assigned to things — heaps up in the cloud. At the same time, data has become a pervasive cultural force: “big” data gets mined toward commercial, disciplinary, and epistemological ends; meanwhile, you have to watch your monthly data consumption. Steeped as many of us are in contemporary data cultures, what would it mean to historicize and theorize the conjunction of data and art? While it might be tempting to subsume this conjunction under the discourse of information-based art — consolidated by the eponymous MoMA exhibition in 1970 — this panel seeks to investigate the values of more expansive optics. In particular, how can artists, critics, curators, and scholars address the specificity of “data,” not only as material and medium, but also as subject matter, ideology, institutional resource, and means of inquiry? The panel welcomes papers of diverse methods and disciplines that address a range of issues at the intersection of art and data, including but not limited to themes like data art, data mining, critical cartography, dataveillance and counterveillance, quantification, data and identity, metadata and archives, and visualization and sonification.

### **Autonomy and the 1960s**

Chair(s): Sam Rose, University of St. Andrews, sper@st-andrews.ac.uk; Vid Simoniti, University of Cambridge, vs418@cam.ac.uk

The critique of autonomy is often described as a defining characteristic of the 1960s. This was the point, according to standard accounts, when the high modernist embrace of the aesthetic and associated freedom from the social world were rejected in a broad range of art practices. Despite the apparent undoing of autonomy at the time, however, the concept has in recent years experienced a resurgence. From philosophers such as Jacques Rancière to art historians such as Claire Bishop and Grant Kester, a range of writers have stressed not only that aesthetic autonomy survived the 1960s, but that it remains central to our understanding of art of the present day. This panel invites proposals that rethink the idea of autonomy, and in doing so question the story of autonomy’s demise during and since the 1960s. What aspects of autonomy remained even in non-high-modernist art practices of the 1960s? To what extent, conversely,

might late modernist practices of the time actually problematize rather than rely on autonomy? And to what extent have these debates shaped views of autonomy in art and critical theory since? The panel welcomes both 'big picture' papers, which combine philosophical and art historical approaches, as well as more precise case studies that illuminate the bigger issue.

#### **Avant-Gardes and Varieties of Fascism**

Chair(s): Trevor Stark, Columbia University, [trevor.e.stark@gmail.com](mailto:trevor.e.stark@gmail.com); Rachel Silveri, Columbia University, [rcs2145@columbia.edu](mailto:rcs2145@columbia.edu)

The term "avant-garde" itself implies a progressive orientation opposed to the forces of political and aesthetic reaction. This narrative cracks, however, under the pressure of the extreme case of fascism, understood less as a unified political doctrine and instead as a mobilization of passions through strident nationalism, glorification of violence, narratives of crisis and decline, demands for purity, and appeals to patriarchal authority. Bracketing the collaboration of Italian Futurists with Mussolini, art history has largely inscribed the opposition between Fascism and the avant-gardes by prioritizing either moments of outright artistic resistance (epitomized by John Heartfield) or moments when the turn to authoritarian politics coincided with the abdication of avant-garde tactics (the "return to order"). Yet, as Alice Kaplan argued, Fascism was conceived by certain enthusiasts as a form of utopian revolt set against bourgeois liberalism, a rhetoric at times entwined with or emerging from that of the avant-gardes. How, then, can the relation between the European avant-gardes and the far right be re-mapped, historically and ideologically? This panel seeks papers on topics including: aesthetic strategies of resistance to fascism; race and racism in the avant-gardes (Julius Evola); women artists of the resistance (Gabrielle Buffet, Mary Reynolds, Claude Cahun); surrealist responses to fascism (Le Collège de sociologie, Contre-Attaque, A.E.A.R.); literary fascisms (F.T. Marinetti, Drieu la Rochelle, Ezra Pound); irony and complicity (Francis Picabia, Giorgio de Chirico); anti-Semitism in the avant-gardes (Hugo Ball); aesthetics of the Popular Front and populisms; Nazi aesthetics; feminist critiques of fascist visual cultures; and the returns to realism.

#### **Biennials of the Global South: Charting Transnational Networks of Exchange**

Chair(s): Joseph L. Underwood, Kent State University, [junderwood12@gmail.com](mailto:junderwood12@gmail.com)

In our age of "biennialization," this ephemeral exhibition format boasts manifestations on every continent. The biennial alternates between a frustratingly universalizing platform and a site for decidedly local experimentation. Though the roots are often traced to Venice, the biennial has operated and evolved significantly as nations and spaces in the Global South have revisited, reimaged, or reappropriated the structure and audience of an art biennial. Often eschewing the strident nationalism that defined the original Biennale, these alternative models had great impact in establishing and expanding various layers of regional, continental, or global interactivity — or transnational conversations. Indeed, as a locus, or hub, the biennial has offered generations of artists, critics, and local populations the opportunity to exchange art and ideas away from the metropolises with imperialist tendencies. This panel invites scholars and artists to revisit the biennials that took place in the mid-to-late-twentieth century in order to mine these various platforms for their impact in defining networks of dialogue, exchange, and influence in the Global South. Papers might consider the legacies of a single iteration of a biennial, or the impact of a particular biennial on the career of a single artist, or the relationship between two biennials of the Global South. In focusing on the particularities of these transnational operations, this panel aims to chart the interwoven relationships

among cultural practitioners of the Global South, thus expanding art history's perspectives on twentieth-century transnational exchange.

#### **Borders and Breakthroughs: The Afterlife of PST LA/LA, Part II**

Chair(s): Charlene Villaseñor Black, University of California, Los Angeles, [cvblack@humnet.ucla.edu](mailto:cvblack@humnet.ucla.edu); Elisa Mandell, California State University, Fullerton, [elisacmandell@gmail.com](mailto:elisacmandell@gmail.com)

This panel focuses on the methodological, theoretical, and museological contributions of the 80 exhibitions of PST: LA/LA in 2017–18. Research on Latin American art, and the emerging field of Latinx art, has traditionally been dominated by social art history. What new research approaches have recently emerged? How did PST: LA/LA foster new research and study tactics? Topics to consider include influences or contributions from LGBTQIA studies, feminist art history, American or ethnic studies, and decolonial methodologies. How did exhibitions, curators, and artists broach nationalism and transnationalism, the global and the local, diaspora and border studies? What new ideas emerged around art and activism, community art making, and public art? Other topics to consider include materiality, mapping, sustainability and the environment, global conceptualisms, political trauma, and time. How did the formats of shows, whether thematic, monographic, or historical, contribute to new inquiry? In the end, speakers on this panel will map the current shape of the study of Latin American and Latinx art in the wake of PST: LA/LA. What are the implications for research in these fields, as well as the effects of PST on art history overall? We seek papers from either direct participants in PST LA/LA (such as artists, curators, or art historians), from outside observers of, or other commentators on, the initiative. We welcome a variety of viewpoints from various disciplines, including film studies, anthropology, cultural studies, history, gender studies, ethnic studies, and others. This panel complements a pre-formed panel with the same title (Part I).

#### **Breaking Down Barriers: The Visual Culture of the Border in Late Antiquity**

Chair(s): Laura Veneskey, Wake Forest University, [veneskey@wfu.edu](mailto:veneskey@wfu.edu); Sean V. Leatherbury, Bowling Green State University, [sleatherbury@gmail.com](mailto:sleatherbury@gmail.com)

The visual culture of Late Antiquity (ca. 200–700 CE), the period during which the polytheist Roman state transformed into Orthodox Byzantium, has often been considered in terms of large-scale developments within the empire, driven by shifting religious preferences and associated political, social, and cultural changes, or in terms of the relationship between center and periphery. However, while scholars of Byzantine and later medieval art have long been interested in artistic interactions across borders, between Byzantium and its neighbors, historians of late antique art have been less focused on the border's role in defining, limiting, or diffusing artistic and architectural forms. In light of the contemporary rise of nationalism and growing anxiety over the permeability and permanence of borders, this panel aims to investigate the role of the border in the art and architecture of the late antique Mediterranean and beyond. To what extent did borders act as barriers to the movement of people and ideas or instead facilitate artistic interaction between different populations? Did borders strengthen or weaken "national" artistic preferences and tastes? How did visual culture contribute to the formulation or performance of identity within contested areas or frontier zones? Did cultural boundaries operate in the same way as political ones? Papers in this panel might consider the role of borders or frontiers in shaping artistic interaction in the Mediterranean region in the period; objects or buildings produced in border regions; artists, objects, raw materials, or ideas in motion; or artworks as diplomatic gifts.

### **Build It and They Will Come: How to Bring the Art World to Your Backwoods Outpost Town**

Chair(s): Judith Rushin, Florida State University, jrushin@fsu.edu;  
Rob Duarte, Florida State University, rduarte@fsu.edu

Most artists living in minor towns and cities are tired of battling a path to New York and LA. Life in the flyover zone has its own advantages, but it is decidedly difficult to build professional creative networks unless you live in one of the major cultural centers. Many artists in smaller towns and cities are solving this problem by developing vital projects that attract the attention and participation of significant artists, curators, and writers. We are interested in hearing from artists, collaborative groups, programmers, and others who have developed programs that serve as creative incubators, residencies, and other catalytic community builders.

### **CARPA: Craft Advanced Research Projects Agency**

Chair(s): Sara Clugage, Dilettante Army, sara@dilettantearmy.com; Otto von Busch, Parsons School of Design, The New School, vonbusco@newschool.edu

The Craft Advanced Research Projects Agency (CARPA) is seeking innovative and disruptive ideas that enhance United States defense capabilities and prevent strategic surprise. CARPA makes pivotal breakthroughs in crafts for the security of our nation and allies. At the College Art Association (CAA) conference, CARPA directors will facilitate several brief presentations of US craft capabilities in various operation theaters (including today's complex and ambiguous "Gray Zone" conflicts). In this Request for Proposals (RFP), CARPA invites institutions, corporations, and individuals to consider the impact of craft strategies in building the strength of American soft power initiatives and inculcating American values both at home and abroad. Proposed technologies and infiltration strategies can be designed to function in a variety of adversarial, natural, and cultural terrains, as well as zones in which US forces have more covert involvement, such as art or academic institutions (foreign and domestic). Presentations may draw on the broad spectrum of previous CARPA-backed initiatives like studio craft, DIY, and craftivism in order to transform craft programs into strategic technologies supporting US national interests. As the US Department of Defense (DoD) continues to build its sphere of influence, it is poised to take an oversight position in relation to smaller government agencies such as the National Endowment for the Arts (NEA) and the National Endowment for the Humanities (NEH). CARPA invites both basic and applied research that will enable this transition. For more information, visit [craftresearchagency.com](http://craftresearchagency.com).

### **Community College Professors of Art and Art History (CCPAAH) Championing the Relevancy of Studio Art and Art History in the Twenty-First Century: Stories of Success and Advocacy**

Chair(s): Walter Meyer, Santa Monica College, Meyer\_Walter@smc.edu; Susan Altman, Middlesex County College, SAltman@middlesexcc.edu

In the last decade there has been a palpable decline in support for the humanities in general and studio art and art history in particular. The pressure to justify courses of study in studio art and art history as guaranteeing job prospects has become intense, but we all know the importance of visual literacy as an essential skill set for critical thinking, close observation, and careful analysis, among many other intellectual mechanisms. How can we better share that understanding with our students, colleagues, and institutions? What effective strategies in our classrooms and at our institutions can bolster enrollments, majors, and our perceived relevancy to our institutions? What new ideas are working in your programs that meet the challenges faced in our fields? This session

seeks presentations by instructors of studio art, art appreciation, and art history that describe our successes, best practices, and share information for our disciplines to thrive and grow.

### **"Change the Joke, Slip the Yoke" Twenty Years Later**

Chair(s): Jessi DiTillio, The University of Texas at Austin, jditillio@utexas.edu; Cherise Smith, The University of Texas at Austin, cherise\_smith@utexas.edu

Who is permitted to represent blackness and in what way? Are irony, parody, and satire avenues for redeeming racist stereotypes or do they simply reinforce their presence? These questions and others were addressed in March of 1998 when the Harvard University Art Museums convened a symposium titled "Change the Joke, Slip the Yoke." The symposium was organized to "address the current debate on the recycling of racist imagery, collecting and exhibiting black memorabilia, the use of black stereotypes in the work of contemporary American artists, and representations of blackness in film and theater." Drawing its title from Ralph Ellison, the conference debated the politics of "negative imagery" in art by African Americans, focusing especially on artists such as Robert Colescott, Michael Ray Charles, and Kara Walker. In the twenty years since the conference these debates have persisted — Walker's career boomed, discourses on "post-black" art continued to flower, and the Black Lives Matter movement focused attention on violence and anti-blackness in contemporary America. The current controversy over Dana Schutz's painting in the 2017 Whitney Biennial reaffirms the continued relevance of discussing the politics of racial representation for contemporary artists. This panel will return to the questions of "Change the Joke, Slip the Yoke" to assess how these debates have progressed over the past twenty years. We seek papers that address the changing discourse about minoritarian art, the work of artists using stereotype imagery or black memorabilia, or the reception of artwork pushing the boundaries of political correctness.

### **The International Art Market Studies Association (TIAMSA)**

#### **Changing Hands: When Art History Meets the Art Market**

Chair(s): Veronique Chagnon-Burke, Christie's Education, vchagnon-burke@christies.edu; Julie Reiss, Christie's Education, jreiss@christies.edu

Through case studies, this session proposes to consider how the art market has adapted, expanded, and at times significantly clashed with modern and contemporary art practices as artworks have changed hands. Papers should illuminate how issues relating to fabrication, re-fabrication, and conservation have challenged traditional conceptions of authenticity and authorship, redefined connoisseurship, and set precedents for both institutional and private collectors. We hope that papers will also attempt to assess how the art market may have affected these issues. Under what conditions have artists disavowed works, for example Donald Judd's renunciation of works fabricated by Giuseppe Panza, Cady Noland's disavowal of "Cowboys Milking" and "Log Cabin," and Bruce Connor's disavowal and subsequent reinstatement of CHILD? Conversely, how have artists maintained authorship over multiple versions or remakes of their work as they have been sold? How has the unprecedented presence of living artists in the market changed and challenged the marketplace? This session encourages papers reflecting a variety of perspectives, including but not limited to art historians, conservators, visual arts lawyers, collectors, dealers, curators, and artists. It will also provide a forum for discussion of the intersection of theory and practice, as disconnects between them are often illuminated as art changes hands.

US Latinx Art Forum (USLAF)

**Chican@ Art History: Interdisciplinary Foundations and New Directions**

Chair(s): Karen Mary Davalos, University of Minnesota Twin Cities, kdavalos@umn.edu; Mary Thomas, University of California, Santa Cruz, mamthoma@ucsc.edu

Since its emergence during the 1960s Civil Rights Movement, Chican@ art remains under-examined within art history's flagship journals, mainstream exhibitions, and museum collections despite being championed by scholars, cultural critics, and curators in various academic disciplines. This phenomenon is fueled by the aesthetic hierarchies of art and art history which often undervalue Chican@ artists' engagement with Mexican and Mexican American visual traditions (i.e. political graphics, murals, and home altars) and the disapproval of identity politics and identity-based art. These intersecting misrepresentations and systemic biases support Chican@ art's exclusion from mainstream galleries and museums. Yet, a new generation of graduate students, faculty, and curators invested in Chican@ art are emerging from the discipline of art history who have inherited the multidisciplinary foundations of Chican@ art history and, as a result, overwhelmingly approach their work through an interdisciplinary lens. We seek papers that explore the tensions and opportunities that the interdisciplinary study of Chican@ art presents, especially within art history. Questions to consider include: in what ways do interdisciplinary frameworks support an analysis of how Chican@ art draws upon, expands, and critiques other art movements within the United States, Latin America, and Europe? What ruptures does the disciplinary shift to art history generate for the study of Chican@ art in relation to earlier scholarship? How can methodological conventions linked to fields outside of art history trouble the discipline's imperial and colonial origins? In exploring these questions, papers that focus on object- and performance-based inquiries will be given precedence.

**Circumventing Censorship in Global Eighteenth-Century Visual Culture**

Chair(s): Lauren Kilroy-Ewbank, Pepperdine University, lauren.kilroy@pepperdine.edu; Kristen Chiem, Pepperdine University, kristen.chiem@pepperdine.edu

Today, we recognize many pervasive subjects and decorative motifs from the eighteenth century as lacking radicalized or subversive content. However, many of them emerged within inquisitorial atmospheres that accompanied political revolutions, colonial projects, the enlightenment, and religious transformations. Censorship of artists and images occurred in many instances to maintain or advance dominant ideologies, yet there are also cases where it proved ineffectual. We seek papers that highlight these less successful or futile cases of censorship in global eighteenth-century visual culture, especially of Asia, Africa, and the Americas. Specifically, we are interested in how artists resisted or subverted authoritative ideologies by crafting images that were thoroughly interwoven into the visual and social fabric so as to seem commonplace and unobjectionable. How did artists use innocuous images to implicitly critique power structures or subvert authority? In what ways did censorship that targeted texts or social practices shape visual culture more broadly? How did inquisitorial attempts unintentionally draw attention to the very ideas they aimed to suppress? This panel encourages a rethinking of imagery perceived as decorative, trivial, or benign and the impact of censorship in the eighteenth century.

Leonardo Education and Art Forum (LEAF)

**Cities as Labs for Innovation Tackling Global Challenges: Transdisciplinarity and the Future of the University**

Chair(s): Alan Boldon, University of Brighton, A.Boldon@brighton.ac.uk; Ruth West, University of North Texas, ruth.West@unt.edu

This call for panelists is to discuss whether universities meet current needs, not just in terms of preparing students, but in supporting a resilient, adaptive society capable of resolving complex contemporary challenges. Higher education relies upon separating out areas of inquiry into disciplines, yet many global challenges and wicked problems cannot be addressed unless we draw upon insight from multiple ways of knowing. While collaboration across disciplines is growing, institutional structures, infrastructure, and funding mechanisms often preclude it. Universities and funding councils support and contribute to public discourse about the need for "challenge-driven" and civically engaged universities. This debate stops short of proposing a fundamental overhaul of the structure of the institutions. Benefits from disciplinary specialism are valuable and necessary, but to solve wicked problems we also need to focus on an integrated approach to pedagogy, research, creation, enterprise, and social purpose. Panelists will present a range of perspectives and a set of provocations for possible alternatives including networked and distributed institutions supporting an interdisciplinary and intercultural inquiry into complex problems. We live in a time of global challenges including a lack of water, energy, and food security; loss of biodiversity; and migration and economic inequality. Great learning can be found in universities, cities, communities, businesses, and networks. What would a twenty-first-century institution look like that combines, supports, accelerates, and distributes this learning to make more of the sum of the parts? This panel is proposed by the Leonardo Education and Art Forum and will include the current chair and chair-elect.

**#classroomssowhite: Strategies for Inclusive Teaching in Arts-Based Higher Education**

Chair(s): Allison Yasukawa, California Institute of the Arts, ayasukawa@calarts.edu; Valerie Powell, Sam Houston State University, vjp001@shsu.edu

We are teaching at a moment in which entrenched positions of bias and exclusion have been reaffirmed and reified in the national dialogue while our student populations are becoming increasingly diverse, representing a range of identities (racial, ethnic, linguistic, national, ability, gender, sexual-preference, and economic). As such, there is a growing need in academia to have an honest conversation about power dynamics in the classroom. Enacting inclusive pedagogies is necessary for students from historically marginalized and underrepresented groups to feel safe and have a voice, however, some educators may feel unprepared while others may feel too overloaded by their current responsibilities to undertake such work. Still others may feel they have to choose between teaching the "true" content of their classes and addressing the needs of "non-normative" students. This panel seeks to address a range of topics related to practical approaches for inclusion, awareness, diversity training, and the cultivation of empathy. The following questions serve as a guide for papers to develop upon or oppose: How can we employ pedagogical models (feminist, queer, hip-hop, etc.) to include rather than silence or tokenize these student populations? And how can we do so from micro levels (individual assignments) to macro levels (program development)? How do we implicate students from majority identity groups (white, cis, male, able-bodied, middle/upper-class, etc.) so they engage these concerns as necessary for their own lives? And finally, how do we use arts-based skills of noticing, interpretation, and critique as skill-sets for ethical engagements with difference?

Committee on Intellectual Property  
**Copyright, Fair Use, and Their Limits**

Chair(s): Anne Collins Goodyear, Bowdoin College Museum of Art,  
AGoodyear@bowdoin.edu

Since 2013, when CAA embarked on its Fair Use Initiative, resulting in its Code of Best Practices in Fair Use for the Visual Arts (2015), the Committee on Intellectual Property has been actively involved in sharing information about uses of third-party copyrighted material that might be deemed “fair” in the context of US copyright law. The CIP remains committed to sharing examples of the successful application of the doctrine of fair use for creative, scholarly, and educational purposes. At the same time, an understanding of fair use — and the nature of copyright more broadly — may benefit from a consideration of its limits, some of which are acknowledged in CAA’s Code. Thus, for its February 2018 panel, CIP invites proposals addressing examples of the limitations of fair use as well as the benefits of its invocation. Papers addressing the limits of fair use might consider contractual obligations, the adoption of specific licensing schema, or the deliberate decision not to take advantage of it. Submissions might also explore instances of creative practice where copyright does not apply — such as conceptual art with no fixed form of expression or examples of design. The panel will conclude with a discussion with the audience about these complex questions.

Exhibitor Session: ArtCondo

**Creating Artists’ Spaces and Artists’ Housing – New and Existing Models**

Chair(s): Michele Gambetta, ArtCondo Founder and Artist,  
artcondo2013@gmail.com

Following the 2016 Oakland Ghost Ship fire, issues of safe and legal artists’ spaces have gained prominence. Lack of affordable spaces, rising rents and gentrification are additional issues. For artists, (work) space is a “means of production” and pivotal for a creative livelihood. This session invites proposals to discuss established nonprofits, DIY groups and collectives that are forging new ways of thinking about spaces for artists to live and work within, with a focus upon safe, legal, and sustainable approaches. Emphasis will be upon the models proposed and their methodologies. Session structure will be determined by the number of applicants and diversity of proposals. Examples of possible organizations include ArtSpace, the leading national non-profit developer creating affordable spaces for artists; the Oakland Warehouse Coalition, advocating for low-income Oaklanders who live and/or work in industrial spaces; Arbor Artist Lofts in Lancaster California supported by US Dept of Housing and Urban Development; the NYC Real Estate Investment Cooperative (NYCREIC) working to secure permanently affordable space for civic, cultural, and cooperative use in NYC; Affordable Housing Partnership for Artists (AHPA) created in 2014; and the Glendale Arts Colony created by Meta Housing Corporation who have created seven past art colonies. ArtCondo, a DIY artists’ project helping NYC artists co-develop buildings collectively for work space, life/work, and fractional ownership, is a CAA 2018 exhibitor and has proposed this session.

