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Abstract

Communicationists and Un-artists: Pedagogical Experiments In California, 1966-1974

by

Hallie Rose Scott

Advisor: Professor Claire Bishop

A network of experimental workshops, classes, and schools foregrounding interdisciplinary, non-hierarchical, and process-based approaches to teaching and learning emerged in coastal California between 1966 and 1974. These initiatives embodied a new pedagogical approach that I call “communication pedagogy,” in which students were taught to exchange ideas and collaborate, rather than to produce objects. Analyzing three central case studies, Anna and Lawrence Halprin’s Experiments in Environment workshops, Ant Farm’s proposals for learning networks, and Allan Kaprow’s ‘Happenings’ course, I argue that communication pedagogy helped to foster a new paradigm for artistic practice: the artist as facilitator and network-creator. By the mid-1970s the new pedagogy had lost traction in educational institutions—the economic crisis caused severe budget cuts, resulting in restrictions to experimental curriculum. However, I posit that, far from becoming obsolete, the communicator-artist was a precursor to the neoliberal model of the network-driven worker and communication pedagogy anticipated the current proliferation of extra-institutional education initiatives.
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Introduction

“CHIP LORD COMMUNICATIONIST” state the large block letters at the top of the architect and video artist’s 1969 curriculum vitae (Appendix I). Below this heading, a list of “biographical data” indicates Lord’s race, height, weight, blood type, and organ status: “all natural organs still in use.”\(^1\) Lord, who co-founded the experimental architecture and video collective Ant Farm in 1968, describes his current focus as divided equally between “Current Fantasy (50%) Cowboy Nomad” and “Current Reality (50%) Visiting Critic of the College of Architecture Univ [sic] of Houston Texas.” His recent education consists of a Bachelor of Architecture degree from Tulane University and “continuous self education” in a variety of locations across the United States. The description of current projects includes creating inflatable architectural structures, giving lectures and workshops at several universities and colleges, “environmental consultation” for a music festival in Japan, and the development of a “lifestyle/information network.”\(^2\) By identifying as a “communicationist”—and by including this range of information on his c.v.—Lord refused to align himself with a conventional occupation.

In the postwar period, “communication”—defined as the transmission of information within a system—represented a central concept within the emerging field of cybernetics, which formed to study behavior within biological and mechanical systems.\(^3\) According to cybernetic

---

\(^1\) Chip Lord, Curriculum Vitae, c. 1969, 1. Ant Farm Archive, 2005.14.241.3.a-b, Berkeley Art Museum, Berkeley, CA. The two quotes that follow also come from this page.

\(^2\) Lord, Curriculum Vitae, 3.

\(^3\) The field of cybernetics was initiated at the Macy Conferences, a series of meetings of scholars from the sciences and the humanities. The conferences, which took place in New York City between 1946 and 1953, aimed to promote dialogue between disciplines. Cybernetics formed as a transdisciplinary field of study. In articulating their understanding of communication, cybernetics scholars built upon pre-World War II sociological research that started before World War II, and that focused on the connection between mass media and propaganda. However, Cyberneticists adapted the concept into one that could apply to the hard sciences. For more on the development of cybernetics see Steve Joshua Heims, *Constructing a*
theory, communication is an inherently multi-directional and therefore, non-hierarchical, process that occurs across disciplines and media, and between humans and machines. When a person transmits information to a machine, for example, she always receives a signal of confirmation or some other form of “feedback” in return. A mechanism for gathering information that can maintain or correct a process, feedback serves a crucial regulatory function—and highlights the capacity for horizontal interchange—within cybernetic systems. For members of the counterculture, this emphasis on non-hierarchical interactions offered an alternative model for information exchange and social organization. By the late 1960s, “communication” had become a countercultural buzzword signifying the belief that more efficient and horizontal information exchange would break down the hierarchical bureaucracies and specialized divisions of labor that characterized postwar society.

Lord, an avid reader of cybernetic theory, thus categorized himself as an interdisciplinary collaborator and facilitator, focused on exchanging information rather than producing objects or buildings. Although the cybernetic understanding of communication informed all aspects of his practice, it especially shaped his pedagogy. Lord and the other members of Art Farm rejected the dominant model of art and architecture education, in which master teachers taught students discipline-specific skills through a program of studies and assignments intended to instruct students in professional norms and habits. They viewed this individualistic, compartmentalized,

---


technocratic, and product-oriented educational system as stultifying—it reinforced the corporate focus of architecture practice, the market-driven thrust of artistic practice, and the hierarchical, conservative social structures in postwar society more broadly.

To counter this indoctrination Ant Farm instead modeled their teaching practices after cybernetics and media theory, as well as progressive pedagogies. They belonged to a network of visual artists, dancers, designers (including architects, landscape designers, graphic designers, product designers), and other creative thinkers who took similar approaches to challenging institutionalized arts education. This network developed a set of pedagogic practices that cultivate facilitation and communication as artistic skills, including facilitative leadership, workshops, scores, networks, and the use of communication technologies as a means to circulate information and ideas. In doing so, they aimed to foster experiential processes, collaboration, and the exchange of ideas rather than the creation of finished products; prioritize non-hierarchical learning structures; cross disciplinary boundaries; and bring learning outside of the confines of the classroom and into the “environment.”

---

6 Media theorist Marshall McLuhan and cybernetician Norbert Wiener represent central influences for Ant Farm, as do the early experiments with digital information networks that occurred in the San Francisco Bay Area in the late 1960s and 1970s. John Dewey and Alexander Sutherland Neill are two major pedagogic references for my protagonist.

7 I am using the term “communication technologies” to encompass any and all technologies that facilitate information exchange. These include telephones, computers and computer networks, radios, and telefax machines. The term “network” is used in two ways throughout this dissertation. In this case, I define a network as a reticular social structure. I draw upon sociologists Luc Boltanski and Eve Chiapello, who summarize the definition of networks within the social sciences as “structures that are minimally hierarchical (if at all so), flexible, and not restricted by boundaries marked out a priori.” Luc Boltanski and Eve Chiapello, *The New Spirit of Capitalism* (London; New York: Verso, 2005), 104. However, I also use “network” at other points of my dissertation to refer to linked computing devices that exchange data. Sometimes, as is the case with Ant Farm’s pedagogical networks, these two concepts are intertwined; Ant Farm proposed both social and digital networks.

8 The notion of “environment” signified an expanded field for art, design, and dance in the 1960s. It implied a rejection of the autonomous art object, a repudiation of the neutral studio (or classroom), and an interest in the specifics of a space, site, or place. This investment in site and context highlights this generation’s frustration with the lack of concern for the specifics of place in modern architecture and design.
proponents of these practices also viewed teaching as indistinct from their artistic practices. Although the members of this network did not think of themselves as inventing a codified pedagogy and did not explicitly name their practices as such, their shared effort to develop an alternative approach to teaching and learning in the arts resulted in a web of interrelated ideas and practices. Because the contemporaneous notion of “communication” is so prevalent within the discourse surrounding this web, I refer to these shared ideas and practices as “communication pedagogy.”

The network of practitioners of communication pedagogy, which started to emerge in 1966 and lasted through 1974, was concentrated in coastal California. As a longstanding military-industrial hub that burgeoned during the Cold War, the state experienced an economic boom that financed the creation and expansion of educational institutions and alternatives, which nourished pedagogical innovation. In addition, the concentration of countercultural activities in California drew artists wishing to escape the strictures of East Coast academies. By the mid-1970s, however, communication pedagogy practices had lost traction in educational institutions; the economic crisis caused severe budget cuts and exacerbated tensions between trustees and faculty. The shift to the right in state and national politics further aggravated this situation, resulting in an administrative push to restrict experimental curricula.

This dissertation tracks the emergence and dissolution of communication pedagogy using three case studies: the Experiments in Environment workshop that dancer Anna Halprin and landscape designer Lawrence Halprin organized in 1968, the proposals for pedagogical networks that Ant Farm created between 1969 and 1971, and the Happenings course that artist Allan Kaprow taught at California Institute of the Arts (CalArts) between 1970 and 1974. The first study to define and analyze communication pedagogy as an educational approach, this dissertation posits that this method helped to foster a new paradigm for artistic practice: the
artist as facilitator, communicator, and network-creator. I argue that this new paradigm of the artist was an unwitting precursor to the neoliberal model of the flexible, network-driven worker and anticipated experiments in art and education that have emerged in the past decade.

***

Contextualizing the emergence of communication pedagogy within the culture of dissent that developed in the United States during the 1960s, my study combats prevailing scholarly biases regarding the ruptures of that decade. The widespread disaffection among young people that provoked these ruptures arose in response to racism, sexism, the wars in Vietnam and Cambodia, the draft, the expanding nuclear arsenal, conservative institutional structures, and the false rhetoric of consensus and prosperity that dominated Cold War discourse, among other issues. My concern is the clash between “technocracy,” a term that in the 1960s referred to the authoritarian, anonymous corporate bureaucracies that characterized postwar institutions in the West, and the “counterculture,” a liberal youth culture motivated by “radical discontent and innovation,” and a deep and abiding distrust of adult authority and prerogative. I focus on this

---

9 I call this the “artist-as-facilitator” paradigm.
10 I refer here to the neoliberal worker as defined by Boltanski and Chiapello in The New Spirit of Capitalism. According to Boltanski and Chiapello, the neoliberal laborer is a collaborative worker who moves from team-based project to team-based project, building a network of connections. Within this labor paradigm, leaders are selected because they have strong visions, networks, and facilitation skills. In contrast to the “expert managers” who dominated the postwar corporate system, these contemporary leaders have labels like “project head” or “team-coordinator.”
11 Theodore Roszak, The Making of a Counterculture: Reflections on the Technocratic Society and its Youthful Opposition, (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1969), xiii. Among my three case studies, Ant Farm alone identified as members of the counterculture; the Halprins and Kaprow belonged to an older generation of cultural radicals. However, the educational practices in all three cases align closely with the broad goals and activities of the countercultural movement. Most historians of this period distinguish the counterculture from the New Left, a youth-dominated political movement that sought direct democracy, the erosion of elite power in the United States, and a reformed national defense. This distinction highlights a supposed divergence in politics between the two movements: historians contrast the counterculture’s preoccupation with cultural transformation with the more direct political engagement of the New Left. I counter this binary by advocating a more nuanced understanding of the two movements.
clash as it played out around art and architecture pedagogy. Although countercultural strategies of resistance included standard political tactics, like protests and strikes, youth in the movement also searched for alternative modes of culture and politics. Counterculturalists explored untraditional lifestyles like collective living on agrarian communes, challenged proscriptions against premarital and interracial sex, engaged in consciousness expanding activities such as taking psychedelic drugs or practicing meditation, invented new music and new venues for the arts, and performed non-normative identities including homosexuality and the appropriation of Native American costuming. They also founded numerous alternative schools (often called “free schools”). Modeled after Progressive Era education reforms and the African American Freedom Schools founded by Civil Rights leaders, the alternative schools that emerged in the 1960s and early 1970s typically existed outside of the public school system, operated through grassroots organization, and utilized progressive pedagogical approaches.\(^\text{12}\)

I take issue with the dominant historical accounts of the counterculture, which uphold what art historians Elissa Auther and Adam Lerner describe as the “death-of-the-sixties narrative.”\(^\text{13}\) This narrative moves from the experimentation and optimism of the movement’s

---

formative years to the debauchery, disorder, and violence of the late 1960s and early 1970s, highlighting the supposed loss of morality and damaging breakdown of societal norms that resulted from the efflorescence of alternatives. Cultural historian Thomas Frank and others have reinforced this failure-centered narrative by arguing that, since the late 1970s, corporate America has co-opted countercultural production and rhetoric, incorporating it into contemporary consumer culture. A few recent studies have begun to frustrate this narrative by elucidating the productive social, political, and technological impact of countercultural efforts. Cultural historian Julie Stephens’s description of countercultural tactics as “anti-disciplinary protest,” which “rejected hierarchy and leadership, strategy and planning, bureaucratic organization and political parties,” serves as a useful model for understanding countercultural politics. Communication scholar Fred Turner’s excellent study of the connections between countercultural experiments in communication technology and contemporary cyberculture also provides an important model and source for my research. Like Turner, I argue that my protagonists actively influenced and shaped new paradigms, which are now widespread.

Experiential, interdisciplinary, and produced far from the New York-based art market, the artistic practices that occurred in and around the countercultural movement have been omitted from art historical discourse. The dominant art historical account of the 1960s traces a linear

---

16 Stephens, Anti-Disciplinary Protest, 4.
17 Turner, From Counterculture to Cyberculture.
progression through distinct movements—Neo-Dada, Pop, Fluxus, Minimalism, Post-Minimalism, Earth Art, Performance Art, Conceptual Art—and privileges New York as the artistic center. Much of this history focuses on the relationship between artists and the art market.

The art produced in 1960s California has been seen as peripheral and superficial—too far removed from the New York-centered art market and the intellectually rigorous concerns of its artists to be taken seriously. The bulk of the research that does focus on the art of California during this period seeks to construct a parallel history, highlighting local movements that compare to those in New York. These histories typically exclude the experimental education initiatives, psychedelic environments, alternative living spaces, protest art, and other artistic forms of countercultural production because they have no relationship to the art market or New York-based artistic movements. When art historians do address the artistic production of the counterculture, they often treat it as cultural context for mainstream artistic movements, rather than as subjects for art historical analysis.

My dissertation offers a necessary corrective to this omission by placing the creative work of the countercultural in dialogue with more canonical artistic practices. My research builds on several recent exhibitions, including the Getty Research Institute’s 2011-2012 research initiative, *Pacific Standard Time: Art in L.A. 1945–1980*, which

---


substantially expanded the existing histories of art in postwar Southern California. In addition, West of Center: Art and the Countercultural Experiment in America, 1965-1977 (Museum of Contemporary Art Denver, 2012) and Hippie Modernism: The Struggle for Utopia (Walker Art Center, 2015) provided rich overviews of countercultural artistic production.

Some communication-based practices have also been included in the discourse around “dematerialized” artistic practice in the late 1960s. Argentine critic Oscar Masotta first coined the term “dematerialization” in 1967 to describe the dispersion of objects and information into systems of mediation, especially mass media. Lucy Lippard, a writer and curator based in New York, later employed the term to delineate artistic practices that prioritized immaterial ideas and proposals over objects as a means to circumvent the art market. These practices included instruction pieces, which could, but did not have to be carried out; art published in magazines or other forms of circulatable media; and works that utilized communication technologies. However, critics began to denounce the strategy for its failed politics as early as 1973, when Lippard herself admitted that dematerialized art’s aim to escape the system was utopian at best. In 1990, art historian Benjamin Buchloh argued that rather than promoting economic or social change most dematerialized practices ultimately adopted an “aesthetic of administration”

---

22 The practices of the Halprins, Ant Farm, and Allan Kaprow do not fit neatly into any one official art historical discourse; however, the artistic practices of Ant Farm and Allan Kaprow have been linked to the narrative of dematerialization. Indeed, communication pedagogy’s embrace of communication technology, cybernetic ideals, and rejection of finished artistic products parallel the interests of many of this movement’s protagonists.


that aligned with the logic of late capitalism. Architectural historians and critics assign similar interpretations to countercultural building practices, bemoaning their appropriation by consumer culture or their formalization within the postmodern architecture movement. Although many of the protagonists of the latter engaged in a critique of corporate high modernism in the late 1960s and early 1970s, by the early 1980s, postmodern architects focused on form and style over politics. By contrast, I restore artists’ and designers’ agency by arguing that the dematerialized practices of communication pedagogy anticipated new models of artistic labor.

The prevailing account of art education in the United States depicts the changes wrought during the 1960s in similarly mournful terms. Art historian Thierry de Duve frames this history as a progression of three major paradigms: Academic, Bauhaus, and Conceptual. Originated in the royal academies of seventeenth- and eighteenth-century Europe, the academic model cultivated medium-specific skills and techniques through a curriculum based on imitation. Rather than invent new approaches or genres, academic students strove to produce naturalistic representations of canonical subjects. The Bauhaus model, which derived from the German interwar art school (1919-1933), fostered the questioning and exploration of artistic media, and rewarded invention and experimentation. In contrast to the academic model, those who follow this paradigm rejected the traditions of the Western European artistic canon in pursuit of modern

---


formal vocabularies. The Conceptual paradigm rose to prominence in several art schools across the United States beginning in the late 1960s. It taught students to demonstrate critical positions informed by theory, to define their work as a general “practice” rather than as an investigation into a specific medium or tradition, and to deconstruct art history. De Duve denounces the conceptual model as a sterile and faithless negation of art.  

This narrative omits communication pedagogy and other forms of educational experimentation that focus on experiential activities and interdisciplinary collaboration and exchange. In doing so, this account (mis)aligns pedagogical developments from the late 1960s with the increasingly bureaucratized academic system that followed. I challenge this view by looking at the ways that the experimental teaching and learning practices of the period operated in opposition to that system.

Like the aforementioned narratives of the 1960s, this understanding of Conceptual art education describes artists, architects, and other counterculturalists as inevitably (and helplessly) co-opted by technocracy. I oppose these narratives by emphasizing artists' agency in actively shaping new paradigms through pedagogy, which I view as a praxis capable of forming new models of artistic labor. In doing so, I propose a new reading of the artistic practices of the late 1960s and early 1970s in which communication serves as a central strategy for both dematerialized and countercultural practices. By drawing this parallel between dematerialized and countercultural practices, this reading aims to redress the omission of the latter in art historical discourse.

In focusing on artists' teaching practices, I also counter an art historical tendency to deemphasize education. When art historians do address artistic training, they privilege finished works created by well-known teachers and students. Instead, I use pedagogical documents like

---

30 De Duve, “When Form Has Become Attitude – And Beyond,” 33.
31 This system is discussed in chapter four.
course proposals and workshop scores as my primary archive. I break with the object-oriented art historical methods that dominate these histories by taking an interdisciplinary approach that draws upon communication, education, and cultural studies. In doing so, I hope to present a potential model for future histories of art pedagogy. My research also provides a prehistory for the so-called contemporary “pedagogical turn,” highlighting previous critiques of educational institutions. In bringing the work of my protagonists into dialogue with contemporary artist-driven attempts to counter the neoliberalized higher education system, I ask what contemporary artists and educators can learn from the communication pedagogy initiatives of the 1960s and 1970s.

In developing this history, I draw upon a spate of recent exhibitions and publications that elucidate aspects of experimental education in California specifically and in the counterculture more broadly. Several of the exhibitions in *Pacific Standard Time: Art in L.A. 1945–1980* highlighted artistic practices in and around institutions of higher education, demonstrating these institutions’ role as centers for experimentation in an area with a diffuse art scene. Both *West of Center: Art and the Countercultural Experiment in America, 1965–1977* and *Hippie Modernism: The Struggle for Utopia* also featured a handful of alternative learning initiatives and educational projects. However, the aforementioned exhibitions present the art objects that resulted from the educational experiences, neglecting the specifics of the pedagogy and the

---


34 The former included the Halprins’ workshops, Pond Farm (1952–1980), Paolo Soleri’s *Arcosanti* (founded in 1970), the Naropa Institute (founded in 1974), and Bonnie Sherk’s *The Farm* (1974–1987). The latter included Ant Farm’s *Truckstop Network*, several experimental initiatives at CalArts (in the early 1970s), and Ken Isaac’s educational environments (c. 1962).
dematerialized communication that it engendered. Similarly, the bulk of the literature on the Halprins, Ant Farm, and Kaprow, frames pedagogy as a minor detail within the subject's career, subordinate to actual artworks.35

In focusing my research and analysis on pedagogy, I am contributing to a recent outpouring of art historical literature on teaching practices at the Bauhaus, Black Mountain College, and other institutions and alternative educational sites.36 Especially relevant to my research are Géraldine Gourbe and Janet Sarbanes's analyses of art pedagogy in Southern California.37 Pedagogy is also a central focus in much of the discourse surrounding the current

---


Sarbanes, “Radical Arts Pedagogy from Greek Philosophy to Los Angeles,” in *In the Canyon, Revise the Canon*, ed. Géraldine Gourbe (Annecy, France; Lescheraines, France: ESAAA Editions; Shelter Press, 2015), 37–50.
pedagogical turn, which serves as an important model for my research in its suggestion that critical, experimental, and collaborative approaches to education can counteract the contemporary “corporatized” academy. The emerging literature on digital learning initiatives, which aligns education with digital tools and modes of inquiry inspired by the Internet, also represents a useful theoretical model for thinking through how communication technologies can inform education: its proponents view the Internet as a vehicle and model for horizontal exchange, student-driven learning, and open public access.

This dissertation assumes that teaching and learning methods can serve as strategies for social change, or, conversely, as tools for reinforcing hegemonic structures. In keeping with the literature on the pedagogical turn, I treat pedagogy as an artistic practice, rather than as secondary to works of art. The educational methods that my protagonists employed therefore serve as the central objects of my analysis. The project of reconstructing and analyzing communication pedagogy thus depends primarily on archival research: proposals, curriculum plans, course materials, documentation, written reflections, and correspondence that make up the bulk of my source material. I employ an interdisciplinary method to analyze these materials, combining curriculum analysis drawn from education studies with art historical approaches to analyzing dematerialized processes and actions, the latter of which often trace both production


40 In addition to the writing of Paulo Freire, which I discuss below, this understanding of pedagogy draws from Henry Giroux, bell hooks, Ivan Illich, and Ira Shor.
and circulation through documentation, artists’ writings, and other archival materials.  

In theorizing these pedagogical approaches, I follow the interests of my protagonists, drawing upon contemporaneous media and systems theory by Marshall McLuhan, Norbert Wiener, Gregory Bateson, and others, as well as the student-centered pedagogies of John Dewey, Ivan Illich, and Alexander Sutherland Neill. I also draw upon Brazilian critical pedagogue Paulo Freire’s critique of the “banking” approach to education—in which teachers reinforce oppressive social and political structures by transferring hegemonic knowledge to passive students—in my discussion of the politics of communication pedagogy. The theories of Freire (and Illich) highlights a central tension between my protagonists’ theory and practice. Although the Halprins, Ant Farm, and Kaprow sought horizontal alternatives to the banking approach, they and their participants were primarily white, privileged members of the middle class. By contrast, critical pedagogues advocate an education that empowers the poor and disenfranchised. This disjunction points to larger economic and racial inequities perpetuated by arts institutions in the United States in the 1960s and 1970s. 

---

41 Following education studies, I analyze curriculum by assessing whether plans, process, outcomes, and feedback implemented successfully stated goals. My art historical models include Alberro, Conceptual Art and the Politics of Publicity; and Felicity D. Scott, Living Archive 7: Ant Farm (Barcelona/New York: Actar, 2008).  


43 Freire’s Pedagogy of the Oppressed (1968) was translated into English in 1970. However, the Halprins, Ant Farm, and Kaprow were not aware of his writing. In discussing the political potential of communication pedagogy, I also draw upon contemporary philosopher Jacques Rancière, The Ignorant Schoolmaster: Five Lessons in Intellectual Emancipation, trans. Kristin Ross (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1991).  

44 Although many artists and collectives worked to expose and counter the structural elitism and racism of
theorists’ privileging of process over content also contributed to their confusion of politics—many of the protagonists of communication pedagogy initially believed that regardless of content, dehierarchized learning systems would automatically engender social equality. To theorize the shift towards a flexible, network-driven model of labor, I use David Harvey’s *A Brief History of Neoliberalism* (2007) and Luc Boltanski and Eve Chiapello’s *The New Spirit of Capitalism* (2005). Boltanski and Chiapello’s assertion that the neoliberal labor model resulted from the capitalist system’s accommodation of the critiques issued during the 1960s and early 1970s informs my understanding of the relationship between the two periods. My discussion of the subject of neoliberal education is indebted to Wendy Brown’s *Undoing the Demos: Neoliberalism's Stealth Revolution* (2015).

***

The historical trajectory of communication pedagogy sets the temporal scope of this study: the Halprins conducted the first *Experiments in Environment* workshop in 1966 and Kaprow left CalArts in 1974. During this period, the network of communication pedagogy practitioners was large, complex, and diffuse, spreading far beyond the confines of coastal California. This region represents the focus of my study, however, because of its particular combination of economic growth, higher education industry expansion, and countercultural enclaves, which gave rise to a high concentration of interconnected communication pedagogy initiatives. In privileging three case studies, I have omitted myriad other experimental initiatives, the art world during this period, most focused on gaining representation in galleries and museums and rather than on questions of pedagogy. In California, these politically-radical artists and collectives include ASCO, a Chicano performance art group working in Los Angeles between 1972 and 1987, Samella Lewis, who cofounded *Black Art: An International Quarterly* in 1976, and Noah Purifoy, an African American artist who organized *66 Signs of Neon* in Los Angeles in 1966, an exhibition that featured assemblages inspired by and composed of physical remnants of the Watts rebellion.
such as the slide exchange project created by the Los Angeles-based research collective Environmental Communications (founded in 1969); the community video workshops offered at the Media Access Center at the Portola Institute in Menlo Park (founded in 1966); and Bonnie Sherk’s *The Farm*, an urban farm community and school in San Francisco (1974–1987).\(^45\)

Outside of California, one could look to David Askevold’s Projects Class at Nova Scotia College of Art and Design (1969-1972), in which students completed instructions mailed to them by internationally-based artists; Hans Breder’s Intermedia program at the University of Iowa (established in 1968), an interdisciplinary studio art program known for early experimentation with video; and Joseph Beuys’s Free International University (established in 1973), an extra-institutional school initially run out of the artist’s studio in Düsseldorf—alongside many other international projects that align with aspects of communication pedagogy.

I have selected *Experiments in Environments*, Ant Farm’s pedagogical projects, and Kaprow’s teaching at CalArts over the myriad other initiatives because these three cases best illustrate the arc and aims of communication pedagogy. Each case is representative of one of the three major forms that communication pedagogy initiatives took: the workshop, the network, and the institution. Focusing on the teachings of a dancer and a landscape architect, a collective comprised primarily of architects and video artists, and a visual artist who originally trained as a painter, these cases also highlight the diverse disciplinary backgrounds of the protagonists of communication pedagogy.\(^46\)

Furthermore, the interrelations between my protagonists epitomize

\(^{45}\) Others include the School of Design at CalArts (1970-1972), whose projects included a design-your-own dorm furniture kit; and Southern California Institute of Architecture, an experimental architecture school founded in 1972, by teachers and students seeking an alternative to the program at California State Polytechnic University.

\(^{46}\) The substantial archival record available for each of these cases also determined my selections. Anna Halprin’s archive is located at the Museum of Performance and Design, San Francisco; Lawrence Halprin’s is at The Architectural Archives of the University of Pennsylvania; Ant Farm’s is located at Berkeley Art Museum; and Allan Kaprow’s is at the Getty Research Institute.
the rhizomatic connections characteristic of this approach to teaching and learning.\textsuperscript{47}

The rise of California as a center for educational experimentation in the postwar period represents the focus of Chapter 1, “Golden State.” I provide three interrelated contexts for this development: the growth of higher education in California during this period, the student dissent that arose in the 1960s against this “knowledge industry,” and the countercultural quest for alternative forms of learning that resulted in myriad initiatives across coastal California in the late 1960s and early 1970s. I argue that this countercultural push for alternatives, in conjunction with the developments in higher education in the state, created a fertile environment for the emergence of communication pedagogy.

Chapter 2, “Taking Part,” charts the beginnings of communication pedagogy through an analysis of Anna and Lawrence Halprin’s *Experiments in Environments* workshop in 1966 and 1968. Designed to transmit the couple’s shared – and, at the time, novel – interest in cross-disciplinary exchange, the workshops combined dance, environmental design, and Gestalt psychology into a scored set of group activities. By prioritizing interdisciplinary collaboration and experiential processes over pre-determined outcomes and finished products, the Halprins embraced new modes of teaching that influenced many of the subsequent educational experiments. Following John Dewey, John Cage, and recent systems theory, they viewed themselves as facilitators of creative processes, rather than as authoritarian experts. I argue that this teaching style established a model of the artist as facilitator of learning, rather than as producer of finished artistic products.

Ant Farm co-founder Chip Lord participated in the Halprins’ workshop and his collective adopted many of the Halprins’ pedagogical methods in the manifold proposals, workshops, and

\textsuperscript{47} Future Ant Farm members Chip Lord and Curtis Schreier participated in the Halprin workshop in 1968; Ant Farm led a workshop at CalArts in 1971; Allan Kaprow and Anna Halprin were correspondents.
other educational projects that Ant Farm undertook between 1968 and 1971.\textsuperscript{48} Ant Farm strove to bring these methods into their teaching at universities, but encountered resistance. Ultimately rejecting institutional education, the collective translated these teaching and learning strategies into proposals for extra-institutional learning networks. Their proposals are representative of the growing interest of countercultural educators in systems of horizontal exchange. Tracing this history in Chapter 3, “Access to Tools,” I argue that Ant Farm’s proposals for pedagogical networks present a student-driven alternative to the standardized, linear learning that occurs within most art and architecture schools, and anticipate the rhizomatic forms of exchange and collaboration that characterize contemporary digital communication.

Chapter 4, “Un-Artists,” traces the fate of communication pedagogy within institutions of higher education using Allan Kaprow’s experience teaching at the recently established CalArts as its case study. When it opened in 1969, CalArts embraced total pedagogical freedom. This openness motivated Kaprow to collapse his artistic and teaching practices: he structured his Happenings course around collaborative, score-based events that were indistinguishable from his art. As the school matured, however, tightening finances and a growing rift between faculty and conservative trustees led to increasing constraints on experimental teaching. When Kaprow left the school in 1974, the administration had begun to enforce a much more codified curriculum. Similar restrictions on pedagogical experimentation occurred at educational institutions across the United States in the first half of the 1970s.\textsuperscript{49} I argue that these restrictions prevented the continued efflorescence of communication pedagogy and its long-term effect upon art education within colleges and universities.

\textsuperscript{48} In 1971, Ant Farm turned away from education as a central focus, as will be discussed in chapter three.
\textsuperscript{49} Examples include the end of the Department of Design at Southern Illinois University in Carbondale’s experimental design program (1955–1970); the dissolution of “The Farm,” an experimental anthropological research project at University of California, Irvine (1966–1972); and termination of the student-run Experimental College at San Francisco State College (1965–1970).
The conclusion provides an overview of the dissertation and connects communication pedagogy to contemporary labor and education. Analyzing the current surge of experimental education initiatives, I posit that communication pedagogy practices represent a potent alternative to today's neoliberal higher education system, in which market-driven policies increasingly shape teaching and learning.
Chapter 1

Golden State: Higher Education, Dissent, and Alternatives in Postwar California

*Fat City School of Finds Art (FCSFA)*, located in Hollywood, California, conferred over 50,000 “Masters of Finds Art” (MFA) and “Doctors of Dada” (PhD) degrees between 1969 and 1975. The diplomas were issued without charge to anyone who sent a mail order request, regardless of educational background. The conceptual artist Lowell Darling, who founded the unaccredited school under the pseudonym Dudley Finds, ran the institution from his apartment. Darling, best known today for entering the 1978 and 2010 California gubernatorial elections, moved to Los Angeles after receiving an MFA from Southern Illinois University in the late 1960s.¹ He claims to have invented FCSFA after stumbling upon a large convention of college art departments in a hotel lobby. When an attendant asked which college he represented, he said the first thing that came to mind: “Fat City!”²

FCSFA functioned like many other conceptual mail art projects of the time, adopting an “aesthetic of administration” and uniting a loose network of emerging artists across the United States.³ Darling’s project also criticized the very institutions that it mimicked, albeit with the deadpan humor that is particular to Los Angeles-based conceptualism. In issuing tens of thousands of diplomas, FCSFA imitated the proliferation of real MFA degrees in the late 1960s and early 1970s. However, in issuing the diplomas without requiring tuition or prior training, the

---

FCSFA inverted the increasing professionalization and skyrocketing admissions of art schools and departments. As a resident of Los Angeles, Darling witnessed these changes firsthand: California expanded its public system of colleges and universities in the postwar period, becoming a center for growth and innovation in higher education. Complex administrative structures, which enforced codification and specialization within disciplines, regulated the new state system. Darling’s project is one of many responses to these changes. In the late 1960s and early 1970s, myriad parodies, critiques, alternative initiatives, and experimental pedagogies emerged across coastal California. Communication pedagogy—an approach to teaching and learning that cultivated communication, facilitation, and interdisciplinary collaboration through facilitative teaching, workshops, networks, scores, and communication technologies—developed as part of this outpouring of educational innovation.

This chapter provides context for the efflorescence of pedagogical experimentation in California during the postwar period. The first section analyzes the transformation of higher education after World War II through the rapid development of California’s public system of colleges and universities, and traces the effects of this transformation on art and architecture education. The rise of student dissent against these developments is the focus of the second section. The third turns to the spate of educational experimentation in California in the latter half of the 1960s, highlighting countercultural initiatives. I argue that the countercultural cultivation of alternative forms of cultural activity and exchange, in conjunction with the state’s booming higher education industry and the student dissent that it galvanized, made California a fertile environment for the emergence of communication pedagogy.

In using the term “experimental,” I am following contemporaneous accounts that ascribe the term to the outpouring of non-traditional teaching and learning practices during this period.
I. The Multiversity

In a 1963 lecture, Clark Kerr, President of the University of California (UC) system, characterized the transformation of higher education in the modern era as progressing from “a single community ... of masters and students” to “a whole series of communities and activities held together by a common name, a common governing board, and related purposes.” Kerr described the transition from an isolated academic community to what he termed the “multiversity” as an inevitable historical development that paralleled that of village to city. Like the city, the multiversity is influenced by, rather than isolated from, the outside world, and it depends on a formalized administration to regulate and manage its many operations. Kerr also posited that the multiversity functions as a “knowledge industry” that can serve as a boon for the national economy.

Although oversimplified, Kerr’s notion of the multiversity captured the scale of expansion within the higher education system during the three decades that followed World War II. Between 1940 and 1970, student enrollment in colleges and universities rose from just under 1.5 million to over 7.9 million. Campuses grew rapidly in scale, as did the administrative processes and structures required to make them run. In addition, federal policy-makers established a new rhetoric of “mass access” to colleges and universities, and academic 

---

5 Clark Kerr, *The Uses of the University* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1963), 1. In the first chapter, Kerr illustrates the historic development of ideal higher education institution types by analyzing University of Dublin founder Cardinal Newman’s concept of the Academic Cloister and American educator Abraham Flexner’s notion of the university as research organism.
6 Kerr, *The Uses of the University*, 41.
7 Ibid., 88.
research in the sciences became a crucial arm of national defense. These changes were especially prevalent in California, where the booming military-industrial and service economies spurred the expansion of the state’s public higher education system, similar growth for private colleges and universities, and the advancement of federally funded scientific research centers in both private and public higher education sectors. In California and elsewhere across the U.S., the multiversity functioned increasingly as part of what President Dwight D. Eisenhower termed “the military-industrial complex.” Although Eisenhower intended to caution the public against this alliance between public policy and military and defense industries, universities jostled to reap the benefits of military-industrial funding. As a result of these changes, the multiversity embraced a technocratic pedagogy, which fostered codified curricula and specialized academic fields, including in art and architecture.

The Knowledge Industry

The rapid expansion of California’s military-industrial and service economies in the mid-twentieth century led to the transformation of public higher education in the state. Historian Roger Lotchin has demonstrated that California city officials lay the groundwork for this economic boom during and after World War I, when they forged mutually beneficial alliances with the U.S. military. These alliances resulted in the establishment of bases, training centers, air stations, and contracts with defense industries. In doing so, they effectively transformed the state’s economy from one rooted in agriculture, mining, and timber, to one centered around the military-industrial complex. During World War II, demands for new aerospace and electronics

---

9 Eisenhower coined this term in his farewell address in 1961.
industries, shipbuilding, and food processing plants intensified—between 1941 and 1945, California took in over $70 billion in federal funding.\textsuperscript{11} This wartime boom created hundreds of thousands of jobs, which in turn triggered migration and immigration on an unprecedented scale. Historian Marilyn S. Johnson describes the movement of migrants to the Pacific Coast in search of military or civilian jobs during and in the aftermath of the war as “one of the most powerful forces in the spatial rearrangement of the population in the twentieth century.”\textsuperscript{12} This movement resulted in a population upsurge and dramatically increased racial and cultural diversity in West Coast towns and cities.\textsuperscript{13} In response to the rapidly growing cities, public and private planners undertook substantial urban and suburban expansion projects, converting much of the land of coastal Northern and Southern California into freeways and suburbs.\textsuperscript{14} While this transformed large areas of the state into what one detractor described as “unsightly scab[s] of congested tracts and slurb-lined freeway,” it also created abundant jobs, thereby perpetuating economic growth.\textsuperscript{15}

This economic boom had an immediate effect on higher education: by 1947, the state had the highest per capita expenditure on students in the nation.\textsuperscript{16} However, the influx of students and funds exacerbated intrastate rivalries between the complex system of public

\textsuperscript{11} Gerald D. Nash, \textit{The American West Transformed: the Impact of the Second World War} (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1985), 25–26. Aircraft plants, which stretched from San Diego to Santa Monica, employed over 200,000 workers during the peak of production in 1943. The northern part of the state served as a major shipbuilding hub, with large-scale shipyards in Richmond, Vallejo, Sausalito, Alameda, and South San Francisco. The military also bolstered preexisting air and naval bases, supply depots, and training camps.


\textsuperscript{14} See Greg Hise, \textit{Magnetic Los Angeles: Planning the Twentieth-Century Metropolis} (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1997).


\textsuperscript{16} Thelin, \textit{A History of American Higher Education}, 278.
universities, state colleges, and junior campuses. Over the course of the 1950s, several committees worked to negotiate a governance structure that would coordinate the three sectors. A long negotiation process resulted in the Master Plan of 1960, which consolidated the system and divided labor and mission among the three sectors. The resulting multi-campus statewide system set a model that Texas, North Carolina, Georgia and other states soon followed. Clark Kerr played a central role in establishing this plan. Appointed Associate Professor of Industrial Relations at UC Berkeley in 1945, Kerr rose to chancellorship in 1952, and became president of the entire UC system in 1959. The changes implemented under his leadership inspired the concept of the multiversity that he articulated in 1963.

By 1965, the UC system contained nine degree-granting university campuses, including new campuses at Irvine, Santa Cruz, and San Diego, as well nineteen state colleges, and over one hundred junior colleges. In addition, private college and universities including Stanford University, California Institute of Technology, Claremont Graduate School, and Pomona College experienced substantial growth during this period. Many universities cultivated high tech science research centers, which frequently operated in conjunction with national defense industries. The Jet Propulsion Laboratory at the California Institute of Technology, for example, became one of the chief centers for rocket research in the nation. UC San Diego constructed a

---

17 The plan divided labor and mission so that the university campuses, which could draw undergraduates from the top 10 percent of high school graduates, were the sole conferrers of doctoral degrees. State colleges could confer master’s degrees and draw undergraduate students from the top third of high school classes. The community college system would serve as an entry point for all other undergraduate students. The plan also articulated a system of credits transfer between educational sectors. John Aubrey Douglass, The California Idea and American Higher Education: 1850 to the 1960 Master Plan (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2000), 279–97.

18 Thelin, A History of American Higher Education, 289–90. The State University of New York (SUNY) system represents another, similar model for statewide education networks. CUNY, formed in 1961, was independent of the state system until a 1975 financial crisis.

19 Ibid., 288.

new laboratory focused on improving submarine detection, which was funded by the National Academy of Sciences.\textsuperscript{21} UC Berkeley's laboratory infrastructure for applied sciences—which centered around what was then called the Berkeley Radiation Laboratory—also served many large-scale federally funded projects in physics and biology, including atomic energy research that contributed to the development of nuclear weapons.\textsuperscript{22}

The transformation of higher education in California exemplified changes occurring across the United States. The Servicemen's Readjustment Act, more commonly known as the GI Bill, catalyzed many of these shifts. Signed into law in 1944, the bill encouraged veterans to enroll in higher education institutions by guaranteeing them partial or full tuition, student fees, and book costs. Congress initiated the bill as a measure to postpone returning GIs from flooding the labor market before factories had time to retool. However, it had the unintentional effect of fostering mass matriculation into postsecondary education: by 1950, more than two million veterans had enrolled in colleges and universities.\textsuperscript{23} The bill also enabled many members of the working class and racial, ethnic, and religious minorities to enroll in colleges and universities for the first time. As described by American studies scholar Christopher Newfield, this dramatic broadening of access to higher education forwarded the belief that every American could enter the "middle class." Newfield posits that access to higher education symbolized access to "interesting work, economic security, and the ability to lead satisfying and insightful lives in which personal and collective social development advanced side by side" for the majority of Americans.\textsuperscript{24} This ideal belied the fact the majority of the GI's were male, reversing some of the

\textsuperscript{21} Nash, \textit{The American West Transformed}, 154–55.
\textsuperscript{22} The Berkeley Radiation Laboratory (Rad Lab) is now called the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory. Its contributions to atomic energy research included experiments with linear particle accelerators. Thelin, \textit{A History of American Higher Education}, 273.
\textsuperscript{23} Ibid., 263.
\textsuperscript{24} Christopher Newfield, \textit{Unmaking the Public University: The Forty-Year Assault on the Middle Class}
gains won by the women who had entered colleges and universities during wartime. And, while the bill did help to increase the enrollment of racial, working class ethnic, and religious minorities, it did nothing to combat college discrimination policies. However, as remarked by Newfield, the opening of access to higher education and the “vision of publicly funded social development” that it endorsed, did engender a “mass middle class” broader than in any other period of U.S. history.

The GI Bill also reshaped many aspects of academic culture. In order to be eligible for GI Bill funds, colleges had to be accredited through regional associations. This increased the codification of academic policies and standardization across regions. Colleges also competed to attract GIs through lavish recruitment campaigns and programs aimed at welcoming veterans. The dramatic increase to the application pool also required a faster and more formalized admissions process and new modes for tracking students within schools. The former demand resulted in the nearly universal adoption of standardized testing as a central component to the selection process. The College Entrance Examination Board’s Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) dominated the booming testing industry, serving as a giant “sorting machine” that quantitatively measured students’ verbal and mathematical skills. The SAT test not only helped to sort students according to a single national standard, but also shifted the admissions process from one based on wealth and connections to one based on merit. In creating a meritocracy, the test disestablished quotas that discriminated against ethnic and religious minorities at elite institutions.


25 According to Thelin, women’s enrollment in undergraduate programs dropped from 40% in 1939-1940 to 32% in 1950; women’s enrollment in professional fields also declined in the 1950s. Ibid., 267.

26 Thelin, A History of American Higher Education, 267. The bill did not require colleges to change racial and ethnic discrimination policies in order to be eligible for participation.

27 Newfield, Unmaking the Public University, 4.


institutions. Large universities, such as University of Iowa and UC schools also employed mechanized processes—such as an IBM punch card system for managing student registration—to track and sort students within schools. In contrast to previous manual registration systems, the IBM punch cards converted students and their course choices into data, which computers could then process and store. In addition, GI's preference for professional fields like business and engineering resulted in an increasing prioritization of those fields within the academy. At the same time, their motivation to complete their degrees quickly and enter the workforce catalyzed a push for more streamlined programs and requirements.

Colleges and universities mandated extensive expansion and construction projects in order to accommodate the rapid growth in student population. Academic halls, laboratories, dormitories, and other specific-use buildings were rapidly erected at schools across the U.S. Many campuses installed prefabricated corrugated-aluminum Quonset huts—most of which had originally served as military structures during the war—to supplement existing housing, classrooms, and research spaces. University administrators also commissioned buildings by major architects—such as Ludwig Mies van der Rohe’s Illinois Institute of Technology (IIT) campus, completed in 1955, and Louis Kahn's Richards Medical Research Laboratories at Penn, completed in 1960—as symbols of institutional prosperity and modernity.


expansion initiatives, including IIT, required colleges and universities to acquire and redevelop property in surrounding neighborhoods. In order to construct IIT, institute officials successfully campaigned to demolish the Mecca—a historic apartment complex then inhabited by African American tenants—on the grounds that the building was a “slum tenement.” An amendment to the National Housing Act of 1959 bolstered this type of campaign, offering federal funding for universities, cities, and corporations to partner on urban renewal programs that cleared and redeveloped previously inhabited “slum” areas.

The unexpected success of the GI Bill also pushed higher education onto the agendas of federal and state policy-makers. Mass access to higher education became an important issue for the Truman administration, which recognized the integral role that higher education could play in the nation’s defense and in its social and economic health. In July 1946, President Truman established a Commission on Higher Education, marking the first time that a president deliberately directed federal inquiry towards national higher educational issues. The resulting Truman Commission Report provided a blueprint for the federal government to create financial aid policies, plans for capital investment, and tax policies that would fund the long-term growth of postsecondary education. Although the federal government did not immediately enact these policies, state governments, private foundations, and individual colleges adopted many of them in the late 1940s and early 1950s. The report also provided an important framework for


36 Ockman and Sachs, “Modernism Takes Command,” 143f67. This policy of expansion led to major student protests at Columbia University in 1968 (discussed in the following section).

37 Prior to this period, the federal government had not substantially intervened into higher education since the Morrill Acts (1862, 1890), which financed the establishment of “land-grant” colleges and universities. See Thelin, A History of American Higher Education, 74–79.
legislation passed during the John F. Kennedy and Lyndon B. Johnson presidencies. These policies intervened into realms that had previously been under state jurisdiction and private control. They established a precedent for federally-regulated education that continues to play out today and made education policy a battleground for partisan debate.

Spurred by Cold War tensions, the federal government also intervened in scientific research during the postwar period. In accordance with *Science, the Endless Frontier*, a 1945 report by Vannevar Bush, the Head of the Federal Office of Scientific Research and Development, the federal government developed policies that would extend substantial support to “Big Science” research undertaken by university science departments. The resulting system of competitive research grants—still in place today—entails that university scientists submit proposals to a panel of peer-reviewers. Many of the funded programs—MIT’s Research Laboratory of Electronics and Caltech’s Jet Propulsion Laboratory, for example—fed directly into the Department of Defense and other federal agencies related to the military. The injection of federal money into science departments created an unprecedented collusion between universities and the military-industrial complex. The role of faculty within the applied sciences

---


40 For a discussion of the Cold War’s effect on the political discourse surrounding elementary and secondary public education, see Andrew Hartman, *Education and the Cold War: The Battle for the American School* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2008). Amy F. Ogata has shown how Cold War anxieties around the protection of freedom and democracy in the United States led to an embrace of individuality and innate creativity, which was reflected in the design of spaces and goods geared towards children. Amy F. Ogata, *Designing the Creative Child: Playthings and Places in Midcentury America* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2013).

41 “Big Science” refers to the large-scale scientific research projects that are typically undergone for governmental use. The nuclear physicist Alvin Martin Weinberg popularized the term in response to Dwight D. Eisenhower’s concept of the “military-industrial complex.”
became increasingly administrative, focused on grant applications and managing research projects rather than teaching.\textsuperscript{42} Other fields soon adopted the peer reviewed, federally funded grant structure utilized by organizations like the National Science Foundation, established in 1950.\textsuperscript{43} The resulting discipline-specific grant systems heightened divisions between academic fields, reduced interdisciplinary collaboration and discourse, and touted science as a model for the social sciences and humanities, despite the limitations of its applications to those fields.\textsuperscript{44}

McCarthyism and the anti-communist investigations held by the FBI and the House Un-American Activities Committee (HUAC)—many of which specifically targeted academic communities—also influenced academic research and discourse in the postwar period. Rather than protect allegedly left-wing faculty members, many academic administrations fired the faculty and graduate students who were brought before congressional and state investigating committees.\textsuperscript{45} In addition, public universities required faculty to sign loyalty oaths and abolished texts that represented “threats to the free world” from their libraries.\textsuperscript{46} These anti-communist measures drove leftist scholars away from Marxist theory; led liberal economists to focus on growth and consumption, rather than questions of reform or wealth distribution; and influenced social scientists to limit their inquiry to questions that could be answered with empirical analysis.\textsuperscript{47} Historian Godfrey Hodgson popularized the term “liberal consensus” to describe these academic trends:

\textsuperscript{43} National Endowments for the Arts and Humanities were established in the mid-1960s.
\textsuperscript{46} Victor S. Navasky, \textit{Naming Names} (New York: Viking Press, 1980), 335. Navasky’s examples of purged texts include books by the novelist Howard Fast and texts that depicted city slums.
\textsuperscript{47} Bender, “Politics, Intellect and the American University,” 29–32.
The intellectuals tended to be influential only in proportion as their ideas fitted in with the needs, fears, or preconceptions of their new patrons. They tended to be forced into the role of technicians. The “hot” topics of specialization were those most immediately related to the government’s most urgent perplexity, or at best to the tactics of its political opponents…Alternatives were not what the government wanted. It wanted solutions. It expected to get them from men who displayed a maximum of technical ingenuity with a minimum of dissent.48

This notion of “consensus” was predicated on an understanding of democracy as an empirical process rooted in experimentation, which the U.S. had purportedly perfected. It assumed that the success of American capitalism had all but eradicated class inequality and limited political conflict.49 This ideology masked profound flaws within the U.S. system, not least the racial inequities that would soon erupt into the civil rights movement and influence widespread student dissent (discussed in the second part of this chapter).

Art and Architecture in the Multiversity

Within the multiversity, training in art and architecture became more standardized and professionalized. The accreditation requirement for GI Bill funding eligibility affected art departments and, especially, unaccredited independent art schools that wanted to attract GIs. In order to create separate accreditation channels from those utilized by colleges and universities, schools formed arts-specific organizations, like the National Association of Schools of Design. These organizations required art programs to formalize their admissions processes, curriculum requirements, and degree granting structures, resulting in an increasing professionalism in arts

48 Godfrey Hodgson, America In Our Time, (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1976), 97. For Hodgson’s list of the key maxims that comprised this consensus see Ibid., 76. This shift has also often been described as “the end of ideology,” following Daniel Bell’s book of the same name.
Most art departments and schools adhered to discipline-specific curricula and, although vestiges of traditional academic training remained, embraced teaching practices derived from European modernism. In the majority of programs, students took an introductory “Basics” or “Foundations” course during their first year of study and then entered into a specialized artistic discipline. The Bauhaus preliminary course served as the model for these first year courses. Initiated by painter Johannes Itten in 1920 at the Weimar Bauhaus, the preliminary course introduced fundamental issues of color, form, and materials to all students who entered the school. Itten structured the course around a series of abstract exercises in which students explored these principles using basic geometric forms and a range of materials. This prepared students for collaborative experimentation and projects in which they applied artistic principles to industrial design. The Bauhauslers who emigrated from Germany in the years leading up to World War II imported the concept of the preliminary course to the United States. However, while many members of the former Bauhaus found teaching positions at U.S. colleges and universities, the interdisciplinary ethos of the German school only pervaded the introductory level. As Bauhaus scholar Gabriele Diana Grawe explains, most U.S. art departments viewed interdisciplinarity as counter-productive to their “goal directed curricula.” Therefore, most of the former Bauhauslers working in U.S. institutions taught highly specialized upper-level courses.

53 Emigrants included Walter Gropius, Ludwig Mies van der Rohe, Josef and Anni Albers, and László Moholy-Nagy, among many others.
54 Grawe, “Continuity and Transformation,” 361.
55 Ibid., 360. Gropius and Mies van der Rohe taught in architecture departments at Harvard University
Even students at László Moholy-Nagy’s “New Bauhaus,” located at what became the Illinois Institute of Technology, were required to select one of four courses of study: industrial design, advertising arts, textile design, and photography.\textsuperscript{56} As a result of this cultivation of specialization, for the majority of art students, the only opportunity for interdisciplinarity occurred during the first year of training.\textsuperscript{57}

After completing the introductory course, these students selected a specialization and enrolled in upper-level courses that facilitated medium-specific experimentation. For example, the formalist explorations of Abstract Expressionism, whose protagonists flooded East Coast colleges and universities, dominated painting departments.\textsuperscript{58} Howard Singerman, who devotes a chapter to this topic in \textit{Art Subjects: Making Artists in the American University}, describes Abstract Expressionism’s effect on university art department as providing a “professional charge, an arena within which the young artist had to act in order that his work could be seen as serious.”\textsuperscript{59} Hans Hofmann, the German painter who had trained many of the Abstract Expressionists, influenced the resulting pedagogy. Hofmann immigrated to the United States in 1932, bringing a direct knowledge of the European avant-garde to his students first at the Arts

---

\textsuperscript{56} Ibid., 358.

\textsuperscript{57} At the original Bauhaus, in contrast, both master craftsmen and fine artists taught subsequent workshops and students were expected to collaborate across them.

\textsuperscript{58} Mark Rothko taught at Brooklyn College, University of Colorado at Boulder, and later at Tulane; William Baziotes and Robert Motherwell were on the faculty of Hunter College; Adolph Gottlieb and Franz Kline taught at Pratt and Gottlieb later taught at UCLA; Ad Reinhardt was on faculty at Brooklyn College; Clyfford Still was at Washington State University, Virginia Commonwealth University, and several City University of New York (CUNY) schools; and Philip Guston taught at University of Iowa and Washington University at St Louis.

Students League in New York City and then at the Hans Hofmann School of Fine Arts, which he founded in 1933. Amalgamating Cubism's abstraction and Fauvism's use of color, Hofmann developed and disseminated what he called the “push and pull” approach, which embraced the counterbalancing of reactive forces in a painting. He cultivated this approach by encouraging students to repeatedly explore the effects of abstract, gestural brushstrokes on canvas.\(^60\)

An assignment from Ad Reinhardt’s drawing course at Brooklyn College in the 1950s exemplifies the medium-specific experimentation typical of upper-level studio arts courses. Reinhardt instructed his drawing students to produce self-portraits in pencil and charcoal on fine paper. When they finished, he asked them to erase and begin again, repeating this process on the same sheet of paper. This encouraged students to investigate the medium and processes of drawing, loosening them from the constraints of accuracy and opening them to an active and subjective approach.\(^61\) Although this exercise broke with the naturalistic or imitative drawings previously utilized in academic training, the experimentation remained limited to traditional drawing media. The exercise also maintained hierarchical teacher-student relationships: Reinhardt required students to repeat a specific process that he deemed necessary. Thierry de Duve has referred to this pedagogical paradigm as “creativity-medium-invention,” arguing that it supplanted the nineteenth-century academic education system, which stressed “talent-\textit{métier}-imitation.” For de Duve, the privileging of “creativity” over talent translated to the belief that students should discover the fundamental elements and syntax of a medium and explore them through personal instinct and emotion.\(^62\)


\(^{61}\) Singerman, \textit{Art Subjects}, 145.

\(^{62}\) Thierry de Duve, “When Form Has Become Attitude – And Beyond,” in \textit{The Artist and the Academy: Issues in Fine Art Education and The Wider Cultural Context}, ed. Stephen Foster and Nicholas deVille,
Architecture schools also embraced modernism as a style during the postwar period, albeit with some resistance from Beaux-Arts holdouts. As in art schools, the Bauhaus represented a central influence for this shift. Many programs exalted Walter Gropius and Mies van der Rohe (as well as Le Corbusier and Frank Lloyd Wright) as “Modern Masters” and trained students in the stylistic elements of modernism: rectilinear forms, modern materials, planar surfaces, open interior spaces. Crucially, however, most curricula divorced these elements from the progressive social aims associated with the original innovators of these forms. This tendency aligned with the “routinized corporate modernism” that dominated the profession during the postwar period. At Harvard, for example, students were taught to join corporate architecture practices that served elite clientele. A 1960 Baccalaureate thesis by Yale student Stanley Tigerman reveals similar aims (figure 1.1). Tigerman’s design—a luxury apartment building for a Chicago lake front property—features a tower of classicized, “pseudo-Meisian” rectangular forms. Like the work of many of his peers, Tigerman’s project ignores the social and environmental context of the site.

A push for standardized, technocratic pedagogy also marked architecture curriculum

---

63 Ockman and Sachs, “Modernism Takes Command,” 127. The Beaux-Arts Institute of Design, which had previously been a center for Beaux-Arts pedagogy and design competitions, renamed itself the National Institute of Architectural Education in 1956, a sign of the fallen significance of Beaux-Arts principles. The Beaux-Arts tradition cultivated the neoclassical architectural style through the study of Ancient Greek, Roman, and Renaissance models.


65 Ockman and Sachs describe this curriculum as institutionalizing the “process of depoliticizing modern architecture that Philip Johnson and Henry-Russell Hitchcock had commenced in 1932 with their International Style exhibition” at the Museum of Modern Art. Ockman and Sachs, “Modernism Takes Command,” 135.


67 Herbert McLaughlin, Jr., “The Style of Education,” Progressive Architecture 39 (July 1958): 11. Nicknamed the “Yale Box,” these forms were a popular modernist element in the work of students who studied with Philip Johnson at Yale in the 1950s and early 1960s.
during the postwar period. As in visual arts education, the architectural accreditation process became stricter: the National Architectural Accreditation Board established requirements that standardized study within architecture, working with state departments of education to license professionals.\(^{68}\) The shift towards more technocratic curriculum began during the war, when architecture departments added new engineering courses—such as aircraft design and drafting—in order to prepare students for participation in the war effort.\(^{69}\) This trend continued after the war, when a surge of GI Bill sponsored veterans inundated architecture departments seeking professional training.\(^{70}\) Much of the resulting pedagogy focused on teaching students how to apply new materials, technologies, and rational design methods to architectural projects. Walter A. Taylor, who served as the director of the Department of Education and Research at the American Institute of Architects (A.I.A.) from 1946 until 1960, advocated teaching students to follow design methods that derived from military logic. According to this methodology, the design process begins with the collection and analysis of information about a design problem, followed by the generation and evaluation of solutions. The designer then implements and tests the “optimal” solution, and then modifies it as need be. Aspects of this method entered many schools in the 1950s.\(^{71}\) This introduction of systems analysis and other forms of military-derived technoscientific logic into the academy highlights the symbiotic relationship between architecture schools and the military-industrial complex.

Some schools mitigated the specialized thrust of technocratically-oriented curriculum by

---

\(^{68}\) For example, as of 1949 the National Architectural Accreditation Board only awarded accreditation to 5-year undergraduate programs. Students who graduated from accredited programs were allowed to take licensing exams more quickly than those who didn’t.

\(^{69}\) Ockman and Sachs, “Modernism Takes Command,”123. Aircraft design and drafting are two examples of courses offered at Cornell in 1943.

\(^{70}\) Ibid., 126. Ockman and Sachs describe these new students as being older, more mature, and more vocationally-oriented than previous students.

\(^{71}\) Ibid., 143–44.
cultivating collaboration. At UC Berkeley, for instance, William Wurster, who became dean of
the School of Architecture in 1950, merged the departments of architecture, city planning, and
landscape architecture into a unified College of Environmental Design. This unification
corresponded to an emerging understanding of architecture as operating in dialogue with other
fields that design the physical environment for human usage.\textsuperscript{72} In merging these departments,
Wurster replaced the Beaux-Arts curriculum maintained by the previous dean, Warren Perry,
with modernist pedagogy.\textsuperscript{73} However, he tempered modern architecture’s disregard for the
particularities of place by advocating attention to regional characteristics.\textsuperscript{74} In addition, he
countered the national trend towards an increasingly standardized architecture curriculum by
encouraging multiple approaches to design. He and his successor, Martin Meyerson, brought in
faculty with diverse perspectives ranging from Charles Moore, who became a central figure in
postmodern architecture, to Christopher Alexander, who applied computer technology and
systems thinking to the design process.\textsuperscript{75} Not all schools embraced this collaborative approach,
however. At Columbia, for example, city planning remained a separate department and the
curriculum did not include landscape architecture or environmental design.

Other creative subjects, such as modern dance—an expressive approach to dance that
rejected the strict positions of ballet in favor of more organic movements—also became codified

\textsuperscript{72} Richard Peters, “W.W. Wurster,” in \textit{Design on the Edge: A Century of Teaching Architecture at the
University of California, Berkeley, 1903-2003}, eds. Waverly Lowell, Elizabeth Byrne, Betsy Frederick-
Rothwell (Berkeley: College of Environmental Design, University of California, Berkeley, 2009), 70.
\textsuperscript{73} Wurster served as dean until 1963. For more on Perry and the clash between Beaux-Arts and
and the Student Campaigns for Modernism at Berkeley,” in \textit{Design on the Edge: A Century of Teaching
Architecture at the University of California, Berkeley, 1903-2003}, eds. Waverly Lowell, Elizabeth Byrne,
Betsy Frederick-Rothwell (Berkeley: College of Environmental Design, University of California, Berkeley,
2009), 46–56.
\textsuperscript{74} Peters, “W.W. Wurster,” 63.
\textsuperscript{75} Alexander came to Berkeley in 1964 and Moore in 1962. Ockman and Sachs, “Modernism Takes
Command,” 143–46.
in the postwar university. The first form of dance to be taken seriously as an academic subject, modern dance courses entered colleges and universities in the 1930s. Prior to this period, dance education had occurred in small studios, where the personal approach of each studio’s founders shaped the curriculum. Once established as an academic discipline, modern dance faculties consisted primarily of instructors who had learned the discipline from the “Big Four” of modern dance: Martha Graham, Hanya Holm, Doris Humphrey, and Charles Weidman. As a result, the instructors transmitted the movements and styles of these key figures to their students, rather than encouraging them to initiate their own forms. While the training included some improvisation, instructors ultimately expected students to copy the movements and styles of their predecessors. Ironically, this academicization broke with the initial conception of modern dance as a style predicated on individualized movements and the expression of subjective emotion.

Although rare, exceptions to this trend towards specialization and standardization in art, architecture, and dance pedagogy did exist during the postwar period. Black Mountain College, perhaps the most influential among these exceptions, opened in 1933 and remained in operation until 1957. The school was founded outside of Asheville, North Carolina by a group of faculty members who had been dismissed from Rollins College, a liberal arts college in Winter Park, Florida, for criticizing the school’s conservative administration. Black Mountain, in contrast to Rollins, endorsed student-driven education and saw art as an essential aspect of this

---

76 Two of the central figures in the introduction of dance into academia were Margaret H’Doubler and Martha Hill. H’Doubler, who trained with John Dewey at the Teachers College at Columbia University, established dance as a major with a BS degree at University of Wisconsin in 1917, making it the first college or university to offer a professional dance degree in the nation. H’Doubler’s student Hill established Bennington School of the Dance (1934–1942,) a summer program at Bennington College that invited major choreographers to teach and perform.


active learning process. Students worked with faculty “learning guides” to develop individual programs of study, while quantitative assessments and rankings were all but nonexistent.\textsuperscript{79} Influenced by John Dewey’s theory of learning through experiences and by the Bauhaus interest in interdisciplinarity, this approach fostered experimental processes and collaboration between teachers and students from different disciplines.\textsuperscript{80} For example, students and teachers worked together on theatrical performances, such as a 1948 production of Erik Satie’s \textit{The Raft of the Medusa}, directed by John Cage and starring Buckminster Fuller (both temporary faculty at the school). In addition to Cage and Fuller, this experimental ethos drew choreographer Merce Cunningham, painter Robert Rauschenberg, and former Bauhauslers including Josef and Anni Albers, among many others.

By the late 1940s, internal conflict and financial struggles threatened Black Mountain College’s stability. A lack of strong, consistent administrative leadership and disagreements among faculty members regarding the college’s goals led to several faculty departures in the early 1950s.\textsuperscript{81} Dwindling funds and student enrollment rates compounded these conflicts, and the school closed in 1957. Over a half-century later, Black Mountain College remains a central model for alternative educational initiatives. (Unfortunately, many of these subsequent initiatives would experience similar struggles surrounding the transition from an experimental educational platform to a sustainable institution.) Black Mountain College was not the sole alternative

\textsuperscript{79} Initially, grades did not exist at Black Mountain College. Faculty were ultimately asked to award grades, but they were treated as a formality and students could not see them. For more see: Harris, \textit{The Arts at Black Mountain College}, 6.

\textsuperscript{80} Dewey also sat on the school’s advisory council. For more on the Bauhaus influences at Black Mountain College see Eva Diaz, \textit{The Experimenters: Chance and Design at Black Mountain College} (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2015).

\textsuperscript{81} Points of conflict included a debate over supervision versus permissiveness in regards to student behavior, how much support the college should give to the arts, and the extent to which the farm and communal living should be prioritized. For a more detailed account of these and other conflicts see Harris, \textit{The Arts at Black Mountain College}, 169–80.
initiative of the postwar period: Subject of the Artists (1948–49), an independent school run by a group of Abstract Expressionists in New York, and John Cage’s class on experimental composition at the New School (1958–60), represent a few other notable offerings. However, all of these schools and classes must be understood as outliers within the dominant field of standardized, specialized higher education.

II. The Knowledge Factory

On December 11, 1964, Mario Savio, a leader of the Free Speech Movement at the University of California, Berkeley, denounced Clark Kerr as an "able practitioner of managerial tyranny" who was turning Berkeley into a "knowledge factory" that transformed students into "smooth slick products." The metaphor of university as factory reveals a central critique leveled against the higher education system in the 1960s: Savio and many of his peers condemned universities and colleges as replications of and preparation grounds for the rigid, hierarchical cold war military-industrial complex. They also viewed UC Berkeley and other multiversities as protecting the false consensus of U.S. liberalism and prosperity. These critiques erupted in a wave of protests that carried into the early 1970s. As the center for the development of the multiversity, California was also a hub for these protests. In Berkeley and elsewhere across the state, dissenting students fought for institutional reform. This dissent disrupted, and in some instances, overturned the existing art and architecture pedagogy.

---

82 Cage's class will be discussed in chapters two and four.
83 Mario Savio, "The Berkeley Knowledge Factory Speech," in The Essential Mario Savio: Speeches and Writings that Changed America, ed. Robert Cohen (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2014), 211. The following quote also derives from this source.
The Protest Wave

Savio’s denunciation must be contextualized within what sociologist Colin Barker describes as an “international ‘protest wave’”—a period marked by intensified development and diffusion of new tactics for protest and organization, coupled with dynamic interplay between the different contemporaneous movements—that occurred between the mid-1960s and the mid-1970s. It is impossible to view the student protests as completely distinct from the Civil Rights Movement in the United States, the national liberation struggles occurring internationally in remaining colonial holdings, and from uprisings in Spain, Portugal, Northern Ireland, and elsewhere. The Civil Rights Movement, in particular, represented a major influence and catalyst for the U.S. student movement, and the war in Vietnam (and later in Cambodia) became the target of many student protests in the late 1960s. The former arose against the Jim Crow laws that enforced segregation and prevented most African Americans from voting in the southern states. Its tactics—which included sit-ins, boycotts, marches, and other forms of nonviolent protest, voter registration drives, and the formation of a Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee (SNCC)—informed much of the action and organizational strategies that the student movement would soon take. In fact, Barker attributes Savio’s radicalization (and that of Jack Weinberg, another leader of Berkeley’s student movement) to their participation in the SNCC’s “Freedom Summer,” a 1964 initiative that brought white students to Mississippi to assist in a voter registration drive. Notably, education also played a central role in the development of the

---

86 Barker, “Some Reflections on Student Movements of the 1960s and Early 1970s,” 9. According to Barker, the drive had a profound radicalizing effect on its participants, despite the fact that Mississippi racists murdered three of the students.
civil rights movement: many of its protagonists trained in social justice leadership and civil disobedience tactics at the Highlander Folk School in New Market, Tennessee, which was founded by activist Myles Horton, educator and organizer Don West, and Methodist minister James A. Dombrowski in 1932.\(^87\)

The anti-bureaucracy rhetoric and activism that emerged in the late 1950s and 1960s to challenge consensus theories of history and society also informed Savio and his peers' critique of higher education. With nuclear war threats looming, critics took aim at the bureaucratic, centralized military-industrial-academic complex that engendered the atomic bomb and dominated corporate America. Many scholars challenged the hierarchical structure and hyper-rationalized rhetoric of corporate organizations, arguing that these practices engendered alienation and psychological fragmentation in the system's participants. Sociologist C. Wright Mills described the technocrat as a "Cheerful Robot" who is "with' rationality but without reason."\(^88\) In *The Myth of the Machine: Technics and Human Development* (1967), historian and sociologist Lewis Mumford articulated the fears associated with this robotic subject: "instead of functioning actively as an autonomous personality, man will become a passive purposeless machine-conditioned animal whose proper functions, as technicians now interpret man's role, will either be fed into the machine or strictly limited and controlled for the benefit of de-personalized, collective organizations."\(^89\) Media theorist Marshall McLuhan connected the threat of loss of autonomy to the education system. In *The Mechanical Bride* (1951), McLuhan likened

---

\(^87\) The school is now called Highlander Research and Education Center. Rosa Parks, Martin Luther King, Jr., Ralph David Abernathy, and other members of the SNCC studied there in the 1950s. See Aimee Isgrig Horton, *The Highlander Folk School: A History of its Major Programs, 1932-1961* (Brooklyn, NY: Carlson Publishers, 1989).


the modern education system to a meat grinder, which breaks students down into pliable hamburger meat ready for a life of conformity. He attributed this to the spread of the logistics of “the war machine,” whose engines standardize the learning process and its products.\footnote{Marshall McLuhan, \textit{The Mechanical Bride: Folklore of Industrial Man} (New York: Vanguard Press, 1951), 126.} In response to this system, McLuhan asked “why train individuals, if the only available life is the collective dream of uniform tasks and mass entertainment?”\footnote{McLuhan, \textit{The Mechanical Bride}, 128.} The anti-autonomist rhetoric espoused by McLuhan, Mumford, Mills, and many other leftist scholars established a critical vocabulary that permeated the language of student activists.\footnote{Other key texts include Jacques Ellul’s \textit{The Technological Society} (1964), John Kenneth Galbraith’s \textit{The New Industrial State} (1967), and Theodore Roszak’s \textit{The Making of a Counterculture} (1969).}

The belief that the United States had reached such a level of affluence and technological development that its citizens could soon abandon traditional labor also undergirded much student activism. This notion of a “post-scarcity” economy was predicated on faith in technological potential: if technology could cause the social and environmental problems associated with industrialization, post-scarcity proponents like anarchist theorist Murray Bookchin posited, it could also be used to create a utopian future in which technologies would be applied to ensuring social equity, rather than consumer goods and waste.\footnote{Murray Bookchin, \textit{Post-Scarcity Anarchism} (Berkeley: Ramparts Press, 1971). For a discussion of how this theory influenced the development of applied technologies, see Andrew Kirk, “Machines of Loving Grace: Alternative Technology, Environment, and the Counterculture,” in \textit{Imagine Nation: The American Counterculture of the 1960s and ’70s}, eds. Peter Braunstein and Michael William Doyle (New York/London: Routledge, 2002), 353–78.} German critical theorist Herbert Marcuse, who became a figurehead for the New Left movement, also discussed post-scarcity conditions.\footnote{Before coming to the United States in 1934, Marcuse was affiliated with the Institute for Social Research at the Goethe University in Frankfurt (later called the Frankfurt School.) Founded by Marxist scholar Carl Gründberg in 1923, the Institute became known for its examination of the forms of political and cultural domination and subjugation that were developing within the contemporary system, drawing on cultural Marxism and psychoanalysis. This approach rejected a total embrace of Marx’s theories on...}
developed societies were engaging in “surplus repression”—the societies had achieved surplus economic conditions that could, if distributed equally, reduce the need for repressive societal norms and policies. However, the elites maintained control over the resources and wealth in order to reinforce the existing power system and their role within it. According to Marcuse, surplus repression diverted basic humans needs for freedom and community into an inauthentic desire for consumer goods. He advocated that individuals rebel against this oppressive control by embracing “Eros,” Freud’s term for the liberatory and constructive “life instinct”—or the will to create life—which civilization had previously repressed in order to maintain societal progress. This embrace would lead to a “liberation of sensuousness” and a prioritization of play over toil. Marcuse later discussed the implications of the repressive system on culture, positing that the “progress of technological rationality is liquidating the oppositional and transcending elements in the ‘higher culture’” through a process that he termed “repressive desublimation.” Repressive desublimation eradicates any forms of cultural critique in contemporary artistic production, ensuring that all art affirms the existing order. While art from earlier periods included expressions of tragedy and alienation that provoked critical analysis of society, contemporary art

the grounds that they could not fully explain contemporary capitalist societies. Marcuse, along with his Frankfurt School colleagues Max Horkheimer and Theodor Adorno, is often credited with introducing critical theory to the United States. After teaching political theory in several East Coast institutions in the 1950s and early 1960s, Marcuse was appointed to University of California, San Diego in 1965, where he remained until his retirement in 1976.

95 Herbert Marcuse, Eros and Civilization: A Philosophical Inquiry into Freud (Boston: Beacon Press, 1955). Marcuse went against orthodox Freudianism in making this argument. While Freud held that repression was an instinctual human habit that kept humans from their animalistic nature, Marcuse posited that repression only needed to occur when resources were scarce. For a larger discussion of Eros as it connects to the New Left, see Rossinow, “The Revolution Is about Our Lives.”


97 Marcuse, One-Dimensional Man, 62. Marcuse cites anti-heroes in literature as an example of cultural critiques in art. These expressions of tragedy and alienation in literature, according to Marcuse, served as a “rational, cognitive force, revealing a dimension of man and nature which was repressed and repelled in reality.” Now, however that gap between art and the present social order has closed and the critiques have been incorporated into consumer society. Through the process of “technological rationality,” according to Marcuse, culture has become part of the commercial shopping center (62–91).
only reifies consumerism. Marcuse became a popular speaker at on-campus rallies with a large following among student groups. However, the majority of his supporters were white, middle-class students who had access to abundant resources.  