**Crippling the Curriculum: Pedagogical Practices and Strategies when Teaching Disability in the Arts**

Chair(s): Lucienne Dorrance Auz, Memphis College of Art, lauz@mca.edu

“Crippling,” according to disability studies scholar Carrie Sandahl, “spins mainstream representations or practices to reveal able-bodied assumptions and exclusionary effects.” This session asks how instructors can cripple traditional art history, studio art, art education, and museum and curatorial studies curricula in order to reconsider these disciplines’ practices and presumptions through

the lens of disability studies and to counter ableism within the visual arts. Contributors are invited to share their crip pedagogies and innovative strategies for designing lesson plans or semester-long courses that incorporate critical and creative disability studies perspectives. Papers may address the various approaches, challenges, and outcomes encountered when creating a cross-disciplinary class that foregrounds disability-based content; how to develop an inclusive instructional environment; the theoretical frameworks used to bridge this relatively new terrain; and effective ways to discuss topics such as embodied experience or disability as an intersectional cultural identity.

Historians of German Scandinavian and Central European Art and Architecture (HGSCEA)

**Critical Race Art Histories in Germany, Scandinavia, and Central Europe**

Chair(s): Allison Morehead, Queen’s University, morehead@queensu.ca

Critical race theory, which entered art history through postcolonial analyses of representations of black bodies, has remained relatively peripheral to art historical studies of Germany, Scandinavia, and Central Europe, whose colonial histories differ from those of countries such as Britain, France, and the United States. At the same time, art historical examinations of white supremacy in the Nazi period are frequently sectioned off from larger histories of claims to white superiority and privilege. Centering critical race theory in the art histories of Germany, Scandinavia, and Central Europe, this panel will consider representations of race in the broadest of terms — including “white makings of whiteness,” in the words of Richard Dyer. We invite papers that together will explore the imagination and construction of a spectrum of racial and ethnic identities, as well as marginalization and privilege, in and through German, Scandinavian, and Central European art, architecture, and visual culture in any period. How have bodies been racialized through representation, and how might representations of spaces, places, and land — the rural or wilderness vs. the urban, for instance — also be critically analyzed in terms of race? Priority will be given to papers that consider the intersections of race with other forms of subjectivity and identity.

Association for Critical Race Art History (ACRAH)

**Curating Difference: Race and Ethnicity in the US Museum**

Chair(s): Camara Dia Holloway, Association for Critical Race Art History, camara.holloway@icloud.com; Bridget Cooks, University of California, Riverside, b.cooks@uci.edu

This session is intended as a conversation addressing how to implement a critical race visual studies-informed practice in a museum setting. Topics for consideration include: how mainstream and/or culturally-specific institutions in the US have embraced such an approach; case studies about exhibitions devoted to art made by US-based artists of color and/or art made about American communities of color; and strategies promoting greater racial and ethnic sensitivity amongst extant museum professionals as well as diversifying their ranks in terms of the ethno-racial backgrounds and/or awareness of future hires. Submissions from Los Angeles-area and West Coast-based curators and museum professionals are especially encouraged, as are topics focused on this region.

**Curating Experience as a Work of Art**

Chair(s): Jung E. Choi, Duke University, jungchoi401@gmail.com

In contemporary art, artists often function as “context providers” by designing and building experiential contexts. Blurring boundaries between disciplines, they construct situations or alternative realities to enable audience participation, action, and social communication. Art appreciation thus becomes a collaborative and creative process in which artwork operates as an experiential

interface for producing, challenging, and sharing meaning and identity. This session considers “curation” in its broadest sense as not only overseeing preservation and delivery mechanisms but also creating junctions between artists, artworks, and audiences that generate particular and sensible experiences. The session invites scholars, curators, artists, and designers for a discussion of current trends and demonstrations of effective methods for designing and delivering alternative or creative experiences as a form of art. Papers addressing theoretical and/or practical concerns are welcome.

#### **Data Publics: Art in the Age of Platforms**

Chair(s): Peter Mörtenböck, Goldsmiths, University of London, p.mortenbock@gold.ac.uk; Helge Mooshammer, Goldsmiths, University of London, h.mooshammer@gold.ac.uk

The acceleration of data constitutes one of the most powerful transformative forces in the world today. Platform companies, e-government programs, and social media sites are offering almost unfiltered access to millions of lives as well as to all the creative ideas and activities that form the basis of today’s publics. A kind of “dataism” seems to be emerging as the new religion that one needs to embrace in order to be part of the production and accumulation of value, whether driven by new modes of environmental data gathering or mining and quantifying previously unquantifiable categories such as trust, appreciation, and attitude. This panel explores the relationship between these developments and contemporary art practices. How is contemporary art enlisted in shaping new public experiences, attitudes, and expectations around a data-driven world? How does artistic experimentation interfere in the political, economic, and cultural conditions of data generation, data analytics, and dataveillance? Can art facilitate new forms of publics to emerge beyond the techno-capitalist vision of an information society? We invite scholars, artists, and curators to submit papers that engage with such questions through specific case studies and/or broader theoretical perspectives.

Renaissance Society of America (RSA)

#### **De-Centering the “Global Renaissance”: Encounters with Asia and the Pacific Rim**

Chair(s): Irene Backus, Oklahoma State University, irene.backus@gmail.com; Sujatha Meegama, Nanyang Technological University, sujathameegama@ntu.edu.sg

By equally engaging scholars with specializations both in and outside of Europe during the “Renaissance” period (1300–1650), this panel seeks to displace the customary location of the academic gaze in Renaissance art thus confusing the categories of subject and object. It asks: How might a concerted look at the Renaissance and its products appear to viewers in Asia and around the Pacific Rim? More broadly, how might these questions be productively addressed in research and the classroom? Rather than proposing a single way to approach the Global Renaissance, this panel celebrates the rich diversity of not only objects and fields that engage in global art histories, but also the methods of engagement. We especially welcome new voices and emerging scholars who are exploring creative answers to the challenges presented over the past academic generation by Claire Farago and others in the call for a more genuinely “dialogical model” — one in which viewpoints from many localities might be given weight in the variegated web of transcultural encounters.

#### **Decolonizing Art Histories: The Intersections of Diaspora and World Studies**

Chair(s): Victoria Nolte, Carleton University, victoria.nolte@carleton.ca; Andrew Gayed, York University, gayeda@yorku.ca

Current theorizations of modern art reveal the dominance of colonial and imperial epistemological structures: the exclusion of multiple sites of modernity and the entrenchment of binaries that relegate non-Western aesthetic languages as offshoots to dominant Western art movements. While studies of globalization and diaspora have challenged the authority of nation-state identities and rigid cultural categorization, art histories are still written through center-periphery models that maintain Euro-American exceptionalism. How then can world art histories productively be written in order to dismantle the center-periphery binary that maintains such colonial structures? To problematize these framings, this panel is informed by the approaches of comparative transnationalisms, notions of “worlding,” and the limits of current art historical models. It will address the following concerns: What does decolonizing the study and writing of art history look like? How can anti-colonial research be centered, rather than existing as peripheral engagements with dominant modes of representation and discourse? Understanding that knowledge production is one of the major sites in which imperialism operates and exercises its power, how can we decolonize the structural limits that currently condition knowledge production? And finally, how can the theorization of diaspora and diasporic artists shift our assumptions about world art history? Panelists may examine these issues through contemporary case studies, curatorial and artistic interventions, and institutional practices. We encourage proposals that suggest possible methodologies for studying world art history through minor or comparative transnationalisms.

Museum Committee

#### **Decolonizing Art Museums?**

Chair(s): Risham Majeed, Ithaca College, rmajeed@ithaca.edu; Elizabeth Rodini, Johns Hopkins University, erodini@jhu.edu; Celka Straughn, Spencer Museum of Art, straughn@ku.edu

The colonial history of museums is by now familiar, and institutional critiques of and within ethnographic and anthropological collections are fairly widespread. Indeed, many of the objects in these collections have migrated to art museums as a result of postcolonial thinking. But what about art museums? How do these institutions, their collections, and their practices continue to extend colonial outlooks for Western and non-Western art, perhaps silently, and what tools are being used to disrupt these perceptions both in the United States and abroad? This panel explores what decolonizing means for art museum practices and the ways decolonizing approaches can move the museum field toward greater inclusion, broader scholarly perspectives, and opportunities to redress structural inequities. Topics to address might include: detangling collection objects from colonial collecting practices; decentering the status quo across museum operations; reconsidering the relationship between contemporaneity and historicism; alternative modes of presentation (breaking received hierarchies and narratives); embracing varied understandings of objects, materials, catalogues, and archives; polyphony and pluralism in museum rhetoric; and an understanding of “colonialism” that steps outside conventional definitions of this term. We invite papers that combine scholarship, practice, and activism, bringing together case studies with critical reflection on art museums to demonstrate what decolonized practices can and might look like and offer models for institutional change. Papers that explore diverse modes of practice within and outside the United States, that provide intersectional and

interdisciplinary approaches, and/or that present alternative ways for people to use and reimagine art museums are especially welcome.

Design Studies Forum (DSF)

### **Design and Neoliberalism: The Economics and Politics of “Total Design” across the Disciplines**

Chair(s): Arden Stern, ArtCenter College of Design, astern2@artcenter.edu; Sami Siegelbaum, University of California, Los Angeles, samisiegelbaum@gmail.com

Neoliberalism has emerged as a totalizing conceptual apparatus for understanding an array of contemporary phenomena. Whether viewed politically as a system of governance that submits all functions to the authority of market directives, economically as the financialization of capitalism, or socially as the erosion of collective institutions, neoliberalism has impacted cultural production in myriad ways. Design, when analyzed critically, has often been portrayed as complicit with these processes. As Guy Julier has observed, “Design takes advantage of and normalizes the transformations that neoliberalism provokes” (Julier 2014). That is to say, contemporary design practices are not only organized according to neoliberal goals and systems but also promote neoliberal values. Hal Foster has argued that “the world of total design” imagined by modernist avant-gardes such as the Bauhaus has been achieved by neoliberalism’s “pan-capitalist” subsumption of all aspects of life (Foster 2002). Much scholarship on neoliberalism and design focuses on the fields of architecture and urbanism, as well as humanitarian design and activism. What other connections between design and neoliberalism remain unexplored? How have neoliberal economic policies shaped and constrained design and how has design contributed to the financialization of previously uncommodified sectors of life? This session examines the ways in which conditions of neoliberalism have both expanded and constricted the purview of design and seeks to engage global perspectives on these questions across a wide variety of design and design-related fields, including (but not limited to) product design, interaction design, graphic design, advertising, branding, fashion, multimedia, UX, etc.

Committee on Design

### **Design for Participation**

Chair(s): David Howarth, Zayed University, davidhowarth1967@gmail.com; Kevin Badni, American University Sharjah, kbadni@aus.edu

In this era, individuals and groups can take part in social and political life — or all kinds of private or public projects — through a number of public platforms and policies. In this often collaborative and consultative context, what is the role and status of the designer? Design disciplines fundamentally contribute to shaping the virtual and physical public spaces of communities, as well as fostering and shaping culture and heritage, both past and future. How can designers help address issues like inequality or the evolution of participation and representation in the political process and in social life? This session will discuss, highlight, and showcase good and bad practices within the realm of design through collaborative ventures and problem solving in an ever-changing world.

### **Destabilizing the Geographic in Modern and Contemporary Art**

Chair(s): Kailani Polzak, Williams College, kp7@williams.edu; Tatiana Reinoza, Dartmouth College, tatiana.reinoza@dartmouth.edu

Mapping has long served as one of the paradigms of post-enlightenment rationalism because of its efficacy in fixing the unknown contours of the world into calculable positions on a grid of longitude and latitude. Eurocentric rationalism and its

cartographic logic has also constructed racial, gendered, and ethnic categories linked to the territory. But these totalizing visions belie a stabilization mired in pictorial ambivalence. This panel conceives of the geographic as a scripted genre, where makers intended for their pictures to be read/performed in specific ways. We invite submissions that investigate how imperfectness and visual excess destabilize the empirical authority of the geographic. From exploratory voyages in the Pacific that led to imagistic theories of race to representations of immigrant surveillance by contemporary artists, we seek papers that operationalize geographic metaphors and the images of which reveal erasures and excesses that break with the scripted narratives of cartographic reason. In other words, we are interested in art and visual culture which engages the viewer in a process of counter-mapping. We encourage case studies that consider: How does the logic of the geographic underpin other forms of picture-making? In what ways does the transcription of space allow for the continuous re-performance of colonialism? How does embodied knowledge place in question the geometric abstraction of disembodied projection? What alternate views can we recover from phenomenological approaches to territory? How does the reconfiguration of the past produce other spatio-temporal futures? How can we denaturalize the narratives of progress that the geographic purports to offer?

### **Digital Surrogates: The Reproduction and (re)Presentation of Art and Cultural Heritage**

Chair(s): Sarah Victoria Turner, Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art, svturner@paul-mellon-centre.ac.uk; Thomas Scutt, Paul Mellon Centre for Studies in British Art, tscutt@paul-mellon-centre.ac.uk

What new art historical perspectives and kinds of knowledge do three-dimensional visualizations of objects and spaces afford? What are the key possibilities or potential pitfalls to be aware of when generating new visualizations? How can visualizations extend and enhance the public function of museums by increasing accessibility and engagement? How do we connect these visualizations with new methodological insights about objects and their reproductions? Does the creation of digital surrogates result in a democratization of cultural history, or does it further distance researchers and the public from original objects? How does the production of these resources navigate the ‘threshold of originality,’ and to what extent can they be distinguished as original works? What are the most effective ways to share, publish, and circulate these visualizations? This panel seeks presentations and provocations exploring issues relating to the process of creating, collaborating on, publishing, and using 3D visualizations of art works, cultural heritage objects, and architectural spaces. It is chaired by members of the editorial team of British Art Studies (BAS), an online-only peer-reviewed journal that publishes new research on art and architecture. Approaching these issues from the perspective of art history, digital humanities, and cultural heritage, this panel will explore best practices in a growing area of digital art historical research from a range of perspectives.

### **Disability Aesthetics and Choreopolitics**

Chair(s): Leon Hilton, Brown University, leon.hilton@gmail.com; Amanda Cachia, University of California, San Diego, acachia@ucsd.edu

This panel considers how the choreography of disability is a political project that is concerned with the shaping and transformation of movement. This panel aims to rethink from the perspective of disability how art history and aesthetic practice adjudicate questions of representation, embodiment, movement, and sense perception. To do so the panel places into conversation two sets of emerging discourses and practices: the first is disability aesthetics, which according to disability theorist Tobin Siebers

seeks to “establish disability as a critical framework that questions the presuppositions underlying definitions of aesthetic production and appreciation” by emphasizing “the presence of different bodies and minds in the tradition of aesthetic representation.” The second concerns a concept that performance theorist Andre Lepecki has termed “choreopolitics,” a term that suggests how new critical and aesthetic work addressing the forms of violence and dispossession that saturate our contemporary political moment can be thrown into relief by attending to how movement plays into the way power orders, arranges, impedes, and allows bodies to circulate. By rethinking disability aesthetics choreopolitically, the panel aims to develop new ways of studying the politics and aesthetics of bodily movement both historically and in the contemporary moment.

### **Disappointment and Representation**

Chair(s): Elizabeth Howie, Coastal Carolina University, ehowie@coastal.edu

The word disappointment, which originally meant the dismissal of an individual from an appointed position, has come to describe the emotional impact or affect of such a removal: it can amalgamate surprise, loss, melancholy, hopelessness, anger, embarrassment, etc. Despite its familiarity, the feeling of disappointment may be so overwhelming and confusing that it is hard to identify and articulate. Such confusion may mark a productive breakdown of ideologies, when things don't go as expected. Unlike melancholy, disappointment may be a response to a very specific loss. Like paranoia, it may engender a terrifying anticipation of possible bad outcomes. It may be directed both outward to a known perpetrator or situation, or inward like depression or shame. The shock of disappointment may identify previously unrecognized desires or may demonstrate that desires were much more powerful than previously understood until they were denied. Disappointment appears in visual art overtly in terms of, for example, sentimental nineteenth-century representational works. How else might visual art invoke disappointment? Is there a particular facial expression for this affect? How might abstraction reference it? Is disappointment purely human? What are its historical roots? What are its political and ethical implications? Following recent theoretical investigations into affect, including minor ones, by Sara Ahmed and Sianne Ngai among others, this panel seeks to explore disappointment in a broad range of art, whether in terms of a literal representation, more generalized content, or as a theoretical approach to understanding a work of art's impact.

Professional Practices Committee

### **Disciplinary Distinctions: Art History / Visual Studies / Studio Art**

Chair(s): Brian Bishop, Framingham State University, bbishop@framingham.edu

This panel will explore the definitions and boundaries between Art History, Studio Art, and the various expansions that have emerged in the past few decades including but not limited to: Material Culture, Visual and Cultural Studies, Critical Studies, and Curatorial Studies. As more and more institutions move toward these types of hybrid programs, this session seeks to clarify the goals and outcomes for degree programs on both the baccalaureate and graduate level. The purpose of this session is to delineate the difference between these interdisciplinary programs and their counterparts in Studio Art and Art History. What are the benefits and drawbacks of such courses of study? Do they adequately, or better, prepare students for careers and/or graduate study in art, art history, museum studies, and arts management? Is it wise to blend together the study of art production with its history, or should the two remain separate while building on one another as they have in the past? The topic of this session began with

a discussion in the Professional Practices Committee as they embarked on reviewing and revising the Standards for the BA and BFA Degree in Studio Art; Standards for the AFA Degree in Studio Art; and completing a revision of the Standards for the MFA Degree. Does CAA need to draft guidelines for degree programs in Visual Studies as well? This panel will investigate this need and attempt to bring to light a better understanding of this emerging discipline.

### **Exhibition as Evidence and Postwar International Avant-Gardes**

Chair(s): Amara Antilla, Guggenheim Museum, amaraantilla@gmail.com

Building upon the historical discourse examining institutions of display, curatorial practice, and exhibition typologies, this panel aims to activate the history of exhibitions to revisit neglected perspectives on postwar avant-gardes. By revisiting various exhibitionary, pedagogical, or performance-based events it becomes possible to map out overlooked contact points between artists and thinkers internationally and highlight alternative networks that are indicative of larger political, social, and economic affinities. Furthermore, through an exploration of ephemera (posters, publications, documentation etc.) new ideas are solicited that expand our understanding into how these art histories have been recorded and what has been left out. We invite curators and scholars to submit papers that examine artist-organized exhibitions; international or regional biennials and periodic exhibitions; or reflect upon methodological problems related to employing the history of exhibitions as a part of curatorial and academic work.

### **Dissent and Resistance: Responses to Authoritarianism in Ancient Art**

Chair(s): Anthony F. Mangieri, Salve Regina University, anthony.mangieri@salve.edu; Rachel Foulk, Ferris State University, foulkr@ferris.edu

Ideological clashes over politics, religion, and identity are a few examples of the kinds of power struggles that dominate the history of the ancient world. This session seeks papers that recover material traces of resistance to various kinds of authoritarian or autocratic power. How does dissent or resistance register in the visual arts of the ancient Mediterranean and Near East? Papers should speak to the role that art plays in combating tyranny, broadly taken to mean all forms of oppression; that is, the hegemonic imposition of power in all realms of experience, which is not limited to the political or religious, but includes issues of ethnicity, social class, and gender and sexuality among other concerns. How have dominant power structures sought to silence resistance, and how have dissidents used visual communication to combat authoritarianism? Resistance in the ancient world often took place within the very systems of power that existed to repress people, so also welcome are papers that can decode or interpret instances of dissent within the fabric of normative power hierarchies. While parallels like Greek plays and Roman political rhetoric are well known, this session seeks to illuminate how images have been marshaled as forms of resistance. In light of widespread turmoil and repression in the United States and around the world, we hope that studying historical examples of how people have responded to tyranny and authoritarianism in its many forms can serve as a catalyst for identifying similar practices today and for empowering reform.

### **Eccentric Images in the Early Modern World**

Chair(s): Mark A. Meadow, University of California, Santa Barbara, meadow@arthistory.ucsb.edu; Marta Faust, University of California, Santa Barbara, marta\_faust@umail.ucsb.edu

Trompe l'oeil paintings, anamorphic portraits, anthropomorphic landscapes, pictorial stones, reversible heads, and composite figures are doubly eccentric. Often dismissed as curiosities and aberrations, they have been marginalized and de-centered within art history. Frequently, they demand that the viewer take unorthodox positions, looking at them from extreme angles from more than one physical location or shifting from one perceptual mode to another. Rather than trivializing such pictures as mere games, virtuosic trivia, and forms of entertainment, this session invites papers that explore how such eccentric images explore issues concerning perception, artifice, and both human and natural creativity. What different modes of artistic production and perception do they require? What questions do they pose about cognition, viewing experiences, and alternate subject positions? What questions do they raise about the role of viewers in constituting the work of art? How do images that seem to change before one's eyes engage with period notions of paradox, volatility, and mutable forms? How do they establish conditions for a more self-aware beholder? We welcome submissions addressing any aspect of eccentric imagery, from any cultural perspective, in the long early modern period (ca. 1400–1800 CE).

### **Educating Hybrid Practitioners**

Chair(s): Anne Mondro, Penny W. Stamps School of Art & Design, University of Michigan, amondro@umich.edu

It is widely acknowledged that educating the next generation of artists and designers will require learning and teaching that fosters creative inquiry at the intersection of diverse domains of knowledge. Artists will need to develop hybrid practices that merge disciplines. Shifting away from curricula that focus on single art or design concentrations to ones that integrate multiple disciplinary experiences within a four-year undergraduate art and design program is a challenge. Tearing down the silos that have provided group identity and community affiliation can facilitate cross-disciplinary collaboration and discovery. It can also leave each individual in isolation searching for a place to belong. Similarly, barring the conventional format of sequential learning in a given concentration, how do students find the right balance of expertise in one area with proficiencies in others in order to become impactful cultural innovators? This panel seeks papers which discuss new curricular frameworks, approaches, and models designed to aid students in strategically navigating across boundaries to develop a multi-, cross-, or inter-disciplinary art and design practice.

### **Energy and Photography**

Chair(s): James Nisbet, University of California, Irvine, jnisbet@uci.edu; Daniel Hackbarth, Independent Scholar, hackbart@alumni.stanford.edu

This session explores the role of energy in discourses and practices of photography from the medium's early history in the nineteenth century through the present day. Over this same period, energy came to define the very possibilities of industrial production and consumption, crossing over from a technical issue of the sciences to the forefront of political debates on ecological sustainability. We find frequent mention of visible light and invisible radiation in the writings of photography's trailblazers, of avant-gardists associated with numerous twentieth-century movements, and of contemporary artists using both artisanal and cutting-edge techniques. Still other practices and critical frameworks evoke an "energetic imagination" through less explicit means. Since Anson Rabinbach's pathbreaking book "The Human Motor" (1990)

established a cultural history of energy in industrial modernity, interest in the reception and interpretation of energy within the arts has grown steadily. However, despite photography's fundamental engagement with forms of energy exchange, it plays a surprisingly small role in recent anthologies such as "From Energy to Information" (ed. Bruce Clark and Linda Dalrymple Henderson, 2002) and "Vibratory Modernism" (ed. Anthony Enns and Shelly Trower, 2013). Within the history and theory of photography, notions of energy suggest both novel approaches to the field and a means of reassessing established topics, such as the indexical qualities of the photograph and the relationship between analog and digital images. We welcome papers giving voice to the intersections between energetics and photography in addressing aesthetics, science and technology, politics, the history of ideas, and/or material cultures.