Campus Radicalism

Many of the students and recent graduates who espoused this anti-bureaucratic rhetoric were members of the Students for a Democratic Society (SDS). The SDS developed out of an intercollegiate socialist student group that had become anti-Communist due to McCarthyite pressures. In 1962, the SDS issued a manifesto, “The Port Huron Statement,” that declared their opposition to racism, racial discrimination, the arms race, big business, labor unions, and Cold War foreign policy. Although the SDS advocated initially for a “liberal-labor-civil rights coalition” that aligned with the aims of previous generations of leftists in the United States, it quickly discarded the old left’s focus on labor and class, instead issuing a broad based critique of American politics, culture, and society, and targeting institutions of higher education as central sites for insurgency. Throughout the 1960s, the SDS employed antagonistic political techniques on and around college and university campuses to demonstrate on behalf of free speech and racial equality and against bureaucratic institutions, industrial growth, and the Vietnam War.

The Port Huron Statement influenced Savio and many other students at Berkeley. When

---

99 The SDS created the “Port Huron Statement” during a gathering of student radicals in Port Huron, Michigan in 1962. Their focus on racial discrimination was informed by the bigotry witnessed during the civil rights movement.
Savio, Weinberg, and other participants in Freedom Summer returned to campus for the start of the Fall 1964 semester, they set up tables on university-owned land to inform other students about the Civil Rights Movement. The administration opposed this tabling on the grounds of a preexisting ban against the promotion of political causes on campus grounds. Tensions between students and the administration escalated and after several clashes—including a thirty-six-hour sit-in—a coalition of several student activist groups formed the Free Speech Movement (FSM) to fight the administration’s restrictions. When the negotiations between the FSM and the administration broke down in early December, students initiated a large-scale protest, occupying Sproul Hall, the administrative building. Governor Pat Brown responded by ordering the police to intervene, resulting in hundreds of student arrests. In the meetings that followed, the faculty voted with the FSM, rejecting the restriction of political activity on campus. The Regents of the University of California ultimately tempered this ruling, but it remained an important symbolic victory for the students. The Free Speech Movement’s adoption of antagonistic tactics came to serve as a model for student-driven political action in both the United States, and in Western Europe.

Following the uprising at UC Berkeley, students at large universities targeted the size of jumbo lecture courses—held in large lecture halls, and without personal contact with instructors—and bureaucratic administrative processes. These critiques soon began to encompass students’ anxieties about universities’ involvement with government agencies and classified research. Many also raised concerns that curriculum was not relevant to female

---

103 Seymour Martin Lipset, Rebellion in the University (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1972), xx.
104 This occurred at other UC schools and Michigan State.
students and students of color. The demand for new majors such as Black, Chicano/a, Ethnic, and Women’s Studies became a rallying point for many student activists. After the assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr. in April 1968, colleges across the country began to acquiesce to student demands for ethnic studies programs. However, these programs were frequently met with controversy. At UC Berkeley, for example, a plan for a Third World College—whose status as a “college” would have allowed for the curricular and administrative autonomy demanded by student and faculty supporters—was cut back to a Department of Ethnic Studies. This conservative administrative decision bespoke looming fears of potential radicalism.

Student dissent escalated as the U.S.’s military presence in Southeast Asia intensified. As sociologists Irving Louis Horowitz and William H. Friedland argue, “the war…has been largely responsible for the creation of militant student cadres on the university campus. The movement has had its greatest success in those areas where war and university have come together and university administrations have become in one way or another tied to the war effort.” Initiated at University of Michigan, Ann Arbor in 1965, teach-ins—in which faculty members and students abdicated their class schedules to gather for prolonged lecture and discussion sessions aimed at educating and activating against the war—became a widespread method of anti-war demonstration. In Ann Arbor, Berkeley, and on other U.S. campuses, teach-

---

106 For a more in-depth discussion of the debate over Berkeley’s Ethnic Studies Programs and those at San Francisco State College, University of California, Los Angeles, University of Oregon, and Western Washington University, see Joseph Fashing and Steven E. Deutsch, Academics in Retreat: The Politics of Educational Innovation (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1971).
ins and other anti-war demonstrations gained momentum over the course of 1965.\textsuperscript{108} During the next few years, antiwar sentiments and determination to avoid the draft spread beyond traditionally liberal colleges. In the first half of 1968, the Tet Offensive in Vietnam, the assassination of Martin Luther King, Jr., the rise of the Black Panthers, the student insurrection in France and across Europe, and the murder of Robert Kennedy, spurred increasing agitation on and around U.S. campuses.\textsuperscript{109} When Berkeley erupted in protest in late spring of that year, the violence escalated to the extent that the rioters erected barricades behind which they could fight the police.\textsuperscript{110} By 1970, the protest movement had spread to nearly all U.S. campuses. After the U.S. invasion of Cambodia, which began on April 30 of that year, and the National Guard killing of student protesters at Kent State on May 4, more than four million students went on strike.

**Dissent within Art and Architecture Departments**

Dissent against the multiversity system pervaded art and architecture departments, where students were especially critical of the trend towards overspecialization and insularity in these fields. By the late 1960s, students viewed the newly bureaucratized and formalized art education system as rigidly conservative, and antithetical to both interdisciplinary, dematerialized art practices and to the technophilic media theory embraced by the emerging

\textsuperscript{108} Barker, “Some Reflections on Student Movements of the 1960s and Early 1970s,” 11. Events at Berkeley included a two-day long protest in May, 1965 and a protest march with over 10,000 participants in November of that year.

\textsuperscript{109} Major student-initiated demonstrations erupted in Germany, France, Italy, and England and in May of 1968. Workers movements joined these demonstrations in the latter three countries. In addition, student movements also erupted in Poland, Yugoslavia, Czechoslovakia, Mexico, and Northern Ireland over the course of spring, summer, and fall 1968. For a detailed account of these events see Chris Harman, *The Fire Last Time: 1968 and After*, 2nd ed. (London: Bookmarks, 1998); and Barker, “Some Reflections on Student Movements of the 1960s and Early 1970s.”

\textsuperscript{110} This use of barricades was borrowed from the tactics adopted by French students. Todd Gitlin, *The Sixties: Years of Hope, Days of Rage* (New York: Bantam Books, 1993), 314–16.
generation of artists. Many students’ critiques targeted the compartmentalized, medium-specific mode of study. Sociologist Judith Adler, who conducted fieldwork at CalArts in the late 1960s and early 1970s, summarized this opposition as follows:

The university setting inhibits mutual collaboration and influence between different kinds of artists by encouraging rigid definitions and maintenance of disciplinary boundaries. Whereas the university has brought different artists together in a single organization, the promise thus raised of new creative synthesis—of a new Gesamtkunstwerk—has not been fulfilled because a bureaucratic work organization has encouraged ever more narrow specialization and rigid demarcation of discrete domains of aesthetic activity.

In pursuit of this notion of creative synthesis, many advocated “Intermedia” or “mixed media” courses, in which students could experiment across artistic media, as a counterpoint to this discipline-specific curriculum. Intermedia proponents believed that breaking down the barriers between media would enable greater spontaneity, collaboration, and fewer restrictions to the artistic process. However, when institutionalized, these courses were often offered as isolated classes or majors with specific Intermedia instructors, rather than as trans-departmental collaborations.

Students also denounced the tendency of this discipline-specific system to teach art as a process divorced from political and social realities. Educator James Sullivan articulated this view.

---


114 Hans Breder’s Intermedia major at the University of Iowa represents an example of this compartmentalization.
when he condemned art education as “self-defeating” in its insularity—a “dull academic exercise” that has no bearing on contemporary life.\textsuperscript{115} To combat art’s isolation within the academy, artists and educators called for schools to treat “the various areas of art education and scholarship as a broad communicative system that is inseparable from social, urban, and global conditions.”\textsuperscript{116} This reorientation would replace studio-based art classes focused on the production of art objects with classes that branched into fields like environmental studies, behavioral science, urban planning, and mass media. This critique reveals the influence of media theorists like McLuhan, who argued that education should prioritize the “new languages” of mass media.\textsuperscript{117} McLuhan also posited that students should learn directly from the contemporary media-saturated environment, rather than in classrooms.

These twinned critiques of specialization and insularity also contained an ambition to transform the dynamics of art classrooms. More interdisciplinary and outward-facing art programs would, advocates believed, increase collaboration and decrease individualistic competition among students. The aforementioned prioritization of experimentation and social and political engagement would also shift teacher-student dynamics away from the master-pupil

\textsuperscript{115} James Sullivan, “Perceptarium,” in \textit{New Ideas in Art Education: A Critical Anthology}, ed. Gregory Battcock (New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc., 1973), 243. According to Sullivan, “art schools have become as compartmentalized and insulated from the pathos of their times as other academic superspecialties...a compartmentalized and insulated specialization that does not punctuate the totality of things to which it is related is self-defeating.”

\textsuperscript{116} Gregory Battcock, “Introduction,” in \textit{New Ideas in Art Education: A Critical Anthology}, ed. Gregory Battcock (New York: E. P. Dutton & Co., Inc., 1973), xi. Battcock suggests the fields listed in the following sentence. Allan Kaprow was also a proponent of this reorientation of arts education in the academy; his “Education of the Un-Artist, Part 1” was included in Battcock’s publication.

\textsuperscript{117} McLuhan argued, “Today, in our cities, most learning occurs outside the classroom. The sheer quantity of information conveyed by press-magazines-film-TV-radio far exceeds the quantity of information conveyed by school instruction and texts. This challenge has destroyed the monopoly of the book as a teaching aid and cracked the very walls of the classroom so suddenly we are confused, baffled.” Marshall McLuhan, “Classroom without Walls,” in \textit{Explorations in Communication, An Anthology}, ed. Edmund Carpenter and Marshall McLuhan (Boston: Beacon Press, 1960), 1. Although he was primarily writing about elementary and secondary education, McLuhan’s writings were widely read by artists.
hierarchies common in traditional art programs. Female artists were especially critical of the
dominant gender dynamics within programs, which art historian Jill Fields characterized as
“blatant discrimination.”¹¹⁸ Patronizing male teachers, unequal distribution of scholarship funds,
and lack of jobs for female graduates were among the challenges faced by women at art
schools in the postwar period.

The increasingly specialized and technocratic curriculum also became a major point of
dissent in architecture schools and programs. Many disparaged the replacement of humanities
courses with a technocratic curricula as eliminating the “feeling” aspects of architectural
production.¹¹⁹ Objections to the alliances between architecture departments and the military-
industrial complex compounded this critique of rationalist methods. According to architectural
historian Mary McLeod, “American postwar architecture was seen as corporate architecture—
repetitive, conventional, elitist, and part of the same laissez-faire liberalism that had resulted in
the social inequities of the [Vietnam] war itself.”¹²⁰ Students saw failed urban renewal and mass
housing projects as evidence of the devastating effects of corporate modernism, and
disparaged the modernist architectural language as alienating and arcane.¹²¹ The writings of
Jane Jacobs, Herbert Gans, and other critics of urban planning informed many of these
charges, and inspired populist sentiment among students.¹²² These critiques gave rise to the
beginnings of postmodern tendencies in architecture. In 1966, architect Robert Venturi
published Complexity and Contradiction in Architecture, which became a founding manifesto for

¹²⁰ McLeod, “The End of Innocence,” 163.
¹²² Jane Jacobs’s The Death and Life of the Great American Cities (1961) and Herbert Gans’s The Levittowners (1966) were especially influential texts.
many postmodernists. In it, he denounced “the puritanical moral language of orthodox Modern architecture,” advocating instead an architecture that captures the “richness and ambiguity of modern experience” through a “hybrid” of historic and vernacular forms.\textsuperscript{123} These concerns also echoed a larger crisis of identity within the profession: should architecture serve wealthy individuals and corporations, the predominant clients of the modern era, or should it serve the larger social good? In pursuit of the latter, many students demanded a more socially responsible curriculum that would provide them with practical experiences working with low-income communities.

This debate exploded at Columbia University, where the university’s plans to build a gymnasium in Morningside Park, a public park straddling Morningside Heights and Harlem, catalyzed a student rebellion.\textsuperscript{124} The Society of Afro-American Students and the campus chapter of SDS led around hundreds of student demonstrators to occupy several academic buildings for seven days in April 1968, before the police violently ended the occupation. During this time, architecture students seized Avery Hall, the architecture building, and demanded more socially relevant training and more input into the university’s expansion plans. The rebellion continued through the end of the semester, with architecture students succeeding in their demands to change curriculum, but less so regarding campus planning policies.\textsuperscript{125} At UC Berkeley in 1969, a related uprising occurred around a park that students and community


\textsuperscript{125} The following semester witnessed a more flexible curriculum and a push to recruit women and minority students and faculty members. See Gutman and Plunz, “Anatomy of Insurrection”, 183–210.
members erected on a vacant lot owned by the Board of Regents.\textsuperscript{126} College of Environmental Design faculty member Sim Van der Ryn and his students worked with local residents to construct People’s Park, which they intended to serve as a community meeting place and as a symbol of their protest against the university’s plans for expansion. Governor Ronald Reagan recognized the park as a potentially important symbol in his campaign to “clean up” campus radicalism, and pressured Berkeley chancellor Roger Heyns to call in the police to bulldoze the park. When students responded by occupying the park, the police fired on the students, killing one, blinding another with tear gas, and injuring many more. Reagan also brought in the National Guard, turning Berkeley into “an occupied territory under martial law.”\textsuperscript{127}

People’s Park and the other acts of nonviolent resistance undertaken by students across the country demonstrate the widespread opposition to the postwar higher education system. However, the creation of the park illustrates not only California’s role as a center for student dissent, but also the quest for generative alternatives that characterized youth movements in the state.

\textbf{III. The Knowledge Bonanza}

In the 1960s, Immaculate Heart College in Los Angeles offered experimental printmaking classes taught by Catholic nun and anti-war activist Sister Corita Kent.\textsuperscript{128} A few hours up the coast, visitors to the Esalen Institute, an alternative education center founded in Big Sur in 1962, participated in meditation, yoga, and Gestalt psychology sessions. In 1965, UC

\textsuperscript{126} For more on the history of this site see Peter Allen, “The End of Modernism?: People’s Park, Urban Renewal, and Community Design,” \textit{Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians} 70, no. 3 (September 2011): 354–74.
\textsuperscript{127} Gitlin, \textit{The Sixties}, 357. For more on the events surrounding People’s Park see Ibid., 353–361.
\textsuperscript{128} Sister Corita Kent left the College in 1968
opened a new campus in Santa Cruz (UCSC) that was conceived as an alternative to the more research-focused arms of the UC system. In the Bay Area, educators Salli Rasberry and Robert Greenway established several free schools in the second half of the 1960s and published a how-to guide based on their experiences.\textsuperscript{129} Journalist Mel Wax aptly described these and the myriad other educational initiatives that developed in postwar California as a “knowledge bonanza.”\textsuperscript{130} Communication pedagogy, and many other forms of pedagogical experimentation, emerged out of this “bonanza” in the late 1960s and early 1970s. I argue that the interest in pedagogical experimentation in California grew primarily out of the pervasiveness of countercultural innovation, especially the generation of alternative methods and structures for learning, as well as a push towards experimentalism in the state’s higher education system.

**The Postwar Education Bonanza**

In the mid- to late 1960s, the UC system launched several experimental initiatives as a means to mitigate student dissent against the multiversity. Led by visionary educator Dean McHenry, UCSC was perhaps the largest of these initiatives. When it opened in 1956, the university comprised eight small, semi-autonomous residential colleges that fostered experimental teaching approaches.\textsuperscript{131} McHenry and the administration commissioned different architects to design each college, lending each a unique sensibility. Charles Moore and William Turnbull designed the most innovative of the resulting architecture, Kresge College (founded in 1971), which resembled a modernized Mediterranean village tucked into the surrounding


\textsuperscript{130} Mel Wax, “The Knowledge Bonanza,” in *The California Revolution*, ed. Carey McWilliams (New York: Grossman Publishers, 1968), 32. In his essay, which primarily focuses on the University of California system, Wax describes the optimism and scale of these initiatives, as well as potential shortcomings, such as pay inequities between faculty at junior and senior colleges.

\textsuperscript{131} UCSC currently has ten residential colleges.
redwood forest (figure 1.2). The array of mixed-use buildings arranged along a paved street demonstrate the architects’ desire to create space for different forms of social interaction and to reject the hierarchies of most campus architecture and the anti-street ideology of the modern movement. Notably, this design also incorporated student input; the architects worked with students in a course entitled “Planning Kresge College,” and through subsequent independent studies.¹³²

University of California, Irvine, which was described as an “instant university” when it opened in the middle of rapidly developing Orange County in 1964, also encouraged academic freedom. The school’s first chancellor, Daniel Aldrich, gave faculty significant leeway in the development of academic programs. For example, Aldrich approved Social Science Professor Duane Metzger’s “Proposal for a Detached Cross Cultural Teaching/Research Facility”—a simulated field site where students could practice ethnographic research—as an experimental new mode of learning by doing. The facility, which came to be known as “The Farm” when it opened in 1968, housed indigenous craftsmen and farmers from Mexico, Guatemala, and Samoa on a previously undeveloped plot on campus. These residents were invited to practice their crafts and lifestyle, while students and faculty observed utilizing new research methodologies. Student counterculturalists soon joined the original Farm inhabitants, creating a commune in some of the unused buildings. The Farm was shut down in the early 1970s, in part by faculty’s frustration at the lack of sustained interaction between the inhabitants and students and in part because of the unruly behavior of the commune.¹³³ However problematic this project now seems, its brief existence indicates the openness to pedagogical experimentation within the campuses of the UC system. This desire to build experimental programs extended to the other

sectors of the state system. San Francisco State College, for instance, established a student-run Experimental College for alternative courses in 1965. Course offerings included “Revolutionary Capitalism” and “Cybernetics and LSD: A Study of the Application of Consciousness-Expanding Drugs to Technology.”

The expansions to the UC system also comprised the addition of some innovative art and architecture programs. In addition to the aforementioned courses, the Experimental College’s offerings included artist and writer Jeff Berener’s “Astronaut of Inner Space: A Survey of the European Avant-Garde, 1880 to the Present,” and artist Ken Friedman’s “Intermedia” class, which engaged with Fluxus concepts and sensibilities. At UCSC, the head of the art department, Gurdon Woods, collaborated with Fluxus artist Robert Watts on an “Experimental Arts Workshop” whose participants created scores for actions and events; James Lee Byars, John Cage, Allan Kaprow, and other like-minded artists were invited to discuss experimental education.

Fresno State University, located in the San Joaquin Valley, supported the first Feminist Art Program in the U.S., which was launched by Judy Chicago in 1970. Wanting to provide a learning environment in which female students did not feel oppressed by male-dominated academic structures, Chicago created a course of studies in which faculty and female students worked together to “struggle out of gender conditioning.” This “empowerment education” involved bringing personal issues into art-making content, using performance as a pedagogical strategy, learning construction skills through the process of building their own workspaces, and participating in consciousness-raising circles. The Women’s Studies Program

136 Ibid., 157.
won official approval from the school in 1971, and Chicago was hired by California Institute of
the Arts (CalArts) to start a similar program later that year. CalArts, which formed as a merging
of the financially bereft Chouinard Art Institute and the Los Angeles Conservatory of Music,
represents one of several expansions to private art schools and programs that also occurred
during this period.\textsuperscript{138} UC Berkeley, the University of Southern California, and Southern
California Institute of Architecture (SCI-Arc)—a school that was formed in 1972 by a group of
architects who left California State Polytechnic to create a more experimental program—were
among the schools with innovative architectural programs in California.

This atmosphere of growth and innovation in higher education, coupled with a relative
lack of existing museum and gallery support for contemporary art, made educational institutions
important centers for artistic experimentation in California during the late 1960s. Both Los
Angeles and San Francisco lacked strong gallery infrastructures to evaluate and promote
contemporary art. In Los Angeles, for example, only a handful of galleries showed contemporary
art in the 1950s and, although this number grew slightly in the 1960s, informal venues such as
artist-run spaces, private homes, churches, cafes, and bookstores remained the major sites for
contemporary art.\textsuperscript{139} In contrast to close-knit art scenes in compact East Coast cities, the
horizontal, diffuse urban fabrics of Los Angeles and the Bay Area produced largely
disconnected, localized artistic communities.\textsuperscript{140} Schools thus became crucial venues for

\textsuperscript{138} CalArts will be discussed in depth in the fourth chapter, which focuses on Allan Kaprow’s tenure at the
school. Pomona College, a private liberal arts college located in Claremont, California, also had a very
experimental art department and gallery during this period. For more on Pomona see \textit{It Happened at

\textsuperscript{139} For a discussion of arts venues in Los Angeles see: Lucy Bradnock and Rani Singh, “Papa’s Got a
Rebecca Peabody, Andrew Perchuk, Glenn Phillips, Rani Singh, Lucy Bradnock (Los Angeles: Getty

\textsuperscript{140} This point is made by several of the participants in “L.A. Stories: A Roundtable Discussion,”
displaying work and cultivating audiences for contemporary art. This encouraged those teaching and studying in art departments and schools to embrace experimental practices and drew artists from the East Coast.

The Counterculture

Historian Theodore Roszak describes the streets of Haight-Ashbury in San Francisco and Telegraph Avenue in Berkeley in the late 1960s as full of individuals projecting the “ragged independence” associated with “cultural disaffiliation,” whose style and posture signaled “a principled rejection of well-behaved, antiseptic, upwardly mobile middle-class habits in favor of a return to folk origins and lost traditions.”

As a hub for counterculturalists, the Bay Area drew many who shared this disaffected stance. The counterculture’s opposition to technocratic society engendered not only dissent, but also an outpouring of alternative practices and organizations. Countercultural strategies included methods of cultural deconditioning—such as the pursuit of alternative lifestyles, psychedelic experiences, or spiritual explorations—as well as guerilla theater, politically engaged music, and other forms of performative activism.

Communication pedagogy grew out of the interdisciplinary ethos, interest in non-traditional modes of living, learning, and making, and network-based forms of exchange that marked countercultural life in California.

The utopian mythos and natural environment of coastal California made it a culturally

---

141 Theodore Roszak, From Satori to Silicon Valley: San Francisco and the American Counterculture (San Francisco: Don’t Call it Frisco Press, 1998).

142 See Peter Braunstein and Michael William Doyle, eds., Imagine Nation: The American Counterculture of the 1960s and ’70s (New York/London: Routledge, 2002). Some counterculturalists also appropriated the identities of marginalized groups, such as Native Americans, in order to assume oppositional positions. See Philip Deloria, “Counterculture Indians and the New Age,” in Imagine Nation: The American Counterculture of the 1960s and ’70s, eds. Peter Braunstein and Michael William Doyle (New York/London: Routledge, 2002), 159–88.
and geographically potent site for countercultural activity. Historian Andrew Kirk notes that the western landscape has engendered “malleable and powerful myths and imagery that lend themselves well to redefinition of self and reinvention of politics.”¹⁴³ Many of these myths center around notions of the West as an uncontaminated, open frontier, a place ripe for discovery.¹⁴⁴ This sense of openness and reinvention drew many individuals wishing to escape the constraints of East Coast society. The temperate climate allowed for year-round experiments with alternative forms of shelter, nomadic lifestyles, and other outdoor activities. Communes and festival organizers also took advantage of the abundance of underdeveloped land for large-scale projects and events.

This Californian mythos fostered an interdisciplinary ethos that predated the emergence of the counterculture in the mid-1960s. Artists and other cultural producers on the West Coast had long embraced a blurring of disciplinary boundaries and divisions between art, life, and lifestyle.¹⁴⁵ Curator Karen Moss attributes this blurring to the distance from New York’s critical and commercial hegemony; artists felt free to experiment and to look outside of the art world for inspiration.¹⁴⁶ In the 1950s, this looseness gave rise to interdisciplinary art spaces such as King Ubu Gallery in San Francisco, founded in 1952 by poet Robert Duncan and artist Jess Collins (Jess), and the Ferus Gallery in Los Angeles, founded in 1957 by artist Ed Kienholz and curator

¹⁴⁴ See David M. Wrobel, Promised Lands: Promotion, Memory, and the Creation of the American West (Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 2002.)
Walter Hopps.\textsuperscript{147} The latter supported the group of visual artists and poets that contributed to \textit{Semina} (1955-1964), an archetype of Beat-era collaboration that combined poetry, collage, drawing, photography, and other media into a loose-leaf publication.\textsuperscript{148} In Southern California, the movie industry—within which countless creators with different backgrounds and skills worked together—also provided a central model.\textsuperscript{149} This openness to interdisciplinarity was especially appealing to artists wishing to escape the discipline-specific strictures of East Coast academies.\textsuperscript{150}

The counterculture continued and extended this interdisciplinary ethos. The coalescence of a countercultural community in San Francisco has often been traced to the 1966 Trips Festival. Organized by Beat writer turned countercultural icon, Ken Kesey, and the future founder of the \textit{Whole Earth Catalog}, Stewart Brand, among others, the festival included rock and electronic music, teepees and other temporary architectural structures, multimedia installations made with light machines and slide projectors, Native American dancers, and day-glo costumes. This event provided a model for the comingling of artistic forms that came to characterize the creative production of the counterculture. The festival also united disparate social groups, including an acid-fueled psychedelic drug scene, artists and musicians, and thousands of youths, for a weekend of collective experience.\textsuperscript{151} The festival’s popularity

\textsuperscript{147} Ibid., 122. City Light Bookstore, established in 1953 by the poet Lawrence Ferlinghetti and the sociologist Peter D. Martin, was another center for Beat culture in San Francisco.


\textsuperscript{149} John Baldessari, “L.A. Stories: A Roundtable Discussion,” moderated by Michelle Kuo, \textit{Artforum} 50 no. 2 (October 2011): 248.

\textsuperscript{150} Among the protagonists of communication pedagogy, East Coast transplants included Lawrence Halprin, Doug Michels of Ant Farm, and Allan Kaprow.

\textsuperscript{151} The art troupes included USCO, a collective formed by architect Steve Durkee, poet Gerd Stern, and music technician Michael Callahan in 1962, which focused on creating multimedia environments and
spawned many similar events and garnered much media attention. Fred Turner has argued that it turned San Francisco into “Oz to a generation that feared that it would grow up into a black-and-white Kansas of a world—if it lived long enough in the face of nuclear weapons and the draft to grow up at all.” In pursuit of this Oz, artists, disillusioned teenagers, and countless others migrated to the Bay Area from across the country, often initiating their own festivals, communes, and artistic collectives. Although rooted in San Francisco, these activities spread throughout coastal California.

The Diggers, a guerrilla theater troupe active in Haight-Ashbury in the late 1960s, serve as one example of the interdisciplinary artistic practices that arose within this context. The Diggers staged anti-capitalist interventions and performances in keeping with their namesake, radical Protestant agrarian anarchists from mid-seventeenth-century England. Their actions included the *Free Frame of Reference* (c. 1966), a giant yellow picture frame through which they served free food in Golden Gate Park; the creation of a Free Store and a Free Medical Clinic, staffed by volunteer medical students; and happenings like *The Death of Money* (1966), a public funeral service for the capitalist economy. They conceived of these projects as “life acting:” “a form of prefigurative politics in which one lived out the revolution by acting it out, thereby experiencing it as a reality.” By utilizing public spaces and by eradicating boundaries between actors and audiences, the Diggers sought to expose the social rigidities of mainstream culture. The Diggers and other local theater troupes, such as the San Francisco Mime Troupe and the Cockettes, contributed to the atmosphere of festive anti-institutionalism and communality in the

---

153 The Trips Festival has been discussed as a precursor to Burning Man (founded in 1986), an annual festival held in Nevada that includes psychedelic drugs, makeshift architectural structures, and mixed-media performances. See Brian Doherty, *This is Burning Man: The Rise of a New American Underground* (New York: Little, Brown, 2004).
Bay Area and modeled a theatrical form of activism.\textsuperscript{155}

By the late 1960s, many counterculturalists left San Francisco and other increasingly congested cities to form back-to-the-land communes in remote regions of the Western U. S.\textsuperscript{156} Seeking to isolate themselves from technocratic society, these “New Communalists” followed previous generations of settlers who viewed the American West as an uncontaminated open frontier, offering self-determination and freedom from established institutions and norms.\textsuperscript{157} Communes like Drop City, founded in Southern Colorado in 1965 and made up of Buckminster Fuller-inspired geodesic domes, eschewed conventional governance structures in favor of “collective harmony,” which tended towards anarchy.\textsuperscript{158} Many communes also engaged in collaborative creative production. The New Communalists at Drop City, for example, created what they termed \textit{Droppings}, environments and happenings meant to inspire heightened consciousness. One such \textit{Dropping}, \textit{The Ultimate Painting} (1966), is disc-shaped canvas that viewers can spin and project stroboscopic lights onto using a control panel, thus creating an immersive physical experience (figure 1.3). As Turner argues, New Communalists also embraced small-scale technologies ranging from farming tools to LSD as a means to “bring

\textsuperscript{155} See Bradford D. Martin, \textit{The Theater is in the Street: Politics and Performance in Sixties America} (Amherst: University of Massachusetts Press, 2004).
\textsuperscript{156} The Diggers, for example, moved to rural areas of California including Forest Knolls, Olema, Covelo, Salmon River, Trinidad, and Black Bear.
\textsuperscript{157} See Kirk, \textit{Counterculture Green}, 156–60. I am borrowing the term “New Communalists” from Fred Turner to delineate the large faction of the counterculture that established communes to turn “away from political action towards technology and the transformation of consciousness as the primary sources of social change.” See Turner, \textit{From Cyberculture to Counterculture}, 4.
\textsuperscript{158} Turner, \textit{From Cyberculture to Counterculture}, 74. For more on Drop City see Erin Elder, “How to Build a Commune: Drop City’s Influence on the Southwestern Commune Movement” in \textit{West of Center: Art and the Countercultural Experiment in America, 1965–1977}, ed. Elissa Ausher and Adam Lerner (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2012), 3–20. Other intentional communities assumed a strict social order, often rooted in religious beliefs. An example of the latter is the Lama Foundation, a spiritual community founded by former-USCO member Steve and Barbara Durkee near Taos, New Mexico in early 1968. The community, which followed the teachings of the Indian guru, Meher Baba, claimed to reject hierarchies. However, a committee of “caretakers” made all communal decisions. For more on both forms of commune organization see Hugh Gardner, \textit{The Children of Prosperity: Thirteen Modern American Communes} (New York: St. Martin’s Press, 1978).
people together and allow them to experience their common humanity." These personal technologies served as alternatives to the large-scale technologies and massive, alienating bureaucracies that dominated mainstream society, allowing for self-sufficiency, intimate forms of collectivity, and the “transformation of consciousness” sought by counterculturalists. The protagonists of communication pedagogy viewed small-scale, personal technologies as potent tools for alternative modes of teaching and learning.

The formation of alternative organizations and institutions represented another common form of countercultural resistance and innovation, which influenced the establishment of communication pedagogy initiatives. Central among the organizations in the Bay Area was the Portola Institute, a non-profit education foundation founded in Menlo Park in 1966 by Dick Raymond, a former member of the Stanford Research Institute. Portola aimed to “scale-down, democratize, and humanize our hypertrophic technological society” by serving as a platform for smaller initiatives and by providing young students with instruction in computers and later, portable video cameras. Among the many alternative organizations that Portola helped to support were the Farallones Institute, a center for the study of ecological design founded by architect Sim Van der Ryn; Big Rock Candy Mountain, which published “learning to learn” handbooks and other alternative educational resources; and the Briarpatch Society, an organization that supported small businesses. Portola thus served as a counter-institution, working against large-scale corporate business models by establishing a smaller, less hierarchical, and more localized model of operation. That many of the organizations based at

---

Turner, *From Cyberculture to Counterculture*, 4.

160 The Stanford Research Institute (SRI) was a governmentally funded technology research center where early experiments that led to the development of the Internet took place.

161 Roszak, *From Satori to Silicon Valley*, 8. As cited by Turner, *From Cyberculture to Counterculture*, 70. Portola brought computer education into local schools and housed a Media Access Center, which held classes and workshops with the aim of putting video in the hands of community members.
Portola focused on education demonstrated the widespread demand for alternatives to the education system. These educational initiatives tested and modeled pedagogies and materials that opposed the standardized curriculum mandated in the K-12 and higher education systems. Many communication pedagogy initiatives also took the form of counter-institutions that offered small-scale and independently determined forms of learning and exchange.

The dispersion of the New Communalists across the West and the emergence of multitudes of small-scale institutions necessitated the creation of new networks for exchange. Independently published books, magazines, and DIY manuals became primary vehicles for sharing information between disparate countercultural nodes. Central within this outpouring of printed media was the *Whole Earth Catalog* (1968–72), founded by Stewart Brand and published at the Portola Institute. The catalog grew out of the *Whole Earth Truck Store*, which Brand and his wife Lois initiated earlier that year. Recognizing the demand for access to materials, tools, and practical information among those living off the grid, the Brands converted a truck into a mobile lending library stocked with gear, books, blueprints, and magazines and travelled to communes and outposts across the Western U.S. After the successful trip, they turned The *Whole Earth Truck Store* into a storefront in Menlo Park and began to publish *The Whole Earth Catalog*. Inspired by both the L.L. Bean catalog and Denis Diderot’s *Encyclopedie* (1751–72), the *Catalog* serves as a compendium of advertisements for tools and books, reviews, commentary, DIY tips, and essays geared towards a countercultural existence. The editors present these contents without hierarchy, inviting the reader to research her interests and needs, and thus facilitating autonomous learning (figure 1.4). It also specifically promoted extra-institutional and alternative pedagogical initiatives in a section titled “Learning.” The

---

162 For example, Big Rock Candy Mountain created boxed kits dedicated to different decades. The kits included newspaper clippings and other records, which students could read and interpret, developing their own history of the decade, rather than regurgitating the history presented in textbooks.
The catalog’s endorsement of autodidacticism and other modes of alternative education influenced the protagonists of communication pedagogy—both Lawrence Halprin and Ant Farm published how-to guides that echoed its content and aesthetic.  

The catalog’s network of readership also parallel the social networks fostered by communication pedagogy initiatives. Although the catalog was aimed initially at back-to-the-land communities and countercultural lifestylists, it grew to encompass contributions from new technology industries, proponents of Eastern mysticism, university-based scientists, and the New York and California art scenes. *The Whole Earth Catalog* thus served as what Turner describes as a “network forum,” a vehicle that facilitates connection and exchange between various communities.  

In engineering this forum, Brand acted as a “network entrepreneur,” or one who knits together formerly separate intellectual and social networks. As a meeting ground for experimental artistic collectives, musicians, and youths from across the country, the Trips Festival can also be seen as a product of Brand’s network entrepreneurship. This model of social organization derives from Brand’s interest in cybernetic theory and the interdisciplinary modes of research undertaken by its creators, an interest shared by Lawrence Halprin, Ant Farm, and Allan Kaprow, as will be discussed in the following chapters. Rhizomatic networks became a defining mode of organization among countercultural groups, manifested through small-scale publications, gatherings, and other forms of exchange. Turner argues that, like the aforementioned small-scale institutions, these networks operated as alternatives to the

---

163 These how-to guides will be discussed in chapters two and three, respectively.

164 Turner, *From Counterculture to Cyberculture*, 5.


166 Brand’s first introduction to systems oriented thought occurred when he studied ecology and evolutionary biological systems in a biology class as an undergraduate student at Stanford University. His teacher, Paul Ehrlich, was among many biologists applying systems theories to the natural world in the postwar period. See Turner, *From Counterculture to Cyberculture*, 43–45.
hierarchical structures of large-scale corporate bureaucracies. \(^{167}\) Network-based modes of organization characterize communication pedagogy practices, which viewed networks as a means to foster non-hierarchical and interdisciplinary methods of exchange. \(^{168}\)

Crucially, countercultural networks frequently connected to the emerging personal computing industry, which was also based in the Bay Area and shared the former’s interest in cybernetics and networks. The advent of personal computing technology centered around the Stanford Research Institute (SRI) a research laboratory in Menlo Park, which housed an Augmented Research Center (ARC). Led by engineer Douglas Engelbart, the ARC was dedicated to exploring how personal computers could augment human brainpower and communication. Although governmentally funded, this research operated outside of the mainstream computing industry, which focused on large-scale mainframe computers made for corporate use. \(^{169}\) Engelbart and his team worked on shrinking the size of computing technology, creating user-friendly software. They also developed digital networks that led to the creation of early forms of the Internet. \(^{170}\) They also participated in many aspects of the local countercultural lifestyle, joining parties, LSD sessions, and visits to communes. In return, they also shared their research with this community through public talks and demonstrations. Brand and his colleagues at the Portola Institute played a central role in forging these connections. Turner and journalist John Markoff argue that both groups were informed by the others’ ideas of

\(^{167}\) Ibid., 5.

\(^{168}\) My protagonists’ interest in network-based modes of exchange will be discussed in the following chapters, especially in chapter three, where I argue that networks are key to Ant Farm’s understanding of extra-institutional learning.

\(^{169}\) As described by John Markoff, mainstream computer research, which was primarily based in East Coast labs, maintained a focus on mainframe computers for corporate use throughout the 1960s. Mainframe engineers did not comprehend the significance of personal computing. John Markoff, *What the Dormouse Said: How the 60s Counterculture Shaped the Personal Computing Industry* (New York: Penguin Group, 2005).