### **Evasive Articulations in the Age of 'Fake News': Thinking About the Relationship between Art and Truth During the Trump Era**

Chair(s): Aja Mujinga Sherrard, University of Montana, aja.sherrard@umontana.edu

Artwork has long dipped into the imaginary. Whether by depicting figures of myths and metaphor; reducing information to the interplay of colors, forms, or materials through a practice of abstraction; or — in the tradition of conceptual artists like Adrian Piper, Cindy Sherman, and Coco Fusco — presenting audiences with imagined circumstances, alternate selves, and false narratives, artists have veiled their sincere exploration into cultural systems and the human experience within evasive articulations. For contemporary artists working from poststructural, postcolonial, or feminist and queer theory, questions such as "whose truth?" are necessary. However, in a political moment that flaunts misinformation, where "fake news" shapes elections and politicians speak, un-speak, re-speak, and call everything but praise a lie, those of us who make, curate, and write about art must ask ourselves certain questions: Can we defend the imaginary during an assault on truth? What is the role of art (and evasive articulations) in this political age?

### **Experiments with Technology in Latin American Art: From the 1960s to the 1980s**

Chair(s): William Schwaller, Temple University, william.schwaller@temple.edu; Tie Jojima, The Graduate Center, The City University of New York, tiejojima@gmail.com

In Latin America, the late 1960s and early 1970s witnessed the emergence of experimental artistic practices with an interdisciplinary interest in communications and technology, followed — or fostered — by the creation of institutions and exhibitions dedicated to such productions such as the Centro de Arte y Comunicación founded in 1968 in Buenos Aires, the exhibition Computer Plotter Art in São Paulo in 1969, the first video art exhibition at MAC/USP in São Paulo in 1974, etc. Artists engaged new modes of perception, new modalities of production and distribution of objects, and information created with technology. This panel seeks to examine Latin American artists' experiments with technology through individual case studies or key issues. How did artists incorporate technology and scientific thinking in their practices as examinations of notions of emancipation and progress, alienation, or barbarism? How might engagements with technology (or its mere representation) perform dis/utopian imaginaries and speak to the larger socio-economic reality of the region? How did system and network thinking (such as arte de sistemas, mail art, and minitel art) shape artistic practices across geographic, political, and cultural borders? What was the role of economy and bureaucracy in the availability of technological apparatuses to artists and how they engaged with these material conditions? How might these questions and concerns introduce different methodologies to the study of Latin

American art or more nuanced studies of the region? Lastly, what were the contributions of institutions and curators to these art and technology experiments?

### **Faithful Copies: On Replication and Creative Agency in Buddhist Art**

Chair(s): Chun Wa Chan, University of Michigan, gchanart@umich.edu

From architectural forms like the pagoda, to objects such as icons, reliquaries, and scriptures that are handwritten or printed, replication has remained one of the dominant modes of production of Buddhist art across Asia. As Shen Hsueh-man remarked, in most cases, these “copies” are regarded not only as efficacious, but as authentic as their often lost “prototypes.” This panel examines this seemingly mundane, yet highly pervasive mode of the production and circulation of Buddhist art. Foregrounding replication as a productive rather than derivative process, this panel approaches Buddhist art within a broad range of contexts, inviting papers that address works made in the premodern Buddhist world, as well as those by contemporary artists that engage with Buddhist metaphysics. In particular, this panel asks: how is one to write a history of art when the boundary between the “originals” and the “copies” are dissolved? If the referent is lost, what discursive devices are established to guarantee that the copy is visually or spiritually faithful? How shall we conceive of the act of copying when it entails not a dismissal but a reassertion of creative agency? To what extent does the physical labor involved in varying strategies of replication resonate with Buddhist ideas? Taken together, how does the case of replication in Buddhist art speak to the practice of art history, a discipline that often preoccupies itself with the issues of unique authorship and authenticity?

### **American Society for Hispanic Art Historical Studies (ASHAHS) Fashion, Costume, and Consumer Culture in Iberia and Latin America: A Session in Honor of Gridley McKim-Smith**

Chair(s): Mey-Yen Moriuchi, La Salle University, moriuchi@lasalle.edu; Mark Castro, Philadelphia Museum of Art, mcastro@philamuseum.org

“Material splendor — rare and exquisite fabrics, dazzling displays of wealth and sartorial beauty — is a compelling value in Hispanic-American clothing” (McKim-Smith, “Lexikon of the Hispanic Baroque” 2013, 111). Gridley McKim-Smith (1943–2013) argued that the “profound materiality and sensuality of costume is crucial in Spain’s American possessions, where only stuffs recognized as prestigious can insulate the wearer from public disgrace and where the most sumptuous silks or alpacas, sometimes interwoven with precious metals, can make the wearer both admired and desired.” (114) In honor of the late McKim-Smith’s research interests and scholarship this session will consider representations of dress and fashion in Iberia and Latin America. In the Spanish- and Portuguese-speaking worlds, depictions of costumes in paintings, sculptures, prints, and other visual media, as well as the creation of textiles and garments, demonstrate the power of dress in the construction of social, racial, gender, and cultural identities. The existence of extensive global trade networks facilitated the exchange and synthesis of artistic practices and craftsmanship permitting unique garments and objects which revealed the wearer’s style, aesthetic preferences, and social status. We seek papers from broad geographical and chronological periods, from Precolumbian to modern, that consider the role of fashion, costume, and consumer culture in the Spanish- and Portuguese-speaking worlds. How do clothes mediate identity, ideology, social rank, and subjectivity? What is the relationship between consumer culture and conspicuous consumption in Iberia and Latin America? How did dimensions of lived experience — psychological, performative, and political — survive in articles of dress?

The Feminist Art Project (TFAP)

### **Feminist Art in Response to the State**

Chair(s): Rachel Lachowicz, Claremont Graduate University, rachel.lachowicz@cgu.edu; Connie Tell, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey, ctell@cwah.rutgers.edu

Feminisms inherently engage politics, and by extension systemic state power and the marginalization and oppression of individuals. Current events have triggered a magnified importance and urgency to this engagement. The Feminist Art Project seeks proposals for papers and presentations from artists, art historians, and theorists related to the ways in which art can further respond to politics and amplify resistance to the state. Topic possibilities may be: effective strategies that artists currently or have employed and ways in which feminisms can evolve in constructing new paradigms as well as critiquing the shortcomings of existing methods. Proposals with potential images to be included are preferred.

### **French North Africa and the Architecture of Counterinsurgency**

Chair(s): Ralph Ghoche, Barnard College, rghoche@barnard.edu; Samia Henni, ETH Zurich, arch@samiahenni.com

The French invasion of the Regency of Algiers in 1830 marked the onset of a long era of colonization of North Africa. In French Algeria, and the French protectorates of Morocco and Tunisia, French troops were met with widespread rebellions, counteroffensives, and popular uprisings. To combat these resistances, and to control and pacify the masses, the colonial regimes introduced spatial reforms that aimed to divide and conquer. In the nineteenth century these interventions took the form of military camps, new urban plans, penitentiary complexes, protective agricultural settlements, and large infrastructural projects (ports, roads, rail, water). During the Algerian Revolution (1954–62), tensions between colonists and the native population came to a head, leading to new forms of oppression and the establishment of an unprecedented number of counterinsurgency mechanisms: the demarcation of forbidden zones, the construction of fortified camps, the clearance of slums, and the building of mass housing across French Algeria in an effort to impede revolt. The session examines the buildings, territorial interventions, and infrastructures that ensured France’s effective hold over North Africa from the start of France’s colonization of Algeria in 1830 to Algerian independence in 1962. We seek papers that critically discuss and disclose the involvement of specific actors in spatial counterinsurgency endeavors in Algeria, Morocco, or Tunisia under colonial rule. The objective is to investigate the role of architecture and planning in obstructing and dominating insurrections and to scrutinize the roots of spatial counterinsurgency procedures and their impacts on the consolidation of a colonial order.

### **Gender Parity and Bias in the Arts: A Demand for Change**

Chair(s): Jody Servon, Appalachian State University, jodyservon@gmail.com; Xandra Eden, DiverseWorks, xandra@diverseworks.org; Jina Valentine, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, valent@unc.edu

In this session we will review current research; strategize ways to confront gender bias in relationships between artists, arts institutions, and academia; and discuss how these biases impact women’s careers in the arts. The race for recognition among artists, curators, arts professionals, and academics often occurs at the same time that women are making family planning decisions. Whether we raise children or not, women have shared concerns about how their voices are heard and needs are met as professionals, cultural producers, and vital contributors to the workforce. Together we will formulate concrete actions for artists, art professionals, arts and university administrators, and legislators

that will increase awareness and empower women, mothers, and parents to demand change within existing power structures. Presentation topics may include: examinations of motherhood/parenthood bias illustrated in the careers and pathways of artists; the imbalance in the representation of women artists in museum/gallery exhibitions and public projects; professional advancement and/or residency opportunities for women/parents; methods for increasing awareness of bias in different situations (among all genders, including women who hold positions of power); and intersectional gender bias (i.e. minority, female, LGBTQ, etc.). Contributors to the session will give a short presentation and facilitate conversations with attendees. Co-chairs of this panel represent artist, teacher, curator, and executive director perspectives.

### **He, She, and the In-Between: Reassessing Gender and Sexuality in Ancient Mediterranean Art**

Chair(s): Bridget Sandhoff, University of Nebraska Omaha, bsandhoff@unomaha.edu

Issues of gender and sexuality revolutionized art historical/archaeological studies of ancient Greece and Rome. While the field relied primarily on traditional methods (i.e., connoisseurship, formalism, and contextual history), this fresh viewpoint opened up a new realm of artwork considered too sexually graphic for study. In addition, gender — as an interpretative model — generated alternate approaches on how to examine visual representations of male/female/other and erotic imagery and its audience in the classical past. Consider standard works such as K. J. Dover's groundbreaking examination of Greek homosexuality (1978/1989/2016), Eva C. Keuls' analysis of sexual politics in Athens (1993), the edited volume on sexuality in ancient art by Natalie B. Kampen and Bettina Bergmann (1996), or the examination of Roman sex edited by Marilyn Skinner and Judith Hallett (1997). A peak in the scholarship occurred in the 1990s. Now, almost twenty years later, can scholars add anything more or innovative to established views? Motivated by the current political and social climate concerning gender, this panel seeks papers addressing different perspectives, new ideas/research, and/or reevaluations of the field. Possible topics include but are not limited to: fetishized sex organs or "sexy" body parts (e.g., breasts, phallus, back, buttocks); performative aspects of gender (i.e., funerals, religious ceremonies); gendered objects; images of masculinity and femininity; "disruptive," excessive bodies; gendered spaces; androgynous humans or deities; representations of same-sex relationships; scenes of motherhood; depictions of sex acts; and expressions of love. Also welcome are gendered topics of underrepresented groups (e.g., Celts, Etruscans, Scythians) from the ancient Mediterranean.

### **Historicizing Loss in Early Modern Europe**

Chair(s): Julia Vazquez, Columbia University, jmv2153@columbia.edu

The history of art and architecture in Baroque Madrid is bookended by two major events: the fire that burned down the Pardo Palace in 1604 and the fire that burned down the Alcázar Palace in 1734. Resulting in the loss of dozens of paintings by Titian, Antonis Mor, and Velázquez, in addition to the buildings themselves, these events represented unprecedented moments of loss to the historical record of this period. Scholars that work in this field usually lament losses like these for their historiographic repercussions. This panel aims, instead, to resituate loss in its historical context. How can the loss of any one object transform the reception of others in their own historical period? How do patrons and artists respond to the destruction of objects? How are losses narrativized, and how do they transform existing narratives? When and under what circumstances does the destruction of existing artworks stimulate the production of new ones?

Are objects ever recuperated or reconstituted, and if so, how? Although organized by a scholar of the Spanish Baroque, I invite scholars working in any period of early modern Europe to propose papers dealing with these or related questions.

### **Histories of Fake News**

Chair(s): Emily K. Morgan, Iowa State University, emorgan@iastate.edu

In the past year the apparently novel phenomenon of "fake news" has received a great deal of attention. Misleading or false stories in the news, or from news-like sources of questionable derivation, turn out to have remarkably extensive power to sway popular opinion. The question of what constitutes "news" at all, and by extension what constitutes truth, has become pressing. The notion that false or inaccurate reporting might have real influence on real events seems to have caught many people by surprise. No historian of art or visual culture, however, ought to be shocked by these developments: art has always been post-truth. Images — whether in houses of worship, museums, or the pages of the newspaper — have always served the ends and the truths of those who create, commission, and circulate them. Visual meaning has always been manipulable. In the face of current popular soul-searching over the meaning of information in a post-truth era, this panel aims to take a long view. What would a history of fake news look like? How might we bring historical depth and breadth of vision to bear on this not-so-new phenomenon? The panel welcomes submissions from historians of art and visual culture focused on a range of eras, regions, and media.

### **How Many Ways to Miss the Mark? Lucio Fontana between Formalism and Historicity**

Chair(s): Laura Moure Cecchini, Colgate University, lmourecchini@colgate.edu; Jaleh Mansoor, The University of British Columbia, jaleh.mansoor@gmail.com

Internationally renowned for his singular idiom of slashed and punctured paintings, Lucio Fontana's oeuvre has provoked much recent research. Exhibitions in Paris (2014) and Milan (2015) and studies by Anthony White (2011), Pia Gottschaller (2012), and Jaleh Mansoor (2016) have complicated previous generations' views of Fontana solely as an eccentric representative of postwar gestural aesthetics. Indeed, from the mid-1920s to 1968, Fontana experimented with a variety of media, from ceramic to jewelry and from painting to neon. Fontana's integration of artistic methods and collaborations with architects and designers opened the way for later generations of artists who queried and dismantled categories and genres. And yet Fontana's own seemingly peripatetic if elegant transgression of boundaries among media continues to go unaddressed. This lacuna around the question of genre and artistic processes might be the only common ground among the studies cited above. Maybe more than any other artist, Fontana has suffered from the conflict between formalist and historicist readings, and between philological and critical examinations of his production. On the fiftieth anniversary of Fontana's death, we hope that new lines of inquiry might offer a cohesive sense of his oeuvre and open onto new questions around problems of genre and style. We invite contributions that address unexplored aspects of Fontana's work while challenging prevailing methodological approaches and avoiding hagiography. We seek papers that offer an original exploration of Fontana's at once odd and remarkable practice in order to offer a more complex approach to artistic praxis in the interwar and postwar periods.

### **How We Practice**

Chair(s): Carmen Winant, Columbus College of Art and Design, cwinant@ccad.edu

What is 'practice'? It is, at once, a thing that we carry out, attend, innovate and possess, used to describe both our research and the application of that research. Practice describes certain care-oriented activities (studio art, yoga, writing) and not others (cooking, mothering, sleeping); why is this? Can its selective implementation be measured through voluntary and involuntary action? Physical embodiment? Monetary gains? This panel would seek to define the often contradictory and absorptive term as it now functions across contemporary art discourse, offering new ways to read and apply it in the process. The speakers will examine 'practice' from several points of access and experience, including that of legitimacy, unpacking in the newfound role of artist-as-professional, and the influence of MFA programs in promoting the posture of creative work as white collar labor. ("Who practices, after all," writes Peter Schjeldahl, "if not doctors, lawyers, and dentists?") The speakers/performers will also import influences from outside of the field of art production — looking to the world of athletics, amongst other rituals — to approach the implications, strategies, and potentialities of practice vis-à-vis labor and exhaustion, repetition and pleasure, gender and rehearsal. This panel will not make value judgments on the meaning and use of 'practice' as it functions. Rather, it will work to tease out its problems, possibilities, and points of connection, ultimately offering a more nuanced and specific view of what this heavily used and under-defined term offers to a critical and imaginative landscape of artists.

### **Hucksters or Connoisseurs?: The Role of Intermediary Agents in Art Economies**

Chair(s): Titia Hulst, Purchase College, The State University of New York, titiahulst@gmail.com; Anne Helmreich, Texas Christian University, alhelmreich@gmail.com

The roles of art dealers in the creation of art economies and the circulatory exchange of goods have come to increasing attention of late. However, much work remains to be done to counter the long history of the hagiographic treatment of dealers, which owes a great deal to the fact that histories of dealers were largely authored by dealers themselves, eager to write themselves into the history of art. For this session, we seek to bring a critical and historical perspective to the role of intermediary agents in the primary and secondary markets. We seek papers that will examine dealers who mediated between the artist as producer and the consumer, whether conceived as an individual patron or broadly configured audiences. We also seek papers that identify strategies developed by these intermediary figures in response to changing social-historical as well as geographical conditions. Relatedly, what role did dealers play in the emergence of art history as a discipline and the construction of its narratives given the vested interest of these agents in knowledge formation and collection building? Since histories of art dealers have long been dominated by narratives drawn from the Western market, we are particularly interested in papers that examine the role of this figure in non-western art economies as well as topics that help us test and question standard models derived from the early modern and modern Western context. We encourage analysis of historically grounded strategies and practices, as opposed to anecdotal heroic narratives.

### **Imagining Constructivism's Constellations: Alternative Histories of Cold War Cultural Production**

Chair(s): John A. Tyson, National Gallery of Art, J-tyson@nga.gov

Today art historians typically understand constructivism to be limited to Soviet cultural production from the years following the October Revolution. However, in the 1960s, the taxonomy was far more flexible and referred to artists of various generations and nationalities. George Rickey's widely read "Constructivism: Origins and Evolution" (1967) groups together all manner of works that are geometric in form, modular in construction, and often kinetic. Major "constructivist" exhibitions, like the Albright-Knox's "Plus by Minus: Today's Half Century" (1968) and MoMA's "The Machine as Seen at the End of the Mechanical Age" (1968), showed works by contemporary artists alongside those of the historical avant garde. Beyond the US, David Medalla and Paul Keeler viewed the Latin American artists in their London-based Signals Gallery (1964–66) as heirs to the constructivist tradition too. Naum Gabo (more than Aleksandr Rodchenko or Vladimir Tatlin) was cast as the movement's key progenitor; artists who might seem worlds apart now—from Lygia Clark to Larry Poons to Hans Haacke—formed part of a common field. Building on Maria Gough's "Frank Stella is a Constructivist" (2007) and Hal Foster's "Some Uses and Abuses of Russian Constructivism" (1990), this panel will importantly flesh out scholarship. Contributors will explore alternative perspectives on cultural production in the 1960s (and after) in order to enrich understandings of twentieth-century art. What neglected connections can transnational constellations of "constructivism" reveal? What are the implications of adopting and adapting of "Soviet"-coded forms during the Cold War? How might "constructivism" enable a redrawing of art world boundaries?

Design History Society

### **Imagining the International: Repositioning Peripheral Narratives in Global Design Histories**

Chair(s): Hui-Ying Kerr, Design History Society, huiying.kerr@ntu.ac.uk; Rebecca Bell, Design History Society, rebecca.bell@network.rca.ac.uk

This panel calls for papers exploring peripheral narratives in global design history, welcoming reexaminations of methods by which post-war cultural practices negotiated ideas of centrality. Taking two contrasting economic and political models as starting points, the Japanese Bubble Economy (1986–91) and socialist Czechoslovakia (1948–89), this panel addresses the role of individual subversion and tension within official design hierarchies. Recent design history scholarship has focused on the mechanisms and implications of transcultural flows (Adamson, Riello, Teasley, 2011). This panel proposes that these studies can also enrich our understanding of how non-Western narratives were engaged in a process of conflict, subversion, and dialogue with the hegemony of patriarchal modernization, thus reimagining the international. In exploring individual design and making practices that were in a process of constant repositioning in relation to 'official' (and often Western) discourse, this panel will show how design historians have a vital role to play in reevaluating hierarchies of globalized histories and claims to cultural centrality. Examples this panel's themes include (but are not restricted to): adoption, transformation, and reinterpretation of international styles; use of the international as a challenge to the status quo; reempowerment of the local as a recentering against (or dialogue with) the international; and individual cultural reimagining outside of official discourse. Areas of interest include (but are not restricted to): architecture, interiors, craft, furniture and product design, decorative arts, visual communication, exhibitions, fashion, gender, subcultures, and oral histories within global and material design histories. We invite four fifteen-minute papers for a ninety-minute panel.

Historians of Eighteenth-Century Art and Architecture (HECAA)  
**Imitation, Influence, and Invention in the Enlightenment**  
Chair(s): Heidi A. Strobel, University of Evansville, hs40@evansville.edu; Amber Ludwig, Independent Scholar, amberludwigotero@gmail.com

Much eighteenth-century artistic training and practice centered on the idea of copying. Sir Joshua Reynolds encouraged Royal Academy students to contemplate and quote the old masters to elevate their works; the Académie des Beaux-Arts sponsored the Prix de Rome to allow French painters and sculptors uninterrupted study of antiquity and Renaissance art and architecture. Exhibitions like John Boydell's Shakespeare Gallery relied, in part, on revenue from print sales to turn a profit, while artists like sculptor Anne Damer used prints to broaden the audience of her works. The purpose of this session is to interrogate the complicated relationship between imitation, influence, and invention and the ways in which value — educational, monetary, cultural, etc. — is assigned to artwork created after or influenced by another.

### **Imperial Islands: Vision and Experience in the American Empire after 1898**

Chair(s): Joseph R. Hartman, University of Missouri–Kansas City, josephresslerhartman@gmail.com

The empire of the United States began with a bang in 1898. The US Navy docked the Maine battleship in Havana's bay to protect Americans living in war-torn Cuba. It exploded under mysterious circumstances. The US blamed Spain and joined rebel forces to liberate the island in the Spanish-American War. Three months later, the US (not Cuban) flag replaced Spain's atop Havana's Morro Castle. Cubans soon found themselves under the power of a new American imperium. By the end of the so-called "Splendid Little War," the United States had taken possession of Cuba, Puerto Rico, Guam, and the Philippines. Massive infrastructural investments and bureaucratic overhauls from the United States redefined the ex-colonies of Spain, creating a visible confrontation of local indigenous, Spanish, and US imperial cultures. This session invites papers that reconsider how the United States and the island nations of the Americas and Southeast Asia were transformed through histories of visual, spatial, and material culture after 1898; including, but not limited to, studies on photography, print culture, popular media, performance, urbanism, and architecture. Papers might address embodied and artistic forms of resistance to US cultural presence; the role of architecture in expressions of state power; visual regimes of race and racism; or gendered representations of the United States and its foreign holdings in the Pacific and Caribbean. Papers examining the consumption and production of art in support or critique of US imperialism at the turn of the century in Havana, Manila, and San Juan are particularly welcome.