\(^{170}\) For a detailed discussion of this history see Markoff, *What the Dormouse Said.*
nonhierarchical interconnectivity and exchange.\textsuperscript{171} As a result of this dialogue, many counterculturalists, including Ant Farm, understood personal computers and communication networks as potential tools for facilitating alternative networks.

This rich field of countercultural interactions—in combination with California’s booming education industry—gave rise to communication pedagogy initiatives across the state’s coastal regions. These initiatives responded to the growth and technocratization of higher education in the postwar period, and to the student dissent that arose in opposition to the “multiversity.” The protagonists of communication pedagogy initiatives were particularly opposed to the specialization, insularity, and professionalization of art and architecture education. Inspired by the interdisciplinary ethos, counter-institutions, and networks that permeated coastal California, they sought to create viable alternatives to the dominant institutional approaches to teaching and learning in these fields. The resulting initiatives cultivated interdisciplinary collaboration, embraced open-ended processes, and rejected hierarchies, including those that typically divided artistic practice and teaching. The next chapter looks at a pioneering example, Anna and Lawrence Halprin’s *Experiments in Environment* workshops, which initiated educational strategies that became central to communication pedagogy.

\textsuperscript{171} Ibid. See also Turner, *From Counterculture to Cyberculture*, 106.
Chapter 2

Taking Part: Facilitating interdisciplinarity in Anna and Lawrence Halprin’s *Experiments in Environment* Workshops

A color photograph shows a man standing on a redwood deck holding a large scroll that rolls out to display a horizontal calendar (figure 2.1). The days on the calendar are divided into activities—“Blindfold Walk,” “Movement Session,” “Driftwood Village”—and include instructions like “experience environment before seeing it,” and “build an environment as a community.”¹ Designers (primarily architects and landscape designers), dancers, and the man’s teenage daughter surround him holding mugs of coffee, eagerly awaiting the plan for the day. Their dress—thick wool sweaters, jeans, long hair, a red bandana—and casual group dynamic signify countercultural lifestyle. The man is landscape architect Lawrence Halprin and the scroll contains the “score” for the 1968 *Experiments in Environment* workshop, an alternative education initiative organized by Lawrence and his wife, dancer Anna Halprin.² The forty participants are nine days into the workshop. They have spent the past five living and working together at the Halprins’ home in Sea Ranch, California, an innovative coastal residential community.³ While at Sea Ranch, they visited a Pomo Indian reservation and constructed a village out of driftwood. As delineated by the score, after conducting a “Departure Ritual,” they

---
¹ Copy of 1968 Score, Lawrence Halprin Papers, Architectural Archives, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia. These instructions are excerpted from the scores for “Blindfolded Walk” and “Driftwood Village,” respectively.
² *Experiments in Environment* is one of several titles that the Halprins, other facilitators, workshop participants, and contemporaneous critics use to designate the 1966 and 1968 workshops. However, most recent scholars have adopted that phrasing and I will adhere to this usage in this chapter.
³ Lawrence created the master plan for Sea Ranch in 1963. It is situated on sloping land along the edge of the San Andreas Fault and, in his design, Lawrence focused on preserving this landscape and its natural ecology. Charles Moore designed several of the houses, which are seen as early examples of postmodern architecture.
will leave for Marin County, where they will participate in an activity focused on nakedness.

This photograph highlights both the experiential focus of the *Experiments in Environment* pedagogy and the Halprins’ role as facilitators within this learning process. Designed to transmit the Halprins’ shared—and, at the time, novel—interest in interdisciplinary exchange, the 1966 and 1968 *Experiments in Environment* workshops combined dance, environmental design, and later, Gestalt psychology, into a scored set of group activities. By prioritizing interdisciplinary collaboration over pre-determined outcomes in the workshops, the Halprins articulated an influential early form of communication pedagogy.

Despite their influence, scholars have paid relatively little attention to Anna and Lawrence Halprin and their collaboration in developing the *Experiments in Environment* pedagogy. Anna Halprin (b. 1920) has typically been treated as a peripheral figure in histories of twentieth-century dance and, although she is recognized as an important teacher, her development of an interdisciplinary pedagogy has received scant attention.\(^4\) Anna’s omission is also indicative of the transitional status often attributed to the generation of choreographers that emerged in the 1940s and 1950s: decades traditionally seen as a stagnant period between the decisive innovations of the 1930s and the 1960s. Much of the scholarship on modern dance privileges Merce Cunningham, Anna’s New York-based contemporary, as the central figure in the shift from the expressive modern dance of Martha Graham and her contemporaries to the objectivist “postmodern” dance that emerged in the 1960s, typically exemplified by the Judson Dance Theater.\(^5\) When Anna is included in dance history surveys, she is often discussed as “a

---

\(^4\) Anna went by ‘Ann’ until 1972, when she switched to ‘Anna.’ I refer to her by the latter name.

mother to the Judson Dance Theater” and to the broader emergence of postmodern dance in the 1960s. In these narratives, the many now-famous students of Anna’s San Francisco Dancers Workshop—including Simone Forti, Trisha Brown, Robert Morris, Meredith Monk, and James Waring—tend to supersede their instructor as subjects for historical analysis. These histories discuss Anna’s innovations as a teacher in so far as they influenced her students, rather than as significant pedagogical advances in their own right.

Anna was also largely omitted from the body of research produced between the late 1980s and early 2000s by scholars in the emergent field of “dance studies,” who sought to theorize dance practice through an interdisciplinary lens. However, a recent strain of scholarship exploring intersections between visual art and dance has given her choreography more attention.

---


2010) acknowledged Anna’s role in bridging the disciplinary gap between dancers and non-
dancers at the San Francisco Dancers Workshop. Another contemporary publication, Rebekah
J. Kowal’s *How To Do Things with Dance: Performing Change in Postwar America* (2010) uses
Anna as a case study of the correlation between postwar choreography and the uses of the
body in progressive social change movements. Kowal argues that, like the Greensboro, North
Carolina sit-ins of 1960, Anna’s contemporary choreography created an active encounter
between dancers and audience members, forcing both to “renegotiate the terms of their
engagement.” However, while these two historians do much to enlarge Anna’s status within
dance history, they focus on her choreography, not her pedagogy. More useful for
understanding the latter is dance historian Janice Ross’s *Anna Halprin: Experience as Dance*
(2009), which provides an extensive biography and includes discussion of Anna’s educational
influences and teaching practices. Ross’s attention to Anna’s archive results in a detailed record
of the dancer’s life, but her affirmative approach lacks critical distance, and she does not
address Anna’s pedagogy within the broader context of experimental education on the West
Coast.

Similar problems exist in the literature on Lawrence Halprin (1916–2009). Surveys of
landscape design discuss him as part of the “California style” of modern landscape design that
emerged in the 1950s and 1960s, but do not treat him as a central figure. Lawrence has been

10 Rebekah J. Kowal, *How To Do Things with Dance: Performing Change in Postwar America*
(Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 2010), 243.
11 See Therese O’Malley and Marc Treib, *Regional Garden Design in the United States* (Washington,
Landscape Architecture: The Relationship of People to the Environment* (New York: Elsevier North
the subject of several well-illustrated monographs, but these tend to focus on built works and employ little critical analysis. Until recently, Lawrence’s completed designs have overshadowed his work on creative processes and participatory design practices in the literature. A few new publications have begun to redress this issue, focusing on Lawrence’s design process. They examine his use of scores and his development of the “RSVP Cycles,” a system for collective creative processes that guided both his design work and the pedagogy that he and Anna developed in the Experiments in Environment workshops. These discussions of the participatory and process-based nature of Lawrence’s design work provide useful background for my research. However, aside from Eva J. Friedberg’s chapter on the Experiments in Environment workshops and Peter Walker and Melanie Simo’s astute assertion that the Halprins “discovered a new role for the artist—not the solitary hero but the person who choreographs or ‘scores’ a wide-ranging set of activities for, and with, the community,” these texts do not focus on the Halprins’ development of a new form of creative pedagogy.

The Experiments in Environment workshops have long been overlooked in both the literature on the two protagonists and historical narratives of the counterculture. The


14 Walker and Simo, Invisible Gardens, 156.

15 Examples of this omission in literature on the counterculture include Andrew Blauvelt, ed., Hippie Modernism: The Struggle for Utopia (Minneapolis, MN: Walker Art Center, 2015); Peter Braunstein and
scholarship on art and architecture pedagogy in the twentieth century has also omitted the workshops.\textsuperscript{16} When scholars do addressed *Experiments in Environments*, they discuss them as events that need to be reclaimed and rewritten into art history. These accounts often link the workshops to the Happenings of the 1950s and 1960s. While this process of re-inscription into canonical art history is important, it tends to oversimplify the workshops in order to legitimize them within preexisting narratives. As a result, this literature does not address the Halprins’ pedagogical advances or the new role for the artist that emerged therein.\textsuperscript{17} An exception, the recent exhibition *Experiments in Environments: The Halprin Workshops, 1966–1971* (Graham Foundation, 2014), featured prolific archival and video material that documents the interdisciplinary processes and collectivity within the workshops.\textsuperscript{18} However, the organizers did not publish a catalogue and presented the archival material without written analysis.


\textsuperscript{17} An exception is Solveig Nelson’s observation that the workshops “pointed beyond the concerns of any one medium to signal a broader transformation in the role of the artist, from creator of objects to facilitator of aesthetic experience: a ‘synthesizer,’ as the Halprins put it, of multiple inputs.” Solveig Nelson, “Space Age,” *Artforum* 53, no. 5 (January 2015): 99–100.

\textsuperscript{18} This exhibition was also staged at the Arthur Ross Architecture Gallery in Columbia University’s Graduate School of Architecture, Planning, and Preservation with the title “The Halprin Workshops, 1966–1971” in 2015 and at the California Historical Society in 2016.
This chapter charts the early, extra-institutional development of communication pedagogy through the Halprins' *Experiments in Environment* workshops and the subsequent publication of *Taking Part: A Workshop Approach to Collective Creativity* (1974), which I read as a manual to that pedagogy. The first section traces the development of the workshop pedagogy through Anna and Lawrence’s educational backgrounds and their early careers. The second analyzes the 1968 workshop, focusing on their approach to facilitation. The third and final section turns to the dissemination of the Halprins’ pedagogy through the publication of *Taking Part*. I argue that the *Experiments in Environment* workshops initiated a new model of creative pedagogy, which focused on process, experience, interaction with the environment, and interdisciplinary collaboration, rather than specialized learning and finished products. In doing so, I posit that the Halprins established a new model for the artist: artist as a facilitator of processes and experiences, rather than a producer of objects.

I. A Workshop Approach to Collective Creativity

“Anna gave us the tools to really study what we have,” recalls Simone Forti, who studied with Anna Halprin in the mid-1950s and participated in her summer dance workshop in 1960. “The main teacher is your own body. Your sensation, your experience of the force of gravity, your experience of momentum in space.” Forti drew a contrast between this approach to teaching and the traditional dance education that she had previously received: “The little bit of dancing that I had tried—I didn’t like what I was being asked to do, like to turn out at the hip

---

joint; my hips didn’t want to do it. And I trusted my body more that I trusted the tradition that was being taught to me.” Forti’s description of Anna’s pedagogy highlights the latter’s prioritization of student-driven improvisation over memorized positions and sequences, a strategy that set her teaching apart from most formal dance training of the time. Facilitating the movements and experiences of others became one of the three influential pedagogical strategies that the Halprins employed in *Experiments in Environment*. In addition to facilitation, they used workshops as formats for extra-institutional learning and scores in place of conventional assignments. For the Halprins and subsequent communication pedagogy initiatives, facilitation, workshops, and scores represented dynamic alternatives to the educational methods used in academic dance, visual art, and design training.

**Facilitation**

The notion that the teacher should serve as a facilitator, rather than what Jacques Rancière describes as a “master explicator,” is central to the Halprins’ pedagogy.20 This approach to teaching stems from Anna’s exposure to progressive pedagogies, first in her elementary education and then again in college. In her youth she attended public schools in Winnetka, Illinois that followed progressive educator Carlton Washburne’s “Individualized Learning” plan.21 This plan aimed to cultivate the “whole child” through an experience-based curriculum that addressed intellectual, emotional, social, creative, and physical development. It

---


21 Washburne implemented the “Individualized Learning” plan, also known as the “Winnetka Plan,” when he served as superintendent of the Winnetka school district from 1919 to 1943. Washburne had previously worked with Frederick Burke on creating individualized instruction at San Francisco State Normal College’s Demonstration School. Anna attended Washburne schools from the mid-1920s, when she entered elementary school, to the mid-1930s, when she entered high school.
balanced individualized approaches to learning an evolving set of “common essentials” with experiential activities such as collaborative research projects, art-making, and field trips. In implementing this curriculum, teachers facilitated students’ processes, rather than acting as lecturer or disciplinarians. This notion of the role of the teacher aligned with John Dewey’s understanding of the teacher as a facilitator. Writing in 1897, Dewey described the teacher as one who “is not in the school to impose certain ideas or to form certain habits in the child, but is there as a member of the community to select the influences which shall affect the child and to assist him in properly responding to these influences.” Although Dewey originally intended this as a radical challenge to the conventional hierarchy of the classroom, by the 1930s he had revised his position to one that cautioned against unlimited freedom. He argued instead that teachers should foster students’ agency over their own learning while maintaining order and progress through organized, pre-planned curricula. This requires planning: the educator, according to Dewey, “must survey the capacities and needs of the particular set of individuals with whom he is dealing and must at the same time arrange the conditions which provide the subject-matter or content for experiences that satisfy these needs and develop these


24 As noted by Diane Ravitch, Dewey did not advocate unlimited freedom for students—although many progressive educators interpreted his writings this way—but instead advocated that teacher-facilitators continue to organize information and plan curriculum for students. In Experience and Education (1938), he criticized progressive educators who gave students free reign over the classroom. Ravitch, Left Back, 307–10.
Anna came into contact with a complementary model of facilitation when she studied dance at the University of Wisconsin, Madison between 1938 and 1941. The dance program at Madison was founded and led by Dewey acolyte Margaret H'Doubler. Informed by Dewey's *Art as Experience* (1934), H'Doubler regarded teaching, rather than performing, as the ultimate aim of dance education; she focused on the creative impulse cultivated by dance, not for the stage, but for the dancer's self-development. Her dance classes typically began with studying the anatomy of a skeleton followed by a series of simple actions exploring minor movements or isolated joints, which the students performed while lying on the floor. Other common activities involved investigating natural patterns of motion, such as crawling or walking, or asking students to develop “movement solutions” to anatomically rooted questions and problems, such as letting the curve of your spine guide your movement. These exercises did not have predetermined outcomes. Unlike traditional dance studios, the Madison classrooms did not have mirrors, which foster a focus on form and imitation; H'Doubler also did not demonstrate techniques, eliminating the likelihood of students copying her movements. Thus, students learned solely from their own experiences of their own bodies.

H'Doubler's pedagogy operated in marked contrast to conventional modern dance capacities.

---


26 H'Doubler founded the program in 1917. In 1926, Wisconsin became the first college or university to offer a professional dance degree in the nation. H'Doubler studied with Dewey at Teachers College at Columbia University in 1916. She was especially influenced by his theory of art as experience and his use of the scientific method of inquiry. She titled her book, *Dance: A Creative Art Experience* (1940) as a tribute to *Art as Experience* (1934). Her previous work as a physical education teacher also informed her teaching.

27 Ross, *Anna Halprin*, 28–29. She also encouraged her students to teach, helping them find placements in local schools.

education, in which a “star” dancer catalogued her individual movements into a formal vocabulary that could be transmitted to students. This form of education aimed to prepare students to dance in the star’s troupe. For example, Martha Graham instructed her students in what dance historians Nancy Reynolds and Malcolm McCormick describe as “units of movements [that] became codified and were repeated in various compositions.” Graham’s approach can be seen as a movement-based example of what Paulo Freire describes as the “banking concept of education,” in which the students are passive recipients of the “deposits” that the “bank-clerk” educator makes them memorize and regurgitate. According to Freire, this model minimizes students’ “creative power” and ability to develop a “critical consciousness.”

The “banking” mode of dance education was brought into academic institutions first through programs like the Bennington School of the Dance (1934–1942), a summer program at Bennington College that invited major choreographers to teach and perform, and later through accredited academic courses in fine arts departments. Anna attended the Bennington School of the Dance in 1938. While at Bennington she demonstrated an early desire to reject the codified pedagogy of the modern dance establishment: she co-choreographed a final

---

29 Reynolds and McCormick, No Fixed Points, 148. The students also emulated Graham in terms of appearance, copying her severe hairstyle and mode of dress. The Humphrey-Weidman school similarly transmitted Doris Humphrey’s style of dance to students. For more see Reynolds and McCormick, No Fixed Points, 157–165.


31 Graham, Doris Humphrey, Charles Weidman, and Hanya Holm (known as the “Big Four” of modern dance) all participated in the first six-week session in 1934. The summer school became a site for dancers to premiere new works. By the early 1950s, many colleges and universities offered modern dance as an accredited academic course within fine arts departments. Many modern dance professors were students of Graham or other major modern dancers; most conducted their courses using the same imitation-based pedagogy. Kowal, How To Do Things with Dance, 9. Eisenhower’s Emergency Fund for International Affairs (1954) compounded the calcification of modern dance that occurred in colleges and universities by establishing an international touring program that upheld “normative artistic standards” for choreographers wishing to participate. See Naima Prevots, Dance for Export: Cultural Diplomacy and the Cold War (Middletown, CT: Wesleyan University Press, 1998).
composition in which she and her collaborator crawled aimlessly on the floor.  

Anna implemented facilitation-based teaching in 1946, a year after moving to San Francisco with Lawrence, when she co-founded the Halprin-Lathrop School, one of the first modern dance schools in the city. While her co-founder Welland Lathrop’s courses maintained much of the conventional transmission-based modern dance training, Anna’s classes for both adults and children focused on students’ personal experiences of movement. She began to utilize improvisation as a central pedagogical tool, adopting modified versions of H'Doubler’s kinesthetic exercises to encourage students to explore their bodies’ natural movement. She also used interactive improvisational structures, like asking students to pass around a weight. This approach fostered each dancer’s personal experience of motions, rather than a specific formal appearance. In leading these activities, Anna sought to respond to the needs of her students; she did not pre-plan lessons. She continued to assume the Deweyan role of the facilitator as her teaching practice developed, teaching dance as a process of individualized, experiential learning, rather than a series of transmitted techniques.

Lawrence also engaged facilitation in his landscape architecture practice, albeit with less abdication of authority. Although his training and early work as a landscape architect did not

---

32 “Reaction to Bennington,” created by Anna and Jeanne Hayes, elicited silence from the audience. Ross, Anna Halprin, 26–27. Halprin participated in the Bennington program again in 1939. She had also studied modern dance as a high school student, taking tri-weekly classes in the Humphrey technique and occasionally participating in Humphrey’s master classes. At the end of high school, Anna received an offer to join Humphrey’s program. Pressured by her parents to go to college, she declined. For more on Anna’s early involvement with modern dance, see Ross, Anna Halprin, 16–27.

33 Lathrop had trained with Martha Graham and maintained his teacher’s dramatic style and penchant for mythic narratives in his choreography.

34 Novack, Sharing the Dance, 28. This interest in differential subjectivity was in marked contrast to the personal expression in the work of modern dancers like Martha Graham or Doris Humphrey, who imposed their own expressive movement vocabularies on their students and companies.

35 Halprin described this improvisational teaching in an essay on her classes for children: “From the response of the children the teacher can get his cue...Teaching this way you never know what will happen in advance of a class.” From Anna Halprin, “Teaching Dance,” Impulse (1949): 20.
include facilitation, by the late 1960s, he had begun to act in this role.\textsuperscript{36} When he established his landscape architecture practice, Lawrence Halprin & Associates, in San Francisco in 1949, Lawrence worked as head designer with a small team.\textsuperscript{37} By 1969, however, the company had grown to almost fifty employees—many of who were from non-design disciplines like political science and social anthropology—and branched into a second office in New York City. As the firm grew, Lawrence’s role shifted from designer to a “conceptualizer” committed to “facilitating the creativity of others.”\textsuperscript{38} This permutation corresponds to changes in his field; the late 1960s witnessed the emergence of large, interdisciplinary, corporate landscape architecture offices, which focused on large-scale developments and broad planning initiatives.\textsuperscript{39} However, as Hirsch points out, despite Lawrence’s claim to run a dehierarchized office environment, he continued to demand final say in design decisions. Lawrence adopted a practice of facilitation much closer to that of Anna’s while co-leading the \textit{Experiments in Environment} workshops.

\textbf{Workshops}

In addition to adopting the role of facilitator, both Halprins embraced workshops as a key teaching and learning method. This interest in workshops demonstrates the influence of Bauhaus pedagogy on Anna and Lawrence’s practices. However, while Bauhaus workshops focused on building technical skills, the Halprins used workshops as structures for fostering soft skills like collaboration, creativity, and self-awareness. This approach aligned with many other

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{36} Lawrence received a B.S. in Plant Science from Cornell University’s School of Architecture in 1939. He then enrolled in graduate school at the University of Wisconsin and began coursework towards his M.S. in Horticulture. The couple met at the University of Wisconsin and married in 1940.
\item \textsuperscript{37} The practice was incorporated as Lawrence Halprin & Associates in 1960.
\item \textsuperscript{38} Hirsch, \textit{City Choreographer}, 58.
\item \textsuperscript{39} Walker and Simo, \textit{Invisible Gardens}, 287. These large firms replaced an earlier model of smaller, more hierarchically organized corporate landscape architecture firms. Examples of these large-scale developments include new towns, military facilities, corporate campuses. Broad planning initiatives include environmental impact reports, participatory urban planning, and resources inventory and analysis.
\end{itemize}
countercultural education initiatives.

The couple was immersed into a community of former Bauhauslers and their students in 1941, when Lawrence received a scholarship to study landscape architecture at Harvard's Graduate School of Design. Walter Gropius, who founded the German school in Weimar in 1919, served as the chair of the Graduate School of Design's department of architecture from 1937 to 1952. Gropius had prioritized workshops within the original Bauhaus curriculum and, although workshops were not implemented at Harvard, he worked to preserve and perpetuate the history and pedagogy of the German school among his students and colleagues. Modeled after training in medieval craft guilds, Gropius defined “workshops” as study into a specific craft, such as weaving or ceramics, occurring in a room specifically outfitted with tools for that craft. Workshops thus referred to both the mode of study and the room in which the study took place.

Gropius viewed them as an alternative to academic training: the former cultivated the

40 Under the leadership of Walter Gropius and Marcel Breuer, the Graduate School for Design became a center for former Bauhausers in the United States. Lawrence and Anna moved to Cambridge soon after they married. Lawrence had planned to study with Canadian landscape architect Christopher Tunnard at Harvard. However, Tunnard was drafted during his first year, and Gropius and Breuer became his informal advisors.

41 In the first "Bauhaus Manifesto and Program," Gropius advocated that “the school is the servant of the workshop, and will one day be absorbed in it.” Walter Gropius, “Bauhaus Manifesto and Program,” 1919, n.p. Gropius was largely unsuccessful in his attempts to implement aspects of Bauhaus pedagogy at Harvard, but he succeeded at archiving and publicizing the German school's history. Despite Gropius's efforts, the program at Harvard diverged from that of the original Bauhaus in its structure and its approach to collaboration. Joseph Hudnut, former Dean of Architecture at Columbia University, determined the academic structure for the Graduate School of Design (which merged the schools of architecture, landscape architecture, and city planning). A New Deal liberal, Hudnut took a pragmatic approach to modern design education that prioritized realistic design problems and addressed social concerns. Under his leadership, curriculum at Harvard centered on large-scale social issues such as reconstruction and housing and fostered teamwork between the three disciplines. Although Gropius also advocated teamwork, he viewed teamwork as collaboration between architects, rather than architects and other disciplines. Hudnut and Gropius also clashed over other aspects of the curriculum. Gropius pushed for a general design course modeled after the Bauhaus preliminary course, but Hudnut did not allow him to implement it until 1950, and then only briefly. For more on the disagreements between Hudnut and Gropius see Anthony Alofsin, “American Modernism’s Challenge to the Beaux-Arts,” in Architecture School: Three Centuries of Educating Architects in North America, ed. Joan Ockman (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2012), 117–19. For more on Hudnut see Marta Gutman and Richard Plunz, “Anatomy of Insurrection” in The Making of an Architect, 1881–1981: Columbia University in the City of New York, ed. Richard Oliver (New York: Rizzoli International Publications Inc., 1981), 187–89.
exploration of materials and the processes of making, whereas the latter taught through the imitation of historic forms. He also saw workshops as eradicating the “class distinctions that raise an arrogant barrier between craftsman and artist.” Master craftsmen and avant-garde artists taught Bauhaus workshops jointly in order to balance technical skill with advanced aesthetics. Bauhaus curriculum also included a “preliminary course”—in which students investigated form, space, and perception using a range of media—as a prerequisite to the workshops. Gropius designed both the preliminary course and the workshops to counter what he saw as the current “isolation” of arts; the school aimed to “produce a new unity” in which all of the arts would be integrated under the common goal of creating gesamtkunstwerk.

Anna, who often sat in on Lawrence’s classes and attended parties hosted by Gropius and his wife, Ise, came to view Bauhaus pedagogy as a model for her own. She interpreted the Bauhaus notion of the workshop as fostering a communal relationship and a focus on process, later evolving her own definition of workshops as “a way of learning that shifts emphasis from the individual-to-teacher configuration to a situation in which individuals inter-act [sic] in a group process with the teacher acting as participant and guide.”

---

42 This elevation of the workshop was not original to the Bauhaus, but derived from a preexisting feature of modern craft schools. See John V. Maciuika, Before the Bauhaus: Architecture, Politics, and the German State, 1890–1920 (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2005).
44 This course was developed by painter Johannes Itten and implemented in Fall 1920 as a way to give entering students initial and unifying training in fundamentals. (See discussion in chapter one, p. 13.)
46 Anna was also influenced by the Bauhaus concept of the total work of art. She began to draw connections between dance and other arts, with which she experimented in the evening dance classes for architecture and design students that she offered in 1943. See Ross, Anna Halprin, 52–65, 173.
workshops to structure her own teaching in the mid-1950s, as a means to escape the limitations of the Halprin-Lathrop School; the shared studio space had necessitated a rigid class schedule and imposed a semester-like structure, in which classes were expected to culminate in a performance.\textsuperscript{48} Beginning in 1954, she invited small groups of dancers and others to participate in two-week-long summer workshops on the outdoor dance deck that Lawrence built at their new home in Kentfield, California (figure 2.2). The deck, which Lawrence built in collaboration with theater architect Arch Lauterer, was a cantilevered platform (or stage) set downhill from their house. Built from Douglas fir, it echoed the canopies of redwood trees surrounding the property. The informal, extra-institutional setting offered a break from the regimen of studio-based teaching. Anna did not have to share the dance deck with other teachers or impose artificial time constraints; by contrast, sessions could last many hours, allowing for prolonged experimentation. The outdoor setting also enabled Anna to incorporate the natural environment into the improvisational exercises that she had begun using at the Halprin-Lathrop School.\textsuperscript{49} Forti describes the process of generating ideas for movements from the surroundings:

\begin{quote}
One of the most important tools Ann[a] gave me was how to work from nature. She taught the process of going into the woods and observing something for a period of time and then coming back and somehow working from those impressions. We were not judging what kind of movement we wanted. We were hoping for awareness and the freedom to just use any movement quality. Stiffness, heaviness, speed, fluidity, anything.\textsuperscript{50}
\end{quote}

in Haight-Ashbury 1963. She referred to both the space and the group of dancers, with whom she worked, as the Workshop.

\textsuperscript{48} Her continued frustration with this format and the stagnation of modern dance precipitated her departure from the Halprin-Lathrop School in 1955. Anna’s participation in the American Dance Festival series in New York in 1955 catalyzed this departure. Martha Graham had invited her to perform The Prophetess (created in 1947), an invitation that signified acceptance into the modern dance establishment. However, Anna was so dismayed by the lack of individuality within the major dance troupes that she decided to cut ties with the modern dance world and leave the Halprin-Lathrop School. (Anna did, however, continue teaching her children’s classes at the school.) See Ross, Anna Halprin, 108–15.

\textsuperscript{49} For example, Anna would ask students to observe something in the woods and then let those observations guide their movements.

\textsuperscript{50} Simone Forti, Janice Ross’s interview with Forti, Los Angeles, August 11, 2001, as quoted by Ross in
By foregrounding improvisation, the dance deck workshops continued their Bauhaus predecessors’ prioritization of process over imitation. Anna also maintained Gropius’ interest in collaborative learning. However, the dance deck workshops diverged from their Bauhaus predecessors in their rejection of technical skill in favor of self-investigation through bodily exploration. A further difference was duration: Bauhaus workshops involved long-term training, while Anna’s workshops lasted only two weeks.

By the late 1960s, intensive short-term workshops had begun to proliferate among proponents of communication pedagogy and other countercultural groups as an extra-institutional mode of learning and exchange. Highly varied in terms of structure, countercultural workshops focused on topics ranging from experimental building techniques (such as Buckminster Fuller’s dome-construction workshops, which depended on teamwork) to therapeutic exchange (like those held at the Esalen Institute, a spiritual center in northern California).\(^{51}\) Whether focused on a pragmatic process or a spiritual one, these workshops cultivated self-development through an exploration of alternative lifestyle practices or deeper modes of awareness. The disjunction between these aims and Gropius’s goals of skill-building and breaking class barriers can be attributed, in part, to the inward turn taken by much of the counterculture at the end of the 1960s and in the early 1970s. This turn prioritized alternative lifestyles, modes of creativity, and spirituality over political or social

---

\(^{51}\) See Auther and Lerner, eds., *West of Center*. 

Anna Halprin, 126. However, as noted by Ross, despite the openness of this exploratory format, Anna had trouble relinquishing her own expectations for the exercises. She was not able to fully escape the master/student dynamic that she so disdained in the work of predecessors like Graham. See Ross, *Anna Halprin*, 127–9.
change. By the mid-1970s, self-improvement workshops had become a popular mainstream practice, albeit one decried by critics as a symbol of self-obsession and indulgence characteristic of the decade. The Experiments in Environment workshops serve as early models for the outpouring of workshops in the 1960s; operating in a flexible, extra-institutional context, they fostered both collaborative creative process and personally enriching experience for an interdisciplinary group of participants.

Scores

Informed by both John Cage and systems theory, the Halprins came to view scores as pedagogical devices that functioned as alternatives to conventional assignments. They put this into practice in the Experiments in Environment workshops, where they used scores to catalyze open-ended, interdisciplinary learning.

The Halprins met Cage in 1957, when his partner, dancer Merce Cunningham, delivered a lecture-demonstration on their dance deck. Five years earlier, Cage had revolutionized musical composition with 4’33” (1952), a blank score that solicited a silent performance. Liz Kotz argues that in its substitution of numbers and words for musical notes, this piece “effectively


53 For a scathing account of the abundance of self-improvement workshops in the 1970s see Tom Wolfe, “The ‘Me’ Decade and the Third Great Awakening,” New York Magazine (August 23, 1976): 27–48. Wolfe analyzes the Erhard Seminars Training, the encounter sessions held at the Esalen Institute, mystic and meditation groups such as Hare Krishna, the Sufi, and the Maharaj Ji communes, the “psychic phenomena” movement, advertising, therapy, and swingers, among other trends of the 1970s.

54 Cunningham spoke about the quest for a “balance between the man-made and the natural” in his choreography and demonstrated some movements. Ross, Anna Halprin, 106–7. During this same meeting, Cage gave a lecture composed of short, random vignettes. Friedberg, “Action Architecture,” 19. Following this meeting, Cage and the Halprins continued to correspond frequently.
inaugurates the model of the score as an independent graphic/textual object, inseparably words to be read and actions to be performed." In *Water Music* (1952), for example, Cage replaced musical notes with words (figure 2.3). Cage also undermined the authority attributed traditionally to composers by using aleatory compositional methods and by leaving his scores open to interpretation and chance. Branden W. Joseph describes this approach as disarticulating conventional power relations between composer, score, performer, and listener, thereby enabling each to “work from their own centers.” The Halprins were aware of Cage’s experiments with scores through their continued correspondence with the composer and through their association with Cage acolytes, La Monte Young and Terry Riley, who collaborated with Anna in the early 1960s.

Anna did not begin to use score-like devices as a means to facilitate improvisation until the mid-1960s. She choreographed *Parades and Changes* (1965) through a set of six index cards communicating basic tasks like slowly undressing, tearing sheets of paper, and talking in the audience. The lighting designer for the piece, Patrick Hickey, and the composer, Morton Subotnick, also created their own set of six index cards. For each performance, they reshuffled their respective decks of cards to create a new “score.” This use of chance as a means to sequence a series of events parallels Cage’s composition methods. Anna also invited variation

---

57 Cage had written to Young, a student at Berkeley, encouraging him to get in touch with Anna. Young had previously initiated a correspondence with Cage after hearing lectures on and performances of the latter’s work at the Darmstadt Festival for New Music in 1959. In 1960, Anna choreographed *Still Point, Visions*, and *Birds of America, or Gardens Without Walls*, to sound scores by Young and Riley. The two also accompanied Anna’s dance deck workshops. Young showed Anna and her students his *Composition 1960 #2* and *Composition 1960 #5*, both of which embraced indeterminate outcomes. For more on this relationship see Ross, *Anna Halprin*, 139–53.
58 A Swedish musician, Folke Rabe, took Subotnick’s place when the Dancers’ Workshop performed *Parades and Changes* in Stockholm later that year.
by asking the performers to improvise in response to the instructions for each section and by including audience participation. Like a Cagean score, the structure of *Parades and Changes* thus destabilized conventional power dynamics between creator, performer, and audience.

Throughout the 1960s, Lawrence applied the term score to a variety of diagramming methods that he employed while working on landscape architecture designs. By the late 1960s, he had developed a notion of scores as catalysts for creative processes. While this definition could also apply to Cagean scores, Lawrence diverged from Cage in conceptualizing scores as part of a larger process of creativity. This conception reveals Lawrence’s interest in systems ecology, especially the work of Eugene Odum and Ian McHarg, who recognized environments as interconnecting, responsive systems. Odum’s ecosystem flow charts, for

---

60 In the early 1960s Lawrence used what he called “ecoscores,” or graphic illustrations of movements or shifts in natural phenomena, to demonstrate the effects of these forces. In the mid-1960s he developed a practice that he labeled “motation,” a notional device for recording movement through time and space, which he used to score the movements of both natural and designed elements. See Lawrence Halprin, “Motation,” *Progressive Architecture* (1965): 126–33. Lawrence intended motation to be not just a tool for landscape architecture, but also a universal mode of notation used by creators from fields like dance, theater, and planning, among others. Lawrence’s interest in movement through environments began when he worked in the landscape architecture office of Thomas Church after graduating Harvard and serving briefly as a lieutenant in World War II. A pioneer of “California style” gardens, Church's designs combined simple forms derived from Constructivism and Surrealism with a respect for the existing landscape. The resulting gardens served as outdoor living spaces and featured “processional sequence through a number of unfolding spatial experiences.” Hirsch, *City Choreographer*, 40. Lawrence worked for Church from 1945 to 1949 and maintained an interest in outdoor space as a stage for action after he left to start his own practice. For more on Church’s influence see Lawrence Halprin, “The Choreography of Gardens,” *Impulse* (1949): 31–32. For more on Thomas Church’s practice see Marc Treib, ed., *Thomas Church, Landscape Architect: Designing a Modern California Landscape* (San Francisco: William Stout, 2003).
61 “Scores are symbolizations of processes which extend over time... a way of communicating these processes over time to other people in other places at other moments and as a vehicle to allow many people to enter into the act of creation together, allowing for participation, feedback, and communications.” Lawrence Halprin, *The RSVP Cycles: Creative Processes in the Human Environment* (New York: George Braziller, 1970), 1.
62 Lawrence’s undergraduate studies in horticulture served as his introduction to the then emerging field of ecology and he frequently drew upon systems ecology in his landscape architecture practice. His interest in ecology corresponded to a broader trend within the field of landscape architecture, which began to incorporate the new, systems-based understanding of ecology in the early 1950s and continued throughout the 1960s. In addition, the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 required environmental
example, depicted ecological processes as systems that operate through a “dynamically calibrated flow of information” (figure 2.4). McHarg, a landscape architect, argued that natural systems must inform design processes, and that the human use of designed environments must not disturb pre-existing ecological systems. Lawrence drew upon these ideas in what he called “ecoscores,” graphic illustrations of movements or shifts in natural phenomena. In preparation for designing Sea Ranch, for instance, he created an ecoscore recording changes in the “sea-climate,” landscape, and fauna from the Jurassic era to the present in the region (figure 2.5). This score takes the form of a Fibonacci spiral, a graphic device that demonstrates Lawrence’s interest in systems found in nature. Lawrence used this score in preparation for creating a master plan that would preserve the existing coastal ecology.

Architect and design theorist Christopher Alexander’s *Notes on the Synthesis of Form* (1964) also influenced Lawrence’s understanding of design processes. Alexander viewed design as arising out of a dynamic process of feedback between form (the designed work) and context (the environment). In this process, form and context constantly evolve in response to “information” that they receive from each other. Alexander’s notion of information and feedback correspond to that of cybernetician Norbert Wiener, who describes feedback as an “apparatus for collecting information [which is then] turned into a new form available for the impact statements for many landscape design projects, further enhancing the scientific thrust of the profession.

---


65 Rather than divide the land up into private lots, for instance, Lawrence placed building sites according to the shape of the landscape and included large swaths of commonly-held land. In doing so, he not only aimed to preserve the natural terrain, but also sought to create an overall feeling of community and place. Lyndon and Alinder, *The Sea Ranch*, 19.

66 *Notes on the Synthesis of Form* is included in the bibliography of *RSVP Cycles*. For more on Alexander’s influence on Lawrence, see John-Alder, “A Field Guide to Form,” 69–70.
further stages of performance." However, while Wiener belongs to what science and literature scholar N. Katherine Hayles describes as the first wave of cybernetics (which focused on equilibrium-seeking systems), Alexander’s concept of design as an evolving, self-regulating system corresponds to second wave cybernetics, which emerged in the early to mid-1960s. In contrast to the first wave, second wave cybernetics focused on reflexive, self-organizing systems that privileged complexity and evolution. Lawrence’s understanding of creative systems also conforms to this second wave, echoing Alexander’s framing of design as a flexible feedback loop.

Lawrence also developed a methodology for creative processes, the “RSVP Cycles,” which included scores as a central component (figure 2.6). Although an evocation of the French répondez s’il vous plaît is not entirely accidental—the cycles revolve around the notion of response—Lawrence’s version of the acronym stands for Resources, Score, Valuaction, and Performance. Resources denotes materials, which, for Lawrence, include both objective materials like site, funding, and building materials, and subjective materials, such as attitudes and expectations. As such, Resources can aid or limit the collective process. Scores drive the cycle and can be “open” (loose instructions that leave much of the performance up to the

---

68 Hayles describes these second wave systems as “autopoietic” or “self-making.” N. Katherine Hayles, How We Became Posthuman: Virtual Bodies in Cybernetics, Literature, and Informatics (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999), 10.
69 Although Lawrence does not directly reference second wave systems theorists like Heinz von Foerster or Gordon Pask, he would have been introduced to their ideas through Alexander. In a 2006 interview, Lawrence says that he did not know von Foerster, but that his understanding of design systems includes the same idea of the feedback loop that is articulated in von Foerster’s work. Lawrence Halprin, “Hans Ulrich Obrist interview with Lawrence and Anna Halprin,” Arbitare (November 16, 2009): accessed May 10, 2016, www.abitare.it/wp-content/uploads/post_images/1258393115InterviewAnnaandLawrenceHalprin.pdf, 2.
70 Lawrence described this system and its uses in The RSVP Cycles.
participants) or “closed” (tightly coordinated events). Scores are carried out in the Performance component of the cycle. Valuaction, a term coined by Lawrence to unite ‘value’ and ‘action,’ is an evaluation and feedback session. This crucial, decision-making component of the cycle engenders actionables, which sometimes take the form of a new score.\(^{71}\) The function of scores within this cycle diverges starkly from that of Cagean scores. In contrast to the latter’s interest in chance procedures, RSVP scores are rooted in intention.\(^{72}\) They seek to initiate forms of experience that can lead to deeper reflection on or resolution of specific issues or problems raised during the Resources leg of the cycle.

A comparison of how these two forms of score function within educational settings highlights this distinction. In his class on experimental composition at the New School for Social Research, taught between 1956 and 1960, Cage gave his students simple prompts and asked them to respond by creating scores, which the entire class would then enact and discuss.\(^{73}\) By inviting students to create scores, Cage refused to inhabit an authoritative role in the classroom. Instead, he maintained a dehierarchized learning environment in which teacher and students could contribute equally. For Cage and his students, creating and enacting scores represented a new, liberating approach to art that generated chance operations.\(^{74}\) In other words, the

---

\(^{71}\) I have put these out of order of the RSVP Cycles acronym in part to illustrate Lawrence’s theory that the processes do not have to proceed in a particular order. According to Lawrence, all four steps must be completed, but some may be repeated multiple times.

\(^{72}\) Lawrence asserts that while “Cage works with chance; I work with intention.” Halprin, “Hans Ulrich Obrist interview with Lawrence and Anna Halprin,” 3.


\(^{74}\) This counteracted the subjectivity of the Abstract Expressionists who dominated the New York art scene and most visual art departments at the time. These outcomes are discussed in Liz Kotz, *Words to be Looked At: Language in 1960s Art* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2007), 68.
processes of creating and enacting scores represented ends unto themselves.

In contrast, the Halprins created predetermined scores for their participants to carry out during the *Experiments and Environment* workshops. I posit that these scores functioned as alternatives to conventional assignments. Although many of the scores used in the workshops initiated free-form experiences, these experiences were not an end unto themselves, but cultivated collaboration, experimentation, and environmental awareness in order to enhance creativity. For example, one of the scores from the 1966 workshop asked participants to “blend” into the bustling crowds in San Francisco’s Union Square. The Halprins intended this score to function not only as an invitation to experience an urban center, but also as an observation exercise that prepared participants to design a new urban plan for the square. Furthermore, although the Halprins’ frequently followed the scores alongside their students, unlike Cage, they did not relinquish their authority by asking students to create scores for the group. Instead, they used their predetermined scores to shape the flow of learning in a manner akin to conventional assignments. However, in terms of content, the Halprins’ scores were far from conventional; they presented workshop participants with new experiences and methodologies.

II. *Experiments in Environment*

Before convening as a group, each of the participants in the 1968 *Experiments in Environment*

---


76 Some visual artists also used scores as pedagogical strategies in the late 1960s and early 1970s, including John Baldessari in his teaching at CalArts (c. 1970) and David Askevold at Nova Scotia College of Art and Design (1969–1972). Baldessari supplied students with a list of optional “assignments,” which fall somewhere between conceptual art instructions and fluxus event scores. Askevold invited artists to send scores and instructions for his students to carry out.
Environment workshop spent the first day following an individualized “City Map” score (figure 2.7). The maps guided the participants through divergent spaces and experiences around San Francisco, among them a Woolworth’s, a bustling downtown area, an aquatic park, a cable car ride. The Halprins and their co-facilitator, Dr. Paul Baum, had mailed the maps prior to the start of the workshop, carefully coordinating the routes so that the participants’ trajectories would not intersect.77 As intended by the three facilitators, “City Map” fostered heightened awareness of the urban environment and created common ground for the participants before the commencement of the workshop. This careful engineering of the introductory experience and first meeting is indicative of the Halprins’ approach to leading workshops: they utilized scores to facilitate individual and group experiences followed by opportunities for collective feedback and processing. The 1968 workshop built upon the 1966 iteration, expanding the latter’s focus on self- and environmental-awareness to include “new concepts of the idea of community.”78 After a brief overview of the earlier workshop, this section analyzes the activities of the 1968 iteration and the implications of the Halprins’ approaches to leadership. In developing and implementing a pedagogy that fostered experience and process, the Halprins articulated and modeled the role of the artist as facilitator of learning.

The 1966 workshop, which lasted four weeks, brought together twenty-nine dancers and fifteen designers to explore collective creative processes that would “deal with problems of perceiving the environment.”79 The impetus for the workshop stemmed from a shared desire to

77 As they travelled through those locations they were instructed to do things like: “Look out and pay attention to the drama of the environment,” and “Imagine yourself in a place of fantasies and act accordingly.” The exception to these individualized paths was that all participants came to Union Square at 3pm, where they were asked to face the sun; see Halprin and Burns, Taking Part, 180.
78 Halprin and Burns, Taking Part, 178.
79 “Lawrence Halprin Announces a Summer Workshop,” 1966, Lawrence Halprin Papers, Architectural Archives, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia. I am taking my cue from Lawrence Halprin in using “designers” as a broad term to encompass architects, landscape designers, and urban planners.
increase holistic environmental perception in both designers and dancers and to explore collaborative, interdisciplinary learning. In her interdisciplinary collaborations on the dance deck and at the San Francisco Dancers' Workshop, Anna had also become alert to parallels between her work and happenings. However, she sought to distance her work from happenings, criticizing the latter for the “mismatch” of participants and their juxtapositional approach to bringing together different artistic practices. Instead of seeking to explore the possibilities of productive collaboration, she believed happenings frequently resulted in discordant combinations, and she was eager to use *Experiments in Environment* as a platform for the former. Lawrence’s interest in collaborative group processes arose from his observations of “inter-relationships” in nature: “I searched for linkages between our group processes and the processes of the environment itself—for some form of collective creativity.” Both also acknowledged the dearth of models for collaborative, process-based pedagogy in the conventional learning settings of universities and traditional dance schools. Lawrence described his increasing frustration with what he called the “‘giving-receiving’ format” of higher education. Implicit within the design of the workshop was the notion that conventional schools failed to train creative professionals in interdisciplinary collaboration and creative problem solving.

The Halprins structured the 1966 workshop so that the two groups, dancers and designers, would interact frequently as they engaged in experiences involving a range of disciplines. Although the workshop enrollment was limited to dancers and designers, the Halprins invited “faculty” working in a range of media. Alongside Anna and Lawrence,

---

82 Ibid., xi. Lawrence had occasionally taught and frequently lectured in universities.
83 The term “faculty,” which typically connotes an academic learning environment, is Lawrence’s term.
cinematographer Joe Ehreth, lighting specialist Patrick Hickey, architect Charles Moore, geographer Richard Reynolds, graphic designer Barbara Stauffacher, and composer Morton Subotnick all led sessions. The workshop schedule shows that the faculty alternated so that the first half of an afternoon might be spent learning the principles of ecology with Reynolds, followed by a movement workshop led by an instructor from the San Francisco Dancers’ Workshop (figure 2.8). This shifting from subject to subject demonstrates the Halprins’ desire to foster the investigation of different disciplines and the creation of connections and comparisons between disciplinary processes. The juxtaposition of subjects throughout each day corresponded to the variety of locales in which the workshop took place: the dramatic coast at Sea Ranch, the woodlands surrounding their Kentfield, Marin County home, and urban San Francisco. Moving between these three locations was central to the workshop’s pedagogy: the Halprins invited the participants to experience the contrasting landscapes in ways that heightened their environmental awareness and sense of place. This strategy contrasted the disregard for site and place in modern design and dance education. The schedule also indicates frequent social gatherings such as cocktail events, collective dinners, and a banquet, revealing an interest in communal lifestyle as well as collective learning. Furthermore, the workshop continued over most of the weekends. This schedule fostered the sense that participants were part of an intensive learning community, cut off from exterior realities and free from the structured time of traditional schooling. The focus on creating a sense of community aligns with Deweyan pedagogy: the progressive educator advocated the creation of a co-operative learning community in a classroom, of which the teacher is both a leader and a part. However, the

84 The Halprins knew most of these session leaders from previous collaborations. Charles Moore had worked with Lawrence on Sea Ranch, for example, and Anna’s San Francisco Dancers’ Workshop originally shared a building with Morton Subotnick’s Tape Music Center.
focus on community also belied a disciplinary distinction between the two participating groups—the intellectual designers versus the sensory dancers—that also manifested itself within the workshop structure as some of the design-specific activities were only intended for the former group. The Halprins sought to move away from this distinction in the second iteration through a more intensive investigation of community.

1968

The announcement for the 1968 workshop describes a process that moves from exploration on the individual level towards “the idea of group interaction with the environment, which will lead to the development of an understanding of larger communities.” The promotional flyer features two scenes of dynamic collaboration, a mostly male group working together to hoist a wooden log and a predominantly female group trying to balance in a pyramidal form (figure 2.9). The division between the men and women in this announcement illustrates the Halprins’ binary approach to gender, which became problematic towards the end of the workshop. Although the flyer solicited dancers and environmental designers, the Halprins extended the call for participation to other disciplines too. They also invited Gestalt therapist Paul Baum to collaborate with them as a co-leader. Baum’s therapeutic practice, which focused on perception, bodily sensation, and relationships between self, others, and environment,

---

86 The two sets of promotional materials also display significant differences. While there is no evidence that Anna’s materials comprised more than the basic poster, Lawrence’s press release included an outline of subjects that would be covered and a reading list. The outline of subjects included “Ecology,” “Kinetic Environments,” “Processes and Formatting,” and “Environmental Planning.” The reading list included works by John Cage, Walter Gropius, Gyorgy Kepes, Paul Klee, John Kouwenhoven, Lazlo Maholy-Nagy, William L. Thomas Jr., and a reading on Happenings from the Tulane Drama Review.  
complemented the experiential thrust of the workshop.\textsuperscript{88}

The twenty-four-day workshop, which began on July first, took place in the same three locations as the earlier iteration: downtown San Francisco, Sea Ranch, and Kentfield. The forty enrollees included educators, designers, psychologists, dancers, planners, sociologists, and architects. As mentioned in the introduction to this chapter, the Halprins and Baum created a monumental score for the entire workshop, which organized the days into a horizontal grid divided into morning, afternoon, and evening sessions (figure 2.10). The morning and afternoon blocks typically include an “event” and an “assignment” for that event. The articulation of a complete score for the workshop, prior to its start, reveals the facilitator’s careful sequencing of a “cumulative series of experiences.”\textsuperscript{89}

The use of the score represents a paradox in the workshops’ structure: the Halprins and Baum designed the score as a device to permit freedom and experimentation, but they created it without input from the participants, maintaining some of the traditional hierarchy between teacher and student. Writing a few years after the workshop, Baum aptly described this score as a metaphor for the power dynamics of the workshop itself: “Kids can have a democracy within their classroom or workshop, but they don’t get to plan the curriculum.”\textsuperscript{90} This structure went against some of the most radical theories of education circulating during the 1960s and 1970s, such as Cage’s prioritization of student-composed scores or Scottish educator Alexander Sutherland Neill’s experiments at Summerhill School, which provided students with freedom to

\textsuperscript{88} Baum was a participant at the San Francisco Dancers Workshop. He had studied with the originator of Gestalt therapy, Fritz Perls, who lived and practiced at the alternative education and retreat center Esalen Institute. Baum, Perls and three other therapists, formed the Gestalt Institute of San Francisco in 1967. The other faculty from the first workshop were not involved in leading the second, but several of their scores were adapted and re-used, including Hickey’s and Moore’s score for the Driftwood Village.

\textsuperscript{89} Halprin and Burns, \textit{Taking Part}, 179.

determine both their paths of study and the structure of the school day.\textsuperscript{91} However, it aligns with Dewey’s promotion of structured learning situations in the 1930s: “the planning must be flexible enough to permit free play for individuality of experience and yet firm enough to give direction towards continuous development.”\textsuperscript{92} Lawrence went further than Dewey’s ideal facilitator, however, when he occasionally gave lectures on topics like the development of Sea Ranch. Despite these instances of traditional teacher-student dynamics, notes from a feedback session suggest that there was some flexibility within the implementation of the overarching score.\textsuperscript{93} And, unlike a traditional school, the workshop had a pre-stated focus; participants knew that they would not be determining the curriculum themselves.

After the initial “City Map” score, the first week comprised activities that were intended to raise bodily awareness. For example, the second day included a “Blindfolded Walk” in which participants donned blindfolds and held hands, collectively navigating a hike through Kentfield’s hilly woods (figure 2.11). By eliminating sight, the exercise heightened all other forms of sensory perception. Following the walk, everyone was asked to draw her or his experience. Lawrence and Burns described the resulting sketches as demonstrating the awareness achieved during the walk: they were largely faithful representations of the actual terrain.\textsuperscript{94} By shifting from physical experience to recording this experience on paper, the participants also practiced

\textsuperscript{91} Neill posited that children should have “freedom,” but not so much freedom that would take “license” to disrespect or transgress the rights of others. See Alexander Sutherland Neill, \textit{Freedom, Not License} (New York, Hart Publishing Co.: 1966). Pacific High, an alternative, “non-authoritarian” high school and community in the Santa Cruz mountains, is an example of a West Coast initiative that was based on Neill’s ideas. For more information on Pacific High see: Michael S. Kaye, \textit{The Teacher was the Sea: The Story of Pacific High School} (New York: Links Books, 1972).
\textsuperscript{92} Dewey, \textit{Experience and Education}, 36.
\textsuperscript{93} Anna lamented that “[I] covered about one tenths of the material I wanted to.” In “Transcription – Final Meeting Of Summer Workshop Participants: Ann And Larry Halprin, Paul Baum, Jim Burns, Rana Halprin,” 1968. Lawrence Halprin Papers, Architectural Archives, University of Pennsylvania, Philadelphia.
\textsuperscript{94} Halprin and Burns, \textit{Taking Part}, 183.
notating movement.

As the workshop continued, the leaders increasingly brought the participants into collaborative situations. They carried out an iteration of a “Driftwood Village” score that the architect Charles Moore had created and facilitated for the 1966 workshop. This activity took place at Gualala Beach near Sea Ranch. The score read: “Build a structure on the Gualala Beach using driftwood and relating to the environment...in groups or singly as you see fit.” Participants responded by constructing a variety of simple structures including homes, spaces for relaxation, and “ritualistic and totemic devices” (figure 2.12). The natural curves of the driftwood echo the undulating waves below, highlighting the extent to which the participants responded directly to the surrounding landscape. The process of solving a design problem through such an immediate exercise reveals a much more holistic and hands-on approach to design than that espoused by most design schools at the time. The workshop participants expanded upon this process the next day, when they returned to the beach and followed another score. This second Driftwood Village score asked them to destroy the previous structures and “use this as a motivation to build our environment as a community; that is, whatever choices you must make include your awareness of their impact on the whole group.” Anna describes the resulting process as one marked by collaborative construction and spontaneous communal rituals. The documentation shows participants balancing together and dancing on a playground-like structure accompanied by two people drumming (figure 2.13).

Together, these two scores illustrate many of the aims of the workshop at large: practicing collaboration and structural and formal design, carrying out these tasks in a manner that

---

95 In the previous iteration it was referred to as a “Driftwood City.”
96 Halprin and Burns, Taking Part, 186.
97 Ibid., 187.
98 Ibid.
99 From Anna Halprins notebook, as quoted in ibid.
responds to a unique natural environment, and undergoing a loose RSVP Cycle, in which an initial process is repeated with the input of feedback.\textsuperscript{100} The documentation also reveals the intersection of different media and artistic practices that the Halprins sought to nurture.

The second and third weeks focused on scores that sought to foster group cohesion. In addition to “Driftwood Village,” activities during the second week of the workshop included group drawing exercises, and the creation of a “Departure Ritual” to commemorate their departure from Sea Ranch. Baum facilitated a “Family Drawing” score, in which participants were assigned groups and each asked to assume a ‘family’ role within the group (figure 2.14).\textsuperscript{101} After inhabiting these roles, the groups created graphics that illustrated their family dynamics. This activity “intensified group identity and made the group like a second family for the participants.”\textsuperscript{102} As in group or family therapy, it also allowed them to address and play out tensions that existed in the group. A subsequent “Nakedness’ activity increased the level of comfort and familiarity among the participants. The score instructed them to “massage your partner’s body and become aware of its makeup.”\textsuperscript{103} Implicit within this score was the message that each workshopper should remove her or his clothing as she or he became more comfortable. Not only would this nudity increase anatomical understanding, but it would also explore “how confident people can feel with their own bodies and how trusting and non up tight [sic] they can become with the group.”\textsuperscript{104} The participants, who eventually all complied, opted to remain nude after the exercise, eating lunch and walking through the woods without clothes on. This familiarity continued when the participants (including the facilitators) gathered for a “class

\textsuperscript{100} In the 1966 workshop participants underwent a stricter RSVP Cycle, conducting a Valuaction session before redesigning the Village.

\textsuperscript{101} These included traditional family roles, but also a dog, a deceased child, a chauffeur, etc. and led to the carrying out of intense emotional conflicts.

\textsuperscript{102} Halprins and Burns, \textit{Taking Part}, 194.

\textsuperscript{103} Ibid., 199.

\textsuperscript{104} Ibid.
photograph” at the end of the workshop: they decided to do one clothed and one unclothed in the same configuration (figure 2.15). While the photograph highlights group cohesion, it also documents personal liberation. As Ross observes, the nude photograph presents the participants as freed from the constraints that dominate mainstream society, having achieved a level of bodily-acceptance and liberation representative of their status as “counterculture rebels.”

“Our Community”

Despite this liberated group dynamic, one of the final activities led to a breakdown in the collaborative atmosphere. The “Our Community” score asked participants to draft a “master plan” that defined the group as a community. The resulting tensions reveal the challenges of getting students to produce a product using process-based pedagogy as well as the larger question of diversity within the *Experiments in Environment* community. The workshoppers disagreed about what form the plan would take and ultimately refused to work as a group, resulting in a frustration of the cooperative ethos that had built up over the course of three weeks. Lawrence’s notes on the process state: “People are not listening, not thinking...Fear of hurting other people’s feelings...Sexual difficulties; women introduce side issues.” A later conversation between the facilitators highlights an important critique of this score: that it was too focused on product. Participants engaged with the process of discussing their ideas about

---

106 The “Our Community” score read: “1. Do something that defines in an external form the unique configuration of yourselves as a community. 2. The group is to realize this is a community process. The resultant or product is to be you, the community (outsiders may be used, but there must be reasons for their use.) 3. Make a master plan first (there are certain dangers to predict about the layout of the studio) so that everyone can visualize what is happening and so you can explore and tighten what you do as you proceed. 4. Be sure to establish a motivation.” This score was published in Halprin and Burns, *Taking Part*, 203.
107 Lawrence Halprin’s notes as published in Halprin and Burns, *Taking Part*, 203.
community, but did not condense those ideas into a master plan.\(^{108}\) The failure to arrive at an outcome indicates a deficiency in collective problem-solving and working through disagreements. Although the workshop fostered substantial communal experience, the response to the “Our Community” score shows that it did not train participants in how to negotiate disagreement.\(^{109}\)

Lawrence’s notes on “Our Community” also reveal gender biases within the workshop, as did the subsequent activity, which the Halprins’ and Baum developed in order to address the conflicts around the “Our Community” score. The “Score for a performance of what the leaders had observed happening during ‘Our Community’” asked participants to physically demonstrate the following observation: “women castrating men by defusing and diverting all process discussions, and the men’s letting it happen.” The group was divided by gender: the women developed a dance that involved a tight communal grouping in which they held each other, while the men formed a shirtless pyramid and lunged at the women (figure 2.16). This exaggeration of stereotypical gender roles parallels tactics used by Judy Chicago in the Feminist Art Program to denigrate these roles; however, there is no indication that this was the intention in the Halprin workshop.\(^{110}\) Anna and Lawrence also did not organize a follow-up conversation to address these gender stereotypes. In fact, Lawrence, at least, seems to have been completely perplexed by gender differences and the women’s movement.

This lack of awareness and latent sexism connects to another blind spot within the


\(^{109}\) By the time that Taking Part was published, Lawrence had incorporated approaches to dealing with disagreement into the “Take Part” pedagogy. These include having participants write about their ideas, responses, or reservations before discussing them as a group, and creating lists of everyone’s views or experiences rather than seeking one overarching consensus.

\(^{110}\) For example, Chicago and her students staged a Cock and Cunt play (1970–1972), in which female students performed male and female gender roles while wearing costumes featuring enlarged genitalia.
workshop’s understanding of community: the Halprins and Baum focused on disciplinary diversity, but for an almost completely white, privileged group of participants. (Most of the participants were white college or graduate school graduates working in creative disciplines.) Thus the workshop’s demographics bely the racial or ethnic diversity or radical racial politics of the Bay Area, where the Black Panther Party had formed only two years earlier. Although there is no indication that the issue of homogeneity arose during the workshop, Anna later asked, “How could we be a true community in any societal sense without the input of broader and more real representation?” The narrowness of the *Experiments in Environment* community not only reveals a lack of direct engagement in the racial politics of the period and place, but also the limitations of the workshop format: its duration and focus targeted participants with flexible work schedules and creative backgrounds. The relatively homogeneous participants’ struggle to collectively work through disagreements highlight the limitations of the Halprins’ methodology. However, the failure of the community score also reinforces the Halprins’ roles as facilitators of processes and experiences rather than objects.

**Facilitation**

Despite neglecting to address difference and disagreement within the collaborative process, the Halprins and Baum successfully broke from traditional teaching roles. They

---

111 Anna Halprin, “Anna Halprin,” in Halprin and Burns, *Taking Part*, xv. Both Anna and Lawrence did, however, actively work with more diverse communities in their individual practices following the workshop. In late July 1968 Anna was invited to work with Studio Watts School of the Arts, a recently formed center in the Watts neighborhood of Los Angeles. She brought together the all-black dance troupe at Studio Watts and an all-white group of dancers from San Francisco Dancers’ Workshop for an intensive ten-day joint rehearsal that would determine the shape of the ultimate performance. The resulting performance, *Ceremony of Us*, did not present resolutions to any of the conflicts that arose, but a lightly participatory restaging of some of the scores and games carried out during the rehearsal session. Following this experience, Anna began “Reach Out,” a program for a multiracial ensemble of dancers and worked to recruit black dance teachers at San Francisco Dancers’ Workshop. Several of Lawrence Halprin & Associates workshops also sought to involve the African American community in planning processes.
participated in most of the activities, including those that were outside of their disciplines. For example, Baum includes a detailed description of his initial discomfort (and eventual relaxation) while participating in the “Nakedness” score in his contribution to *Taking Part*. In many of the photographs of the workshop, Anna is indistinguishable from the participants. The documentation of a movement activity, for instance, shows Anna in her underwear doing exercises with similarly scantily clad workshoppers (figure 2.17). All three leaders also joined the nude group photograph. Although the leader-prepared scores indicate facilitator-participant hierarchy, the Halprins and Baum did not interfere with the participants’ processes of executing the scores. For example, when the workshoppers were unable to create a master plan during the “Our Community” workshop, the leaders did not enforce completion, but instead acknowledged the resistance. In this sense, they embodied Lawrence’s description of their roles as “process enablers, not sideline coaches for ‘success’ in terms of reaching goals.”

In 1974, Lawrence and workshop participant Jim Burns elaborated on this notion of facilitator, describing collective creativity as a “new art” and its facilitation as a “new profession.” According to Halprin and Burns, this role comprises several “functions” or responsibilities: Process Management, or overseeing the logistics and gathering the leaders and participants; Scoring; Facilitating; and Recording, which includes recording feedback and documenting through photography, video, and other media. The facilitator ensures participation through “continual responsiveness to group and individual vibrations and the

---

112 Baum, “Interview between Chip Lord and Paul Baum,” 215.
113 Lawrence’s lectures represent an exception to breakdown of boundaries. Despite his stated disgust with the lecture format of conventional academia, he was unable to completely break from that format and delivered lectures during both the 1966 and the 1968 workshops.
114 Halprin and Burns, *Taking Part*, 204.
115 Ibid., 266.
dynamic interplay of feelings and physical activity.” They “cannot remain outside the process; they must be inside it.” This “new profession” again refers back to Dewey’s notion of the role of a teacher as a guide and assistant for student learning, but it also connects to new forms of professional expertise cultivated by the changing economy of the 1970s. Cultural historian Sam Binkley discusses this new form of professional, the “postindustrial knowledge worker,” in reference to sociologist Daniel Bell’s *The Coming of the Post Industrial Society* (1973). As described by Bell, the rise of the service sector of the economy (which, for Bell, includes education and research) led to an increasing need for people who could disseminate theoretical knowledge, rather than produce manufactured products. Binkley extends Bell’s notion of the new roles engendered by the service sector to the rise of health and human service providers during this period. This group often disseminated knowledge concerning lifestyle and “the development of self.” Anna and Lawrence Halprin can be seen as bridging the gap between these two new forms of service workers, facilitating the transformation of learning and lifestyle.

In adopting the new role of artist-as-facilitator, the Halprins also served as models for their participants. Many left the workshop with a desire to assume a similar facilitation role. Chip Lord, a recent architecture school graduate, for example, enthusiastically wrote to the Halprins that “the workshop was a catalyst, was an education, was a trip into my future, was an

---

117 Ibid., 274.
118 Ibid., 110.
122 In addition to the following examples, this is demonstrated in the feedback from Bruce Bonine and Betty Weismehl, as printed in Halprin and Burns, *Taking Part*, 211.
art form, was a lifestyle, was a freestylelife [sic] race, was groove."\textsuperscript{123} Lord later credited the workshop for helping to extricate him from the conventional architecture path that he had been following prior to the summer of 1968. Instead of entering an architecture firm, he remained in San Francisco and formed Ant Farm with the architect Doug Hall. The two initially framed the collective as a platform for student-driven education, which was modeled after the Halprin workshop. Architecture critic Jim Burns credited the 1968 \textit{Experiments in Environment} workshop as inspiring his decision to leave his editorial job at \textit{Progressive Architecture}, which he described as “the good old Senior Editor security blanket,” in order to join “a multidisciplinary future of creating and communicating with a lot of different people.”\textsuperscript{124}

However, the “positive” effect that the workshop had on participants like Burns and Lord, who left conventional career paths to explore greater creativity and collectivity, must also be qualified. Burns’s evocation of casting aside his “security blanket,” especially, highlights both the desire for freedom and the risk of precarity that that freedom affords. Although intended as an alternative to the conventional authoritarian role of the teacher, this model can also be viewed as a precursor to the contemporary paradigm of the flexible, network-driven “project head,” who leads through her ability to make connections and to facilitate the work of others. As outlined by sociologists Luc Boltanski and Eve Chiapello in \textit{The New Spirit of Capitalism}, the demand for freedom, autonomy, and creativity contained within the critiques of 1960s corporate culture led to an internalization of this discourse and the emergence of a flexible, networked worker. Like the facilitation work of the Halprins, the “mediator” or “project head” of the neoliberal economy

serves as a “coach,” “innovator,” “connector,” and resource identifier. However, the flexibility and autonomy of the “project head” comes at the cost of job security, better collective bargaining, and welfare programs. These connections, of course, can only be made in hindsight. Anna and Lawrence Halprin were not thinking about the future implications of the new role that they had developed. Although they did not collaborate on another Experiments in Environment, both continued to lead workshops in their own practices, and Lawrence began to codify the pedagogy that they had developed.

III. Taking Part

Lawrence Halprin and Jim Burns published Taking Part: A Workshop Approach to Collective Creativity (1974) as a do-it-yourself guide to the pedagogy of the Experiments in Environment workshops. They addressed the book to “anyone interested in collective creativity. That is, to the issue of how people work together in groups to solve problems creatively. This problem-solving approach is appropriate, we believe, to many, many aspects of people’s interactions with each other, not specifically to any one field.” The book, which also contains contributions from Anna Halprin and Paul Blum, was designed and printed by MIT Press (figure 2.18). As indicated in its opening statement, it aims to provide strategies for creative problem solving in collective situations including education, community-based planning, performances, group therapy, and personal communication. Despite its range of anticipated applications, scholars typically discuss Taking Part as a guide for participatory urban planning; its

126 Halprin and Burns, Taking Part, ix. The following quotes in this paragraph are also taken from this page.
pedagogical implications have not been examined.127 The publication presents and circulates a more codified iteration of the Halprins’ teaching approach, which Halprin and Burns labeled “Take Part.” While Halprin and Burns intended this pedagogy to foster more engaged participation within democratic society, the “Take Part” approach also anticipated contemporary models of corporate labor.

The impetus for publishing Taking Part arose out of the warm response to Experiments in Environment and out of Anna and Lawrence’s continued interest in facilitating participatory workshops in their individual practices. As previously mentioned, Lawrence repositioned himself as a “conceptualizer” within Lawrence Halprin & Associates in the late 1960s. In this role, he frequently facilitated community planning workshops, which became a central part of the firm’s practice around this time.128 These workshops exemplified the current trend towards community participation in large-scale design projects, which arose in response to the disaffection with large-scale urban renewal projects. This disaffection was spurred by urban activists like Jane Jacobs, who charged that urban renewal projects destroyed neighborhoods and disenfranchised communities.129 Lawrence Halprin & Associates’ workshops used participatory methodologies to elicit input from local residents who would be affected by the projects. For example, the firm led a workshop in 1969 that focused on transportation issues in the central business district of Fort Worth, Texas. The twenty-five participants (all local business owners and governmental officials) followed scores for a “City Walk”—which included walking, riding the subway, and talking with people on the street—and for design exercises that required them to

draw the city in different stages of historic and future development (figure 2.19).\textsuperscript{130} This workshop drew significant interest and, in 1971, Lawrence Halprin & Associates received a grant to hold a much larger community leadership training workshop in Indianapolis, which involved trainees from city and state planning bureaucracies. In preparation for this event, Lawrence and Jim Burns led a leadership training workshop in San Francisco, which utilized scores and methods from *Experiments in Environment* to train future “Take Part” workshop leaders.\textsuperscript{131} Lawrence also began to focus on publishing manuals that outline the processes that he had developed; *The RSVP Cycles* (1970), discussed earlier in this chapter, represents Lawrence’s first book-length publication of this kind. Concurrently, Anna had been leading “life/art workshops” at the San Francisco Dancers’ Workshop, which explored collective creativity through movement-based exercises. She described her position in the late 1970s as “concerned more and more with the workshop process, rather than performance-oriented goals. ... I’ve given up the idea of a sustained company. Instead I’m concerned with sustaining a community of people working and growing together collectively; reinforcing and nourishing each other in creative ways.”\textsuperscript{132} After leaving his editorial position, Burns frequently consulted with Lawrence Halprin & Associates on their community workshops.

In addition to their continued investment in workshops, the Halprins’ interest in visualizing the creative process led them to exuberantly document both iterations of *Experiments in Environment*, creating a wealth of materials readily available for a publication. Lawrence took copious notes and sketched many of the workshops proceedings in his journal,

\textsuperscript{130} The resulting proposals included an expanded public transit system, better pedestrian walkways, and a mixed-use downtown. Although Lawrence Halprin & Associates had intended to include other members of the community, the City Sector Planning Council refused to invite the broader public. For more on the Fort Worth Workshop see Hirsch, *City Choreographer*, 210–15.

\textsuperscript{131} Both were funded by a Housing and Urban Development Demonstration Grant.

\textsuperscript{132} Anna Halprin, “Anna Halprin,” *Taking Part*, xv.
creating a record that can also be viewed as an art object. As noted by Solveig Nelson, the large-scale score produced for the 1968 workshop similarly falls “at the threshold of art and documentation”; although it served as a functional score, its scale lends it the presence of an art object.\textsuperscript{133} The Halprins also hired photographers to document the 1966 and 1968 workshops, the copious resulting images aestheticize the interactions between moving bodies and shifting environments, thereby capturing the sensory nature of the workshops.\textsuperscript{134} Lawrence and Burns expanded on this practice, commissioning experimental film and video artist Connie Beeson to document the 1971 leadership training workshop.\textsuperscript{135} Beeson recorded the proceedings on both film and video, resulting in silent 16mm films that capture the dynamism of the activities and videos that highlight participant’s intensive discussions. One of the videos, \textit{Workshop}, shows the participants watching a previously recorded video of themselves carrying out a score in which they describe their neighborhood (figure 2.20).\textsuperscript{136} This meta-documentation highlights the centrality of records within the workshop process: because the Halprins’ structured the workshops as sequence of experiences that build upon themselves, the ability to revisit past discussions was crucial. The immediacy of video made it an ideal media to create this form of feedback loop. The multiple layers of workshop documentation thus served as devices to visualize creative processes, enhance communication between participants, and as records that could inform future workshops.