### **'Interaction with Color' Redux**

Chair(s): Joyce Polistena, Pratt Institute, joyce.polistena@gmail.com

Josef Albers' book "Interaction with Colour" (1963) initiated a modern exploration of the interdependence of colors with vision, perception, sensation, psychology, and more. Papers in this session will interpret work by artists who invented, adapted, or contributed to contemporaneous theories of color as well as those who asserted moral, mystical, and symbolic values to the color spectrum. Nineteenth- through twenty-first-century practitioners from Delacroix to Delaunay, Hofmann to Joan Mitchell, Ellsworth Kelly and beyond, are on topic. We seek papers that address technical, theoretical, or phenomenological approaches in the adaptation of color vision by individual artists as well as meta-concepts of cultural and symbolic studies of color.

### **Intercontinental: Native American and First Nations Artists on the Contemporary Art Stage**

Chair(s): Michelle J. Lanteri, The University of Oklahoma, lanteri.michelle@gmail.com

Contemporary artists from Native American and First Nations cultures fuse a complex amalgam of the local and the global in their practices, a concept clearly discussed by scholar Dr. Jolene K. Rickard (Tuscarora) in her 2006 essay titled "The Local and the Global." But too often, the international relevance of these artworks is overlooked by curators in favor of preserving cleanly defined exhibition themes that cordon off indigenous artists of the Americas from the majority of contemporary artists at large. These localized, not globalized, exhibitions form conflicted spaces where diversity is acknowledged, but in contexts separate from the rest of the contemporary art world. Despite this predicament, exhibitions and biennials that include Native American and First Nations artists within the international art stage are taking place, most notably with the participation of Postcommodity (Raven Chacon [Navajo], Cristóbal Martínez [Mestizo/Xicano], and Kade L. Twist [Cherokee Nation]) in documenta 14. As well, Dartmouth's Hood Museum mounted an inclusive contemporary art exhibition in 2015, titled "About Face: Self Portraiture in Contemporary Art," which featured works by Cindy Sherman, Chuck Close, Nikki S. Lee, Wendy Red Star (Apsáalooke [Crow]), and others. Thus, this panel considers the multiplicity and overlapping of local and global influences in artworks by Native American and First Nations practitioners, while identifying the local and global reach of particular objects and non-objects via diverse exhibitions, biennials, catalogues, monographs, and the like. Papers presented will also address the problematics of curators' exclusions of Native American and First Nations artists from mainstream contemporary exhibitions.

### **International Abstraction after World War II: The US, France, Germany, and Beyond**

Chair(s): Sabine Eckmann, Washington University in St. Louis, Eckmann@wustl.edu; Angela Miller, Washington University in St. Louis, AlMiller@wustl.edu

The past decade has seen a range of international exhibitions and publications on various phases of postwar abstraction, most recently Ulrich Wilmes's, Katie Siegel's, and Okwui Enwezor's ambitious 2016 "Postwar: Art between the Pacific and the Atlantic, 1945–1965." Primarily comparative and thematic in nature, such engagements with postwar abstraction have not addressed the rich reciprocal exchanges among gallerists, artists, critics, curators, and museums that formed among major sites in France, Germany, the US, and elsewhere. This panel proposes to examine the formally similar languages of abstraction that developed throughout Europe and the US between 1945 and 1959, the year of documenta II, and the reemergence of realism on an international scale. In a decisive move away from representation, artists in these countries focused on the formless, on materiality, and on the processual, redefining central problems of art-making and concepts of the image for a world whose historical and moral horizons had been radically transformed by war, systematized mass murder, and the massive destruction of cultural property. We invite papers that identify transnational approaches to material, process, and medium to reassess postwar aesthetic modernism, analyze specific contexts of exchange, and investigate the interpretation and advancement of the new abstract artistic languages in the culturally and politically contested years after World War II. Other lines of inquiry include concurrent debates about nationalism and internationalism attributed to this new art, and possible reverberations of the politicization of aesthetics under the Nazis.

### **Intimate Geographies**

Chair(s): Alexandra Fraser, University of Michigan, aefraser@umich.edu; Andrew Witt, Independent scholar, andrew.wit.09@ucl.ac.uk

Informed by recent fascinations with fraught spaces of intimacy in contemporary culture, from social media to representations in political tabloids and domestic micro-narratives, this panel explores the longer history of these spaces as expressed in modern art, architecture, and visual culture. Historians have made claims for the new conditions and definitions of intimacy that emerged in the mid-nineteenth century alongside industrial modernity and global capitalism. They have pointed to new experiences of privacy, sexuality, interiority, compressed time and space, psycho-social landscapes of alienation and belonging. This panel explores artists' preoccupations with these emerging dimensions of modern experience and the various social factors that gave them root. We seek papers that broadly and imaginatively answer the following question: In what ways did artists, designers, and architects of the modern period construct, project, and/or represent the modern environment through experimentation with critical forms of intimacy? How and why did they attempt to reconcile new understandings of psychological space with the built environment? We seek papers that engage the period 1870–1945 and encourage a broad geographic scope. Possible contributions may consider: representations of the spaces of privacy, the interior, the studio; "intimisme," decoration, the "gesamtkunstwerk"; psycho-social landscapes of the metropolis; politicization of private experience; "intimate" forms of representation such as the photographic portrait, documentary film, family album; representations of exile, social dislocation, imagined communities, isolation, particularly in the interwar period; the collapse of private and public space in new practices of art viewership, interior design, museum display, shop windows.

### **Italian Renaissance Art in the Age of Leonardo**

Chair(s): John Garton, Clark University, jgarton@clarku.edu

Leonardo da Vinci (1452–1519) remains an artist whose activities in painting, drawing, sculpture, hydrology, engineering, geology, military technology, and other pursuits have augmented our contemporary notion of the Renaissance artist as a versatile thinker and maker. New research on Leonardo and his contemporaries reveals an increasingly complex tableau of aesthetic values, social mores, courtly customs, and religious practice. This session solicits a range of papers addressing Renaissance art topics, especially those related to the geographies, art, and writings surrounding Leonardo or his contemporaries. Los Angeles has long been associated with Leonardo studies, thanks in part to the work of Carlo Pedretti and the interests of the Armand Hammer Center (UCLA). This session seeks to present new research on the artist's personal life, working methods, and historical context. Papers which address the art and designs of his contemporaries are also welcome.

### **Keeping Up Appearances: Historicizing Trans and Gender Variance in and across Art History**

Chair(s): Kirstin Ringelberg, Elon University, kringelberg@elon.edu; Cyle Metzger, Stanford University, cylemetzger@gmail.com

The current visibility of trans and non-binary gender identities reinforces a false and presentist narrative that such identities are more common today than they were in any other historical period. With this panel we seek to challenge such views by unpacking and analyzing trans, non-binary, and gender-variant identities as they have appeared in art and history prior to the contemporary period and particularly in projects that historicize issues of transness and non-binary gender in art, visual culture, and/or historiography in or across any period. How can we locate trans, non-binary, or gender-variant historical agents and/or subjects in "unexpected"

times and places? What appears when we think back through art historical time with a gender-warrior lens? Is it possible, as Thomas Piontek and Erin Silver have asked of minority histories more broadly, to construct a trans-historical approach or a historically trans understanding of art without merely producing a fringe discourse on the outer edges of canonical art history or reinforcing canonical inclusion as an end goal?

### **Late Medieval Drawing as a Figure in Diplomacy, Law, and Literature, ca. 1250–1500**

Chair(s): Caroline Fowler, Yale University, caroline.fowler@yale.edu

Late-medieval drawing is invariably read in relationship to the workshop, the copy, and its function as a model, as an under-drawing, or as a contract. In turn, scholars often discuss works such as Jan van Eyck's 'Saint Barbara' panel, which presents an underdrawing with no overpaint, in regards to the ambiguity of its function. When a drawing has no function in the workshop it becomes autonomous. Yet this panel posits that this dichotomy between functionality and autonomy ultimately hinders the study of late-medieval drawing. Looking beyond the binary of the functional and the autonomous, this panel seeks an interdisciplinary study of late-medieval (ca. 1250–1500) drawing in the context of diplomacy, law, and literature. Drawing played a pivotal and theoretical role in both the literary and the diplomatic culture of the fifteenth-century Franco-Flemish territories, and was frequently used as a metaphor in the poetry of late-medieval poets of the Franco-Flemish court, such as Jean Froissart, Guillaume de Machaut, and Christine de Pisan. It was central to the culture of the eyewitness and diplomacy, as testified by the frequent comments by travelers and diplomats about the importance of developing the skill of draftsmanship in order to provide evidence. Moreover, obscure and profane drawings often appear in unexpected places such as notarial documents, notary's signatures, and the watermark. This panel seeks to uncover, discuss, and bring to attention the importance of an interdisciplinary study of late-medieval drawing in order to better grapple with the emergence of 'autonomous' drawing and its 'functional' counterpart.

Foundations in Art: Theory and Education (FATE)

### **Let's Dance, But Don't Call Me Baby: Dialogue, Empathy, and Inclusion in the Classroom and Beyond**

Chair(s): Naomi J. Falk, University of South Carolina, naomijfalk@gmail.com; Richard Moninski, University of Wisconsin-Platteville, moninskr@uwplatt.edu

Feeling welcome, acknowledged, and heard encourages learning. Fostering inclusiveness and empathy on behalf of minority students legitimizes perspectives. This is especially important for first-year and transfer students, both majority and minority, who are immersed in a brand new environment that may be radically different from their backgrounds. How do we build trust and empathy between faculty, students, peers, and others in our classrooms and communities? How do we create a welcoming and inclusive environment? What has worked? What has gone terribly wrong? Where do we go from here? Examples of readings, projects, tools, and exercises for building inclusive, encouraging, and productive dialogues are all of interest. An open roundtable discussion will continue during FATE's Business Meeting.

Northern California Art Historians (NCAH)

### **Local and Global Career Detours: Negotiating and Navigating the Arts through Precarious Times**

Chair(s): Katherine Lam, California College of the Arts, mr.katherinelam@gmail.com; Pearlie Rose S. Baluyut, State University of New York Oneonta, baluyut@gmail.com

When it comes to diversifying one's professional portfolio, Giorgio Vasari — painter, architect, writer, and historian — embodies a model of a vibrant career in a time of abundance. In the late twentieth century, university career centers listed a plethora of positions available to new art graduates that utilized their skills from attention to details to writing. Those with terminal degrees follow a narrower, albeit privileged path of practice: making and/or teaching art. With the popularity of museum studies programs, curators fill positions in the art education, management, or social media departments at institutions from auction houses to arboretums. Yet the recession of the last decade, creating fierce competition and a growing contingent labor market, proves that the creative must get creative, even entrepreneurial, particularly for people of color and women in America. Moving in and out of the specialty/field, institution/enterprise, or even geography has its advantages and disadvantages. If professional biographies can serve as an analytical tool, they will reveal a variety of undertakings not dissimilar from Vasari's, albeit with the missing support of a Medici. The operative word here is change, and we solicit contributions from art historians, visual artists, designers, and curators whose professional experience thus far involved major career detours, negotiating and navigating the arts through uncertain times locally and globally. The session's focus on first-person narratives aims to empower others in such predicaments.

### **Made by Hand: The Revival of Drawing from Direct Observation**

Chair(s): Ruth Weisberg, Roski School of Art and Design, University of Southern California, reweisb@usc.edu

In reaction to the ubiquitous practice of digitally-assisted art production, there is a great revival of interest in drawing by hand from direct observation. This has affected both academic course offerings and the practice of established artists. Many artist groups have been formed around the United States and beyond to discuss this revival of interest, to draw from models, or to hear artists' presentations. It is part of a wider renewal of skill-based artistic practice which has also affected painting and sculpture. The CAA has recently hosted several sessions examining computer-based practices. I am proposing the opposite — a panel which focuses on the rewards and challenges of drawing from observation, with its integration of hand, eye, and brain as well as the intense interest surrounding it in various periods of art history. It would be rewarding to hear from artists from various parts of the country discussing what form this interest has taken in their region.

### **Makerspace 2.0: Sharing Successes, Admitting Mistakes, Assessing Outcomes**

Chair(s): Gwyan Rhabyt, California State University, East Bay, gwyan.rhabyt@csueastbay.edu

In the last decade, hundreds of makerspaces, hackerspaces, and fablabs have been established in colleges and universities around the world. They are found in art, design, education, and engineering departments; in campus libraries and student unions; and beyond higher education in high schools, membership non-profits, and public libraries. Where there was once novelty and hype, many institutions have settled into regular cycles of classes, budgets, and assessments. Some makerspaces have been unexpected successes; others have been dispersed after a few years, and many have been substantially restructured. For some, the integration into coursework has been problematic;

for others, budgeting for second and third generations of equipment has been a challenge, or student attention has moved on. How have makerspaces redesigned themselves for a second decade? Embracing new equipment and technologies? Changing pedagogical approaches? Rewriting curricula? This panel invites post-utopian examinations of mature makerspaces reinventing themselves.

### **Making Things Modular**

Chair(s): Jennifer Kaufmann-Buhler, Purdue University, jkbuhler@gmail.com

Modularity has had a long history in design practice, and is often celebrated as a means of enabling high levels of customization, producing systems, objects, and spaces that are adaptable to diverse scenarios of use. Despite its emphasis on customization, modularity ultimately depends on a high level of standardization to produce interchangeable components that can be reconfigured in a variety of forms. Further, though modularity often promises "infinite" customization, it generally produces finite choices, ultimately limiting options and privileging the needs, preferences, and expectations of a dominant group of users and thereby often excluding the needs of people who are outside of that dominant group. This panel will examine some of these tensions between standardization and customization by considering some of the theories, practices, processes, and problems of modularity. How does modularity work? What are the ideas that underpin modular design as a concept? What is the aesthetic "language" of modularity? How have modular design concepts informed design practice historically? How has modularity been marketed to users? Whose needs are included in modular design practice and whose are excluded? What is the relationship of modularity to DIY forms of making? Papers are invited that: explore particular historical case studies of modular design (for example specific objects, spaces, or processes); discuss the application of modularity in particular design disciplines (for example, product design, interior design, graphic design, typography, fashion, technology, etc.); or examine modularity theoretically in order to consider the processes and problems of modular design.

Association of Research Institutes in Art History (ARIAH)

### **Material Culture and Art History: A State of the Field(s) Panel Discussion**

Chair(s): Catharine Dann Roeber, Winterthur Museum, croeber@winterthur.org

Over the past generation, art history has become increasingly more inclusive in the objects it takes as its focus of study. In tandem, some practitioners have turned to the term 'material culture studies' to describe their work. We are looking for short presentations (ten minutes) that can open out into a larger discussion among panelists, organizers, and attendees about conceptual frameworks and methodological approaches emerging from this ongoing nexus. Proposals are welcomed from educators, curators, designers, and artists. Rather than case studies, we would value more reflective perspectives.

### **Material Processes of Medieval Art and Architecture**

Chair(s): Kristine Tanton, Université de Montréal, kristanton@gmail.com; Meredith Cohen, University of California, Los Angeles, mcohen@humnet.ucla.edu

This session will explore the material processes of medieval objects and monuments. Art and architectural historians focus most often on the finished product, but there is much to be gained by considering the processes of making as a site of constant negotiation and conflict. Amendments to objects and structures present distinct moments that may be defined beyond Marxist approaches. For example, what are the phenomenological

experiences related to making? How do the inherent temporalities in artistic production shed light on decisions and workflow, as well as temporary, transitory, and intermediate solutions? How do changes in materials, such as the addition of gold leaf to manuscripts or gems to a reliquary, serve as signs of problem solving or problem making? New technologies such as digital reconstructions, laser scans, X-ray fluorescence, and Raman spectroscopies provide us with the opportunity to understand the conceptual processes of art making in the Middle Ages as never before through reverse engineering. We invite presenters to analyze medieval objects and structures in relation to the inherent temporalities in working procedures involving ephemerality, instantaneity, or memory to explore what it means to make in the Middle Ages.

#### **Materiality and Metaphor: The Uses of Gold in Asian Art**

Chair(s): Michelle C. Wang, Georgetown University, mcw57@georgetown.edu; Donna K. Strahan, Freer Gallery of Art and Sackler M. Gallery, Smithsonian Institution, StrahanD@si.edu

Unique among Asian art materials, gold is both a color and an artistic medium. Embodying a host of contradictions, gold functioned as a marker of wealth and prestige and was minted into coins and cast into jewelry, yet it was also commonly used to embellish repairs made to utilitarian objects such as ceramics. Malleable and lustrous, gold furthermore was used as frequently on its own as it was in conjunction with other materials, including bronze, lacquer, and textile, and applied to paper as surface decoration. The conceptual associations of gold are equally varied. In Daoism, alchemists experimented with a range of substances in order to produce life-prolonging elixirs of gold. Within Buddhism, the body of the Buddha is believed to be golden in hue and emit light. Despite its omnipresence within a broad range of artistic and cultural traditions in Asia, however, the study of gold is still in its infancy. Only in the past twenty-five years have scholars of Asian art turned their attention to the serious study of gold artifacts. This panel seeks to bring together art historians and conservators from museums and universities in a conversation about gold as material and metaphor in Asian art. Creating a cross-cultural and comparative platform, we seek papers that simultaneously pay attention to the materiality of gold and place it into dialogue with larger theoretical and conceptual concerns in Asian art and culture.

International Center of Medieval Art (ICMA)

#### **Medieval Echo Chambers: Ideas in Space and Time**

Chair(s): Jessica Barker, University of East Anglia, j.barker@uea.ac.uk; Jack Hartnell, University of East Anglia, j.hartnell@uea.ac.uk

In recent decades, historians of medieval art and architecture have begun to think about the ways in which the interaction of objects, images, and performances were focused by particular medieval spaces. Whether directed towards a powerful cumulative spirituality, a slowly-accruing political self-fashioning, or more everyday performances of social coherence, it is clear that medieval space had the power to bind together sometimes quite disparate objects, forming their multiple parts into coherent messages for different types of viewers. Thus far, however, such discussions have largely chosen to focus on individual moments of such medieval consonance, thinking through these "Gesamtkunstwerke" in only one particular iteration. This session will expand this type of thinking beyond the snapshot by considering how medieval spaces could not only encourage resonance between objects in a single moment but also echo these ideas over time. How did certain medieval spaces act as ideological echo chambers? How did certain spaces encourage recurring patterns of patronage, reception, or material reflection? How did people in the Middle Ages respond to the history of the spaces they inhabited, and how did they imagine these spaces' futures? We are seeking submissions for fifteen-minute papers and

encourage speakers to put forward proposals on material from any part of the Middle Ages, broadly defined both chronologically and geographically.

#### **Medium Sensitivity and the Ingenuity of Translation**

Chair(s): Sam Omans, Institute of Fine Arts, New York University, samuel.omans@fulbrightmail.org

The concept of medium stretches to the beginnings of art criticism and the writings of Aristotle, Simonides, Horace, Dio Chrysostom, and others who sought to categorize human activities. It recurs as a fundamental category in criticism. But history repeatedly demonstrates the porosity of medium categories in art practice. Artists resist the anchoring of a given subject, function, or technique to one medium, and adapt or translate it to another. This session invites papers that address the technical, social, or conceptual challenges posed by cross-medium translation. The geographic and temporal breath of the session is deliberately left open, but papers should unite in addressing the inventive and selective qualities of translation. Concepts of medium underpin a wide range of topics in the history of art from discursive techniques like "paragone," social institutions like academies and museums, and theoretical traditions like the autonomy of art or medium specificity. One aim of this session is to delineate the attributes targeted by artists (or thinkers) for cross-medium translation in a given historical context. Key issues could include the translation of visual aspects, techniques, meaning, the survival of vestigial qualities, the afterlife of prototypes in the functioning of an artwork, attributes of a work of art that defy translation, as well as challenges to the premise that translation is a useful model for historical processes.

#### **Methodologies for the Contemporary Art of Global Asias**

Chair(s): Andrea Fitzpatrick, University of Ottawa, afitzpat@uottawa.ca; Elia Eliev, University of Ottawa, eelie047@uottawa.ca

Art theorists, curators, and artists working beyond Western frameworks face exceptional challenges: conflicting demands for specialization and cultural specificity alongside the simultaneous desire for recognition from and inclusion within various related-but-separate research communities that work in close proximity and share parallel goals but often miss taking advantage of opportunities for dialogue. When involved in transnational or global art history, does one pursue the niche or umbrella research model? This session aims to address various methodologies employed and challenges faced in the study and creation of art from contemporary Global Asias, which we conceive as a critical inclusive term inviting contributions from global art historians, artists, and curators from Asia, its diasporas, and beyond, including East Asia, South Asia, South-East Asia, Central Asia, the Middle East, Africa, the Global South, and indigenous nations and peoples. We invite papers exploring new methodologies and articulating existing challenges to frameworks involving race, gender, sexuality, disability, nation, citizenship, ethnicity, language, religion, geography, and a broad range of contested terms (such as Islamic, Queer, modernity, the political, the traditional, etc.). We welcome papers critically addressing forms of colonization, hyphenated or unmarked identities, canons of art history, Neo-Orientalism, representational violence, institutional silencing, racism and stereotypes, binaristic terms and frameworks, appropriation, authenticity, imperialistic thinking, tensions between diasporic and indigenous communities, temporalities (i.e. what constitutes modernity or contemporaneity), art and activism, (self-)censorship and what remains (whether strategically or not) unsaid and unseen, the use of traditional materials in conjunction with new technologies, performativity, translatability, and intermediality.

Association of Art Museum Curators (AAMC)

### **Mobilizing the Collection**

Chair(s): Kristen Collins, The J. Paul Getty Museum, KCollins@getty.edu

With the decentering of the discipline of art history, museums in this century are working as never before to transcend the paradigms that shaped their collections. The proposed panel explores how a primarily Western-centric collection can engage contemporary audiences in a multicultural society. The proposed panel discussion and conversation will include four ten-minute presentations by curators and directors who will outline projects that have attempted to address this issue through loans, exhibitions, and programming. Questions to be addressed include: How are we to mobilize our collections, using our works of art as a starting point for conversations that promote inclusiveness and connection to our audiences? What are the potential challenges that face museum professionals who move outside their areas of specialty in order to speak with, rather than at, intended audiences? Issues to be dealt with include how museums can work across boundaries established by institutions, established canons, and audiences. We will problematize periodization and traditional ideas regarding East-West exchange. We will also address the inherent challenges of decentering the history of art from collections that essentially work to affirm the Western European canon. Alternately, we welcome panelists who can speak from the perspective of specialist museums who seek to appropriate and transform the canon. The panel will also explore the negative tropes associated with race, gender, and class that are reflected in our collections and will discuss how museums can tell the truth about these difficult and ugly aspects of our shared history.

### **Modern Architecture and the Middle East in the Twentieth Century**

Chair(s): Abdallah Kahil, Lebanese American University, abdallah.kahil@lau.edu.lb

In the middle of the twentieth century a surge of architectural production permeated the capitals of the newly formed Middle Eastern countries, including Turkey, Iran, Iraq, Egypt, Syria and Lebanon. European, American, and local architects shared the language of post-WWII architecture. Modernizing efforts were seen through the many buildings constructed in the capitals of these countries. Architectural school thrived with local students, and Western curricula were predominant. Political and economic factors were essential to this surge. This session is open to contributions which further explore questions of the direct role of international and national politics, economy, and social modernization in the formation of modern architecture in the Middle East. It focuses on the turning point in this development, discussing styles, building types, contexts, and the theoretical pretexts used to market the newly constructed edifices.

### **Molds as Cultural and Material Mediators**

Chair(s): Hannah Wirta Kinney, University of Oxford, Hannah.Kinney@history.ox.ac.uk; Emily Knight, University of Oxford, Emily.Knight@history.ox.ac.uk

Molds, used in a variety of artistic and artisanal practices, are understood as a means of creating an exact likeness. Through the use of the mold the maker is able to pull forth an (supposedly) unmediated image of a subject that already exists — the wrinkled face of a deceased person, the scales of a lizard, or the ornament of an ancient monument. But beyond the transmission of the form mediated by the mold, the touch of the mold to the subject it imprints has been seen in different historical moments as having particularly potent social power in not only capturing the subject's likeness, but also its interior qualities. In the case of death masks, for instance, the mold that imprinted the face was also seen

## **Call for Poster Session Proposals**

CAA invites individual members to submit abstracts for Poster Sessions at the 106th Annual Conference. Any CAA individual member may submit a proposal. Accepted presenters must be CAA individual members. Poster Sessions — presentations displayed on bulletin boards by an individual for small groups — usually include a brief narrative paper mixed with illustrations, tables, graphs, and similar presentation formats. The poster display can intelligently and concisely communicate the essence of the presenter's research, synthesizing its main ideas and directions. Poster Sessions offer excellent opportunities for extended informal discussion and conversation focused on topics of scholarly or pedagogical research. Posters are displayed for the duration of the conference, so that interested persons can view the work even when the authors are not physically present. Posters are displayed in a high-traffic area, in close proximity to the Book and Trade Fair and conference rooms.

Proposals are due by **Monday, August 14, 2017**. Send all materials to Katie Apsey, CAA manager of programs, at kapsey@collegeart.org. A working group of the Annual Conference Committee selects Poster Sessions based on individual merit and space availability at the conference. Accepted presenters must be active members and maintain their membership status through February 28, 2018. The following five items are required for a Poster Session application to be reviewed:

1. Title of Poster Session
2. Summary or Abstract of project, maximum 250 words
3. Name of presenter(s), affiliation(s), email(s), telephone number(s), and active CAA member ID(s)
4. A shortened CV for each presenter
5. Email or letter of that addresses interest in the conference, importance of project content, and a sentence or two about how the project will be *visually represented* on the display board itself

Poster displays must be assembled by 10:00 AM on Thursday, February 22, and cleared by 2:00 PM on Saturday, February 24. Live presentations last sixty minutes and are scheduled for the 12:30–1:30 PM time slot on Thursday and Friday. During this time, presenters stand by their poster displays while others view the presentation and interact with the presenters.

CAA assigns presenters one freestanding bulletin board (about 4 x 8 feet of display space) onto which they can affix their poster display and other materials, as well as a table where they can place materials such as handouts or a sign-up sheet to record the names and addresses of attendees who want to receive more information. CAA also provides pushpins or thumbtacks to attach components to the bulletin board on the day of installation.

to facilitate the transfer of their essence into the cast positive, thereby making the absent person present. By freezing the fleeting subject, the mold thus creates temporal stasis. It is due to molds that we are able to study plaster casts of ancient monuments that have since been destroyed or worn away by time. Considering molds' social, and not simply practical, function therefore opens up broader questions about mimesis, temporality, memory, and presence, as well as the influence of likeness and creativity upon them. This session seeks papers that explore the mold as more than a tool, but instead a means of making that is integral to the way in which the objects that result from it functioned and were understood.

### **Mural, Mural on the Wall: Successes and Setbacks among Community Mural Projects, ca. 2008–Today**

Chair(s): Shalon Parker, Gonzaga University, [parker@gonzaga.edu](mailto:parker@gonzaga.edu)

More than forty years ago, Judy Baca began "The Great Wall of Los Angeles" in the Tujunga Flood Control Channel of the San Fernando Valley with a team of eighty youths, ten artists, and five historians. Since then, community-based mural projects have become a cornerstone of neighborhoods and communities throughout the world, often as part of urban renewal, social justice, and/or community engagement efforts. Indeed, there has been in recent years an even stronger resurgence of and interest in mural paintings as more and more community leaders recognize the social, cultural, and economic value and long-term impact of a vibrant public arts scene. This session seeks papers that examine the successes and challenges of the community mural during the last decade. What have been productive strategies for maximizing the educational and community value of mural paintings? What kinds of community partnerships have led to inspiring mural projects that have been fully embraced by the communities in which they exist? How have race, ethnicity, or regional identities perhaps intersected (or clashed) with public mural projects? In those cases of setbacks and challenges, what have been the lessons learned about creativity in public/community spaces? This session invites proposals from artists, art historians, arts administrators, community activists, and any others invested in the mural arts.

### **Museums, Access, and the Ethics of Care**

Chair(s): Elizabeth Guffey, Purchase College, The State University of New York, [elizabeth.guffey@purchase.edu](mailto:elizabeth.guffey@purchase.edu); Amanda Cachia, University of California, San Diego, [acachia@ucsd.edu](mailto:acachia@ucsd.edu)

This panel considers care as both a concept and a practice relevant to art museums. Building on recent feminist theory on the ethics of care and trends in science and technology studies (STS) on notions of maintenance, we welcome submissions that foreground ideas of care in settings where art is presented to diverse audiences. In this context, care is not a predetermined idea or sentiment, but is rather positioned as an embodied response toward ideas of interdependence. Care has a transformative character, remaking the social and material environment. Care, as noted in the paradigm-shifting work of feminist and critical legal theorist Martha Albertson Fineman, cultivates "the attachments that support people." These ideas have led to a vigorous discussion of care as an essential function of planning urban environments. But, we ask, how might care be reflected in the structures of art museums? In museums as buildings? In exhibition design? In tactile-friendly displays, or displays that contain multi-sensorial material? In wall labels that are available in large print or Braille copy? Are the displays hung on the wall so that they are accessible to a variety of human scales? Are sound-based works accompanied by captions or American Sign Language interpretation? Do museums consider how audio tours may coexist alongside audio

descriptions? All these questions and more will be considered in this panel. Above all, we ask: How can we broaden our conception of museums as institutions of care?

### **New Directions in Black-British Art History**

Chair(s): Maryam Ohadi-Hamadani, The University of Texas at Austin, [maryam.ohadi@gmail.com](mailto:maryam.ohadi@gmail.com); Eddie Chambers, The University of Texas at Austin, [eddiechambers@austin.utexas.edu](mailto:eddiechambers@austin.utexas.edu)

How do Afro-Caribbean and South Asian (or Black-British) artists factor in the histories of modern/contemporary British art? Canonical histories of British art often exclude such artists, or accord them only peripheral status. But the generation of artists from countries of the Empire and Commonwealth, migrating to Britain after WWII, helped to transform London into a global center of artistic exchange, despite a political climate characterized by ongoing racialized and jingoistic rhetoric. Rasheed Araeen's exhibition "The Other Story: Afro-Asian Artists in Post-War Britain" (1989) was one early attempt to present a history of Black artists' contributions to British art. Since then, there have been other attempts to broaden the canon of British art, including Guildhall Art Gallery's 2015–16 exhibition "No Colour Bar: Black British Art in Action 1960–1990," the digitizing of Guyana-born painter Aubrey Williams' archive at Tate Britain, and now, somewhat posthumously, Tate Britain has begun acquiring works by artists including Williams and Anwar Shemza (Pakistan). The historicizing of Black-British artists' work has continued for a later generation of practitioners, including Sonia Boyce and Keith Piper, exhibited in Nottingham Contemporary's "The Place is Here" (2017), though these Black-British artists often struggle with an art world privileging their sociopolitical subjectivity over the aesthetic object. This panel seeks submissions relating to new scholarship on Black-British modern and contemporary art history. Papers might consider the aesthetic and the formal, the relevance of the diasporic and the postcolonial, themes of transnationalism and globalism, and/or issues of exile and exclusion.

### **Society for Paragone Studies**

Nineteenth-Century Critical Rivalries

Chair(s): Sarah Lippert, University of Michigan–Flint, [sarjorlip@gmail.com](mailto:sarjorlip@gmail.com)

The nineteenth century was well populated with critics, theorists, and artists who regularly engaged in competitive relationships with one another. During a century of reorganization in the academies and exhibition systems, the art world was perpetually rife with opportunities for critical and theoretical rivalries. This session welcomes topics from a broad but important strain of this phenomenon — rivalries between specific artists and theorists or art critics. It seeks to consider how professional relationships between artists and critics were at once both personal and public by considering examples of these relationships that have not been well explored in current scholarship. This session is sponsored by the Society for Paragone Studies, which is dedicated to exploring the history of artistic competition from all eras.

### **No Discipline**

Chair(s): Lisa Wainwright, School of the Art Institute of Chicago, [lwainw@saic.edu](mailto:lwainw@saic.edu); Dan Price, School of the Art Institute of Chicago, [mprice2@saic.edu](mailto:mprice2@saic.edu); Tim Parsons, The School of the Art Institute of Chicago, [tparso@artic.edu](mailto:tparso@artic.edu)

Increasingly, the fields of art and design are coming closer together. Practitioners such as Andrea Zittel, Superflex, Mischer Traxler, and Vito Acconci interrogate a shared and expanding space of art/design hybridity. Principles once separately ascribed to art, such as autonomy and contemplation, are combined with design strategies like use value and collaborative practice. Our world is ever more figured by design. Design is no longer simply the

commercial application of art, and art is not only the sacrosanct other. We hope to initiate a conversation about what we are calling the nexus of art and design, about the healthy dissolution of their boundaries and what that may yield in new material ideas and social agendas for artists and designers. How can we in the academy support such an enterprise? How can education catch up and support what appears to be a growing phenomenon of shared strategies and methodologies? This session seeks papers addressing pedagogy that specifically breaks with conventional structures of discrete educational practices and instead imagines radical strategies for combining design and art curricula. We also invite papers that address how facilities such as shared workplaces or tools might accommodate this new synthesis. We invite artists, designers, scholars, educators, and administrators to articulate development and best practices in the realm of innovative teaching and structural planning within the burgeoning art/design nexus.

### **Object - Event - Performance: Art, Materiality, and Continuity since the 1960s**

Chair(s): Hanna B. Hölling, University College London, h.holling@ucl.ac.uk

In the 1960s, the art world and its objects began to experience a dramatic shift in what and how art can be. New modes of artistic expression articulated through Fluxus activities, happening, performance, video, experimental film and the emerging practices of media art questioned the idea of a static object that endures unchanged and might thus be subject to a singular interpretation. Different from traditional visual arts, the blending genres and media in art since the 1960s began to transform not only curatorial and museum collecting practices, but also the traditional function and mandate of conservation, now augmented to accept the inherent dynamism and changeability of artworks. How do these artworks endure over time despite their material and conceptual changes? How do their identities unfold contingent on ruling knowledge, values, politics, and culture? Forging an examination of the physical and immaterial aspects of artworks at the intersection of art history and theory, material culture studies, and conservation, our session proposes to interrogate artworks that evade physical stability and fixity familiar from traditional works often conceived in a singular medium and meant to last “forever.” Intrinsically changeable and often short-duration, these artworks challenge art, conservation, and museological discourses. Not only do they test the standard assumptions of what, how, and when an artwork is or can be, but they also put forward the notion of materiality in constant flux that plays a significant role in the creation and mediation of meaning.

### **Objects of Change? Art, Liberalism, and Reform across the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries**

Chair(s): Caitlin Beach, Columbia University, cmb2226@columbia.edu; Emily Casey, St. Mary's College of Maryland, eccasey@smcm.edu

This panel seeks to consider the dynamics of producing, mobilizing, and consuming images in the pursuit of social justice and reform. The eighteenth and nineteenth centuries saw a proliferation of such campaigns, with movements to abolish slavery, extend suffrage rights, and transform labor laws numbering amongst the many efforts to effect large-scale societal changes in Europe and the Americas. From Josiah Wedgwood's oft-reproduced antislavery medallion of 1793 to the imagery and highly visible pageantry of women's suffrage movements towards the turn of the twentieth century, visual and material culture has long been seen to play a vital role in shaping and articulating rhetorics of liberal political reform. However, recent scholarship on the entangled — and oftentimes parallel — historical trajectories of liberalism, capitalism, and empire complicates a straightforward

understanding of the relationship between images and reform. As Lisa Lowe, Marcus Wood, and others have suggested, ideologies of liberal governance and reform often did as much to scaffold the status quo as to incite radical societal change. How did art objects — broadly defined — manifest, transform, obscure, or interrupt relationships between liberal reform campaigns and the forms of power they supported? How did markets for fine and decorative arts participate in or overlap with capitalist networks? How might our understanding of objects of reform shift if we see them operating with — rather than in opposition to — the imperial nation-state? Finally, what are the stakes of mobilizing such historical objects today, particularly in museums, scholarship, pedagogy, and contemporary activism?

### **Olfactory Art and the Political in an Age of Resistance**

Chair(s): Debra Riley Parr, Columbia College Chicago, dparr@colum.edu; Gwenn-Aël Lynn, Independent Artist, gwenn@gwennaelynn.com

The modernist aesthetic regime privileges the optical over other bodily experiences of the sensorium, considering what is seen to be the basis of knowledge and medium specificity. As performance studies theoretician Rebecca Schneider has noted, within Western culture artifacts must remain permanently visible in order to be considered valuable. Art history follows suit in its reinforcing of optical hegemonies. But lately, in order to engage critically with the meaning, for example, of perfume in James Lee Byars' performances, menstrual blood in the work of Judy Chicago, or body odor in the installations of Sissel Tolaas, attention shifts to methods that may augment or challenge the primacy of the visual. Thus, olfactory art has emerged as a mode of inquiry. This panel calls for papers that question the limits of visual experience, engage the political and olfaction, consider olfactory disruptions within artistic processes, and examine the role of scent in art, contemporary and historical. What is at stake in supplanting and/or supplementing art objects with fragrance? What is the role of interference with social demands for deodorized bourgeois spaces, or as Bourdieu puts it, an expectation of “no smell?” What kind of dematerialization, ephemerality, or objective endurance do these olfactory artworks allow? Is the interest in the olfactory related to critiques of artistic production and distribution? The work of this panel will be to contemplate the vitality of olfactory artwork and the politics of odor in art history, visual culture, activism, the politics of representation, and performance studies.

Association for Latin American Art (ALAA)

### **Open Session for Emerging Scholars of Latin American Art**

Chair(s): Lisa Trever, University of California, Berkeley, Ltrever@berkeley.edu; Elena FitzPatrick Sifford, Louisiana State University, efitzsifford@gmail.com

Each year increasing numbers of scholars are awarded doctoral degrees in Latin American art history. This session seeks to highlight the scholarship of advanced graduate and recent PhD scholars. Papers may address any geographic region, theme, or temporal period related to the study of Latin American art or art history, including Caribbean and Latinx topics. Please note, Association for Latin American Art (ALAA) membership is not required at the time of paper proposal, but all speakers will be required to be active members of CAA and ALAA at the time of the annual meeting. ALAA membership details are available through the session chairs.

### **Pacific Standard Time: LA/LA — Case Studies in Teaching from Exhibitions**

Chair(s): Anuradha Vikram, 18th Street Arts Center/Otis College of Art and Design, anu@curativeprojects.net

The Getty's "Pacific Standard Time: LA/LA" initiative, which will just be wrapping up at the time of CAA, will have engaged over eighty arts institutions in programming around Latin American and Latinx subjects in art history. These exhibitions cover eras from the Precolombian to the contemporary, and geographies from Los Angeles to Santiago de Chile. An essential aspect of this region-wide initiative has been to integrate classroom pedagogy into outreach objectives, such that one outcome of the project is likely to be a new familiarity with Latin American and Latinx subjects and audiences for museum and university educators. What kinds of curricula and pedagogies will emerge from these objectives? How are institutions connecting with these new audiences, who are projected to comprise 50% of the regional population by 2030, and creating conditions that will encourage them to return? This session invites papers from educators at the university and K-12 levels and in museums who are using PST exhibitions as a platform to engage contemporary Latinx audiences in the LA area in innovative ways. Artists, art historians, critics, curators, and scholars and practitioners of design, architecture, and urban planning may be among those whose projects and practices fit within the theme. Priority will be given to papers proposed by committed Getty PST: LA/LA program partners.

### **Palpable and Mute as a Globed Fruit and Dumb as Old Medallions to the Thumb**

Chair(s): Donald Preziosi, University of California, Los Angeles, preziosi@ucla.edu

If we suspend conventional perspectives on distinctions between art making, art history, art theory, art criticism, museums, museology, collecting and exhibitionary practices, aesthetics, and the fashion, tourist, and heritage industries, and instead consider what is common to these modern domains of knowledge-production, these epistemological technologies, such a move may recall insights of Hannah Arendt who in her postwar writings on the origins of totalitarianism observed that these lay fundamentally in a desire to make the world more consistent; more like a work of art. A conundrum as old as Plato's dilemma on the crafting of state polities whose artistry appears to echo and is in synch with a 'natural' or cosmic order. This session invites papers delineating and charting the varied consequences of such a move for the contemporary practice of social critique in our own totalitarian 'realities,' and of art history as itself a mode of advocacy — one of the explicit desiderata of today's CAA.

### **Permanence/Impermanence: Materiality in the Precolumbian World**

Chair(s): Stephanie M. Strauss, The University of Texas at Austin, stephanie.strauss@aya.yale.edu; Elliot Lopez-Finn, The University of Texas at Austin, emlopez@utexas.edu

Sculptural traditions in the Precolumbian world take on a wide variety of material expressions: from the plaster-covered statuary of Central Mexico and the earthworks of the Mississippi Valley to the monumental stone spheres of ancient Costa Rica and the miniature gold figurines of the Andes. Whether permanent or impermanent, portable or static, free-standing or cut from the earth, the materiality of a sculptural form has profound implications for its life history. This session will explore the role of material selection and sculptural manipulation across Precolumbian visual culture traditions. Fruitful avenues of exploration include the intentional use of enduring materials — for example, stone or metal — versus perishable materials, such as wood, feathers, or amaranth, but related creative interpretations

are welcomed. Of particular interest are papers that critique the primacy of monumentality in sculptural production; examine the role of ephemerality and performance in understanding sculptural creation and use; or address the phenomenology and physicality of monuments during ritual interaction. Taking sculptural materiality as center, authors may further focus on the acquisition of source materials and processes of creation, the meeting of permanent and impermanent surfaces, the monumentality of small objects, or the physicality of sculpted bodies and/or landscapes. In an effort to bridge the interdisciplinary divisions within Precolumbian art history, we welcome papers that address any region or time period from the indigenous Americas and Caribbean.

### **Place and Agency in Ancient American Murals and Monuments**

Chair(s): Margaret A. Jackson, University of New Mexico, mars@unm.edu; Victoria Lyall, Denver Art Museum, vlyall@denverartmuseum.org

What is the relationship between place and agency in Ancient American visual culture? Public and monumental arts provide specific instances of how ancient indigenous artists and patrons envisioned certain kinds of relationships. As locations of public nexus, monuments bear the imprint of underlying ideological concepts. Visual arts — objects of visual focus, murals and friezes in particular — serve as mediators for the complex events and social functions each monument fulfills. In many cases, murals function as visual interlocutors. This session seeks scholars whose work interrogates the relationships between site-specific works and human participants in prehispanic America (north, central, or south). We seek work that, in addition to articulating the formal characteristics or essential iconography of particular artwork, attempts to discover the mechanisms by which those visual compositions mediate human experience. Place might refer to physical location, but likewise to constructions of space. Monuments could include palaces, temples, sacred sites, or other specialized sites. Agency may perhaps suggest the actions or participation of human protagonists, but might also be found in the mediatory agency of things. Evidence of such agencies is possibly found through analysis of costume and pageantry, iconography, transmission of knowledge, or political and social identities. Studies that question or posit models of spatial relationships in built environments, describe patterns of circulation, point toward religious or social informants, or examine the role of particular human agencies in the construction of visual meaning are welcome.

### **Pop Art and Class**

Chair(s): Kalliopi Minioudaki, Independent Art Historian, Minioudaki@aol.com; Mona Hadler, Brooklyn College/The Graduate Center, The City College of New York, mhadler@brooklyn.cuny.edu

Whether seen as the last realist language of modernism or the first realist metalanguage of postmodernism, Pop Art stormed the art scenes of the sixties from London, New York, and Paris to Buenos Aires, São Paulo, Tokyo, and beyond with diverse manifestations, origins, modes of production, stylistic characteristics, and goals. Whether critically embracing or exposing the conditions of postwar reality, subjectivity, and visual culture, these often met in a radical melding of high art and pop culture that quickly lost its impact upon the swift trimming of its canons and Anglo-American focus. While narrow definitions of Pop Art and its politics — or better yet Pop's lack of politics — begin to collapse under current reconsiderations of the inscription of cultural and gender difference that mark the revision that Pop Art has undergone in the past decade, it remains prescient to further investigate the role of class in Pop Art. Such questions have been more consistently addressed in light of the working class origins of British Pop, in

the work of Warhol, and brought to the fore in Thomas Crow's latest take on Pop Art. This panel invites papers that illuminate old and new facets of the role of class in the production and reception of Pop Art and its continuous impact on art and visual culture, whether in light of the work of individual artists from the expanded international framework of Pop Art contexts in the 1960s, or of diasporic, national, or transnational collective manifestations, cold war politics, and historiography.

Italian Art Society (IAS)

**"Processi italiani": Examining Process in Postwar Italian Art, 1945–80**

Chair(s): Tenley Bick, Independent Scholar, tenleybick@gmail.com

Dominant narratives in modern and contemporary art history have positioned the 1960s Italian avant-garde Arte Povera — known for ephemeral practices, informalist aesthetics, and "deskilled" procedures — as a subset of process art and post-minimalism, ascribing Italian innovations to movements associated with British and American artists. This Anglo-American reading, however, does not account for the rich experimentation in process in Italian art throughout the post-WWII period or for the distinctly Italian concerns thereof — including the politics of artistic labor during the Italian labor movement, the turn to process art as a politicized response to the cultural geopolitics of object-based practices, and the significance of process-focused rather than product-focused art in the post-fascist state. Indeed, closer examination of process in postwar Italian art distinguishes the work of Italian artists from that of their American and British counterparts. At a moment of renewed attention to postwar Italian art this problem is particularly pressing, calling for a revisitation of process and revision of postwar art history. This panel invites papers that examine process as a critical site of creative practice in postwar Italian art. Especially welcome are papers that consider process as a distinctive problem or politicized site of Italian artistic practice from 1945 to 1980. Topics might include: the reconfiguration of design in the contro-design movement and vanguard groups such as the Gruppo N; the implementation of the artisanal and craft in the post-war avant-garde; paper practices in radical architecture; the reconceptualization of artistic work and the labor movement; and ephemeral practices in Arte Povera.