That \textit{Taking Part} took the form of a do-it-yourself guide corresponds to a broader

\textsuperscript{133} Nelson, “Space Age,” 100.
\textsuperscript{134} Workshop photographers included Paul Ryan, a video artist who went on to be involved with the video collective Raindance Collective and their publication \textit{Radical Software}, and future Ant Farm member Curtis Schreier.
\textsuperscript{135} Beeson had previously worked with Anna. To document the 1971 workshop, she used a Sony Portapak camera. Sony released the first affordable and easily mobile video camera, the Portapak, in 1967.
\textsuperscript{136} The video that they are watching is called \textit{My Neighborhood}. It depicts participants carrying out a “My Neighborhood” score by describing their neighborhoods.
countercultural publishing trend. Sometimes referred to as “meta-manuals,” do-it-yourself guides proliferated during the 1960s and 1970s as tools for disseminating information among countercultural networks.\textsuperscript{137} Many proponents viewed these meta-manuals as alternatives to institutional education because they supported autodidactic pursuit of knowledge. Meta-manuals frequently focused on skills or processes that enabled readers to live outside of mainstream society, such as subsistence farming and cooking techniques, DIY building processes, and herbal medicine. Alternative pedagogical methods also represented a central focus of these meta-manuals—many other practitioners of communication pedagogy created similar guides to propagate their ideas.\textsuperscript{138} Stewart Brand’s \textit{Whole Earth Catalog} (1968–72), which synthesized “tools” for a variety of alternative lifestyle and educational needs, served as a central forum for popularizing and promoting these manuals.\textsuperscript{139} By the mid-1970s, the surge of do-it-yourself manuals had come to represent a powerful arm of the U.S. book market. Publications like \textit{The Massage Book} (1972), \textit{The Moosewood Cookbook} (1977), and \textit{What Color is your Parachute} (1970) became best sellers and indicators of a burgeoning lifestyle industry.\textsuperscript{140} As such, these guides served as important communication technologies that circulated countercultural ideas and practices to wider audiences. Binkley argues that many of these guides were instrumental to the cultural “loosening” (the shift away from conformity and self-regimentation towards self-discovery and relaxed social mores) that occurred in mainstream society in the United States in the late 1960s and early 1970s because they offered “narrative accounts of a transformed self,”

\textsuperscript{137} For more on meta-manuals see Lorraine Wild and David Karwan, “Agency and Urgency: The Medium and Its Message” in Andrew Blauvelt, ed., \textit{Hippie Modernism: The Struggle for Utopia} (Minneapolis, MN: Walker Art Center, 2015), 50–52.\textsuperscript{138} Examples include Ant Farm’s \textit{Inflatocookbook} (1970), and Michael Shamberg and Raindance Corporation’s, \textit{Guerrilla Television} (1971).\textsuperscript{139} For more info on \textit{The Whole Earth Catalog} see Fred Turner, \textit{From Counterculture to Cyberculture: Stewart Brand, the Whole Earth Network, and the Rise of Digital Utopianism} (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006.)\textsuperscript{140} The latter is a guide to job-hunting.
that were relatable and consumable.\textsuperscript{141}

Taking Part follows the non-standardized format of many of these meta-manuals: it offers insight, instructions, diagrams, illustrations, and examples for all aspects of “Take Part” workshop planning and facilitation, and is written in a conversational tone by multiple authors.\textsuperscript{142} The publication thus eschews inaccessible academic jargon and rejects the notion that one singular author (or teacher) can accurately purvey knowledge. The book is organized into individually authored sections that focus on aspects of the workshop process and in-depth overviews of past workshops, and culminates with a “Take Part Process Handbook.” This handbook functions as a manual within the manual, which the authors describe as a “score, if you will, of your own Take Part Processes.”\textsuperscript{143} This layered format ensures that the four authors describe the techniques and processes multiple times, allowing for a nuanced understanding. Halprin and Burns also intended this organization to demonstrate “the various interrelationships that occur in a take part process.”\textsuperscript{144} However, it is worth noting that the multiple authors do not disagree about the process as a whole. This non-linear organization allows the reader to select the examples and concepts that are relevant to her own purposes. The book also includes many short scores for the reader to carry out. These scores focus on tasks and activities that introduce the reader to processes described in subsequent pages. Functioning as reflective

\textsuperscript{141} According to Binkley, these DIY lifestyle guides packaged what could be a “traumatic change” in the face of shifting societal norms into real, non-threatening, “purposeful narratives.” In choosing to purchase these guides, Binkley argues, the consumer could choose feel as if she was choosing the self that she wanted to emulate. Binkley, Getting Loose, 9, 12.
\textsuperscript{142} Lawrence Halprin and Burns chose to present each authorial voice as distinct “so that the four voices would not become one.” Halprin and Burns, Taking Part, ix.
\textsuperscript{144} Ibid., 267.
writing prompts rather than catalysts, they are closer to conventional assignments than the scores used in the workshops, but they invite open-ended and process-oriented responses. For example, the first chapter ends with the following score: “At this point in reading this book write down your expectations; what do you expect from the book. Keep to refer to later” (figure 2.21). Like many of the scores, a blank page surrounds this text, inviting the reader to write directly in the book or to use the score as a template for an activity in a future workshop. The book’s design echoes this interactive format. It juxtaposes many different types of typography, photographs, clippings, handwritten notes and hand-drawn diagrams, creating a visual cacophony that completely contrasts the formal, linear design of a conventional textbook.

The pedagogical method outlined in the publication represents a more codified version of that used in Experiments in Environment. It describes building a team that will manage the “Take Part” process by gathering participants, scoring, facilitating, and documenting. The “pre-planning process” includes designing scores that can later be modified according to participants’ needs or workshop direction. Participant selection involves asking different stakeholders to generate lists of potential workshoppers, which can then be discussed and consolidated. In addition, “project managers” must gather relevant “Resources” before the beginning of the workshop. The authors highlight the importance of creating a media center, which can range from a collection of drawing and writing materials to sound and video recording technologies. To initiate the workshop, they recommend using an introductory score, such as asking participants to write down their expectations or introduce themselves to each other.  

145 Ibid., 24.  

146 They specify that “Media must be useable, malleable, immediately available, and susceptible to change by the group.” The various equipment would allow participants to experiment with different forms of communication with an eye towards breaking typical communication patterns, and to create more opportunities for processing and feedback. Halprin and Burns, Taking Part, 294–9.  

147 They recommend that workshop facilitators follow this with a general introduction to the overall
Subsequent scores should explore the workshop goals through process-based, participatory activities. Concluding activities can take the form of consensus reports, in which the facilitator summarizes the groups’ process and any outcomes, and the group provides feedback on that summary. Finally, the process should end with a “closure score” that brings about reflection and acceptance of closure.¹⁴⁸

Halprin and Burns believed that this pedagogy would create a society of citizens that was better equipped to participate in democratic processes: “more and more people are less and less inclined to turn over all decision making to elected or appointed officials or to instructors. So much has happened to reduce confidence in bureaucratic techniques that people have become more and more determined to exert control over the course of their own lives.”¹⁴⁹ This belief parallels Dewey’s theory of education in democratic society, which posits that learning scenarios must “give [students] a personal interest in social relationships and control, and the habits of mind which secure social changes without introducing disorder.”¹⁵⁰ Similarly, the Halprins and Burns designed the “Take Part” pedagogy to give citizens agency to work against a top-down approach to decision-making by acting as stronger creative collaborators. However, rather than Dewey, Halprin and Burns cite Italian theorist Pierpaolo Saporito’s assertion that “a violent stimulation of collective creativity [is] the alternative to lucid and repressive imposition of reference patterns operated by consumerism, which is to say Power.”¹⁵¹

This quote expresses the violence present in the U.S. at this time, but contradicts the

---

¹⁴⁹ Halprin and Burns, Taking Part, 2.
¹⁵¹ Pierpaolo Saporito, cited in Halprin and Burns, Taking Part, 266.
methodology that *Taking Part* proposes. In offering tools for the participation in creative problem solving processes and non-hierarchical learning situations, Halprin and Burns do not incite radical revolt against the existing power structure. Instead, they remain in keeping with Dewey’s dictum—they are ultimately not working to overthrow the dominant democratic power structure, but working to empower citizens to have more agency within that structure.

Furthermore, Lawrence Halprin & Associates often utilized the “Take Part Process” for corporate projects, such as the aforementioned example of the workshop for a business planning district in Fort Worth, Texas in 1970. In fact, much of “Take Part” pedagogy seems aligned with contemporary corporate management strategies. Boltanski and Chiapello demonstrate that much of the corporate management literature that emerged in the 1990s drew on the countercultural critique of corporations in the 1960s. Briefly stated, the resulting neoliberal economic structure that emerged in the 1990s revolves around a rejection of hierarchical management in favor of “small, multi-tasked teams” led by a coordinator. These teams are united by a sense of trust, connection, and communication and are encouraged to “develop themselves personally” and act on “feelings, emotions and creativity.” Much like Halprin and Burns’s facilitator, the co-coordinators or “coaches” will “ensure that [people] attain a better knowledge of themselves, and discover… ‘genuine autonomy’, based on self-knowledge and personal fulfillment.”

Despite, or perhaps because of its prescience, *Taking Part* was not warmly received.

---

152 Participants for this workshop included directors of major banks and insurance corporations, city planning officials, managers of large retail stores and other members of Fort Worth’s urban-industrial power structure. See Hirsch, *City Choreographer*, 210–15.
154 Ibid., 110, 90, 87.
155 Ibid., 90.
Sales were low and the book did not garner much critical attention. At the time of the publication, however, several workshops based on the “Take Part Process” had been carried out including a workshop for federal bureaucrats, sponsored by the National Endowment for the Arts, to determine a “common language,” a Christian Brothers High School curriculum-planning workshop, and Ant Farm’s experimental workshops (discussed in the following chapter).

Although there are few records of “Take Part” activities after the book’s publication, Lawrence Halprin’s archives include a letter from the newly appointed editor at the Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA), Monica Pidgeon, stating that she was using Taking Part as a guide to reorganizing the RIBA’s publication.

Indeed, the Halprins’ articulation of the interdisciplinary workshop format, the score as an assignment, the facilitator role, and the use of a manual to circulate their pedagogy served as a model for many other initiatives whose protagonists sought to break free from the constraints of conventional academic education. The beneficiaries of the Halprins’ innovation include Ant Farm, the subject of the following chapter. Influenced by Lord’s participation in Experiments in Environment, Ant Farm used workshops to explore experimental and collaborative design practices forbidden in conventional architecture classrooms. Seeking to expand the possibilities for exchange and collaboration beyond isolated workshops, the collective soon began to design proposals for communication webs through which the myriad

---

156 Records in Lawrence Halprin’s papers at the University of Pennsylvania Architectural Archives indicate that only 66 copies were sold in 1976. Lawrence Halprin’s files indicate that three publications reviewed the book: Architectural Design, Futures Conditional, and Journal of the American Institute of Architects.

157 These and other examples are listed in Halprin and Burns, Taking Part, 326.


159 Other workshop-based initiatives circa the early 1970s include the workshops at The Farm, an ecological community founded by artist Bonnie Sherk in 1974, Paolo Soleri’s experimental architecture workshops at Arcosanti, and the video workshops for high school students held by the Portola Institute’s Media Access Center. See Auther and Lerner, West of Center.
nodes of countercultural practitioners could circulate information. The implications of the Halprins’ practices also extended beyond their contemporaries. Today, the artist-as-facilitator has become a dominant paradigm for artistic labor, confirming Lawrence Halprin and Jim Burns’s assertion that they were developing a “new profession.” The Halprins and Burns could not have foreseen that the rise of this artistic paradigm would parallel the advent of neoliberal economic policies that have resulted in precarious labor conditions and an increasingly privatized and metrics-driven education system. Yet in the face of this stultifying system, the Experiments in Environment workshops and Taking Part remain crucial alternative models for collective exploration of creative practices in extra-institutional settings. Like the Halprins, many contemporary artists have turned to collaborative, interdisciplinary workshops as a means of facilitating process-oriented, open-ended learning as a defense against neoliberalization.  

160 Examples include Machine Project, an alternative space and platform for artist-led workshops in Los Angeles; Fritz Haeg’s workshop-based Sundown School outside of Los Angeles; Michael Mandiberg’s New York Arts Practicum, an extra-institutional summer institute for emerging artists; Tal Be’ery’s Eco Practicum, an artist run “school” for ecological justice; and Bruce High Quality Foundation University’s free classes, among many others (discussed in the conclusion).
Chapter 3  
Access to Tools: Ant Farm’s Proposals for Pedagogical Networks

In 1970, San Francisco-based architecture and video collective Ant Farm (whose chief members were Chip Lord, Doug Michels, and Curtis Schreier) published a proposal for a *Truckin’ University* in their do-it-yourself guide to inflatable architecture, *Inflatocookbook* (figure 3.1). Under the heading “Get a good American education while you still got a chance!!,” Ant Farm depicted the *University* as a mobile learning platform consisting of a fleet of vehicles carrying video equipment and other communication technology. They described it as an education network for nomadic counterculture denizens: “Institutions in the dominant culture burden our mobility/growth, yet what we are talking about is an institution, a communication network of places like ours, where media nomads can pull off the road (earn College Credit!), repair a truck, video linkup throughout, tools of your trade, nutrients for every need!”¹ *Truckin’ University* is one of many proposals for alternative learning networks designed by Ant Farm between their formation in 1968, and 1971, when they shifted their focus to media networks.²

---

¹ Ant Farm, “Hy-tek,” *Inflatocookbook* (Sausalito, CA: Ant Corps, 1971), n.p. Following Ant Farm, I use the term network to refer to two interconnected concepts: computer networks (connected computing devices that exchange data) and networks as a social structure. In defining the latter concept, I draw upon sociologists Luc Boltanski and Eve Chiapello, who summarize the definition of networks within the social sciences as “structures that are minimally hierarchical (if at all so), flexible, and not restricted by boundaries marked out a priori.” Luc Boltanski and Eve Chiapello, *The New Spirit of Capitalism* (London; New York: Verso, 2005), 104.

² Ant Farm formed in San Francisco in the fall of 1968 as a collaboration between Lord, who had recently graduated from the architecture program at Tulane University, and Michels (d. 2003), a recent graduate of Yale School of Architecture. Curtis Schreier, who had recently graduated from RISD’s architecture program, soon joined them. Lord, Michels, and Schreier remained the core members of the collective until it disbanded in 1978. An ever-changing roster of other young, male architects, designers, and artists shifted from project to project. Frequent additional Ant Farmers included Joe Hall (another participant of the Halprin workshop), Michael Wright (a former Soleri apprentice), Hudson Marquez (an art student from Tulane), and architect Kelly Gloger, among many others. Throughout Ant Farm’s existence, its members frequently collaborated with other collectives and sometimes merged to form new groups. Ant Farm’s collaborators included Southcoast, an architecture collective in Houston; T. R. Uthco, an art collective
Despite Ant Farm’s interest in education, scholars have not focused on their pedagogical work. Indeed, the collective’s oeuvre as a whole has been underrepresented in the history of twentieth-century architecture. This can be attributed in part to the fact that the period of Ant Farm’s collaboration (1968–1978) was a transitional time for architecture as a discipline. The high modernism of the late 1950s and early 1960s, characterized by unshakeable faith in technology and the global spread of modernism, was giving way to critique and experimentation. On the rare occasions when Ant Farm’s work has been addressed in architectural histories, it is classified as one of the many architectural “alternatives” that arose in the late 1960s and early 1970s. These practices took an unorthodox approach to materials, form, and technology and worked against the aesthetic, social, economic, and political systems affirmed by high modernism. They include communes like Drop City in Colorado (1965–1977); visionary designs for cities of the future like those imagined by the British collective Archigram (c. 1960s); ecological projects like Paolo Soleri’s Arcosanti in Arizona (1969–present); and numerous other experimental modes of designing and building. Many of the practitioners of these alternatives sought to escape the existing built environments of cities and the geographic based in San Francisco; and Raindance Corporation, a video collective that formed in New York. Ant Farm and Raindance Corporation merged to form TVTV (Top Value Television) for a video project involving the 1972 Democratic and Republican conventions. In researching this chapter, I conducted an interview with Chip Lord and Curtis Schreier.

Ant Farm does not receive a single mention in William J.R. Curtis’s Modern Architecture since 1900 (1982,) one of the foremost surveys of twentieth-century architecture.


For example, Steve Baer, Francois Dallegret, Drop City, Haus-Rucker-Co, Lloyd Kahn, Superstudio, and many others.
boundaries of mainstream society, choosing to work in deserts and other rural settings. Leftist critics initially heralded these projects as ushering in a new era of lifestyle-altering architecture. Writer and editor Jim Burns, for example, lauded alternative architectural practices for “ameliorating man’s lot in an increasingly desensitized atmosphere, and ... postulating ways in which he can have … a deciding influence on the ways he will live and the nature of places in which he will live.” However, by the mid-1970s, mournful lamentation had largely supplanted the utopian rhetoric around these alternatives. For example, Lloyd Kahn, one of the major proponents of dome architecture in the late 1960s, bemoaned as early as 1972 that the dome had been co-opted by consumerism and mass media.

Mainstream architectural critics and historians have largely ignored countercultural building practices in their discussions of the rise of postmodernism in the 1970s and 80s. This history privileges the debate between the “whites,” who engaged the formal vocabulary of modernism through playful juxtaposition, and the “grays,” who embraced “complexity and contradiction” through vernacular references, historic quotation, and populist rhetoric. The latter group’s initial critiques of corporate modernism and its devastating effects on cities paralleled those of many countercultural builders; however, historians have often downplayed

---

these critiques, focusing instead on the formal and stylistic elements in the postmodern architecture of the 1980s. This tendency illustrates what architecture historian Felicity D. Scott has described as “a call to order” that developed as a reaction to the assumed disorder and radicalism within the discipline of architecture in the 1960s. This excision and distortion of the alternatives circa 1970 has only begun to be redressed in the past decade.

Much of the recent literature on Ant Farm and other “experimental endgames” thus approaches their work as projects that need reclaiming. The resulting scholarship typically praises these projects for their criticality, but does not engage critically with the practitioners’ own intentions. This research also tends to focus largely on the tangible products of Ant Farm’s oeuvre: their architecture or video output. If pedagogy appears at all in this literature, it

---

12 Felicity D. Scott, Architecture or Techno-Utopia: Politics After Modernism (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press), 3. According to Scott, this call to order cast experimental practices as “indications of a discipline spinning out of control.”
is framed as a minor detail within Ant Farm’s career, subordinate to their actual “artworks.” Felicity D. Scott’s research on Ant Farm’s engagement with communication technology and media represents an important exception. Scott reads Ant Farm’s work as forging multiple paths of resistance to dominant political, economic, military, and media regimes. Especially relevant to this study is her reading of Ant Farm’s *Truckstop Network* (1971) as a mechanism through which the collective sought to expose and counter the subsumption of information technology as an apparatus of control. New research by media scholar Tung-Hui Hu connects Scott’s argument to contemporary information systems, positing that Ant Farm’s conception of distributed networks anticipated the decentralized convergence of media that occurs in today’s digital cloud.

This chapter builds on these analyses of the collective’s engagement with networks by examining the ways that Ant Farm’s interest in communication technologies informed their resistance to conventional education systems. I analyze the collective’s pedagogical projects

---


16 Scott uses the term “lines of flight” to describe these paths of resistance. This phrase derives from Deleuze and Guattari, who use it to describe, in Scott’s words, “a movement of deterritorialization or destratification of codified systems or techniques of power, which might take many forms.” Felicity D. Scott, *Living Archive 7: Ant Farm* (Barcelona/New York: Actar, 2008), 283n5. In *Living Archive 7: Ant Farm*, published in conjunction with the exhibition, *Ant Farm: Radical Hardware* (Arthur Ross Gallery, Columbia University, Spring 2008), Scott analyzes Ant Farm’s archive from 1969 to 1972. Scott co-curated the exhibition with Mark Wasiuta, whose short text on the collective’s proposed repurposing of an obsolete military infrastructure similarly highlights Ant Farm’s ability to devise counter-networks. See Mark Wasiuta, “Ant Farm Underground,” *Cabinet* 30 The Underground (Summer 2008), accessed June 15, 2016, http://cabinetmagazine.org/issues/30/wasiuta.php. See also Scott, *Architecture or Techno-Utopia.*


with an eye to tensions between the proponents of communication pedagogy and established educational institutions. Although Ant Farm’s initial pedagogical work took place in universities, they became increasingly occupied by the creation of alternative learning networks that could operate outside of institutional limits. The first section examines the collective’s formation and early educational practice as it was shaped by their rejection of conventional architectural education. The second focuses on Ant Farm’s development of a network-based pedagogy, which drew upon the discourse around networks then emerging in the Bay Area. The third looks at how their participation in alternative video practices informed the collective’s rejection of institutions in favor of extra-institutional learning networks. In their projects and speculative proposals Ant Farm imagined the expansion of communication pedagogy from a relatively insular, workshop-centered practice to an extensive learning network. Although this network required technology not yet in existence, I argue that the collective envisioned a model of learning through peer-to-peer exchange that remains a potent alternative to the hierarchized, linear education that occurs within institutions of higher education.

I. Feedback, Tools, and Student-Driven Learning

During the tumultuous spring semester of 1968, future Ant Farm co-founder Doug Michels was expelled from the campus of Catholic University in Washington D.C., where he had been teaching introductory courses in the architecture department. The department claimed that Michels, who refused to teach the pre-established assignments, represented a threat to learning. Michels, in turn, held that the existing curriculum maintained a standardized, hierarchical approach to both education and architecture; instead, he assigned alternative projects that required students to respond to present-day situations. This conflict, the
subsequent formation of Ant Farm, and the collective’s early pedagogical projects, gave rise to two educational strategies that became central to Ant Farm’s approach to teaching and learning: feedback and “access to tools.” I posit that the desire to transform conventional architectural education shaped the collective’s initial structure and pedagogy, both of which fostered student-driven learning.

Feedback

Catholic University appointed Michels to teach first- and second-year architectural design in the fall of 1967. The university’s architecture department adhered to a curriculum of standard design problems derived from the Beaux-Arts tradition, such as designing a gatehouse for a girls’ school or redesigning the classroom. These problems fostered independent mastery of technical skills such as drafting and model making, in order to prepare students for participation in corporate architecture firms. As such, they did not engage any contemporary

---

19 Michels had just graduated from Yale School of Architecture at the time of this appointment. Prior to Yale, Michels had studied at Catholic University between 1962-63, followed by Oxford School of Architecture in 1963-65. Michels’s enrollment at Yale coincided with a departmental shift from the authoritarian deanship of Paul Rudolph to the lively, open atmosphere created by Charles Moore, who served as dean between 1965 and 1970. Moore encouraged diverse architectural practices and fostered collaboration and student-driven initiatives. The resulting exchange between students from different disciplines highlighted, for Michels, the significance of interdisciplinary learning. He was also influenced by the architecture school’s focus on leaderless team design, in which projects were assigned to horizontally-organized teams, rather than to appointed leaders. This pedagogy likely influenced Michels’s frustration with the more conservative curriculum at Catholic University.

political, economic, or social context and could be solved within the neutral site of the architecture studios. Michels viewed Beaux-Arts derived assignments as completely disconnected from contemporary urban realities: “At a time when people are shooting at each other and burning down their own houses and the Government is building new slums ... the idea of spending your time on a gatehouse for a girls’ school is ridiculous.” In addition, he claimed that these projects reinforced a “fascist” tendency in architecture, in which the architect creates a design without any input from its eventual users. Michels also took issue with the corresponding focus on testing in architectural education. He posited that an overemphasis on the registration exam—which grants professional architecture licenses—fostered a grade-oriented system that eliminated all opportunity for self-determination.  

This system forced students to compete through standardized assignments in which success depended upon the “anticipation of what is desired by the judges and/or testers.” According to Michels, the American Institute of Architects (A.I.A.)—the dominant professional association within the field—perpetrated this “static professionalism” by promoting a set curriculum.  

Michels’s critiques aligned with the explosion of dissent against the architectural establishment in the late 1960s. Many architectural students and architects of his generation rejected both the prevailing pedagogy and the high modernism that dominated the profession. They denounced the destructive tendencies of the latter, arguing that this architecture reinforced

---

24 Michels, “Revision,” 1. Ant Farm staged an intervention at the twenty-third annual convention of the California Council of the A.I.A., disrupting a speaker and handing out a manifesto that attacked the conservatism of the convention. Michels also wrote to the A.I.A. proposing that Ant Farm edit a special issue of the A.I.A. student magazine that would focus on questions of education and the student movement, and that the group organize the 1969 student convention. There is no recorded response in Ant Farm’s archives.
the urban planning policies of the 1950s, which destroyed urban communities through slum
clearance, and encouraged suburban expansion. They also viewed the scale and materials of
high modernism as alienating and the privileging of “univalent form” as oppressive and
unsympathetic to variable contexts. For many, including Reyner Banham, high modernism
seemed emblematic of a megalomaniacal tendency in the architectural profession: it was
unwilling to “relinquish its distinct ‘Modern’ claim to responsibility for ‘the design of the whole
human environment.’” These buildings had become symbols of corporate capitalism, the
military-industrial complex, a racist society, and the bureaucratic practices that produced them.
Such critiques raised larger questions about the role of the architect in society: should she be an
expert technocrat, serving the needs of the corporate world, or a socially conscious builder who
responds to the needs of society? As discussed in chapter one, students across the country
and internationally advocated the latter by fighting for more socially responsible curricula. In
Paris in May 1968, for instance, student protesters successfully demanded the withdrawal of the
architecture school from the École des Beaux-Arts. At several U.S. schools, most notably
Columbia University and the University of California at Berkeley, student dissent centered
around university planning policies. In additions to these rebellions, Michels’s generation

25 McLeod, “Architecture and Politics in the Reagan Era,” 26–27. They also decried the failures of
modernism’s mass housing projects in the U.S. These views aligned with social critiques of urban
planning like Jane Jacobs’s The Death and Life of the Great American Cities (1961) and Robert
Goodman’s After the Planners (1971).
26 Jencks, Language of Post-Modern Architecture, 15. Jencks uses the term “univalent form” to describe
high modernism’s monotonous character. Robert Venturi makes a similar critique in Robert Venturi,
27 Banham, Megastructure, 9.
28 Mary McLeod discusses the reevaluation of architecture during this period as hinging on questions of
“architecture’s own alliances with power and an economic elite.” Mary McLeod, “The End of Innocence,”
in Architecture School: Three Centuries of Educating Architects in North America, ed. Joan Ockman
29 See chapter one for an overview of the protests at Columbia and UC Berkeley. For more thorough
histories, see Marta Gütman and Richard Plunz, “Anatomy of Insurrection” in The Making of an Architect,
embraced alternative architecture pedagogies, both within and outside of educational institutions. Alternative initiatives include the Italian Radical Architects’ “Global Tools” (founded in 1973), an experimental “non-school” with happening-like meetings; The Center for Independent Living (founded in 1972), a student-run initiative to make UC Berkeley more accessible to people with disabilities, which began in 1972; and the architecture school at Valparaíso, Chile, which explored the lived, bodily experience of architecture through observation, performances, and games.\textsuperscript{30}

Michels’s proposals for new assignments paralleled the activities of many of these initiatives. He strove to reform the traditional pedagogy at Catholic University by proposing projects that required students to respond to specific environments and fostered citizen participation in planning and design. One proposed assignment asked students to identify and present solutions for design problems in the area around 18th Street and Columbia Road in Washington, D.C., a diverse, densely-populated neighborhood with a high population of Central American immigrants. The students would research and frame their project through observation and conversations with the neighborhood’s inhabitants. Unlike the traditional curriculum, this project thus encouraged students to engage with the demographic and environmental realities of a specific place and to propose designs that respond to those realities. Another proposed project involved installing weather balloons on the National Mall.\textsuperscript{31} Like the former example, this activity sought to expand the architectural process beyond the protected space of a design


\textsuperscript{31} Massett, “Flying Buttress,” 37.
studio. By working with weather balloons in a dynamic outdoor setting, students would learn to respond to shifting environmental conditions. The focus on ephemeral forms also inverted a common theme in traditional programs: the design of permanent monuments. This inversion would have been accentuated by the site, which is resplendent with national monuments. The faculty rejected both projects and demanded that Michels use a more traditional assignment. He chose to modify a pre-established assignment, which required students to redesign their classroom. He proposed to give students a questionnaire about their classroom preferences and then feed the results of this survey into the school's computer to generate a collective design. Like his previous assignment proposals, this solution highlights Michels’s pursuit of architectural design that takes into account feedback from users. Unsurprisingly, Catholic University did not accept this modified plan and eventually retracted Michels’s teaching responsibilities.

Michels’s three rejected assignments reveal the influence of cybernetic theory on his conception of architecture and education. Cybernetics, as Michels understood it, grew out of research undertaken by mathematician Norbert Wiener during World War II. Working at MIT’s Radiation Laboratory, Wiener began developing statistical methods for tracking and shooting enemy aircraft. He and his co-researcher, engineer Julian Bigelow, realized that this process depended on mechanical and human components; they began to create formulas that considered human soldiers and pilots as mechanical devices. The two researchers soon developed an anti-aircraft predictor machine that could respond to these calculations, signifying the beginnings of a method for treating humans as computational data. As a “highly fluid socio-technical system” created not by a commanding officer, but through dynamic collaboration, the

---

32 Ibid.
predictor modeled a shift from hierarchical structures to horizontal systems. According to cybernetics, these horizontal systems self-regulated by processing feedback. As discussed in the previous chapter, Wiener understood feedback as “the mechanism of controlling a system by reinserting into it the results of its past performance.” He also connected this notion of feedback to learning, explaining if “the information which proceeds backward from the performance is able to change the general method and pattern of the performance, we have a process which may well be called learning.” This notion of feedback as a model of non-hierarchical learning informed Michels and, subsequently, Ant Farm’s understanding of potential alternative education systems, as did the notion of man-machine symbiosis. Michels’s third proposed assignment, in particular, was predicated on the computer’s ability to bring feedback into the design process, rendering the process more egalitarian and horizontal. This cybernetically influenced approach to design education also rejected the need for an authoritative teacher-figure—instead students could learn autonomously through feedback.

Rather than accept Michels’s feedback-based solutions, Catholic University switched his teaching assignment to architectural history, then graphics, and then, still dissatisfied with his approach, cancelled his classes altogether. The administration charged that Michels was “disrupting class schedules, endangering the lives of students (by taking them down to 18th and Columbia), and generally falling down as a teacher.” Michels responded by submitting a complaint to the American Association of University Professors (AAUP) stating that the university was interfering with his academic freedom. The AAUP ruled that the university lacked

33 This vision of circular flows of information within man-machine systems had an influence both the military-industrial-academic complex and the countercultural alternatives to it. Fred Turner, From Counterculture to Cyberculture: Stewart Brand, the Whole Earth Network, and the Rise of Digital Utopianism (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006), 21.
grounds to fire him, and their mediation resulted in an agreement that Michels would continue to receive his salary if he did not return to campus.³⁶

**Access to Tools**

In the following months, Michels used his Catholic University salary to undertake a lecture tour and to co-lead *Crash City*, an “experimental workshop in urban design” that put into practice much of what had been forbidden at the university.³⁷ Based in Washington D.C., *Crash City* aimed to test alternative strategies for architectural education and “to show what a school might be like.”³⁸ Michels coordinated the workshop with his Yale classmate Bob Field. The twenty participants included designers (like architects and graphic artists), filmmakers, and artists at different stages of professional development. As implied by the workshop’s title, Michels and Field invited these participants to live and work communally (in other words, to crash) for an indeterminate amount of time.³⁹ They gave the participants access to “information and equipment”: a large loft, communal house darkroom, workshop, pick-up truck, “the city of Washington, D.C.,” and “the opportunity and freedom to define the problems they felt were important and pursue them at their own speed.”⁴⁰ In other words, Michels and Field provided a site and materials and allowed the participants to determine their own questions, methods, and

---

³⁶ Ibid.
³⁷ Ibid. The lecture tour comprised visits to thirty schools of architecture and planning across the United States, including schools where Michels had personal connections, like Tulane—where he was invited by Chip Lord, then the head of the Architectural Student Association—and schools like University of Houston, which were burgeoning sites of student unrest. These visits served as a platform for Michels to discuss his own work and to meet students and faculty who shared his discontent with current architectural education. According to Scott, the tour cemented Michels’s “position as spokesperson for anti-establishment revolt within the discipline” and allowed him to connect with others seeking to create change. Scott, *Living Archive 7*, 37.
³⁹ Michels specified that they would “live and work together for as long as they like—three days or three months—on projects of their own invention.” Michels, “Revision,” 1.
⁴⁰ Ibid., 2
guidelines. In enabling participants to direct their own learning, Michels and Fields created an open-ended structure in which self-driven, or autonomous, learning could prevail. In including the city of Washington D.C. in the list of “information and equipment” they also asked participants to engage the particulars of the urban site as a context for their experimentation—and this occurred a few months after the uprisings that followed the assassination of Martin Luther King Jr. and racked the city. This investment in the realities of an urban site highlight the coordinators’ rejection of high modernism, top-down planning, and their disregard for context and people. Like Michels’s interest in feedback-based systems, this approach also dehierarchized the learning process, creating a scenario in which both teacher and students could experiment on equal footing. The resulting projects, which included a summer camp for inner-city children and investigations into the use of parachutes as architectural structures, show how this approach engendered experimentation with technology and construction. According to Michels, the workshop cultivated an “atmosphere of mutual trust [that] grew out of the elimination of competition” and the eradication of “normal boundaries between work/play/learning …. [in which participants] lived and learned in a new context; a context based on a more natural human rhythm.”

The self-motivated learning that Michels attributed to Crash City relied on a strategy that counterculturalists referred to as “access to tools.” Central to many countercultural educational initiatives, this approach was popularized as the epigram of the Whole Earth Catalog (figure 1.3), and was elaborated on the first page:

We are as gods and might as well get good at it. So far, remotely done

---

41 I have not been able to track down documentation of these designs except for the Tank Chair developed by Michels and Field. Domus published it on the cover of the December 1968 issue. The chair is a sleigh-like rocking seat with many options for personalization.

42 Michels, “Revision,” 2. For Michels the workshop was a success: the range of insightful and experimental projects confirmed his belief “that self-motivation must be basic to any learning situation.”
power and glory—as via government, big business, formal education, church—has succeeded to the point where gross defects obscure actual gains. In response to this dilemma and to these gains a realm of intimate, personal power is developing—power of the individual to conduct his own education, find his own inspiration, shape his own environment, and share his adventure with whoever is interested. Tools that aid this process are sought and promoted by the WHOLE EARTH CATALOG.\footnote{Stewart Brand, “Purpose,” \textit{Whole Earth Catalog}, (1968): 1.}

In other words, Brand and his staff sought to empower readers to educate themselves, rather than to rely on hegemonic institutions. The “tools” listed in the \textit{Whole Earth Catalogue} range from small-scale technologies to books and periodicals to information about organizations and communes. They are not organized into any formal curriculum beyond loose thematic categories. Instead, the catalog presents the tools as myriad options that each reader can investigate and select as she chooses. Similar to Michels’s and Field’s approach in \textit{Crash City}, this structure allows the reader to direct her own inquiry, free from the constraints of disciplinary learning mandated by academic institutions.\footnote{Turner, \textit{From Counterculture to Cyberculture}, 92.}

Scottish educator Alexander Sutherland Neill represented a central model for the “access to tools” approach. Neill founded Summerhill School, a radical boarding school located in Suffolk, England, in 1921.\footnote{Ant Farm included Neill’s \textit{Summerhill: A Radical Approach to Childrearing} (1960) and \textit{Freedom, Not License} (1966) in the reading list for their “Enviro-Communication” course proposal (discussed in the following section).} Summerhill had a democratic structure, in which students could pursue their own interests, and students and teachers voted on governance in weekly meetings. This structure assumed students’ ability to self-regulate, although Neill cautioned that freedom did not mean that students had license to do whatever they wanted.\footnote{See Alexander Sutherland Neill, \textit{Freedom, Not License} (New York, Hart Publishing Co.: 1966).} Summerhill’s approach to student-determined learning spawned many countercultural educational experiments in the 1960s that sought to provide students with freedom to mold their own learning. For example,
educator Michael S. Kaye founded Pacific High School, a “non-authoritarian” high school and community in the Santa Cruz Mountains, based on the Summerhill model. Pacific High students drove their own learning and teachers served as resources for this process. Ant Farm, Sim Van der Ryn, and many other architects with experimental practices led workshops at the school.47

“Access to tools,” and the autonomous learning that the approach engendered, became guiding ideas within Ant Farm’s pedagogical practice. Reflecting on Crash City, Michels and Field posited that increased support for student-driven learning could alter the university system at large:

School should respond to learning as a continuous life process in which an involvement in doing is the organizing force. People of different ages, different backgrounds might well be operating in the same, changing group...the present work-play orientation may well give way to a fluid learning-doing cycle in which people move between groups oriented to various concerns in a spectrum ranging from personal growth to specific projects.48

In such a society, they continued, “school organization may become an essentially anonymous framework whose function is to encourage and respond to the motivations of those involved in it.” Michels imagined this as a wall-less school system in which groups of students would inhabit and explore the architectural possibilities of different areas and the “real people” who inhabit them. Without the strictures of a conventional school, participants could move to a new area once they felt they had satisfied the concerns of their current site. The actual institution would thus be diminished to a “telephone bill, electric bill, and rent.” 49 This notion of school as an

48 Michels and Field, “What’s Wrong with Architectural Education?,” 56-57. The following two quotes also come from this source.
49 Within this structure, “the people who take responsibility for [each architectural project] should be paid with varying numbers of unpaid volunteers working with them and begin generating and working within their own groups.” Notably, Michels does not indicate where such funds would come from. A second
“anonymous framework” became a guiding principle in Ant Farm’s formation.

**Ant Farm**

Michels’s experiences at and after Catholic University informed the initial conception of Ant Farm. Agitated by the suppression of anti-war candidates during the 1968 Democratic convention, he moved to San Francisco where he began collaborating with Chip Lord, who had recently completed the Halprins’ *Experiments in Environment* workshop. Lord and Michels took the name of the popular plastic toy for their collective because it symbolized their interest in creating “underground architecture” and poked fun at the seriousness of architecture as a discipline. This choice of moniker highlights Ant Farm’s use of humor as a critical strategy, a tactic evidenced throughout their oeuvre. In an early manifesto, Michels framed Ant Farm as a flexible educational platform that expanded on the *Crash City* model: “ANT FARM will bring people together to explore, observe, create, and participate in the context of total involvement with the experience. ANT FARM is essentially an anonymous framework that responds to and encourages the motivations of those involved.” Like *Crash City*, this “framework” would be supported by a set of tools, including a warehouse, workshop, truck, and the city of San Francisco.