**Projecting the Body**

Chair(s): Julia Rosenbaum, Bard College, rosenbau@bard.edu;  
Maura Lyons, Drake University, maura.lyons@drake.edu

For almost two centuries, visual artists, from John Banvard and his mid nineteenth-century Mississippi panorama to Yayoi Kusama's contemporary mirror rooms, have exploited the bodily experience of looking. As Jonathan Crary has argued, one marker of the modern era has been its attention to embodied viewers, leading to a "physiological reconfiguration of subjectivity." For example, optical devices and technologies such as stereoscopes, IMAX, and Google Earth have reoriented bodily experiences of space, depth, and reality by creating illusionistic environments. This session invites papers that analyze and reassess the linkages between the visual and the somatic. How are viewing bodies engaged, and to what end, privately and/or communally? What cultural discourses — artistic, technological, (geo)political, racial, spiritual, or economic — shape the viewing of the body? Whose bodies are addressed, and what other bodies (or vantage points) may be displaced as a result? We welcome investigations of diverse visual media and display practices in rethinking the role of the visual in extending the reach of the body.

**Provenance Research as a Method of Connoisseurship?**

Chair(s): Valentina Locatelli, Kunstmuseum Bern, valentina.locatelli@gmail.com; Christian Huemer, The Getty Research Institute, CHuemer@getty.edu; Valérie Kobi, Universität Bielefeld, valerie.kobi@uni-bielefeld.de

This session will explore the intersections between provenance research and connoisseurship with regard to the early modern period. In order to go beyond today's dominant understanding of provenance research as a practice almost exclusively related to Nazi-looted art and questions of restitutions, the panel will deliberately focus on topics from the late fifteenth to the eighteenth centuries. By setting this alternative chronological limit, we will delve into the historical role of provenance research, its tools and significations, and its relation to connoisseurship and collecting practices. What influence did the biography of an artwork exert on the opinion of some of the greatest connoisseurs of the past? How did the documented (or suspected) provenance of a work of art impact its attribution and authentication process? Which strategies were employed in the mentioning of provenance information in sale catalogues or, sometimes, directly on the artworks themselves? Did the development of art historical knowledge change the practice of provenance research over time? And finally, how can we call attention to these questions in contemporary museum practice and reassess provenance research as a tool of connoisseurship? In addition to addressing the history as well as the strategies of provenance research, this session will be an opportunity to question its relationship to other domains as well as to bring it closer to core problems of art history and museology. We invite contributions that introduce new historical and methodological approaches. Proposals which go beyond the case study are especially encouraged.

**Race, Ethnicity, and Cultural Appropriation in the History of Design**

Chair(s): Karen Carter, Kendall College of Art and Design of Ferris State University, karenecarter@ferris.edu; Victoria Rose Pass, Maryland Institute College of Art, vpass81@gmail.com

Design history has often ignored the thorny issues of race and ethnicity, although design is deeply intertwined with global trade, slavery, colonial encounters, and ethnic and racial stereotypes. Examples of cultural appropriations might include blue and white porcelain export ware from China or paisley cashmere shawls from India that were manufactured for Western markets and subsequently copied by European designers in order to capitalize on the taste for global goods. Additional examples are the use of "blackamoor" figures in interior design or American housewares with depictions of Mammies in which blackness is constructed in opposition to whiteness. This panel seeks to critically interrogate the practice of cultural appropriation by exploring the economic and cultural foundations of design in the past and present (in architecture, industrial design, craft, fashion, graphics, furniture, interiors, and systems). Papers should address some of the following questions: How does cultural appropriation move in multiple directions throughout a globalized history of design? How do designers and/or consumers use cultural appropriation to express their own identities? What role does the concept of "authenticity" play in cultural appropriation? Does cultural appropriation, which often relies on racial and ethnic stereotypes and helps to reify them, also have the potential to undermine stereotypes? How do questions of gender, sexuality, and class intersect with those of race and ethnicity within cultural appropriations? Papers that employ methods from postcolonial and critical race studies and/or case studies of ordinary artifacts that have been eliminated from the traditional canon of design history are especially welcome.

### **Recuperation**

Chair(s): Andrea Liu, The Women's Art Library, Goldsmiths, University of London, aliu001@gold.ac.uk

Recuperation is an inexorable feature of late capitalism, as modes of cultural expression and art that were once resistant, oppositional, or antagonistic from the 1960s and 70s have been gradually absorbed by capitalism and its attendant apparatus. Land art, which once rejected the commodification and circulation of discrete objects of the gallery system, has dissipated into high end "art tourism." Minimalism, which was once a refutation and a threat to the Western infatuation with pictorial representation, has been dehistoricized and caricaturized into a banal design aesthetic. Site-specific installation, which was once in opposition to the idealist space of sculpture and the monolithic monument, was diluted into a benign marketing feature of the globalized art economy eager to manufacture consumable "difference" to break with the homogenization of place. Institutional critique was instrumentalized by institutions to create the appearance of an innocuous self-reflexivity. Participatory art, once in opposition to individual authorship and the commodity object, was easily subsumed by neoliberalism's structures of networks/mobility, project work, and affective labor. In light of this, we must ask, "Is there no 'outside' position?" How can we historicize or theorize this phenomenon where the hollow shell of an oppositional form is preserved but it has been disemboweled of any actual oppositional content? This is not a genre/medium/discipline-specific panel, but one open to examining the issue of co-option of emancipatory/antagonistic/ oppositional forms of art, cultural production, or theory across a panoply of mediums, approaches, or ideologies. Refutations, complications, or contradictions of recuperation are also welcome.

### **Reflective Surfaces in Medieval and Early Modern Art**

Chair(s): Rachel Danford, Marshall University, rachel.danford@gmail.com; Alexandra Letvin, Johns Hopkins University, aletvin1@jhu.edu

This session explores the use and simulation of reflective surfaces in medieval and early modern works of art. In the Middle Ages, reflection often operated as a metaphor for imperfect vision (see: 1 Corinthians 13:12), while in the Renaissance, it came to encapsulate notions of naturalistic representation and artistic production broadly conceived. While we are interested in considering such historical distinctions, in this session we especially seek to understand approaches to light and reflection that remain stable across the medieval and early modern eras through anthropological, ritual, scientific, theological, or literary approaches. We invite proposals that examine objects and monuments that incorporate precious metals, mirrors, gems, and glass, as well as those that simulate the effects of these materials. How might inquiries into late medieval and early modern optical theories clarify such works of art? What do the perceived differences between light emanating directly from a radiant source and light reflected indirectly off a gleaming surface tell us about compositional strategies? What impact did natural lighting conditions have on the design of medieval and early modern monuments that incorporate glittering materials or mirrors? How might reflective surfaces have been deployed for apotropaic or ritual purposes? And finally, how might works of literature that invoke mirrors or reflection be brought into dialogue with the visual arts?

### **Regionalism in the Global Era**

Chair(s): Damon Willick, Loyola Marymount University, damon.willick@lmu.edu; Nicole Woods, University of Notre Dame, nwoods@nd.edu

For much of the twentieth century, regionalism in art was viewed as naïvely provincial in contrast to modernist styles associated with particular urban centers. Such artistic capitals also countered parochial notions of national traditions. This hierarchy was exacerbated in the US after WWII as the cultural climate of the Cold War further marginalized the regionalism associated with New Deal social realism to the point that, by 1972, art critic Peter Schjeldahl could proclaim, "New York's gravitational field is so strong that any American working in a mainstream mode will, should he become influential, more or less automatically be a 'New York artist.'" Soon after Schjeldahl's proclamation, economic and technological transformations would lead to the theorization of a new globalized network for contemporary art. While lessening the dominance of any one particular center or aesthetic, the new system likewise marginalized the regional as both aesthetically and politically regressive. This panel seeks papers that trace a counter-narrative to the history of a globalized aesthetic that emerged from a few privileged centers of artistic production. Pertinent questions include: How have artists working in the US since 1945 asserted regional identity? In what ways can art produced in certain cosmopolitan centers be considered "regional"? What have been the consequences of deliberately resisting global influences in favor of local references? How does the "regional" offer new ways for thinking through contemporary art's position within global systems? How have the shifting grounds caused by globalization changed the notion of regional identity in art?

### **Remote Sensing: The American West in Modernity and After**

Chair(s): Melissa Ragain, Montana State University, melissa.ragain@montana.edu

In 1991, William Truettner's exhibition "The West as America" submitted our mythic images of the "Old West" to the methods of what was then called "new art history," setting frontier imagery in conversation with the anxieties of the industrial and post-industrial ages. Despite the efforts of art historians in the 1990s to pierce the veil of these myths, recent scholarship such as Philipp Kaiser and Miwon Kwon's "Ends of the Earth" has exposed the ways that contemporary art has also treated the West as an imaginary place, remote from contemporary art and politics. The supposed aesthetic seclusion of the West is harmful for a region whose politics of land use, animal rights, tribal sovereignty, and environmental conservation are integral to American politics today, and reinforces the misconception that the art practices associated with this region — those of contemporary Native American artists, or the studio-craft tradition, for example — develop independently from the mainstream art world. The recent art historical recuperation of the West Coast, focused primarily on California, has overlooked histories of the Pacific Northwest and Mountain West, where populations are more widely dispersed and where patronage and documentation have been less abundant. Nevertheless, research like that of Lucy Lippard on mining culture, Bill Anthes on Native Modernism, and Patricia Junker on the Northwest School have challenged readers to see Western art as part of global modernity. This panel seeks papers that address fine art and visual culture in the American West from World War I to the present.

### **Repair and Maintenance in Art, Architecture, and Design**

Chair(s): Sabir Khan, Georgia Institute of Technology, [sabir.khan@coa.gatech.edu](mailto:sabir.khan@coa.gatech.edu)

A concern for repair and maintenance appears in diverse disciplines, practices, and situations — from online collectives, “repair-faires,” and performance art, to the spectrum mapped by renovation, restoration, preservation, and conservation. An emerging discourse on repair and maintenance — in engineering, science and technology studies, anthropology, and material culture studies — mixes up scholars and artists, from Glenn Adamson and Richard Sennett to Stewart Brand and Jorge Otero-Pailos. Yet the discipline-specific instances in art, architecture, and design, have not been given the sustained, cross-disciplinary attention they deserve. Mapping a speculative territory that accommodates, for example, art restorers, facility management crews, and artists such as Mierle Laderman Ukeles, could prompt a recalibration of our understanding of repair and maintenance and help us acknowledge the contingency and entropy of what we make and the often invisible labor that keeps them going. This session invites papers that look at how repair and maintenance figure (or have figured) within the discourse and practice of art, architecture, and design. Papers that examine practices and concepts outside these disciplines — from DIY home repair to a feminist “ethics of care” — are especially welcome. The goal of the session is to explore repair and maintenance through a broad range of methods and approaches: case studies of exemplary objects, projects, and practices; investigations of important terms — patina as idea and as material condition, for example; theoretical or historical analysis of approaches to repair, disrepair, and maintenance; or speculative art and design pedagogies that problematize breakdown, maintenance, and repair, etc.

### **#Resistance Avant la Lettre: Performing Bodies and the State**

Chair(s): Samuel Adams, Northeastern University, [adamss@usc.edu](mailto:adamss@usc.edu); Meg R. Jackson, University of Denver, [Megan.R.Jackson@du.edu](mailto:Megan.R.Jackson@du.edu)

When can embodied representations of violence upend the status quo? What are the performative means by which artists have exposed the normalization of covert government initiatives? Performance art, body art, and related documentary practices since 1945 have engaged with symbolic representations of state violence and have also contributed to legislation and political change. In addition to simulations of state actions within the gallery, this panel looks at the street, administration buildings, and public sites of power and subversion. Do the actions of Ai Weiwei, Xiao Lu, Santiago Sierra, Tania Bruguera, and Trevor Paglen return us to the 1930s “expressionism debates” over realism versus avant-garde expression, or can we now find a more productive middle ground? How can historians resist either judging or valorizing an artist who might have gone “too far” in blurring the line between violence and the representation of violence? Surely we learn something about the values of democracy when artists make visible the conflict between what the state permits itself to do to our bodies and what civilians are forbidden from doing with their own bodies. This panel investigates strategies for counter-hegemonic practices and performance art’s persistent topicality, especially during the postwar period. As alarm is raised about the rise of fanaticism and fundamentalism, this conversation reconsiders historical, theoretical, and artistic responses to such tendencies.

### **Re-Staging Exhibitions: Past, Present, Futures?**

Chair(s): Jane Chin Davidson, California State University, San Bernardino, [janechindavidson@alumni.reed.edu](mailto:janechindavidson@alumni.reed.edu); Nicola Foster, The Open University, [n.foster@open.ac.uk](mailto:n.foster@open.ac.uk)

The turn of the twenty-first century is witnessing a growing number of exhibitions which explicitly claim to repeat and/or re-stage earlier exhibitions; for example, the 1989 “China Avant Garde” (re-staged in Berlin 1993); the 1937 “Degenerate Art” (re-staged LA in 1991 and NY in 2014); and many others that are less politically visible, including historical (medievalist) retrospectives. In re-staging exhibitions curators acknowledge earlier curatorial practices in order to adopt a critical approach for examining how these exhibitions re-construct, re-write and re-present the past. One methodological model can be viewed in Amelia Jones’s study of re-enacted performance-art exhibitions in her book “Perform, Repeat, Record: Live Art in History” (2012), showing how reinterpretation of the past is always productive for both the present and the future. Hans Ulrich Obrist insists that “there is an entire history of unrealised art institutions, which in their dormant state have the potential to inform what an institution of the twenty-first century could be.” His use of Edouard Glissant’s theory of the museum as *mondialité* (globality) argues that history could be seen through the model of ‘creolisation’ — the past is not only the already-narrated, but also that which has been lost/ ignored in existing accounts. This session invites explorations into curatorial practices which acknowledge earlier exhibitions and therefore seek to repeat and reinterpret the past. We question how the re-staging of earlier exhibitions in different geopolitical spaces might highlight curatorial practices that were once perceived as peripheral due to cultural/political differences and to changing historical/political narratives.

### **Restoration and the Architecture of the Global Middle Ages**

Chair(s): Jenny H. Shaffer, School of Professional Studies, New York University, [jhs8@nyu.edu](mailto:jhs8@nyu.edu)

Medieval buildings, restored repeatedly over the centuries, exist as palimpsests. Their survival contingent upon their perceived relevance, these structures exist as ongoing negotiations between pasts and presents. Implicated in shifting contexts — political, religious, cultural, economic, and scholarly — over the erratic courses of their lives, their form and significance are subject to change and open to interpretation. This session engages restoration and the architecture of the global Middle Ages — both loosely defined — to explore issues raised by the lives of medieval buildings. The term “restoration” is unstable: variously interpreted and implemented in the past and contested in the present. The term embraces and links divergent notions of preservation, repair, renovation, reconstruction, and replication: notions that describe the varied experiences of medieval buildings. The idea of a “global Middle Ages” can be unclear and unwieldy, as this relatively recent term encodes concepts of Renaissance self-definition and the classicizing lens of European ideals. Expanding this age to a global stage functions as a catalyst to considering the ways in which the past has served as a foil or a mirror in subsequent presents. Medieval buildings — lost, forgotten, or obscured, and remembered, imagined, augmented, or constructed anew — bring into focus issues of use and reuse, memory and history, appropriation and authenticity, agency and motivation, and audience and reception. Papers on any aspect of, and utilizing any approach to restoration and the architecture of the global Middle Ages — defined loosely as ca. 500 to 1500 — are welcome.

### **Rethinking Regionalism: The Midwest in American Art History**

Chair(s): Lucy Bradnock, University of Nottingham, Lucy.Bradnock@nottingham.ac.uk; Mark Rawlinson, University of Nottingham, Mark.Rawlinson@nottingham.ac.uk

This session interrogates the role that the American Midwest has played in narratives of American art history, as a place, a space, and an idea. It aims to move beyond art histories that focus on the United States' peripheral centers (New York, Los Angeles, San Francisco) or that stage the cultural production of the Midwest exclusively as the history of Regionalist painting. In order to nuance these histories, the session proposes that narratives of American avant-gardism, modernism, conceptualism, and postmodernism are underpinned by the deployment of the Midwest as an ideologically-loaded discursive site against which normative positions are articulated. The session seeks to address the following questions: What is the place of the Midwest in the American cultural imaginary, and what role has it therefore played in American art histories? How have institutions and exhibitions reinforced the occlusion of the Midwest from dominant art historical narratives? How does regional identity operate as a mobile phenomenon, via a Midwest diaspora, according to which artists left behind their Midwestern roots to participate in peripheral/coastal scenes? We welcome proposals that draw on theories and histories of space, place, and region; socio-spatial politics and diaspora studies; cultural and institutional histories; historiography and histories of art criticism; and hegemony and power structures in cultural histories. Our goal is to interrogate the ways in which American cultural and social history is widely invested in the deployment of regional clichés, whilst largely failing to acknowledge the ideas on which those are based.

International Committee

### **Rethinking the Grand Narratives of Art History in the Museum Environment**

Chair(s): Russell Kelty, Art Gallery of South Australia, kelty.rusty@artgallery.sa.gov.au

In art museums across the world, works of art are often displayed according to geographic region or the cultural paradigm in which they were created. While this is often the most straightforward and pragmatic way to understand and categorize works of art, it often encourages — and reinforces — hierarchies and incomplete historical and art historical narratives which are played out on a grand scale for large audiences. Often the art which is believed to be central to the identity of the dominant culture is placed in the most high profile areas of museum's permanent collections. Scholars, art historians, and museum professionals have been reconsidering how these narratives are presented in the museum environment and how they can include the conspicuously absent voices which have been pushed to the periphery of these grand narratives and yet remain integral to them. At cultural institutions across the world, museum professionals have been rethinking how to present a more comprehensive and inclusive vision of art history in permanent displays. Speakers will present case studies of successful or possibly less successful reinstallations at museums around the world. This session is scheduled to be ninety minutes in length and will include a moderator and four speakers.

### **Rethinking Visual Arts Minors: Innovative Curricula for Visual Intelligence**

Chair(s): James R. Jewitt, Virginia Tech, jjewitt@vt.edu

In recent years, numerous colleges and universities have launched undergraduate minors in the visual arts. Many of these programs hinge upon interdisciplinary curricula cutting across traditional silos and aimed at melding domains of knowledge from STEM and creative fields. The present surge in visual arts minors is, on one hand, symptomatic of the changing face of the academy

and, on the other hand, the shifting nature of career paths for graduates. In addition to its importance in arts-related fields, the relevance of visual intelligence is proving increasingly vital to careers once considered outside the sphere of art history, such as law enforcement, law, business, forensics, and medicine — to name only a handful. This session seeks to investigate new and innovative trends in curricula for minors in the visual arts. Papers involving pedagogy, programming, service-learning, and industry or community partnerships as they relate to arts minors are also invited. How does a program's design foster success or failure? How might specific cross-disciplinary relationships maximize learning and training for students? What kinds of creative experiences or practica make a minor valuable and effective for students? How might a fine arts minor enrich major programs traditionally viewed as extrinsic to the arts? What are some future and/or promising directions for multidisciplinary arts minors? This session welcomes proposals from art historians, administrators, studio and design educators, and other relevant instructors. Case studies addressing these themes are particularly desirable.

### **Situational Methods in Graphic (and Other) Design**

Chair(s): Denise Gonzales Crisp, North Carolina State University, dmcrist@ncsu.edu

In the effort to anticipate the role of (graphic) designers in the twenty-first century, the matrix, "Principles of Organization" — authored by design planning guru Hugh Dubberly and College for Creative Studies MFA Interaction Design Chair Paul Pangaro — distinguishes characteristics of our information age from those of the industrial age. Whereas the latter focused on mechanical processes and objects, today designers are necessarily applying organic processes toward designing systems. From this premise, the authors extrapolate designers' roles and artifactual results: from authorship to facilitation; from making independent decisions to building agreement; and from artifacts that are "almost perfect" to "good enough for now," and that are "less predictable" as they adapt or evolve in varying contexts. <http://www.dubberly.com/topics/design/principles-of-organization.html> (2010) These shifts require revisions to design pedagogy within studio contexts that foster student acceptance of change and comfort with less control. Improvisation, ad hoc practices, and creative use (and misuse) of theory are ways of cultivating flexibility, responsiveness, and emergent and divergent thinking and making. I have developed such practices for the classroom, testing and refining methods that include "improv critique," "I wish critique," and many others. I hope to identify a panel of design educators and practitioners who, 1) have found that arranging post-it notes is not the only means to understand complexity, and 2) who are, like me, devising innovative, relational methods that utilize naturalized, design-oriented skills in problem solving. I plan to incorporate the contributions into a book entitled "Situational Methods for Design" (2019).

### **Speculative Play**

Chair(s): Christopher Moore, Concordia University, christopher.moore@concordia.ca

Speculative design, closely related to interaction design stances such as critical design and design fiction, takes the position that design can serve as a means of prompting speculation on alternative presents and futures. Speculative design reimagines often invisible and deeply embedded cultural assumptions of "how the world is" and proposes instead "how the world could be" and prompts examination on "why isn't the world like this?" Speculative designs are not intended for the mass market nor to turn a profit; their value lies in expanding the horizons of the general public, similarly to one role that art has played historically. For this session, we invite papers that address speculative "play." Proposals should focus on how speculative design, drawing on playful interactivity,

can be brought to objects and experiences. Presentations may focus on specific case studies or address the theoretical dimensions of play as an approach to the design process.

Society of Architectural Historians

### **Speech Balloons and Thought Bubbles: Architecture and Cartoons**

Chair(s): Andreea Mihalache, Clemson University, amihala@clemson.edu; Paul Emmons, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, pemmons@vt.edu

The intersections of architecture and comics have a history that has been increasingly documented in recent years. A mode of representation and communication becoming popular as a counterpart to mainstream depersonalized computer-generated drawings, cartoons and comic strips offer opportunities otherwise missing from conventional architectural drawings: storytelling, conciseness, immediacy, irony, and humor. Conversely, cartoons, comic strips, and graphic novels often foreground architecture as a main character that embodies the anxieties of the modern world, a discontent with the status quo, or representations of visions of the future. We are interested in work that examines the particular worldviews revealed between the lines of speech bubbles and thought balloons. As drawing conventions strive to eliminate subjectivity for the sake of clarity, how do comic strips build architectural atmospheres charged with emotion and feeling? How do cartoons and comic strips question the boundary between real and imaginary, between the concrete nature of architecture and its storytelling potential? What are their limitations? With close-up images often focusing on people in movement, what is the role of the body in unfolding graphic stories about architecture and cities? If tweets, texts, and instant messages now constitute universal forms of conversation, how do these drawings become time and place specific and create complicities based on shared worldviews? We invite papers and artwork that discuss critically the interactions of architecture, cartoons, and comic strips across time and space.

### **Sport, Fitness, and Wellbeing in Art History**

Chair(s): Lyneise Williams, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, williale@email.unc.edu; Giulia Smith, Independent Scholar, giuliasmith@googlemail.com

This session calls for critical perspectives on the role of sports and physical culture in twentieth- and twenty-first-century visual media. Relevant objects of discussion might range from popular images of athletes and documentation of the sports industry to utopian avant-garde projects centered on physical education, wellbeing, and welfare as well as contemporary aesthetics of fitness. We are interested in papers that examine the relationship of the body to the state, with significant attention paid to the formation of collective identities along the lines of class, race, and gender. We welcome submissions that deconstruct normative body images from the perspective of postcolonial, feminist, and queer art history. Speakers are also invited to address the question of discipline and management in relation to capitalist models of production. Key to the representation of the body is the state of science and technology. How do changing methods of production and dissemination reshape the image of fitness in society? How does the body of the athlete become a template for the latest visual technologies and vice versa? These questions might be considered in relation to the evolution of the printed press, film, photography, and digital media, as well as by drawing on the traditional fine arts.

Art Historians Interested in Pedagogy and Technology (AHPT)

### **State of the Art (History): Re-Examining the Exam**

Chair(s): Karen D. Shelby, Baruch College, The City University of New York, karen.shelby@gmail.com; Virginia B. Spivey, Independent Scholar, Art History Teaching Resources, virginia.spivey@gmail.com

This session invites proposals for seven-minute lightning talks exploring the pedagogy and philosophy of formal assessments in art history. While we are interested in exam-related practices, we welcome submissions that substitute innovative and non-traditional models as a primary mode of formal assessment of specific skills and art historical content. What are critical and compelling components to formal assessment methods? How do you administer exams? How do you support students' exam preparation? What exam formats do you find most effective to measure student learning, to provide formative feedback, or to achieve other goals of assessment? What is the relationship between formal assessment and student grades? What strategies have you employed to ensure transparency in evaluation and grades? What types of assessments are pedagogically sound for art history majors? Non-art history majors? Students taking art history as a general education requirement? The session will be facilitated by ArtHistoryTeachingResources.org (AHTR), founded in 2011 as a collectively authored discussion around new ways of teaching and learning in the art history classroom. Modeled on the AHTR Weekly, a peer-populated blog where art historians from international institutions share assignments, reactions, and teaching tools, this session will offer a dynamic "curriculum slam" in which speakers, respondents, and attendees will engage in dialogue and reflection on successes/failures regarding issues of undergraduate assessment in art history. The session is dedicated to scholarly discourse that articulates research and practice in art history pedagogy and seeks to raise the profile and value of those who identify as educators.

### **Structure, Texture, Facture in Avant-Garde Art**

Chair(s): Maria Kokkori, The Art Institute of Chicago, mkokkori@artic.edu; Joyce Tsai, University of Iowa Museum of Art, joyce-tsai@uiowa.edu

This panel focuses on the affinities in theory and practice that Bauhaus, De Stijl, and Russian avant-garde artists shared in the early 1920s, manifested in their concerns with structure, texture, and facture. The Bauhaus, Vkhutemas, and Unovis collectives promoted themselves as laboratories in which students and faculty worked experimentally and speculatively to materialize modernity. These artists engaged techniques, media, and materials in unexpected combinations. For example, Moholy-Nagy integrated oil painting techniques with printmaking, using cutting-edge materials from avionics in order to capture immaterial effects. He turned both to film and the printed book as a means to evoke the sensorial effects of future media. The terms structure, texture, and facture appear in avant-garde discourse with frequency in the teens and twenties especially. Their use often resonates with Suprematist and Constructivist contemporaries, but their meanings are often distinct, responsive to different sets of institutional, material, technological and political ambitions. This panel showcases new scholarship generated in the field of object-based art history that draws its strength from the collaborative work among conservators, scientists, art historians, and theorists. We seek submissions focused on the meaning of different surfaces and materials across media in the interwar period.

### **Surrealism's Subversive Taxonomies**

Chair(s): Sean O'Hanlan, Stanford University, sohanlan@stanford.edu; Claire Howard, The University of Texas at Austin, cfhoward@utexas.edu

This panel considers the Surrealist appropriation, subversion, and deployment of the visual form and taxonomic structure of the encyclopedia across the twentieth century. In a 1955 interview with Ferdinand Alquié, André Breton famously claimed that Surrealism was never interested in the loss of reason "tout court," but in the things that reason made man lose. While this certainly operated on the level of the object — a prime example includes Max Ernst's appropriation of natural history illustrations and anatomical diagrams in his collages — the fabrication of alternative versions of Enlightenment and nineteenth-century structures of knowledge also reflects something of Surrealism's historical project of reclamation. From the group's earliest journals in the 1920s and intended "glossary of the marvelous" at the Bureau of Surrealist Research, to their challenge to the museum's empirical and colonial ideologies in exhibitions spanning the 1930s to the 1960s, the Surrealists assembled countless compendiums that sought to organize and inventory even as they subverted the rationalist aims of their formal precedents. We invite papers that engage this critical tension between systematic research, documentation, and classification and the centrality of chance, the unconscious, and dreams in Surrealist practice. What was — and what is — the Surrealist order of things? How did these models help transmit surrealist knowledge across geographical and temporal borders? Submissions that consider the circulation of Surrealist objects and ideas, including the presence of such methods in contemporary artistic practice, are welcome.

Committee on Women in the Arts

### **Taking It to the Streets: The Visual and Material Culture of Women's Marches**

Chair(s): Heather Belnap Jensen, Brigham Young University, heather\_jensen@byu.edu

On January 21, 2017, millions of people the world over donned knitted pussy hats, hoisted handmade banners and posters, gathered designed flyers, brochures, and pins, and took to the streets. The Women's March on Washington is part of a long tradition of woman-led demonstrations, including the 1789 march of women on Versailles; the 1907 Mud March in London; and the 1956 protest in Pretoria, South Africa, among numerous others. Organized to raise conscientiousness of various social, economic, and political injustices, these displays of solidarity have generated rich visual and material culture. This session seeks to gather together artists, critics, and historians intent on exploring how objects and performances produced within local, national, and international contexts have functioned within these contemporary and historical demonstrations.

Public Art Dialogue (PAD)

### **Teachable Monuments: Using Public Art to Spark Dialogue and Address Controversies**

Chair(s): Harriet Senie, The City College of New York, The City University of New York, hfsenie@gmail.com; Sierra Rooney, Stony Brook University, The State University of New York, r.sierra.rooney@gmail.com

"Teachable Monuments" is an initiative begun under the aegis of Public Art Dialogue in order to use public monuments as a focus for civic and civil dialogues in schools at every level from kindergarten to university, and also to develop guidelines for public officials in communities to help resolve controversies regarding public monuments. These guidelines would include a step-by-step guide to researching the historical monument, as well as organizing activities and conversations for students,

community groups, civil servants, and politicians. We are interested in proposals that analyze specific controversies with various outcomes, as well as examples of monuments that convey outdated or unwelcome value systems without prompting debate. Strategies might include inaction, removal, (re)interpretation, or commission of a contemporary "counter" monument. Additionally, we are interested in suggestions on how "Teachable Monuments" might achieve its varied goals, as well as theoretical proposals about how these issues might best be contextualized. We expect "Teachable Monuments" to result in publications beyond the guidelines, possibly an issue of the journal *Public Art Dialogue* and/or an anthology that will address these issues in theoretical as well as pragmatic ways.

Art Historians of Southern California (AHSC)

### **Teaching and Writing the Art Histories of Latin American Los Angeles**

Chair(s): Walter Meyer, Santa Monica College, meyer\_walter@smc.edu; Tom Folland, Los Angeles Mission College, tomfolland@gmail.com

This CAA roundtable discussion will be a continuation of the Art Historians of Southern California (AHSC)'s annual conference taking place on October 6, 2017 in collaboration with the Getty Research Institute, and in conjunction with the Getty's region-wide art initiative *Pacific Standard Time: LA/LA*. This year, across Southern California, a far reaching and ambitious exploration of Latin American and Latinx art in dialogue with Los Angeles is taking place across cultural institutions throughout Southern California. The Getty's PST: LA /LA will provide educators and scholars with invaluable resources that will surely impact the study and teaching of art history for years to come. Aside from the practical concerns of aligning course curricula with a wealth of exhibitions that are temporally and geographically dispersed, there are many richly productive questions that arise in considering how these kinds of exhibitions impact pedagogy and scholarship. This roundtable seeks papers that explore ideas related to the overall theme of PST: LA/LA and that speak to the impact of such exhibitions on pedagogy and scholarship. Potential topics include issues of terminology: Latin American, Latino/a, Latinx, Chicana/o, Chicanx, Los Angeles as a Latin American and Latinx city, Latin American and Latinx culture and identity, Queer and feminist perspectives; historiographies of the fields; pedagogy and the teaching of PST: LA/LA; uncovering hidden local histories and archives; and the relationship between Latin American, Latinx, and indigenous cultures.

Historians of Islamic Art Association (HIAA)

### **The "Three Empires" Redux: Islamic Interregionality in the Age of Modernity**

Chair(s): Chanchal Dadlani, Historians of Islamic Art Association, dadlani@wfu.edu; Ünver Rüstem, Historians of Islamic Art Association, urustem@jhu.edu

The concept of the three "gunpowder empires" in reference to the Ottoman, Safavid, and Mughal polities is well established in Islamic studies and frequently invoked by scholars across disciplines — art and architectural historians among them — to posit and analyze points of interregional comparison and difference. But relatively few attempts have been made to apply this model beyond the empires' putative sixteenth- and seventeenth-century heydays, or to consider its relevance following the fall of the Safavids in the 1730s. This is in spite of numerous known and proposed cases of later artistic intersection between the Ottoman, Iranian, and Indian spheres, as exemplified by the Afsharid ruler Nadir Shah's sending of Mughal plunder to the Ottoman sultan. This session seeks to interrogate the idea of the "three empires" in the context of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, a period marked by changing political circumstances and increased transnational

mobility, commerce, and exchange. We aim to understand the shifting relationships between the material and visual cultures of these regions, including parallels and discontinuities. What defined the transition between the early modern and modern periods? How did artistic taste and aesthetic sensibilities change? What constituted the response to heightened contact with European expansionism? At its broadest, the session examines the applicability of the “three empires” framework to the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, considering the possibilities and limits of this interpretive structure. We invite contributions that explore the Ottoman, Safavid, Afsharid, Zand, Qajar, and Mughal realms, broadly construed, and welcome papers on related regions and contexts.

### **The Aesthetics of Intervention: Federal Governments and Native Art across North America**

Chair(s): Nancy Palm Puchner, The University of North Carolina at Pembroke, nancy.palm@uncp.edu; Alexander Brier Marr, Saint Louis Art Museum, alex.marr@slam.org

Federal initiatives over the course of the twentieth century vastly impacted the native arts of Mexico, the United States, and Canada. Mexican programs were linked to a recent revolution, US efforts responded to the Great Depression and a shift in federal policy, and Canadian measures followed the collapse of the transformative Arctic fur trade. These programs had differing goals and methods — economic, cultural, aesthetic, and political — and notions of indigeneity varied between nations and regions. However, each program sought to reshape broader national identities by heightening the visibility of native art. This panel explores the impact of federal programs across North America on the production, consumption, circulation, and display of native art in the middle of the twentieth century. Recognizing the range of contexts in which federal initiatives occurred, we look to the intersection of native North American art, government policy, and hemispheric currents. We welcome papers that examine, for instance, institutionalized arts programs organized under the rubrics of “indigenismo” and “mestizaje” in Mexico, New Deal cooperatives intended to revive historic means of production in the United States, or Inuit art workshops that introduced new techniques such as printmaking in Canada. We also welcome broader connective topics, such as an underlying federal impulse to regulate Indian identity, sovereignty, and artistic expression, the fluid conceptions of both “modern” and “traditional,” the role of the market, and the creation of sustainable economies for native artists across North America.

### **The Call to the Virtual: Virtual Reality as Artform, Discourse, Intervention**

Chair(s): Patrick Lichty, Zayed University, Voyd@voyd.com

As of 2017, virtual reality is now the ‘hot’ medium in New Media Arts. Spurred on by the convergence of new displays, cheap computation, and high bandwidth connectivity, this medium is reaching new audiences beyond its decades-long legacy of environments like The CAVE, RAVEs, GeoWalls and the like. Patrick Lichty’s 2014 essay for the Oxford Handbook of Virtuality, “The Translation of Art in Virtual Worlds” notes that virtuality as medium is fraught with representational, political, technical, affective, and archival issues. This panel seeks to place these practices in a critical framework in terms of art history, aesthetics, identity politics, and its current relationship to “the Contemporary” in terms of the art-ecological system as well as altern systems like salons and festivals. As it sits at the intersection of the ephemeral (media) arts and the current parade of high technologies like Second Life and 3D printing, possessing a hype, apex, and supposed “death” phase, how will virtual reality in its current form fare in the art world and art historical milieu? We will attempt to ascertain the role of VR in the media arts, its role in its history, and how it already points

forward to other representational regimes such as augmented reality and the “internet of things.” What has the history of VR as an art form been since Jeffrey Shaw’s 1989 work, “Legible City,” how does it create a unique space for art and design discourses, and how does it frame the future?

Committee on Diversity Practices

### **The Collective as a Model for Practices in Diversity and Inclusion**

Chair(s): Raél Jero Salle, Maryland Institute College of Art, rael.salley@gmail.com; Tobias Wofford, Santa Clara University, twofford@scu.edu

Collectives and coalitions among cultural workers are defined as people united by a shared interest. Sometimes, collectives are the means through which practices of diversity and inclusion are enacted. Historically, a wide range of artist collectives have played pivotal roles in producing discourses of identity, institutional inclusion, and cultural politics (i.e. the Guerilla Girls, the Black Emergency Cultural Coalition, and Gran Fury). Recent scholarship has approached these ideas with specific attention to ethical, aesthetic, and historical stakes of collaboration. This panel considers “the collective” as a model for diverse and inclusive practices. We seek presentations that engage with the techniques, strategies, histories, and theories of collectives, as well as research that examines the successes and failures of groups specifically oriented toward the objective of increasing diversity and inclusion. In doing so, we seek to explore a series of possible questions: How do collectives seek to imagine and promote communities? How do collectives embody community identities, express grievances, and demand redress in ways that other institutions cannot (e.g. Yam Collective and the Whitney)? What are the benefits and drawbacks of the collective as a mechanism for battling for visibility (e.g. The “Black Collectivities” of Huey Copeland and Naomi Beckwith)? How might the collective-as-model be used for expressing grievances along the lines of identity? What is the impact of the collective on artistic practices globally? Is the collective-as-model a unique alternative for imagining inclusivity and equity? If so, how? What sort of futures does the “collective-as-model” offer?

### **The Craft School Experience**

Chair(s): Diana Jocelyn Greenwold, Portland Museum of Art, dgreenwold@portlandmuseum.org

Master artists and amateur craftsmen alike have flocked to craft schools across the United States since the early twentieth century. Founded first in the 1930s, these schools have typically been understood as deliberately apart from cosmopolitan centers and art world tastemakers. In the hills of North Carolina or on the shores of Northern Maine, schools such as Penland, Haystack, Pond Farm, Pilchuk, Anderson Ranch, and Arrowmont have nonetheless exerted a profound impact of the field of craft internationally. This panel examines the ways that such institutions — as fertile spaces for the world’s most influential practitioners to coalesce as self-sufficient communities — have profoundly shaped the history and the present state of craft in the United States. Ceramics, metal, glass, and fiber are profoundly different thanks to the legacies and continuing innovations pioneered in these remote, yet internationally diverse, enclaves. This panel seeks contributions from art historians, artists, curators, and administrators to reflect on the history of these schools and their evolving role in shaping the field of craft. Recent and upcoming exhibitions and publications dedicated to Black Mountain College, Haystack, and Penland, among others, suggests the timeliness for such a discussion. In assessing these schools’ histories and continuing missions, this panel uses multiple voices to examine how such institutions have altered individual careers, national tastes, and pedagogical methodologies.

### **The Elements and Elementality in Art of the Premodern World**

Chair(s): Michelle M. McCoy, University of California, Berkeley, mickmccoy@berkeley.edu; Megan C. McNamee, Center for Advanced Study in the Visual Arts, National Gallery of Art, meganmcnamee@gmail.com

Few truths had broader currency in the premodern world than the compound nature of the cosmos and its contents. Plato, writing ca. 360 BCE, described a harmonic system of matter comprising four elements: fire, air, water, and earth. A separate tradition matured in the Han dynasty (201 BCE–220 CE) of China in which cyclic transformations of five elemental phases — wood, fire, earth, metal, and water — governed all phenomena. Across traditions, whatever their number or identity, the elements formed the very fabric of rationality and reality. Paradigmatically, they were bound up with ideas of order, form, composition, and perceptibility. The abstraction and simplicity of the Greek and Chinese systems made them engines of natural philosophy, readily adapted to local exigencies in Europe, Africa, and Asia. Whereas comparing elemental traditions has interested historians and philosophers for centuries, their visual dimensions remain largely unexamined. This panel explores the elements and elementality in and among the art of premodern cultures, from any part of the world. We define the elements broadly, as narrative subjects, schematic principles, objects of empirical inquiry, agents of transformation, matter and media, and factors affecting viewership, etc. By taking a synoptic view, we presume a degree of incommensurability, which, we believe, can yield novel analytics. Our aim is twofold: first, to develop more precise comparative vocabulary in order to lay the groundwork for further intercultural conversation, and second, to analyze the many ways that knowledge of the elements was manifest in visual and material form.

### **The French Fragment: 1789–1914**

Chair(s): Emily Eastgate Brink, University of Western Australia, emily.brink@uwa.edu.au; Marika Knowles, Harvard University, knowles@fas.harvard.edu

In 1979, Henri Zerner and Charles Rosen launched their influential analysis of Romantic aesthetics with a description of the Romantic fragment as “both metaphor and metonymy.” In France, post-Revolutionary artists gravitated towards visions of ruins, butchered bodies, papery sketches, and other manifestations of human transience. Evolving out of this love of pieces, fragments took on a variety of forms throughout the nineteenth century. Romantic artists responded to the spectacle of “bric-a-brac” salvaged from aristocratic interiors, medieval sculptures loosed from cult settings, and collections of ethnographic curiosities comprised of objects from ‘elsewhere.’ Eventually, as artists turned to the spectacle of modern life, the fragment as an object, figure, or ‘other,’ ceded to forms of fragmentary vision. The late nineteenth-century artistic proclivity for cropped bodies, blurred outlines, and decorative vignettes trafficked in fragments, amplifying what Michael Fried has identified as the modern tension between the *morceau* and *tableau*. Nearly forty years after Zerner and Rosen’s publication, this panel seeks to reassess and reinvigorate approaches to the fragment in French art of the long nineteenth century. We welcome multiple approaches to the fragment, including critical definitions of the term. How did the fragment change, or remain the same, over the course of the long nineteenth century? What is the relationship between the fragment and its presumed ‘whole’? How did the fragment represent and articulate relationships within France’s ongoing colonial enterprise? How did new visual technologies, such as lithography, photography, and the cinema, affect the status of the fragment in France?

Historians of British Art (HBA)

### **The Image of the American Indian in Britain, ca. 1800–1930: New Critical Perspectives**

Chair(s): Martina Droth, Yale Center for British Art, martina.droth@yale.edu; Michael Hatt, Warwick University, M.Hatt@warwick.ac.uk

The study of the representation of American Indians has gained increasing attention in recent scholarship. This history, however, has been almost exclusively written from a North American perspective. In nineteenth-century Britain a widespread fascination with Native American cultures was connected to wider debates about empire and the transatlantic world. But what Kate Flint termed the “Transatlantic Indian” in her pioneering study has remained largely unexamined. This interdisciplinary session seeks to explore the various ways in which native peoples from the United States and Canada, and the artifacts of their cultures, were being represented, portrayed, studied, and collected in Britain in the long nineteenth century. Possible topics for discussion might include: Buffalo Bill’s Wild West shows and other live performances; George Catlin’s Indian Gallery in London; ethnographic museums and displays; displays of sculptures at the international exhibitions and other venues; photography and its circulation; and illustrations and the printed press. We welcome papers that address specific case studies or larger conceptual issues.

### **The Park Place Group: Another Minimalism**

Chair(s): Susanneh Bieber, Texas A&M University, bieber@tamu.edu

The Park Place group was a loose collaboration of artists who rented a building with studios and an exhibition space in downtown Manhattan beginning in 1963. The members, including Robert Grosvenor, Tamara Melcher, Mark di Suvero, Leo Valledor, and others, used industrial methods and materials to create geometric paintings and sculptures. They were advancing ideas that would become integral to minimal art, but their work has largely been eclipsed by canonical narratives. Building on Linda Dalrymple Henderson’s important 2008 exhibition, this session situates the artists of the Park Place group within the broader aesthetic and sociopolitical context of the sixties, first to recover their crucial contributions to the development of minimal art and second to identify the reasons for their eclipse. Encouraged are contributions that expand our understanding of sixties art by providing deep formal readings of artworks and practices within specific aesthetic and sociopolitical discourses. Possible topics for papers include the Park Place artists’ interest in new technologies, engineering, optics, psychology, and architecture; their close connection to the West Coast art scene (for example Mark di Suvero’s leading role in constructing the Peace Tower in Los Angeles); the business structure of the group modeled on a corporation; the stature of women, including Paula Cooper’s role as the president of Park Place Inc.; and the group’s relationship to canonical artists, such as Carl Andre, Sol LeWitt, and Robert Smithson, who exhibited at the Park Place gallery.

### **The Poetics and Politics of “Anonymous” Contemporary Craft**

Chair(s): Ezra Shales, Massachusetts College of Art and Design, eshales@massart.edu

Is anonymity in conditions of artisanal production counterintuitive to our understanding of contemporary craft? The great majority of recent exhibitions and publications about modern and contemporary craft cite artistry that has a known provenance, mainly comprised of identified individual authors. Is the monographic study of individual genius, a convention established by Vasari in the Renaissance, still helpful or is it a hindrance, and does that model serve the meanings of pottery, weaving, or cast metals, where workshops of dozens (or hundreds) have a longer historical tradition? If one of the strengths of craft history has been an expansive view beyond the traditional art historical canon and

an inclusion of women's work and indigenous making, a recurring weakness has been its paternalistic attitudes towards marginalized and underrepresented cultures. For instance, a craft museum recently exhibited twentieth-century metalwork as "anonymous African jewelry," typical shorthand that normalizes three problematic terms in one fell swoop. This session seeks papers on anonymous artisans which go beyond the insider/outsider duality and which strive for taxonomies with more nuance than 'folk,' and especially welcomes field work that strays into complex manufacturing or collective production as well as case studies that "look at what the practitioners do" (Geertz, 1973).