---

50 See Tom Diehl, “Ant Farm in Houston,” *Cite* 31 (Winter–Spring 1994): 32–36. Born in 1944 and raised in St. Petersburg Florida, Lord graduated from Tulane University School of Architecture with a B. Arch in 1968. He had spent summer 1966 living in San Francisco and working for the architectural firm of Anshen + Allen and returned to the city upon graduation. Constance Lewallen, “Interview with Ant Farm,” 40. Lord and Michels were later joined by Curtis Schreier, who had moved to San Francisco after graduating from RISD’s architecture program in 1967. Schreier and Lord had met during the 1968 Halprin workshop; the former had worked for Lawrence Halprin & Associates and had participated in the 1968 workshop as a photographer. Realizing that he would never be promoted to associate level, Schreier left the Halprin studio to join Lord and Michels in 1969. Curtis Schreier, “Interview with Ant Farm,” 47.

51 They were first dubbed “Ant Farm” by a friend.

Francisco itself. Ant Farm would follow a semester schedule with a summer session, so as to be accessible to students. Participants from all levels of education and all disciplinary backgrounds could join, provided that they met the sole requirement: “environmental concern.” Notably, while the Halprins conceived of the ‘environment’ as natural and built surroundings, for the members of Ant Farm, the ‘environment’ also comprised information networks. As a platform, Ant Farm would interface with universities, industries, artists, scientists, technicians, and research institutions, ultimately developing into a “research center with emphasis as a meeting place for people from all parts of the country to visit.” This proposal reveals Michels’s commitment to self-determination and continuous, lifelong learning: “I feel that ANT FARM will be a profound experiment with the concept of learning as a continuous life process. It will integrate work, play, and learning, and offer people the opportunity to start from the beginning, define from the beginning, the problems that they as human beings and artists feel are most important.” The desire to connect participants from different disciplinary backgrounds and to incorporate play and learning also drew upon Lord’s experience at the Halprins’ workshop.

Ant Farm undertook projects and accrued members in a much more organic and limited manner than this manifesto suggests, and the collective’s early projects in San Francisco were less focused on creating an education platform than on trying to make money. However, after Michels and Lord took teaching positions at University of Houston’s College of Architecture for the spring 1969 semester, they developed workshops that put their pedagogical ideas into practice.

---

53 Ibid., 2.
54 Michels worked at a body shop, drawing on his experience customizing cars in high school. They designed a poster for Anna Halprin’s Dancers’ Workshop and received a few other commissions for Supergraphics designs.
At the time of Michels’s and Lord’s appointment to the College of Architecture, the students had recently ousted their dean. Following the students’ demands, architecture professor Burdette Keeland offered Michels a visiting professor position. Michels insisted on bringing Lord along as a visiting critic. While on staff, Michels and Lord facilitated two workshops, *Astrodaze* and *Time Slice*, which broke decisively with conventional architectural education. I will focus on the second workshop, *Time Slice*, as it repeated and expanded many components of the former. While inspired in part by Lord’s experience as a participant in *Experiments in Environment*, *Time Slice* had a much looser structure. In keeping with Ant Farm’s pedagogical methods, the workshop sought to provide tools and a variety of environments within which each participant could direct his own learning. The materials, documentation, and Lord’s reflections on *Time Slice* reveal that the workshop provided students with countercultural experiences, but largely failed to inspire self-directed learning on a scale that Ant Farm anticipated.

The “experimental communications and environment workshop” took place over the course of six weeks in summer 1969, after Michels and Lord had finished their teaching duties.

---

55 Michels, who had visited the school on his lecture tour, described it as “very avant-garde” and filled with “longhaired students who had voted to have me come and teach.” Michels, “Interview with Ant Farm,” 42.

56 No documentation of Michels’s courses exists, but Lord recalls them as fairly “traditional.” Chip Lord, interview with the author, San Francisco, May 15, 2015.

57 *Astrodaze*, which took place during the semester, comprised of an overnight field trip to the beach in Freeport, Texas. Like the *ritual beach* field trip in *Time Slice*, this trip focused on the investigation of nomadic architecture. A crucial difference between *Astrodaze* and *Time Slice* was the former’s inclusion of David Sellers, a pioneer of design/build architecture and one of the co-founders of Prickly Mountain, an experimental architecture community in Warren, Vermont; Robert Yelton, the editor of *Harvard Design Magazine*; and Robert Goodman, the MIT professor, who would soon write *After the Planners* (1971), a manifesto against large-scale government-sponsored planning.

58 All but three of the participants were male and all appear to be white.

They promoted *Time Slice* to colleges and universities across the country, and enrolled fifteen students, who came to live at University of Houston. Although the university served as the home base for the workshop, the central events took the form of field trips, including *ritual beach*, a trip to the beach in Freeport, Texas; *Astrodream*, an overnight sleepover in Houston’s Astrodome; and a trip to Padre Island, a barrier island off Corpus Christi. Prior to the workshop, Ant Farm created a loose score that outlined the order of events (figure 3.2). Like the overarching *Experiments in Environment* score, Ant Farm’s score utilized a calendar strip as an organizational device. However, the latter is much less detailed than those created by the Halprins. Collaged with images and doodles, it is as much a visual manifesto as it is a workable schedule. Lord later described the score as its “own work of art,” rather than something that they intended participants to follow directly.60

The field trips aligned with Ant Farm’s current practice and preoccupations, revealing an overlap between “art” and “teaching.”61 Ant Farm always listed *Time Slice* as one of its art projects, not as a distinct education event. Like Ant Farm’s contemporaneous projects (and *Experiments in Environment*), the collective documented many of the events of *Time Slice* in color and black and white photographs. This fusion of teaching and artistic practice is one of the hallmarks of communication pedagogy: Ant Farm saw workshops like *Time Slice* as inextricable from their work as an art collective. During the *ritual beach* field trip, for example, students investigated temporary architecture by experimenting with the *Dreamcloud*, Michels’s 60 x 60 foot nylon cargo surplus parachute (figure 3.3).62 Ant Farm had recently begun using the

61 Ibid.
62 There is no recorded plan for this field trip, but several of the 35mm photographs show the mostly male participants shirtless and sheltered from the sun under the ethereal, tie-dyed parachute.
Dreamcloud and polyethylene plastics as a means to create pneumatic architecture. Activated and altered by natural systems, the parachute functioned as a kinetic “response environment.” It could operate as a minimal shelter, a projection screen, or an inflated structure on which participants could play. As seen in the documentation from the field trip, engaging with this giant parachute required ingenuity and teamwork, rather than the careful diagramming characteristic of conventional architecture education.

In preparation for the next field trip—a two-day visit to Padre Island, a barrier island with white sand beaches—Ant Farm asked participants to create their own tools. During World War II, the Island had been on the list of potential test sites for the atomic bomb. The government ultimately chose White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico as the test site, but Ant Farm was undoubtedly aware of Padre Island’s history. Before the excursion, which Ant Farm described as both a “freak out” and an “elegant celebration/ritual/ceremonies/drop city,” they encouraged everyone to develop “media nomad equipment.” In stream of consciousness, pseudo-militaristic prose, the score specified: “on mon day [sic] morning at 10,00 am there will be an inspection in front of the alamo. each person will present his equipment. perhaps there will be strawberry ice cream after inspection” (figure 3.4). Suggestions for “equipment” included “the gathering of props to reinforce fantasy image,” “electronic accessories” for a “total freak environment,” an “enviropak,” as well as “geodesic dayglo domes,” “indian headdrass,” and

63 Ant Farm began to work more seriously with inflatable structures soon after they returned to San Francisco late in the summer of 1969. They envisioned giant polyethylene inflatables as temporary architecture for venues like rock concerts. For Ant Farm and their countercultural patrons, the amorphous forms of the inflatables not only provided a unique form of shelter, but also possessed the potential to rupture the subjectivity produced by traditional architecture. Many other architects working during this period shared this interest in the liberating and spectacular potential of inflatable architecture including the Utopie group (1966-1971), Reyner Banham, Archigram’s Peter Cook, and Haus Rucker Co. Frei Otto, the German engineer, inspired many of these experiments.

64 Scott, Living Archive, 41.

65 For Ant Farm and many other members of the counterculture, nomadism represented a form of resistance to the socio-political status quo. In The Whole Earth Catalog, the section called “Nomadics” detailed tools and vehicles for a mobile lifestyle ranging from off-road vehicles to mountaineering guides.
“phosphorescent land blankets.” The reference to geodesic domes reveals Ant Farm’s adulation of Buckminster Fuller, whom they lauded as “the lone voice in the wilderness among architects and engineers.” The invocation of a “freak environment,” as well as Day-Glo color palette, imply an acid-fueled psychedelic experience akin to the “Acid Tests” staged by Ken Kesey and the Merry Pranksters in the mid-1960s. According to historian David Farber, the tests staged by Kesey and others aimed to create a “vast collective experience” of freer social mores and a “new collective social presence that could change society.” In other words, participants in these tests viewed acid as a resource or tool for new understandings of societal possibilities. However, the tests also had a spectacular component, as illustrated in the example of the Trips Festival, the massive concert in San Francisco organized by Kesey and Stewart Brand in 1966. As in Ant Farm’s assignment sheet, the Trips Festival attendees were asked to come dressed or painted in Day-Glo colors. This resulted in a psychedelic spectacle, heightened by the fact that many of the costumed attendees were filmed and rebroadcasted to festival audiences on closed-circuit televisions.

Documentation was also central to the Padre Island experience: Ant Farm recorded the two-day excursion in a highly-aestheticized series of 35mm slides that show costumed students

66 Ant Farm, “Assignment Sheet,” published in Scott, Living Archive 7, 42. Spelling and grammar is Ant Farm’s own.
67 Curtis Schreier, “Interview with Ant Farm,” 44. In the interview, Schreier specified that Fuller emerged as a hero for he and the other core members of Ant Farm when they were in architecture school. The older architect continued to be a central influence on the collective, and many other countercultural building practices. Lord and Michels met Fuller when the latter visited the University of Houston in 1969.
68 As discussed in chapter one, the original and subsequent Trips Festivals were gatherings centered around psychedelic drugs, and included multimedia light shows, day-glo costumes, rock music by bands like the Grateful Dead.
70 Turner, From Counterculture to Cyberculture, 65–66.
enacting pseudo-ritualistic performances on the beach (figure 3.5).\textsuperscript{71} The presence of the U.S. flag in this documentation, as well as in the Padre Island score, accentuate the countercultural thrust of the event—the association of the flag (and the pseudo-militaristic language used in the score) with a psychedelic trip issued a provocative send-up of U.S. nationalism and Cold War military culture. Furthermore, while the posing students appear to be appropriating some form of tribal dress, the Day-Glo costumes look futuristic, as if they are “media nomads” in a post-apocalyptic landscape. Their territorial positions and use of the flag extend the military metaphor, signifying that they have conquered this landscape. The vast stretch of white sand also anticipates the lunar landscape that the Apollo 11 mission would conquer later that month, although the industrial plant in the background undermines the illusion of new territory.\textsuperscript{72}

In both \textit{ritual beach} and the Padre Island trip, Ant Farm’s prioritized mind-bending experience over self-directed learning. The environments, the parachute, the equipment available at the University of Houston, and all drugs that were consumed all served as “tools” for this experience. However, unlike the tools provided in \textit{Crash City}, these were less geared towards architecture than towards elevating consciousness. In contrast to the earlier workshop, the focus was not outwards, towards the problems of a city or neighborhood, but inward towards mental and physical experience in a particular place. \textit{Time Slice}, in other words, did not so much teach students to build, but facilitated the development of a mindset that would, potentially, make them better informed builders. Lord described the workshop as “a humanizing architectural process, making it more fluid, participatory, and temporary.”\textsuperscript{73}

\textsuperscript{71} Michels wore a business suit and carried a briefcase containing a letter from the dean explaining that this was an educational experiment, heightening the theatricality of the experience.

\textsuperscript{72} The Apollo 11 moon landing on July 20, 1969 captivated Ant Farm as much as the rest of the country. On the night of the landing, Ant Farm set up an inflatable and the American flag across the street from NASA in an attempt at a media intervention.

\textsuperscript{73} Lord, “Interview with Ant Farm,” 43.
Although the experience of participating in *Time Slice* appears to have been liberating, it was also limited. Only three of the fifteen participants were women and, in the documentation, none appear to be people of color. Unlike Michels’s work in Washington D.C., there is no indication of any effort to investigate issues within Houston’s working class immigrant neighborhoods or the surrounding communities. In turning away from the politics of architecture in the academy, the workshop seems more escapist than reformist. Ant Farm did not record participant feedback, but, according to Lord, at the beginning of the workshop students felt that the participants were “opening up” to new experiences, but then “we turned it back to them to determine what was going to happen and nothing happened...During that experience I felt the need for authority and didn’t move to assert my authority.” In other words, Lord realized that the students needed more direction and structure in order to give shape to their experiences in the workshop. Reacting to this insight, Ant Farm began to shift away from workshops and towards networks as a strategy for structuring and motivating student-driven learning within the context of institutions of higher education.

II. Network as Pedagogy: The “Enviro-Communications” Course Proposal

In the aftermath of *Time Slice*, Ant Farm submitted a proposal for an “Enviro-Communication” course to the University of Houston’s College of Architecture. The course

---


75 Ant Farm continued to use workshops as a method for teaching specific skills like constructing inflatables, but moved away from using them within more general learning contexts.
aimed to “explore environment development with emphasis on technological approaches.”

The “Enviro-Communication” proposal reimagines a college architecture course as a “framework” within which students would travel to experimental architectural sites across the West Coast, collaborate with communities and military-industrial organizations, and contribute their findings to a “synergistic information system” that, if fully realized, would encompass input from students around the world. In other words, the proposal conceptualizes learning as occurring through a global information network, rather than through the linear, standardized curriculum utilized by most educational institutions. The proposal must be seen as speculative in that it requires information technology not yet in existence; however, it demands close examination as it details the collective’s vision for reforming learning in institutions of higher education. The “Enviro-Communication” course proposal reveals Ant Farm’s understanding of the potential for emergent communication technologies and networked modes of social organization to decenter and dehierarchize learning, enabling individuals to actively direct their own education, rather than receive knowledge passively from state-regulated institutions. In contrast to workshops like Time Slice, Ant Farm’s proposed networks also incentivized student-driven learning through mechanisms of participation and exchange.

Network Discourse

In a diagram created in 1970 for a conference in Freestone, California, Schreier depicted

---


77 As one of the potential “experimental projects” for the course, Ant Farm suggested that students “develop a system of communication between students from all parts of the globe.” Lord, “Enviro-Communication Course Proposal,” 5.

78 The University of Houston did not accept the proposal, and Ant Farm never realized it elsewhere.
Ant Farm as part of a network of countercultural initiatives and ecologically focused organizations (figure 3.6). Other nodes within this network include the *Whole Earth Catalog*, California Institute for the Arts (CIA), technology research centers like the Augmentation Research Center (ARC) at the Stanford Research Institute (SRI), experimental education initiatives like Pacific High School, and radical activists like COPS Commune. Schreier illustrates the network as a distributed grid of interlocking circular nodes, connected through various overlapping lines of interest. Many of the nodes include phone numbers. The diagram not only locates Ant Farm’s participation within this network, but also the collective’s fluency with the discourse around networks in the late 1960s. This discourse understood networks as both technological structures (the communication of data between linked computers) and social structures (flexible, horizontal relationships between people and organizations, which would replace the hierarchical social order of the Cold War world). The collective participated in multiple networks in a variety of ways, gaining exposure to both networked modes of social organization and to early forms of digital information networks, both of which influenced the "Enviro-Communications" course proposal.

Ant Farm’s initial experience of networked exchange occurred through mail art and “small publications.” Throughout the 1960s, international networks of artists communicated by

---

79 Schreier’s diagram resembles scientist Paul Baran’s popular diagram of a distributed network created for the RAND Corporation, a military think tank working on military communication networks. The nodes in the former are connected by different types of lines (dashed lines, dotted lines, etc.), indicating shared interests such as “social design,” “education,” “shared work,” and “structure.” The diagram also invites viewers to “Add more people,” underscoring Ant Farm’s understanding of how networks grow.

80 In tracing the various ways in which Ant Farm participated in these networks I draw upon Felicity Scott’s analysis in Scott, “Networks and Apparatuses, circa 1971.”

81 I am taking the term “small publications” from Curtis Schreier who defines this type of publication as a “phenomenon [that] emerged simply because ‘you could do it.’” Curtis Schreier, “Interview with Chip Lord and Curtis Schreier: Inflatocookbook,” in *Clip Stamp Fold: The Radical Architecture of Little Magazines 196X to 197X*, ed., Beatriz Colomina and Craig Buckley (Princeton, NJ: Actar, 2011), 413. These “small-publications” were typically self- or independently-published periodicals and books, produced on low budgets and with small-scale circulation.
mailing each other works on paper, self-published magazines, and newsletters, and by participating in mail art assemblages (calls for submissions typically around a central theme.) For many, including Ant Farm, these systems of mail art represented a means to circumvent the traditional gallery system. Similarly, self-published and small press publications became a major forum for the circulation of critiques and experimental ideas that mainstream publications would censor. For architects and builders, for example, small publications represented an ideal venue for sharing visionary ideas and experimental projects. As such, these publications served as alternatives to conventional architecture education, production, and journalism.

Beatriz Colomina and Craig Buckley have argued that small architecture publications became as central to experimentation and debate within the discipline as bricks-and-mortar structures in the 1960s and 1970s. For example, Archigram, a British collective whose name derives from

82 For example, the New York Correspondence School started as an individual practice in which Ray Johnson sent small collages to a personal mailing list. Over the course of the 1960s, many other artists joined, creating an extensive network for the circulation of small art works. See Ina Blom, “Ray Johnson: the Present of Mail Art,” published January 2008, accessed June 27, 2016, http://www.rayjohnson.org/Ray-Johnson-The-Present-of-Mail-Art/ray-johnson-the-present-of-mail-art.

83 Lord, “Interview with Chip Lord and Curtis Schreier: Inflatocookbook,” 409. Prior to the collective’s formation, Michels and Lord frequently contributed to both small and mainstream publications. Michels’s student work appeared in Archigram 7, Perspecta 11, and both Michels and Lord had work featured in the October 1968 issue of Progressive Architecture, which also featured Supergraphics designs. Michels also served as associate editor of Progressive Architecture. Michels and Lord’s first contact occurred when their work was featured in the same issue of Progressive Architecture; Michels sent Lord a letter criticizing his designs.

84 Although self-publishing and small press operations were first embraced by the artistic avant-garde in the 1920s and 1930s, the emergence of inexpensive printing technologies in the late 1960s—such as portable mimeograph machines and offset lithographic printing equipment, both of which could be housed in a home or studio—made designing and printing magazines much more accessible. These technologies also enabled producers to more readily manipulate design elements in innovative ways: many of the publications adopted a collage aesthetic that juxtaposed typed pages, clippings, handwritten notes, photographs, and other media. Within the student protest movement, for example, students frequently used small publications to disseminate their demands for reform. See Beatriz Colomina and Craig Buckley, “Introduction,” in Clip Stamp Fold: The Radical Architecture of Little Magazines 196X to 197X, ed. Beatriz Colomina and Craig Buckley (Princeton, NJ: Actar, 2011), 6–15; Gwen Allen, Artists’ Magazines: An Alternative Space for Art (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2011).

85 The authors state that publications became “sites of architectural production in their own right, challenging building as the primary locus of experimentation and debate.” Colomina and Buckley, “Introduction,” 8.
the combination ‘architecture’ and ‘telegram,’ began publishing pamphlets as a major part of their practice in 1960. Their irregular, collaged publications typically illustrated the collective’s visionary proposals for futuristic urban spaces, technophilic megastructures that could only exist on the printed page (figure 3.7). Other architecture publications, like mathematician and former U.S. soldier Steve Baer’s Dome Cookbook (1968), functioned as DIY guides. The Cookbook featured diagrams and instructions on how to create dome-style architecture (figure 3.8). Ant Farm’s most significant addition to the network of small publications was their Inflatocookbook (1970), a DIY guide to inflatable structures (figure 3.9). Much like Baer’s Dome Cookbook, the Inflatocookbook aimed to share the collective’s knowledge and provide readers with tools to create their own inflatable architecture. By the late 1960s, more mainstream publications also began to include sections on experimental architectural practices.

Many of the publishers of these small publications participated in the larger network surrounding Stewart Brand’s Whole Earth Catalog (1968–71). Fred Turner describes Brand as a

---

87 Inspired by the Buckminster Fuller-influenced domes at Drop City, Baer developed a design for what he called “zomes,” asymmetrical domes constructed with car tops. Published by the Lama Foundation, a spiritual commune and not-for-profit foundation established by former USCO member Steve Durkee, the cookbook shared designs and offered instructions on how to break out of the prison of “the paucity of shapes to which we have in the past confined ourselves because of our technology-industry-education-economy.” A collage of hand drawn diagrams, handwritten instructions, photographs, and type, the newsprint book sold for $1. Steve Baer, Dome Cookbook (Taos, NM: Lama Foundation, 1968). 3. For more information on the Lama Foundation see Turner, From Counterculture to Cyberculture, 75.
88 Ant Farm worked with Rip Off Press, a local comic book printer, to publish 2,000 copies of the loose-leaf book, which was composed of fourteen 8.5” x 11” pages and eight 11” x 17” pages held together by a transparent plastic jacket. It was distributed by mail order for $3 per copy. Like Brand and Baer, Ant Farm also solicited feedback from readers within the book. One page asks, “Did you use the Inflatocookbook to build an inflatable? ... how did it work? send us photos, slides, drawings? What did you use it for? Where did you find the materials? ... how did the bubble make you feel?” Ant Farm, Inflatocookbook, n.p. They provided a deadline and planned to incorporate this feedback into a never-published second issue of the Inflatocookbook. The Inflatocookbook also demonstrated Ant Farm’s engagement with mail art—it contains bill-like “energy credits,” which were inspired by mail artist Dana Atcheley’s fake money. Schreier, “Interview with Chip Lord and Curtis Schreier: Inflatocookbook,” 411.
89 The London-based periodical Architectural Design, for example, added “Cosmorama,” a section focused on innovative projects and exhibitions.
“network entrepreneur” who wove together myriad groups in a variety of venues, the best known of which was the *Catalog*. The *Whole Earth Catalog* served as a “textual forum,” connecting back-to-the-landers, technologists, academics, artists, spiritual groups, and others within a printed publication. Brand and his staff organized goods and services into seven categories, which provide insight into the range of discourses that the publication encompassed: “Understanding Whole Systems,” “Shelter and Land Use,” “Industry and Craft,” “Communications,” “Community,” “Nomadics,” “Learning.” Brand derived this organizational structure from systems theory: he viewed the categories as “equally legitimate elements of a single system.” In other words, Brand believed that understanding these categories in relationship to one another led to the understanding of the earth as a whole system. The *Whole Earth Catalog* also functioned as a feedback loop; after the first issue, the editors incorporated reader commentary into the design. Thus, the catalog continued to grow through feedback (items were added and edited, but never subtracted), becoming an expanding network of tools shaped by the readers, as well as by Brand and his team. Ant Farm contributed frequently to the *Whole Earth Catalog*, submitting text on the “Cowboy Nomad” archetype to the July 1969 supplement, installing a giant inflatable “pillow” in Saline Valley, California that served as a temporary production facility for the *Catalog*, and promoting the *Inflatocookbook* within the publication.

---

90 Turner uses this term, which was originated by sociologist Ronald Burt, to describe Brand’s ability to connect seemingly disparate groups. Turner, *From Counterculture to Cyberculture*, 5.
91 Ibid., 73.
92 Ibid., 85.
93 “Catalog listings are continually revised according to the experience and suggestions of catalog users and staff.” Stewart Brand, “Function,” *Whole Earth Catalog*, (1968): 1.
94 As a result, the six editions printed between 1968 and 1971 grew from 61 to 448 pages.
95 These *Catalog*-sponsored events include “Liferaft Earth,” a three-day event at University of California, Berkeley that is now thought of as the first Earth Day. Ant Farm performed *Air Emergency*, an intervention that staged a pollution emergency. See Scott, *Architecture or Techno-Utopia*, 209–245. The
Brand’s reach extended to the Bay Area community of technology researchers developing early computer-based information networks in the late 1960s. This community centered on the Augmentation Research Center (ARC) at the Stanford Research Institute (SRI) in Menlo Park, California. Led by engineer Douglas Engelbart, the team of technologists at the ARC investigated “questions of man-machine integration,” a focus that led them to invent many components of personal computing devices.96 Between 1966 and 1968, ARC engineers designed the “On-Line System” (NLS), an intranet system that allowed users stationed at multiple computer units within an office computing environment to contribute to a document simultaneously.97 The ARC was not alone in its interest in developing computer-based modes of information exchange during this period; Joseph C. R. Licklider at the Defense Department’s Advanced Research Projects Agency (ARPA) concurrently developed ARPANET, a TCP/IP-based network that is widely acknowledged as a major precursor to the Internet.98 Both teams of researchers were influenced by the U.S. Office of Scientific Research and Development Director Vannevar Bush’s visionary proposal for the “Memex,” a desktop computer that could store data on human history.99 However, the researchers at ARC also possessed a more countercultural vision for their technologies: engaging the computer’s potential for “transforming human consciousness.”100 Brand helped to foster this latter interest by connecting the members of the

---

96 The computer mouse represents one of the components attributed to the ARC. Turner, From Counterculture to Cyberculture, 107.
98 ARPA also served as a major funder of the ARC’s research.
100 Turner, From Counterculture to Cyberculture, 109. According to Turner, Douglas Engelbart, the leader of the ARC group and several of its members, experimented with LSD and visited communes in the late-1960s.
ARC group to people and ideas within the counterculture movement, including Ant Farm.\textsuperscript{101} The collective installed an inflatable at Peradam, a three-day conference organized by ARC researcher Dave Evans, that served as a key convergence of the countercultural and technological networks.\textsuperscript{102} Schreier also participated in a demo of ARPANET organized by Stewart Brand.\textsuperscript{103} These events introduced the collective to early intranet systems, which informed their understanding of the potential for network-based education.

The “Enviro-Communications” Course Proposal

The “Enviro-Communication” course proposal brought both the social and technological networks that Ant Farm encountered in the Bay Area into an educational setting (figure 3.10).

Crucially, the “Enviro” in the title refers not to the natural environment, but to a postindustrial notion of environment as a “constructed realm characterized by both physical artifacts and expanding information networks.”\textsuperscript{104} In designing a syllabus that would allow students to explore this expanded environment, Ant Farm synthesized the pedagogical

\textsuperscript{101} Ibid.. Brand was connected to members of the ARC group through his colleagues at the Portola Institute, the education nonprofit, based in Menlo Park, that served as home base for the Whole Earth Catalog. Brand connected ARC members to the Lama Foundation and various communes.

\textsuperscript{102} Peradam took place in Lompoc, California in September 1969. The conference united leaders of the California counterculture and the emergent technology scene with the goal of sharing practices and discover common ground. Participants included Brand and Jay Baldwin from the Whole Earth Catalog, alternative architects, applied technology groups, communes, yoga centers, students from alternative schools, and many others. Participating organizations include Liferaft Earth, the Yoga Institute, the Exology Center, Zomeworks, the Hog Farm Commune, high school students from Pacific High (a non-authoritarian high school), and many other groups. The various organizations and individuals presented on their projects and tried to find points of intersection. Scott argues that the conference’s actual aim was to enact a “subtle strategy of reform and synchronization” that would, ultimately result in the capitalization of computers and their attendant information networks. Scott, “Networks and Apparatuses, circa 1971,” 105.

\textsuperscript{103} Curtis Schreier, email to the author, July 16, 2015.

\textsuperscript{104} Scott, Architecture or Techno-Utopia, 89. Scott articulates this definition in her discussion of Emilio Ambasz’s curatorial projects at MoMA in the late 1960s and early 1970s and describes this notion of “environment” as a pressing discourse within the fields of architecture and design during this period. I posit that Ant Farm’s use of the term aligns with this discourse.
principles that informed the collective’s initial manifesto (access to tools and responsive systems). The course structure fostered student-directed learning: students would determine their own goals for the course. They could work individually or in groups on projects of their own devising and share their work with the class and others through non-mandatory presentations. Ant Farm also specified that the class would operate through a student-initiated grading system. As instructors, Lord and Michels would provide feedback when students solicited it, but not structure the flow of information. This autonomous learning structure echoed the student-driven forms of learning advocated by Michels and Field in “What’s wrong with architectural education?”

Rather than follow a predetermined curriculum, students would become participants in a network that included practitioners of experimental architecture, community members, corporate entities, and educational institutions. Students could, for example, join an interdisciplinary design team of architecture and technology specialists or partner with an organization such as N.A.S.A., I.B.M., Experiments in Art and Technology, or U.S. Rubber “to extend the facilities and resources of the course to the most advanced technological level in this country.” Other nodes within the network included Arcosanti, and Buckminster Fuller’s seminars on building domes. Significantly, the proposal describes the College of Architecture as just one of many nodes in this network of potential research sources, highlighting Ant Farm’s rejection of schools as chief centers for learning. Weekly “whole class” meetings would occur, not in the classroom, but at locations in the surrounding community, enabling the inclusion of people from outside of academia. The course reading list further extends this network of information sources—it combines architecture and design texts, publications on alternative education, activist literature, activist literature,

106 The proposal read, “The College of Architecture is viewed as an information system, and resource center providing materials, information and a mix of talents.” Ibid., 2.
futurology, systems theory, and books on psychedelic experiences.\textsuperscript{107}

The proposal also encourages students to utilize multimedia equipment to collect and disseminate information. It describes course meetings as potentially taking the form of “communication events,” which might involve “multimedia nomadic equipment to gather and disperse information, construction of mobile living equipment, geodesic domes, environmental systems, transportation, media equipment.”\textsuperscript{108} Students would not only exchange their findings through meetings and direct contact, but also through digital information networks. Ant Farm describes one mechanism for information exchange as a “data bank,” which would allow for communication within a far larger network than that encompassed by a class or school.\textsuperscript{109} The notion of the data bank recalls Vannevar Bush’s proposal for a “Memex” machine that stores data on human history. Most radically, however, the proposal also includes a potential assignment that asks students to develop a way to communicate this information across the globe. This aspect of the course proposal demonstrates the collective’s knowledge of intranet systems like NLS and ARPANET. However, Ant Farm extends these systems further—rather than an \textit{intra}-net system that shares information between computers in one location, the collective imagines an \textit{inter}-net that connects a global system of computers. This notion of a distributed information network closely resembles contemporary Internet platforms for user-

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{107} Ibid., 6. The reading list includes the following: Periodicals: \textit{The Futurist Magazine}; \textit{Good News}; \textit{The Whole Earth Catalog}; \textit{The Yellow Pages}, \textit{Houston Phone Book}. Books: Christopher Alexander, \textit{Notes on the Synthesis of Form} (1964); John Cage, \textit{A Year From Monday} (1967); Lewis Carroll, \textit{Alice in Wonderland} (1865); Arthur C. Clarke, \textit{Profiles of the Future: An Inquiry into the Limits of the Possible} (1962); Eldridge Cleaver, \textit{Soul on Ice} (1968); Jon Dieses, \textit{Syllabus, the Design of Alternative Futures} (1969); Buckminster Fuller, \textit{Operating Manual for Spaceship Earth} (1968); Abbie Hoffman, \textit{Revolution for the Hell of It} (1968); Carl Jung, \textit{Memories, Dreams, and Reflections} (1963); Herman Kahn and Anthony Wiener, \textit{The Year 2,000: A Framework for Speculation on the Next 33 Years} (1967); Arthur Koestler, \textit{The Act of Creation} (1964); Robert Marks, \textit{The Dymaxion World of Buck Minster Fuller} (1960); Bernard Rudofsky, \textit{Architecture without Architects} (1964); A.S. Neill, \textit{Summerhill: A Radical Approach to Childrearing} (1960) and \textit{Freedom not License} (1966); Allan Watts, \textit{The Joyous Cosmology} (1962); Tom Wolfe, \textit{Electric Kool Aid Acid Test} (1968).
  \item \textsuperscript{108} Ibid., 5.
  \item \textsuperscript{109} Ibid., 3.
\end{itemize}
generated content like Wikipedia or YouTube, to which anyone with Internet access can contribute.

**The Pedagogical Implications of Networks**

By encouraging students to collaborate with experimental architects, community members, and organizations, Ant Farm drew upon the model of the network presented at events like Peradam. In the course proposal, these networks function as an alternative to conventional curriculum that places students in much more experiential learning roles. While curriculum traditionally proceeds in a linear order predetermined by a professor or a higher body of institutional governance, students in the “Enviro-Communication” course could navigate the information provided in the network according to their own interests. Furthermore, rather than doing research on architectural practices or creating models based on their work, as in a conventional architecture course, students would learn through direct participation in projects. Following these hands-on experiences, students would return to share what they learned with their peers. Although Ant Farm suggests nodes in this network, students could extend the network to encompass other interests or practices, thus helping to build the curriculum. In their suggestion that the resulting data be stored and exchanged through a global informational network, Ant Farm envisioned a pedagogical function for the systems contemporaneously in development by ARC and ARPA. The resulting global information network would be distributed among all participants, creating a user-generated platform.

These dual forms of networks within the course decentered the roles of both Ant Farm as the teacher and the University of Houston as the institutional host for the course. If, as is outlined in the proposal, participating students gathered information through their own research and collaborations, they would have no need for an authoritative teacher-figure. Instead of
transmitting information, the teacher would facilitate students’ connections, providing feedback when requested. Ant Farm defined the role of the school as a tool or resource that students have access to, but not an institution that structures or influences their learning. Ant Farm’s proposed vision of networked education thus reduces the need for the institutionalization of learning within schools, extending access to educational materials beyond registered students.

The implications of this vision of a pedagogical network on the roles of the teacher and the school recall media theorists Marshall McLuhan’s technophilic prophesies, which Ant Farm read assiduously. In his 1960 essay “Classroom without Walls,” McLuhan proposed that communication technology infiltrate standardized classroom curriculum, creating open-ended, dehierarchized education systems. By 1967, he had begun to envision education in the form of a network, which he described as “the world communications net.” This “worldwide network of computers,” according to McLuhan, would allow all existing knowledge to be instantly available to anyone anywhere. The resulting system would decentralize communication and information, fostering a multidirectional flow that would be regulated by feedback. While the prescience of McLuhan’s vision of computer-based information exchange networks is frequently recognized, his acknowledgement of how this could change learning systems is rarely discussed. Like Ant Farm, McLuhan believed this system would allow students to assume responsibility for their own learning, rather than relying on teachers to structure their curriculum. He also saw the potential for these networks to dissolve boundaries between learning within and outside of schools.

110 Ant Farm credits McLuhan as one of the chief influences on the design for the course alongside Buckminster Fuller, A. S. Neill, and John Cage. Lord, “Enviro-Communication Course Proposal,” 1.
112 According to McLuhan, “The world communications net, the all-involving linkage of electric circuitry, will grow and become more sensitive. It will also develop new modes of feedback so that communication can become dialogue instead of monologue. It will breach the wall between “in” and “out” of school. It will join all people everywhere.” McLuhan & Leonard, “The Future of Education: The Class of 1989,” 25.
McLuhan’s visionary writing influenced many artists, designers, and architects to create proposals for integrating mass media into education.\textsuperscript{113}

Beyond this decentering and dehierarchizing potential, Ant Farm’s proposed networks also had the capacity to motivate students to a much greater degree than the collective’s workshops. By foregrounding connection, exchange, and contribution to a collective resource, the “Enviro-Communications” networks incentivized participation. Furthermore, by connecting students, the community, and experimental architecture practitioners, these networks gave all three groups stake in the proceedings of the course. This aspect of Ant Farm’s course proposal contains parallels to the “learning webs” envisioned by radical Roman Catholic priest Ivan Illich in his contemporaneous manifesto for unregulated educational networks, \textit{Deschooling Society} (1971).\textsuperscript{114} A comparison of the two theories reveals connections and divergences between Ant Farm’s ideas and a larger dialogue around the political potential of network-based education. Deeply critical of the institutionalization and commodification of education, which he believed limited educational opportunity, Illich posited that “the most radical alternative to school would be a network or service which gave each man the same opportunity to share his current

\textsuperscript{113} For example, Industrial designer Ken Isaacs created the \textit{Knowledge Box} (1962), a bathroom-sized wooden cube installed with projectors that project constantly changing photographs from popular magazines onto all of the interior surfaces. Participants are invited to enter the cube and draw connections between the immersive flow of images. See Susan Snodgrass, “Enter the Matrix: An Interview with Ken Isaacs,” in \textit{Hippie Modernism: The Struggle for Utopia}, ed., Andrew Blauvelt (The Walker Art Center, Minneapolis, 2015), 369–74. The Los Angeles architecture and research collective Environmental Communications started a slide distribution network that sought to expand architectural education by infiltrating institutional slide libraries with photographs of experimental architectural practices. Environmental Communications was founded in 1969. There is no indication of any connection between their name and the “Enviro-Communications” course title. Ant Farm was among the countercultural architecture collectives surveyed in the slides. The Environmental Communications collection was the focus of \textit{Environmental Communications: Contact High} (Arthur Ross Architecture Gallery, Buell Hall, 2014).