### **The Postwar Environment in Global Context**

Chair(s): Meredith Malone, Washington University in St. Louis, meredith\_malone@wustl.edu; Jennifer Josten, University of Pittsburgh, jej40@pitt.edu

This session explores the emergence of environmental installations — three-dimensional works of art that the viewer is encouraged to enter and interact with — from the late 1950s through the 1960s, a period marked by an explosion of interest in this format among artists on both sides of the Atlantic. Rather than a coherent artistic genre or medium, environmental art covers a range of diverse aesthetic, ideological, and culturally informed practices. Allan Kaprow is often credited with coining the term "Environments" in the late 1950s, combining the spatial and performative implications of Abstract Expressionism with a renewed orientation toward quotidian objects. In the US, a focus on Kaprow and the New York scene has obscured the fact that environments appeared simultaneously in Europe and Japan in the late 1950s. The contributions made by postwar European, East Asian, and Latin American artists, who responded to particular aesthetic, cultural, and political circumstances, have yet to be sufficiently interpreted in their own right. Given recent scholarly and curatorial interest in the role of environments in postwar art, the time is ripe for a reevaluation of its larger history and impact. We seek papers that investigate the diversity of approaches, strategies, and socio-political views articulated by artists around the world through the production of environments. Papers that address the apparent contradiction between the ideals of demystification and accessibility espoused by some producers of environments and the less rosy realities of an expanding consumer and spectacle culture that informed and shaped these endeavors are particularly welcome.

### **The Renaissance Contribution to the Formation of "Islamic Art"**

Chair(s): Kathryn Blair Moore, Texas State University, kathryn.b.moore@gmail.com

Historical accounts of the formation of a European concept of Islamic art have primarily focused upon nineteenth-century essentializations regarding the geometry of abstract ornament. This panel solicits papers that will look further back in history to consider the role of Renaissance writers and artists in the emergence of a concept of Islamic art. In what contexts can we identify ideas regarding a non-representational character of Islamic art articulated and/or visualized in the Renaissance period? How did the reception of the arts associated with the Arabic language, and the Renaissance inventions of both arabesques and pseudo-Arabic scripts, relate to the reception of Latin and the notion of a rebirth of antiquity? Why and how did Italian Renaissance artists associate arabesques with grotesques, and what was the impact of this association on perceptions of the origins of Islamic art? What ultimately was the role of the Renaissance characterizations of Islamic art in the emerging self-definition of European art?

### **The Right to Unmake**

Chair(s): Anne Collins Goodyear, Bowdoin College Museum of Art, agoodyear@bowdoin.edu; Jon Ippolito, University of Maine, jippolito@maine.edu

As technological platforms have become more powerful, our ability to deconstruct them has weakened. The Digital Millennium Copyright Act criminalizes farmers who disassemble tractors, hip-hop artists who sample vintage songs, and museum conservators who decompile obsolete software. Store shelves over the last fifty years have likewise undergone a decline in toys that leave play to the imagination, as branded franchises with predetermined narratives like 'Frozen' and 'Star Wars' have crowded out open-ended playthings like generic dolls and chemistry sets. Lego is one of the few toy companies to survive this encroachment with its reputation for exploratory play intact, yet its plastic bricks are increasingly boxed with instructions to build a single vehicle or building — a trend even more pronounced in competitors like Megablocks, whose specialized parts cannot be used to build anything else. Toys that discourage unmaking teach kids that being creative means following instructions. Operating in contrast to the decline of hackability in today's app and toy stores is a spectrum of creators who are decidedly not following instructions. Some hack systems without permission, like those who modify or "speedrun" Super Mario. Other artists exploit the openness of "toy" platforms like Minecraft or design microcontrollers like Arduino explicitly for hacking. This panel invites artist and scholars to interrogate the often contradictory narratives surrounding makers and unmakers of products and platforms marketed as creative media. Depending on proposals received for the panel, its organizers may structure the discussion according to an aleatoric dynamic consistent with the theme of Lego-like creativity.

### **The Tool: Cultural Expressions, Histories, Rhetoric, and Agency**

Chair(s): Francesco Freddolini, Luther College, University of Regina, francesco.freddolini@uregina.ca; Carmen L. Robertson, University of Regina, carmen.robertson@uregina.ca

When addressing the materiality and technical qualities of artworks across a wide variety of Western and non-Western discourses, as well as across periodizations, the materials — e.g. oil, tempera, acrylic, marble, bronze, wood, glass beads, hide, digital media — are often the only element mentioned and explored, while the tools that shaped those materials are rarely investigated as an inherent part of the making process. This session aims to bring the tool — e.g. brush, chisel, drill, spatula, hand — to the fore of discourses on materiality and the making of art. When we look at objects through the lens of the tools that shaped their existence, significant questions arise: How does a tool contribute to or construct meaning through the effects it produces? How do its traces, visibility, or obliteration contribute to or articulate style? How did artists choose, design, or modify their tools and why? How have tools been described in historical and/or historiographical texts? How did tools influence artists' practice, then and now, and across cultures? The tool, as a vehicle for material analysis, has the potential to break down Western hierarchies, invite fresh ways to consider materiality, and provide a productive lens to explore art making and its technologies over space and time. We seek papers that explore the agency of the tools, their rhetoric — intended as their capacity to articulate systems of meaning and knowledge — and their histories, and we are especially interested in contributions investigating both Western and non-Western traditions, across a wide chronological span.

### **Theorizing Drawing: The Gap Between Historical Accounts and Studio Practice**

Chair(s): Margaret MacNamidhe, School of the Art Institute of Chicago, margaretmacnamidhe@fastmail.fm

The literature on drawing in art theory, art history, and studio pedagogy is growing exponentially. Yet these discourses remain separate, and their separation has not been recognized as a theoretical or historical issue. Thematic exhibitions aplenty claim to define drawing's current location. Phenomenological descriptions that depend on terms such as 'immediacy,' 'emergence,' and 'directness,' such as Catherine de Zegher's "On Line," Tania Kovats's "The Drawing Book," and the anthologies "What is Drawing?" and "Vitamin D," provide a euphoric rhetoric that depends, in untheorized ways, on writers like Derrida, Barthes, Badiou, and Nancy. These approaches tend to expand drawing until it becomes coterminous with other media, or even an emblem of the post-medium condition. Art history has developed accounts of drawing's place in modern art history. Persuasive genealogies have been offered by Benjamin Buchloh, Rosalind Krauss, Molly Nesbit, Margaret Iversen, Briony Fer, and others. But this literature is sometimes unwilling to reflect on the often strict and specific conditions of drawing; in addition, these accounts bypass the issue of the genealogy of their own interpretive interests in poststructuralism and phenomenology. The challenge this session sets for participants is to engage these three often separate discourses: the literature of immediacy, emergence, and directness; the detailed contexts of art history; and the often marooned languages and practices of the studio. This session welcomes proposals that theorize examples of drawing practices (whether contemporary or from the long twentieth century) while reflecting on the methodologies of art history and the traditions of studio discourse.

### **Time, Space, Movement: Art Between Perception, Imagination, and Fiction**

Chair(s): Nathaniel B. Jones, Washington University in St. Louis, nbjones@wustl.edu; James P. Anno, Museo e Real Bosco di Capodimonte, james.philip.anno@gmail.com

In the study of the visual arts, the relationship between time and space has always been uneasy. In the mid-eighteenth century, for example, Gotthold Lessing's "Laocoön" cast them as irreconcilable categories. Painting, sculpture, and the other plastic arts, Lessing argued, had spatial but not temporal extension, and should be limited to the depiction of individual moments. Literature was better suited to the narrative representation of change over time. In this opposition of time and space, movement was counterpoised with stillness, and flux with permanence. Today, Lessing's position may seem little more than an artifact of its era. Rather than a transcription of perception, even the most illusionistic art has been revealed as a carefully constructed, highly ideological fiction. And since the invention of the cinema, both temporal duration and movement have become natural-seeming elements of the modern image world. But pressing questions remain. What is the time of art? In what ways is that time mutually implicated with space, and to what extent is that relationship mediated by real or suggested motion? To what degree are time and movement neglected aspects of the question of mimesis? And in what sense are artistic temporality and spatiality both fictive and constitutive of fiction? This session solicits proposals for papers reflecting on any aspect of the interrelationship of time, space, and movement in the visual arts; papers on premodern and non-Western topics are especially welcome.

### **Travel, Diplomacy, and Networks of Global Exchange in the Early Modern Period**

Chair(s): Justina Spencer, Carleton University, justinahspencer@gmail.com

Early modern artists were known to travel alongside ambassadors on diplomatic missions, in accompaniment of explorers, or as entrepreneurial merchants on solo expeditions. Works of art likewise toured en route with artists, were produced amid voyages, or at times illustrated the arrival of foreigners in new lands. This panel seeks to explore the role visual culture played vis-à-vis travel, trade, diplomacy, and transcultural encounters in the early modern period. In what ways did the movement of artists contribute to the construction of aesthetic hybridism and early cosmopolitanism? If art forms such as Japanese Namban screens and Ottoman costume albums divulge a cultural encounter, do they presuppose a burgeoning "global public"? Taking into account that global art history is not, to use the words of Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, "the reverse side of Western art history," but instead contrary to national art and its incumbent limitations, this panel seeks contributions from scholars interested in a horizontal approach to artistic exchange where emphasis is placed on the interconnectedness of visual cultures, styles, and techniques. Contributors to this panel may deal with any aspect of global travel and exchange in the early modern period (1450–1800). Papers might address the visual manifestations of political diplomacy, art as foreign reportage, the adaptation of foreign artistic techniques, or the role of the court as a contact zone for cross-cultural exchange. Topics may include a discussion of an individual work of art or artist, or can consist of more theoretical discussions of travel in the early modern world.

Society for the Study of Early Modern Women (SSEMW)

### **Unruly Women in Early Modern Art and Material Culture**

Chair(s): Maria F. Maurer, The University of Tulsa, maria-maurer@utulsa.edu

From Caterina Sforza's defense of Forlì or Sor Juana de la Cruz's questioning of the misogynist literary tradition to images of slovenly Dutch housewives and objects which facilitated active female participation in and enjoyment of sex, early modern art history abounds with images and stories of misbehaving women. Art and material culture produced during the early modern period allows us to consider ways in which women negotiated and even transgressed social strictures. What did it mean for an early modern woman to be unruly? How was gendered transgression pictured and performed through objects and artworks? Conversely, how might art have been used to normalize problematic female figures? Finally, how have modern art historians treated disruptive female agency? This panel aims to study examples of troublesome or disobedient women and their involvement in early modern art. We seek papers that explore artists, patrons, subjects, and beholders who do not fit into expected frameworks or who disrupt traditional narratives about women's roles in early modern art and society. Paper topics might include, but are not limited to: female artists or patrons who contravened established artistic practices; representations of unusual and/or misbehaving women; examples of female beholders who engaged in alternative interpretations of, or interactions with, art; and female artists, patrons, or subjects who have proved unmanageable for later art historians. We welcome papers from any area of the globe concerning the years ca. 1400–1800, and invite scholars of all ranks to apply.

Society of Historians of East European Eurasian and Russian Art and Architecture (SHERA)

### **Utopianism and Dystopianism in Russian, Soviet, Eastern European, and Eurasian Art**

Chair(s): Joes Segal, The Wende Museum, jsegal@wendemuseum.org; Ksenya Gurshtein, Skirball Museum and Cultural Center, ksenya@gmail.com

This panel considers the impact of utopian and dystopian thought on the art of Russia, the Soviet Union, Central and Eastern Europe, and Eurasia from the modern period until the present day. 2017 has brought us reminders of the power that utopia as a concept still has in shaping our understanding of the historic avant-gardes in the region. In the early twentieth century, the arts in the region embraced unprecedented aspirations for social transformation. By the end of the twentieth century, the collapse of socialism in the Eastern Bloc became widely associated with the “passing of mass utopia.” During the decades in between, the Soviet Union and later its “satellite” states were a global epicenter of utopian thought promoted at the state level and at times embraced enthusiastically by producers of visual culture who imagined new visual languages, new purposes for their work, and new modes of working. As official ideology came under pressure, the region also witnessed a rise of dystopian and anti-utopian impulses in the arts. After the end of state communism, both utopian and dystopian ideas have motivated artworks in the post-socialist countries seeking to define new identities. Meanwhile, greater awareness of such movements as nineteenth-century Russian Cosmism and its extensive influence on twentieth-century art urges us to investigate intellectual histories that give a deeper historical account of utopianism in the region in the “longue durée.” Papers on all topics relevant for this theme will be considered for the session.

### **American Council for Southern Asian Art (ACSAA) Viral Media and South Asia**

Chair(s): Holly Shaffer, Brown University, holly\_shaffer@brown.edu; Debra Diamond, Freer Gallery of Art and Sackler M. Gallery, Smithsonian Institution, diamode@si.edu

From the sixteenth century, European publications about South Asia ranged from travelers’ accounts, military memoirs, and missionary manuals to text and image compilations. The technology of print allowed for compositions to replicate and disperse over hundreds of years, which expanded knowledge — and established stereotypes — about South Asian culture. The role of the visual in establishing, justifying, and corroborating the parameters of European inquiries about South Asian subjects and peoples has urgent contemporary implications as the circulation of true or false images only increases the links between knowledge, politics, and aesthetics. This panel invites papers to address themes related to printed imagery produced about South Asia, or produced by South Asians about other locales, from 1500 to now. The first theme asks how the print medium accelerated the movement of information and stultified it through replication. We are interested in studies about images that ‘go viral’ or circulated ‘fake news.’ The second question concerns the use of artworks as a source for printed images about culture. What were the processes of translating artworks into print? How does the artwork as model alter how information was perceived by makers and received by audiences? The third theme is about theories of reproducibility. How might a study of the conveyance of information about South Asia—by witnessing, hearsay, or objects—disrupt and nuance scholarship on the print medium? Papers can focus on artists, publishers, or publications from anywhere, the only qualifier is that they be about South Asia or produced by South Asians.

### **What Do We Do Now?: Art and Politics circa 1970 and Now**

Chair(s): Kristen Carter, The University of British Columbia, k.carter0009@gmail.com; Serge Guilbaut, The University of British Columbia, guilbus@hotmail.com

In 1970 and in the midst of “deepening political crisis,” “Artforum” circulated a questionnaire to twelve artists asking them to comment on what they believed art’s relationship to politics should be. The answers ranged from retreat and apathy, with Robert Smithson declaring “direct political action becomes a matter of trying to pick poison out of boiling stew,” to demands for political action on both macro and micro levels, with Jo Baer writing “I think the time for political action is now and I believe action should be taken in the art world and in the world at large.” These responses, formulated in the immediate wake of 1968, no doubt spoke to a contentious and uncertain moment wherein much of the hope and radical impetus of the previous decade was brought to a close, and when the relationship between art and politics was suspect. Now, nearly fifty years later and in the midst of our own “deepening political crisis,” “Artforum”’s question seems ripe for reconsideration and analysis. This panel seeks to re-open the question of art’s political efficacy by looking back to the early seventies, an art historical moment mired in profound uncertainty and transition, in an effort to look forward. How did an urgent and palpable crisis of consciousness circa 1970 catalyze a general reconfiguration of the relationship between art and politics, and how might these reconfigurations resonate with our historical present?

### **Association of Historians of Nineteenth-Century Art (AHNCA) Women Artists, 1800–1900**

Chair(s): Jane R. Becker, The Metropolitan Museum of Art, jane.becker@metmuseum.org

On the occasion of the current traveling exhibition regarding women artists working in Paris between 1850 and 1900, this session opens the floor to topics relating to female artists of the nineteenth century. Papers regarding both better- and lesser-known figures are welcome. Subjects to be explored might include developments in artistic education and associations, specific case studies of artists, artists’ critical reception, and explorations of patronage and the market for work by women artists in the nineteenth century. The session chair, Jane R. Becker, is Collections Management Associate in the Department of European Paintings at The Metropolitan Museum of Art. She co-curated “Overcoming All Obstacles: The Women of the Académie Julian” (Dahesh Museum and tour, 1999–2000) and contributed to “Women Artists in Paris, 1850–1900” (AFA/Yale University Press, 2017). The session respondent is Laurence Madeline, former Chief Curator of Fine Arts at the Musées d’art et d’histoire, Geneva, and curator of the current American Federation of Arts traveling exhibition “Women Artists in Paris, 1850–1900” (Denver Art Museum, Denver, CO: October 22–January 14, 2017; Speed Art Museum, Louisville, KY: February 17–May 13, 2018; Clark Art Institute, Williamstown, MA: June 9–September 3, 2018).

### **Coalition of Women in the Arts Organizations (CWAO)**

#### **Women Artists, Social Issues, and the Resistance**

Chair(s): Kyra Belan, Broward College, kyrabelan2013@gmail.com

This panel, titled “Women Artists, Social Issues, and the Resistance,” will examine the works of women artists and their reactions to the last election, women’s struggle toward equality, access to economic and political powers, global warming, reproductive rights, animal rights, or other sociopolitical issues. The panel is open to submissions by women artists and art historians presenting on sociopolitical issues and art. Artists may incorporate new media, performance, installation, collaboration,

conceptual, or any combination of the above while also including traditional mediums. Please submit proposals to the email address above or to Kyra Belan, PO Box 275, Matlacha, FL 33993.

#### **Women's Liberation and the Persistence of Painting**

Chair(s): Sarah Cowan, University of California, Berkeley, sloucowan@berkeley.edu; Amy Rahn, Stony Brook University, The State University of New York, amy.rahn@stonybrook.edu

In the 1970s, many women painters cast aside their brushes as part of a feminist effort to shed patriarchal tradition, yet there were also artists who persisted in painting through the Women's Liberation movement in the United States. While art historical scholarship continues to illuminate the ways feminist practices infect contemporary art, painting is often relegated to the background of these debates. This panel invites papers that address the fraught position of painting in women's modern and contemporary art practices. We will explore how women artists expanded, experimented with, and reconstrued painting through Women's Liberation and its intersections with various political struggles, including but not limited to those led by black, Chicana, disabled, gay and lesbian, and indigenous women. Taking the feminist movement as a historical pivot point, this panel seeks papers that consider the multifaceted meanings of women's painting practices in the US since 1945. We encourage proposals that put pressure on canonical feminist art histories and that think expansively about the category "painting." Possible themes related to painting include: revisionist histories; aesthetic strategies coded as feminine such as detail, decoration, craft, performance, collectivity, and autobiographical content; political subject matter; public art; materiality and bodily engagement; and queerness, gender non-normativity, and sexual transgression. This panel will contribute to the critical work of breaking down art historical silos that obscure the legacies of women artists who braved the thorny past of painting to inaugurate new terms for the present.

#### **Working Out of Medium**

Chair(s): David Pullins, The Frick Collection, dpullins@gmail.com

What happens when an artist steps outside of their preferred medium, or outside the medium that their public has come to expect from them? What leads to such a decision, at what stage in an artist's career might it occur, and with what results? How do such moments fit into an artist's historiography (and the concept of a singular, consistent artistic personality and oeuvre), or the collecting and display of their work (even the literal market value of one object over another)? Inspired by early modern European examples (the pastelist Perronneau working in oil, Chardin in pastel, Oudry in watercolor, Prud'hon in ink), this call for papers is open to a wider geographic and chronological range with the aim of starting from a diversity of particulars in order to address larger, more conceptual questions. This said, ideal proposals will be those that look with nuance at the material properties of the objects produced by one or two makers in order to set them into dialogue the themes of a panel that aims to speak across artistic practice and the construction of artistic identity as it relates to medium.

#### **Woven Spaces: Building with Textile in Islamic Architecture**

Chair(s): Patricia Blessing, Pomona College, pdblessing@gmail.com

This session invites papers that examine the relationship between textiles and architecture within the Islamic world, prior to ca. 1850. Questions of textile as architecture (such as tents) but also textiles in architecture (such as textile furnishings or the use of textile motifs) are relevant to the panel. A larger discussion will develop surrounding the concept of a textile aesthetic in Islamic architecture, and the panel invites speakers to broadly engage theoretical perspectives in this regard. When considered in this framework, multiple relationships between fabric and

monument emerge. Issues of materiality, sensory perception, and intermediality are at stake within the larger question of how fabrics are an integral part of the built environment in the medieval and early modern Islamic world. Textile structures such as tents or canopies were built of fabric; portable architecture that could be folded and stored for transportation, and then reconstructed. Textiles were also central parts of the ways in which spaces were furnished and transformed with changes in wall hangings, curtains, and floor coverings. Textile motifs were frequently integrated into architectural decoration, rendered in a range of materials such as stucco and tile. Overall, the understanding of space is thoroughly transformed once the presence of textiles in these often overlapping modes is acknowledged in considerations of textile spatiality. Contributions will engage with questions related to the multiple uses of textiles as they are integrated into Islamic architecture from late antiquity to the nineteenth century in the various ways outlined.

# Session Participation Proposal Submission Form

## CAA 106th Annual Conference

### Los Angeles, February 21–24, 2018

#### **CONTACT INFORMATION:**

Participant's Name (as it should appear in conference publications):

Participant's Affiliation (as it should appear in conference publications, one affiliation only):

Email: \_\_\_\_\_

CAA Member Number\*: \_\_\_\_\_

Address \_\_\_\_\_

Phone: \_\_\_\_\_

#### **PAPER/PROJECT TITLE (as it should be published):**

\_\_\_\_\_

#### **CHECKLIST**

Have you included the following with this form?:

- Paper/Project/Presentation Abstracts 250 words maximum
- Email or letter explaining your interest, expertise, and availability
- Shortened CV
- *(Optional)* Documentation of work being discussed

#### **MULTIPLE SESSIONS**

*If you have submitted proposals to one or more other session chairs in the 2018 Call for Participation, list chair (s) and titles of other sessions below. It is essential that session chairs be apprised of all of your current submissions\*\*:*

\_\_\_\_\_

*If your individual paper/project proposal was accepted to a Composed Session in June, please list accepted paper/project title below:*

\_\_\_\_\_

\*Current CAA membership through February 24, 2018 is required; see the "General Guidelines for Participants" on the cover page. For a membership details, call CAA's office at 212-691-1051, ext. 1; or visit [collegeart.org/membership](http://collegeart.org/membership). Discount memberships are available. A participant may *not* use an institutional membership ID for participation.

\*\*See Guidelines 4–5 in "GENERAL GUIDELINES FOR SPEAKERS" on the cover page for information on policies regarding participation in multiple sessions.

**Deadline: August 14, 2017**

**Email this form and supporting materials directly to the session chair(s) listed in the CFP**