\textsuperscript{114} Ant Farm was aware of Illich, but dismissed him as overly “academic” and did not read \textit{Deschooling Society}. Curtis Schreier, email to the author, July 16, 2015.
concern with others motivated by the same concern.” To this end, he proposed a system of “webs” offering skill-exchanges, peer matching, a directory of educators, and access to “educational objects” at sites like museums and laboratories, which could be used as references, or focuses for longer-term apprenticeships. Like Ant Farm’s course proposal, Illich’s notion of learning webs is predicated on the ability of the individual to guide her own learning process and to fulfill that process by connecting to and working with others. Both theories identify this type of learning as “incidental education,” highlighting the self-directed nature of knowledge and skill-acquisition within network-based systems. Although technology is less central to Illich’s webs than in McLuhan’s proposed systems, the former would also operate through communication technology. In Illich’s version, participants would enter their information and interests into a computer and receive matches by mail. Both systems are revolutionary in that they would level access to educational resources and produce autonomous, self-motivated individuals, eradicating dependency on capitalist institutions. Unlike the “Enviro-Communication” course proposal, however, Illich wanted to abolish schools altogether.

Illich’s theory also contains a radical undercurrent not present in Ant Farm’s project: the Liberation Theology movement sought to emancipate the poor from social, economic, and political oppression, including that imposed by state institutions, like schools. Through his work as a priest, Illich had observed both the economic and political inequalities perpetuated by

---

116 Illich, Deschooling Society, 23. Ant Farm refers to incidental learning in their description of the network-based learning that occurs in their proposal for the Truckstop Network (discussed in the following section). Like illich, Ant Farm use the term to refer to learning that occurs outside of institutionalized education and that is based on the learner’s needs and interests, rather than an imposed curriculum. Ant Farm, “Truckstop Fantasy One,” 3. Ant Farm Archive, Truckstop Network Proposals, 2005.14.253, Berkeley Art Museum, Berkeley, CA.
117 This movement developed in Latin America in the 1950s and spread to many Latin American intellectuals in the 1960s and 1970s. See Luis Camnitzer, Conceptualism in Latin American Art: Didactics of Liberation (Austin: University of Texas Press, 2007), 103–5.
the current educational system and the potential for peer-to-peer learning outside of that system.\textsuperscript{118} He was also influenced by Paolo Freire’s literacy program, which taught villagers to read through words that resonated with their social and political status.\textsuperscript{119} As a result, Illich championed informal education as a better vehicle for serving poor populations than schools. He posited that "instead of equalizing chances, the school system has monopolized their distribution," and thus “the mere existence of school discourages and disables the poor from taking control of their own learning.”\textsuperscript{120} Schools serve to uphold class distinctions, preventing economic, political, and social equality. When juxtaposed with this Marxist imperative to disestablish schools, Ant Farm’s discourse appears far less revolutionary; although they wanted to break down the boundaries around schools, they were not directly concerned with making education accessible to those who have typically been disenfranchised within education systems. Uruguayan artist and art historian Luis Camnitzer has highlighted this difference, arguing that while reformist pedagogy in the United States cultivates the freedom of the individual (and assumes that this freedom inherently produces a democratic system), most radical pedagogues working in Latin America, including Freire and Illich, saw pedagogy as a tool to engender a dramatic shift in social structure.\textsuperscript{121} By contrast, the pedagogical experimentation of Ant Farm and their peers sought to empower those who were already among the most empowered populations in the world, rather than targeting disempowered populations.

Although Ant Farm did not take as socially radical an approach to pedagogical networks as Illich in their “Enviro-Communications” course proposal, they did imagine possibilities for learning that could substantially alter academic education. In the next few years, they expanded

\textsuperscript{118} Illich had worked as a parish priest in Washington Heights in New York City, where he helped to facilitate a program in which teenagers taught teachers, social workers, and ministers Spanish. 
\textsuperscript{119} Illich, \textit{Deschooling Society}, 18. Freire’s program was also informed by Liberation Theology. 
\textsuperscript{120} Ibid., 12, 8.
\textsuperscript{121} Camnitzer, \textit{Conceptualism in Latin American Art: Didactics of Liberation}, 113.
upon the ideas in the course proposal, envisioning a nation-wide network for extra-institutional exchange.

III. Extra-Institutional Networks

“Eventually we will abandon physical movement for telepathic/cybernetic movement (television), and our network will adapt to the change,” predicted the members of Ant Farm in 1971. “We are already doing it to a degree, and the videosphere is the basis of that system ... It is an educational system, for people are now learning that it is a continual process with no finish with a degree and no start in ‘school.’”122 This statement, made in a proposal for the Truckstop Network, a speculative physical and digital knowledge- and skill-exchange network for high-tech countercultural nomads, reveals a shift in Ant Farm’s approach to both educational institutions and information networks. Catalyzed by their participation in emerging alternative video practices, the collective turned away from their previous attempts to reform teaching within institutions of higher education in the early 1970s. Instead, they expanded upon the ideas in the “Enviro-Communications” course proposal, focusing on the extra-institutional modes of learning and exchange made possible through information technologies and their attendant communication networks.123 This section analyzes Ant Farm’s new focus on extra-institutional learning networks through a discussion of the Truckstop Network (as it is depicted in writing, sketches and diagrams, funding proposals, and other media created during the first half of 1971) and the Truckstop tour, a cross-country road trip that the collective took to promote and

122 Ant Farm, “Truckstop Fantasy One,” 1. Ant Farm likely took the term videosphere from media theorist Gene Youngblood, whose use of the term will be discussed on the following page.
123 By extra-institutional learning, I mean learning that is attained outside of legally accredited educational institutions and programs.
model the *Truckstop Network* in the spring of 1971. Informed by the emerging discourse around the radical potential of alternative video networks, these speculative, extra-institutional learning networks anticipated the dehierarchized forms of information exchange, learning, and labor now possible through digital communication.

**The Videosphere**

In 1970, media theorist Gene Youngblood defined the “videosphere” as a global system of information transmitted through cable television, video, storage networks, “time-shared computer utilities,” and “the domestic satellite system,” which would exist outside of government and corporate control.\(^\text{124}\) While much of the aforementioned technology was only available to military-industrial entities at the time of Youngblood’s writing, the release of the Sony Portapak in 1967 rendered portable video recording equipment relatively affordable and accessible.\(^\text{125}\) Youngblood and others viewed the new video technology as a means to place media production and dissemination in the hands of the masses, with the ultimate goal of creating what video activist Michael Shamberg termed “guerilla television,” or “alternative information structures, not just alternative content pumped across the existing ones.”\(^\text{126}\) As described by film and video curator Steve Seid, many video activists working in the early 1970s viewed network television as a corporate “system of social discipline,” which exerted control “not so much by determining behavior as by discouraging it through its uncanny promotion of passivity.”\(^\text{127}\) Youngblood, Shamberg, and others sought to resist this corporate media system by turning formerly passive

---


\(^\text{125}\) The Portapak sold for around $1,500.


\(^\text{127}\) Seid, “Tunneling Through the Wasteland: Ant Farm Video,” 22.
television consumers into active video producers and by establishing cable television networks for the circulation of the resulting content.\footnote{David Joselit, \textit{Feedback: Television Against Democracy} (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2007), 87. For example, Videofreex, a New York-based video collective, spent four years living in a rural Catskills town, recording and broadcasting a community cable channel. For more on the Videofreex see \textit{Journal of Film and Video} 64, nos. 1–2 (Spring/Summer 2012).}

Many artists, activists, and educators took up this cause, forming collectives, forums, and networks for the exchange of alternative video practices. In New York City, for example, a group of writers, filmmakers, teachers, and activists founded Raindance Corporation in 1969, a McLuhan-influenced “alternative media think tank.”\footnote{Frank Gillette, Michael Shamberg, Ira Schneider, and Louis Jaffe founded Raindance Corporation. Other early members included Paul Ryan, Vic Gioscia, Megan Williams and Harvey Simonds.} In spring 1970, Raindance began to publish \textit{Radical Software} (1970–74), a magazine that became a central forum for alternative video practices. Edited by video artists Beryl Korot and Phyllis Gershuny, the magazine was founded as an “information source which would bring together people who were already making their own television, attempt to turn on others to the idea as a means of social change and exchange, and serve as an introduction to an evolving handbook of technology.”\footnote{“Contents,” \textit{Radical Software} 1, no. 1 (Spring 1970): n.p., Accessed October 2, 2016, \url{http://www.radicalsoftware.org/volume1nr1/pdf/VOLUME1NR1_0002.pdf}.} The publication included media theory, project proposals, technical information, and a feedback section, which contained messages and updates from readers. Many video artists and activists also saw the widespread access to video equipment as having implications for education. For example, the first issue of \textit{Radical Software} included video artist Nam June Paik’s proposal for an “Expanded Education for the Paperless Society,” which re-envisions the higher education system as a global video exchange network.\footnote{Paik’s examples include American University students learning how to play Japanese court instruments through videotaped lessons. Nam June Paik, “Expanded Education for the Paperless Society,” \textit{Radical Software} 1, no. 1 (1970): 7, Accessed October 2, 2016, \url{http://www.radicalsoftware.org/volume1nr1/pdf/VOLUME1NR1_art02.pdf}.} 

\begin{footnotesize} 

\footnotetext[128]{David Joselit, \textit{Feedback: Television Against Democracy} (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2007), 87. For example, Videofreex, a New York-based video collective, spent four years living in a rural Catskills town, recording and broadcasting a community cable channel. For more on the Videofreex see \textit{Journal of Film and Video} 64, nos. 1–2 (Spring/Summer 2012).} 

\footnotetext[129]{Frank Gillette, Michael Shamberg, Ira Schneider, and Louis Jaffe founded Raindance Corporation. Other early members included Paul Ryan, Vic Gioscia, Megan Williams and Harvey Simonds.} 


\end{footnotesize}
The Bay Area, with its proximity to computer technology innovators and its large population of counterculturalists, became a center for alternative video production. Bay Area video practitioners included the Media Access Center, which held classes and workshops that aimed to familiarize participants with video technology; Video Free America, creators of psychedelic video art; and T.R. Uthco, a performance and video collective that satirized mass media.\textsuperscript{132} Ant Farm also participated in video networks in myriad ways, contributing to \textit{ Radical Software}, collaborating with several Bay Area video collectives, and producing numerous video works.\textsuperscript{133} In 1971, for example, Schreier, Allan Rucker, and other Ant Farm members used the Portapak to film \textit{Inflatables Illustrated}, a how-to guide to creating inflatable architecture, much of which takes the form of a mock Julia Child cooking show (figure 3.11). In the video, Schreier demonstrates how to use everyday household items to construct inflatables in a kitchen. The how-to segments of \textit{Inflatables Illustrated} are interrupted by shots of children playing in an inflatable, segments of an interview in which Lord and Michels muse on the experiential potential of pneumatic architecture, and clips taken from mass media. Ant Farm also created proposals for alternative communication networks of the kind imagined by Youngblood and Shamberg. \textit{Truckstop Network} is the most ambitious of these proposals.

\textit{Truckstop Network} 


\textsuperscript{133} Ant Farm contributed to the “Feedback” section of \textit{Radical Software}'s first issue: “ANT FARM designs and constructs inflatables, mostly in California. They have some tape of themselves are putting together a tape on how to do your own inflatable.” Ant Farm, “Feedback,” \textit{Radical Software} 1, no. 1 (1970): 19, accessed October 2, 2016, \texttt{http://www.radicalsoftware.org/volume1nr1/pdf/VOLUME1NR1_art05.pdf}. 

160
Truckstop Network built upon several earlier unrealized proposals: the “Enviro-Communications” course, The Electronic Oasis (1970), and Truckin’ University, with which this chapter opened. A “mobile teaching environment,” The Electronic Oasis comprised a converted school bus, videotape equipment, and inflatables, which Ant Farm proposed to set up at various schools, communities, and conferences with the aim of “sharing ideas, information and resources.”134 The collective expanded this concept in the diagram for Truckin’ University, proposing a fleet of vehicles outfitted with communication technologies, which would function as platforms for mobile learning. Truckstop Network developed these ideas into an entire alternative system that encompassed both a physical network of truckstops and an information network facilitated through “self-regulating audio and video hardware.”135 Ant Farm described this system’s participants as “media nomads,” itinerant, tech-savvy counterculturalists in constant movement from truckstop to truckstop.136

A drawing on a placemat created in 1970 illustrates the physical geography of the Truckstop Network (figure 3.12). The placemat depicts a map of the United States dotted with stations (“truckstops”) located primarily at alternative learning sites like Arcosanti, institutions of higher education including Goddard College in Vermont and the University of Houston, and Cold War infrastructure, such as unused missile silos (figure 3.13). Notably, Ant Farm did not

136 The diagrams of truckstops are peppered with illustrations of vehicles and nomadic dwellings, which these nomads would, apparently, inhabit: a truck with a trailer that has been converted into a cottage, a school bus painted to look like an American flag with a geodesic dome as its portable shelter, a pick-up camper with a tee-pee. These vehicles can be contextualized within a generation of “Truckitecture,” or custom-designed mobile homes that were pervasive across the West Coast in the early 1970s. Environmental Communications coined the term “Truckitecture” in 1974. For more on the “Truckitecture” movement see Chaitkin, “Alternatives,” 267. The media nomads would also have the latest video technologies, including portable video cameras like the Sony Portapak. While designing the Truckstop Network proposals, Ant Farm was also working on their own solution for a high-tech nomadic existence, the media van (discussed later in this section).
completely eradicate schools within this design—instead they recognized that educational institutions had valuable technological infrastructure and cast them as research centers to which everyone should have access. The presence of both schools and surplus sites demonstrate the collective’s ecological and financial consciousness: they strove to repurpose existing infrastructure, rather than create new buildings. Mark Wasiuta argues that Ant Farm’s repurposing of the surplus sites also illustrates the collective’s understanding of the simultaneous rapid obsolescence and constant reterritorialization of military technology.\textsuperscript{137} The only new structures that Ant Farm designed for the \textit{Truckstop Network} are massive inflatables and geodesic domes, both of which leave small ecological footprints (figure 3.14). A series of diagrams depicts the interiors of the inflatable structures as open-plan spaces containing colorful, cell-like bubbles labeled with functions like media center, daycare, and kitchen. The various forms of truckstops would operate as service stations, providing necessities like produce, gas, and tools for vehicle upkeep and repair, as well as access to communication technologies, such as computers and video editing equipment. The truckstops would also serve as learning centers and gathering sites, with studios, workrooms, and spaces for discussion.

Another form of postwar infrastructure—the interstate highway system—connects the truckstops on the placemat map. The nomads would drive along this highway system as they traveled from stop to stop. As Hu has observed, the functioning of the physical web formed by the truckstops and the interstate highway system parallels that of packet-switching networks, an early form of digital network.\textsuperscript{138} Initially developed by RAND Corporation engineer Paul Baran

\textsuperscript{137} At the time, the US military’s missile development was evolving so quickly that silos for liquid-fueled missiles built in the early 1960s were already being abandoned as they were replaced by solid-fueled missiles in the late 1960s. Wasiuta, “Ant Farm Underground,” 92–93.

\textsuperscript{138} Hu, \textit{A Prehistory of the Cloud}, 30. Ant Farm was fascinated by the highway system and American car culture in general and viewed both as soon-to-be obsolete technologies. Their 1974 sculpture \textit{Cadillac Ranch}, a line of upside down Cadillacs buried in the desert in Amarillo, Texas, epitomizes this attitude.
and later incorporated into ARPANET, packet-switching networks operate through the constant transmission of packets, or block-like units of data, from node to node. The media nomads’ perpetual migration from node to node of the Truckstop Network resembles this continual movement. In both forms of network, information is not collected at any central mode, but distributed throughout all of the nodes. This comparison highlights the dehierarchized nature of the Truckstop Network—with no centralized node or authority, all participants had equal share in dictating its operations.

Ant Farm imagined information circulating between the truckstops in a manner similar to the packet-like paths of the media nomads. Each truckstop would contain a media lab outfitted with computers, video equipment, radios, telephones, and other information technologies, all of which could be used to transmit information between truckstops. Like today’s digital calendars and message boards, this equipment would provide constantly updated lists of activities, workshops, and tools available throughout the network and offer a platform for nomads to communicate with each other. This speculative information system would rely on an intra- or inter-net to transmit the data between computers and a video network. Ant Farm envisioned that each truckstop would have a screening area, where nomads could watch activities recorded at other truckstops. Ant Farm admitted that they did not have a complete understanding of how all of these communication systems would function. However, hindsight reveals that
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139 Ant Farm lists other potential uses for computers as: “information dispersal, plug into video. Events, video friends, used campers, rides wanted, messages, love letters, electronic classified with xerox for instant hard copy [sic].” Ant Farm, “Truckstop Fantasy One,” 3.
140 Ibid. The video network would be facilitated through a cable link or an Ultra High Frequency (UHF) channel. UHF is a mode of television broadcasting that uses high frequency radio.
141 Ant Farm’s discussion of the video equipment available at the truckstops includes "large screens so activities in other truckstops are open for viewing for 24 hrs." Ant Farm, “Truckstop Fantasy One,” 3.
142 Ant Farm’s lack of understanding of how they could create the computer-based networks in the proposal is revealed in their question: “what role do computers play in the network? Maybe a man from IBM should come over [sic] and rap get into a what if fantasy” Ant Farm, “Truckstop Fantasy One,” 2.
many aspects of their somewhat fantastical communication network has subsequently been
realized in our all-encompassing contemporary information infrastructure. As Hu argues, Ant
Farm’s amalgamation of multiple forms of networks (computer, video, telephone, radio, and
transportation networks) within an overarching umbrella (the *Truckstop Network*) anticipates
the contemporary cloud (the “system of networks that pools computing power” for information
exchange and storage, which entered widespread usage around 2010). Like the cloud, Ant
Farm did not prioritize specific technologies or media, but instead sought to unite multiple forms
of data.

As a pedagogical structure, the *Truckstop Network* much more closely resembles Illich’s
learning webs than the “Enviro-Communications” course proposal. In describing the network’s
pedagogical implications, Ant Farm asks: “What happens when distinctions between gradeschool [sic] highschool [sic] college are removed? incidental education for wandering learners little kids and old guys growing with mutual feedback. ... truckstop is a one room school [sic].” In other words, the network would eradicate all institutional structures and boundaries around learning, including age, educational background, and tuition. As in Illich’s learning webs, *Truckstop Network* participants would learn through peer-to-peer exchanges: media nomads would share or exchange skills and match with peers with similar learning interests. The multiple communication networks would aid in this process, facilitating skill- and knowledge-exchange between truckstops. Rather than follow any curriculum, participants would direct their own learning experiences based on personal questions or projects. Within this horizontal
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143 This definition comes from Hu, *A Prehistory of the Cloud*, ix. For Hu’s comparison of Ant Farm’s network and the cloud, see Ibid., 32–35. Hu also draws a parallel between Youngblood’s notion of the “videosphere” and the contemporary cloud.
144 Ant Farm, “Truckstop Fantasy One,” 3.
145 One nomad might offer woodworking training in exchange for a lesson in the history of meditation, for example.
system, everyone would have the potential to be both teachers and learners. As described by Ant Farm, learning would become a lifelong process with no barriers to access beyond participating in the network.\textsuperscript{146} The \textit{Truckstop Network} thus anticipated the decentralized and dehierarchized forms of learning now possible via the Internet, such as user-generated forums, tutorials, courses, databases, and myriad other digital platforms for knowledge-sharing and skill-exchange.\textsuperscript{147}

This learning system would function as part of the barter-based economy that governs the \textit{Truckstop Network}.\textsuperscript{148} Ant Farm described the network’s economy as “an abandonment of personal property—when you have a share in the truckstop you ‘own’ part of the physical reality, you don’t need anymore [sic], the energy system insures that energy you put into the system in Sausalito, can be taken out in Houston.”\textsuperscript{149} In other words, media nomads would not be tied to property, regular employment, or the federal monetary system. Instead, they would receive “energy credits” for their contributions to the network, which they could then “spend” on another training or activity. All participants would thus contribute to the shaping and upkeep of the network, creating a feedback loop that would govern its development.\textsuperscript{150} Freed from the time constraints of the conventional workday, nomads would move from project to project at their leisure. This system corresponds to the project-based thrust of contemporary labor in the neoliberal economy, which upholds the network as a “harmonious figure of natural order,” within which work and social life are “composed of a proliferation of encounters and temporary, but

\textsuperscript{146} Ant Farm, “Truckstop Fantasy One,” 1, 3.
\textsuperscript{147} I will elaborate on several of these platforms in my conclusion.
\textsuperscript{148} This model of barter-based skill-exchange directly anticipated contemporary artist-driven projects like Trade School, a barter-based school in which participants trade with teachers in order to enroll in classes.
\textsuperscript{149} Ant Farm, “Truckstop Fantasy One,” 1. The following quote is also from this page.
\textsuperscript{150} Contributions would take the form of independent and collective projects, such as cooking, repairing equipment, and cleaning.
reactivatable connections,” most of which revolve around specific projects. Like Ant Farm’s media nomads, the neoliberal laborer moves from project to project, often shifting roles to work with different collaborators. This comparison highlights a central paradox: Ant Farm viewed their proposal for network-based labor and lifestyle as an alternative to the capitalist economic system, which, at the time was marked by corporate bureaucracies with strict forty-hour work weeks, long-term commitments to companies, and highly-specialized divisions of labor. Today, however, the network represents the paradigmatic form of contemporary corporate organization.

**Truckstop Tours**

In the summer of 1970 and again in the spring of 1971, Ant Farm members undertook cross-country road trips that tested and modeled the “new form of mobile education” articulated in the *Truckstop Network* and served as a platform for experimental video work. Operating similarly to the *Electronic Oasis* proposal, these tours included workshops and demonstrations at various colleges, universities, and alternative education centers that could potentially serve as future truckstops. Ant Farm traveled with “media nomad equipment” including the *Media Van* (a customized Chevrolet van), materials for inflatables, a small library of new media theory and other texts, video equipment, and their own inflatable dwelling, which they often set up during workshops to model the nomadic ideal that they espoused. The collective also documented their activities and surroundings with their Portapak. I will focus on the more extensive 1971 tour,

---

151 Boltanski and Chiapello, *The New Spirit of Capitalism*, 127, 104. For more on this project-centered economy see Ibid., 103-63.
152 This paradox will be teased out in my conclusion.
154 The artist and gallerist Jim Newman (co-founder of Dilexi Gallery) gave Ant Farm a Portapak in 1970.
which built on the experiences of the previous year’s trip and enacted a prescient proto-information network.\textsuperscript{155}

Ant Farm’s “media nomad equipment” functioned as both a tool and a model on the \textit{Truckstop} tour.\textsuperscript{156} The collective customized the \textit{Media Van} during a five-day workshop with students at CalArts. They outfitted it with a Plexiglas “bubble” skylight, a “media lounge” with video editing and viewing equipment, a dashboard-mounted tripod, and other features that turned the van into a mobile recording station that suited the Sony Portapak (figure 3.15).\textsuperscript{157} Thus equipped, the \textit{Media Van} served as both a vehicle for the documentation of roadside culture and a learning lab where students could interact with new video technology. It towed an Eisenhower-era trailer with a kitchen and an inflatable shower unit. Ant Farm also travelled with the \textit{ICE-9}, a conical inflatable for sleeping, named after a fictional chemical from Kurt Vonnegut’s \textit{Cat’s Cradle}.\textsuperscript{158}

The \textit{Truckstop} tour stops, which have been described as “closer to happenings than to typical architectural demonstrations,” aimed to give students access to the latest technologies, experimental architecture practices, and theory, and to promote the collective’s (temporary) nomadic lifestyle.\textsuperscript{159} However, the potential for autonomous education and discovery that these brief stops afforded is difficult to track and seems more rhetorical than realized. Ant Farm

\begin{flushleft}
\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{155} Ant Farm originally planned that this second trip would culminate in an exhibition at the Corcoran in Washington, D.C. According to Michels’s proposal to the Corcoran, the exhibition would have included documentation of the \textit{Truckstop} tour, a temporary display of an inflatable and the Media Van, and presentations by Ant Farm. The Corcoran declined the exhibition due to lack of funds and scheduling issues.

\textsuperscript{156} Ant Farm, “Ant Farm Timeline,” 1976, revised in 2002 by Chip Lord and Doug Michels; published in \textit{Ant Farm: 1968-1978}, 12.

\textsuperscript{157} The roof-mounted bubble allowed a camera operator to have 360 degrees “freeway surveillance” and the videotape set-up ran off the direct current of the truck. Ibid.

\textsuperscript{158} In \textit{Cat’s Cradle}, “Ice-Nine” is a chemical developed to eradicate mud, which turns out to have the power to end life on earth.

\textsuperscript{159} Lewallen, “Introduction,” 2.
\end{footnotesize}
\end{flushleft}
typically set up their equipment, opened their van, and invited students to investigate and play. Beyond providing access to tools, the workshops appear to have been almost completely impromptu, with no pre-set agenda or program. At Yale, for example, Ant Farm persuaded a young singer, whom they had just met at a local car wash, to give a performance. At Tulane, they had a picnic, showed video footage from their road trip, and filmed giggling female students. The bulk of the documentation focuses on students crawling in and out of ICE-9 and posing for photographs alongside the media van, rather than actually testing the video equipment or reading media theory. The footage contains no record of any discussion of new modes of education and the overarching experience appears to be focused more on hanging out than on fostering learning. The tours also largely failed to reach an audience beyond those at elite universities and alternative schools.

Yet, although the Truckstop tour appears far from the sophisticated network advanced in the Truckstop Network proposals, it was surprisingly similar to proto-Internet experiments. As recounted by Hu, in 1976, engineers at SRI tested a protocol that connected an aerial packet radio network to the ground-based ARPANET using a retrofitted van. The SRI outfitted their van with a computer and two packet radio transmitters and drove around Northern California’s Bayshore Freeway in order to test the reception and broadcasting abilities of the network in a mobile situation. The test successfully achieved the first inter-network (Internet) transmission. Although the SRI’s digital transmission was, of course, more technically advanced than the capabilities of Ant Farm’s Media Van, Ant Farm’s Truckstop tour foresaw this convergence of the highway system and media circulation. Like the SRI, the collective imagined a network that combined vehicles, computers, and other media.

---

160 Ant Farm, Ant Farm Media Van v.08 Video: Truckstop Network, directed by Chip Lord, footage from 1971 (Ant Farm, 2008), DVD.
161 Hu, A Prehistory of the Cloud, 30–32.
Crucially, Ant Farm’s Media Van, in contrast to that of the SRI, did not operate in service of a defense-funded experiment. Instead, in both the tour and the *Truckstop Network*, Ant Farm imagined an alternative form of network that would function outside of the dominant political and economic systems. Scott argues that Ant Farm understood that information technologies would not remain in a utopian, decentralized state, outside of the control of the military-industrial system. They issued this manifesto, borrowed from the first issue of *Radical Software*:

> Power is no longer measured in land, labor, or capital, but by access to information and the means to disseminate it. As long as the most powerful tools (not Weapons) are in the hands of those who hoard them, no alternative cultural vision can succeed. Unless we design and implement alternative information structures which transcend and reconfigure the existing ones, other alternative systems and life styles will be no more than products of the existing process.

This call for alternative information networks acknowledges the real threat of FBI and CIA surveillance campaigns on the lives of counterculturalists in the late 1960s and early 1970s, as well as the fear of increasingly technologically-sophisticated weaponry systems. In keeping with *Radical Software’s* manifesto and with Youngblood’s notion of the videosphere, the collective designed and tested the *Truckstop Network* as a counter-form of information exchange, one which would exist outside of the military-industrial complex. Furthermore, Ant

---

162 Scott contrasts Ant Farm’s understanding of networks to that of Stewart Brand. She argues that, in bringing together technologists and counterculturalists, Brand falsely assumed that information inherently functions transparently. In making this assumption, he and many of his countercultural peers failed to raise challenges to the existing “networks of power.” Scott, “Networks and Apparatuses, circa 1971,” 105.


164 In the late 1960s the FBI launched surveillance campaigns against dissident groups that included tapping phones, opening mail, sending forged letters, harassment of the underground press, infiltrating meetings, among other tactics. Many of these tactics led to the arrest and, in some cases, murder of radical activists and Black Panthers. In addition, the CIA’s Operation Chaos, established in 1966, also investigated antiwar protest groups. Todd Gitlin, *The Sixties: Years of Hope, Days of Rage* (New York: Bantam Books, 1993), 378.
Farm highlighted the potential that this form of exchange could have for dehierarchizing education.

**Media Networks**

Aside from these tours, the *Network* never left the page; Ant Farm did not find a way to translate their pedagogy into a more substantial educational initiative. Instead, the *Truckstop* tour of 1971 marked the culmination of Ant Farm’s focus on education. The collective soon became preoccupied with intervening into mass media and creating alternative video networks, practices that they focused on until they disbanded in 1978. The beginning of this shift towards mass media can be seen in Ant Farm’s footage from the *Truckstop* tours, much of which détournes network television reporting. In *Scottsdale Hilton*, 1970, for example, Ant Farm crashed the groundbreaking ceremony for a Hilton Hotel in Scottsdale, Arizona. Wearing a female mask and carrying a microphone, Michels earnestly interviews the formally attired guests in the style of a television news reporter. The camera shifts between the gathering and the vast desert site, highlighting the environmental devastation caused by an increasingly corporate tourism industry. *Scottsdale Hilton* thus participates in the disruptive messaging encouraged by the editors of *Radical Software*; it takes the tools and form of mass media to create feedback that can disrupt the system. Ant Farm continued to employ this tactic throughout the 1970s, perhaps most notably in *Media Burn*, 1975, a staged media spectacle in which Ant Farm members drove a car into a wall of flaming televisions in front of an audience of invited news reporters (figure 3.16).

While this shift could be seen as an abandonment of their interest in pedagogy, and as an acquiescence to the fact that education systems cannot be changed, I posit that nevertheless it continues a central thread of their investigation into education: the desire to
intervene within dominant information networks. As readers of McLuhan, they likely realized that “most learning [currently] occurs outside the classroom. The sheer quantity of information conveyed by press-magazines-film-TV-radio far exceeds the quantity of information conveyed by school instruction and texts.” Furthermore, while the computerized information exchange imagined by Ant Farm in the Truckstop Network was not yet technologically possible in the early 1970s, the means for mass media intervention were already at their disposal.

This shift to mass media illustrates the extent to which Ant Farm innovated beyond the Halprins’ workshop-centered communication pedagogy. Although the collective led many workshops in the late 1960s, they favored a more open ended structure than that of their predecessors. In contrast to the Halprin’s carefully considered scores, Ant Farm encouraged student-driven learning by providing participants only with “access to tools.” Influenced by the discourse around emerging communication technologies circa 1970, the collective soon began to envision vast networks that would enable dehierarchized learning and exchange on a much larger scale. Ant Farm designed speculative proposals for communication webs that connected the diffuse nodes of countercultural education and innovation percolating across the United States. Although the collective struggled to realize their aims in the pedagogical activities that they actually implemented (especially Time Slice and the Truckstop tour), Ant Farm demonstrated the potential for peer-to-peer learning networks to replace the linear, hierarchical education that typically occurs within colleges and universities. In doing so, Ant Farm imagined vivid prototypes for our contemporary moment. Digital forms of exchange—and the rhizomatic connections that they afford—are now widespread. However, while Ant Farm’s prescient technophilia contains eerie similarities to the network-based labor favored by contemporary

---

corporate firms—where professional worth is frequently determined by one’s network and social connections have become a form of currency to ensure increased financial gain—contemporary education institutions continue to adhere to many of the same linear, hierarchical educational models that Ant Farm worked against. Why did communication pedagogy fail to gain traction in institutions of higher education despite these technological advances? The following chapter, which focuses on Allan Kaprow’s tenure at CalArts, takes up this question.
On October 6, 1970, one month after California Institute of the Arts (CalArts) began its first semester, a hundred or so students piled into school buses and drove to Vasquez Rocks, a nearby desert whose dramatic rock formations frequently served as a set for movies and television.¹ They travelled there to participate in a highly anticipated Happening, organized by Allan Kaprow, a pioneer of this artistic practice.² The score for Publicity instructed participants to form work crews and construct temporary structures out of two-by-four boards among the rocks (figure 4.1). It specified that four “video people” film the construction processes using Sony Portapaks and play back the footage at each site, providing participants with feedback that might beget “new ideas, changes, reconstructions.”³ The score also indicated that the work crews should vie for the camera people’s attention using bullhorns and that the Happening continue until nightfall or whenever participants became too tired to continue. This resulted in a chaotic spectacle: students scrambled to construct improvised structures along the unearthly rock facade amid blaring bullhorns and darting camera people (figure 4.2).⁴

¹ The Lone Ranger (1931), Young Buffalo Bill (1940), The Last Musketeer (1952), Shotgun (1955), The Lone Ranger (1949–57), The Gene Autry Show (1950–6), Star Trek (1966–7), The Fugitive (1963–7), and Battlestar Galactica (1978) are among the movies and television shows filmed at Vasquez Rocks. The predominance of westerns and sci-fi themes on this list attests to the rugged, otherworldly character of the site.
³ Allan Kaprow, Score for Publicity (1970). Allan Kaprow Papers, series III, box 18, folder 8, Getty Research Institute, Los Angeles, CA.
⁴ The Happening was rendered even more dramatic by an unplanned invasion led by a CalArts student
The Happening illustrates central principles of Kaprow’s pedagogy while at CalArts: it fostered collaboration between students from different disciplines, utilized new communication technology, and employed feedback loops. However, rather than only demonstrating Kaprow’s pedagogy, *Publicity* also represented CalArts itself. The administration had asked Kaprow to stage the Happening as a “public relations event” that would showcase the school’s “interdisciplinary ideals.” The footage from *Publicity* thus doubled as actual publicity material for the school, forwarding its image as a technology-rich, utopian arts community. Paradoxically, Kaprow had recently moved away from creating large-scale Happenings like *Publicity* precisely because they had become so mediatized. His agreement to facilitate *Publicity* for CalArts belied his turn towards more intimate “events” and “activities.” Simultaneously an artwork, an educational event, and promotional material, *Publicity* illuminates the complex relationship between art, education, technology, and institution at CalArts. The development of Kaprow’s pedagogy at the school presents a micro-history of the fate of communication pedagogy practices within institutions of higher education in the early 1970s.

Although much has been written about both CalArts and Kaprow, the existing scholarship does not address the complex relationship between the artist, his pedagogy, and the institution. Two poles dominate the scholarly literature on CalArts: one that champions the radicalism of the school’s formative years, and one that views the school as an exemplar of the
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5 The Happening was done at the behest of then-Provost Herbert Blau. Kelley, *Childsplay*, 148.
6 Kaprow stopped using the term, Happening, to describe his own work around 1968. This reflected a shift to more intimate types of exchange, which he frequently referred to as “activities” and “events,” and a desire to distance himself from the popularization of Happenings by the mass media and youth culture of the 1960s. Kelley, *Childsplay*, 1–2.
increasingly formalized academic system that followed. Both camps ignore the engagement with technophilic experimentation and exchange that marked the school's beginnings. Janet Sarbanes's reading of CalArts through Cornelius Castoriadis's notion of a "nonmutilating education" is representative of the former approach. Sarbanes posits that the school's dehierarchized learning structures and open-ended curriculum educated for individual autonomy.\(^7\) Sarbanes's application of radical theory to the school recurs in many contemporary analyses. Discussions of Judy Chicago and Miriam Schapiro's Feminist Art Program, for example, often use Paulo Freire's *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* as a theoretical touch point.\(^8\)

Many of the school's original participants also describe the school as "radical" and "utopian."\(^9\) Yet this mapping of radical pedagogical theory onto the school neglects the fact that CalArts' community consisted largely of white middle class students and faculty, and therefore excludes the racially and ethnically diverse populations of the greater Los Angeles area. This community did not, for instance, carry through the political imperative of *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, in which liberatory education empowers the poor and disenfranchised to challenge the existing

\(^{7}\) Janet Sarbanes, "Radical Arts Pedagogy from Greek Philosophy to Los Angeles," in *In the Canyon, Revise the Canon*, ed. Géraldine Gourbe (Annecy, France; Lescheraines, France: ESAAA Editions; Shelter Press, 2015), 26. In addition to Castoriadis, Sarbanes draws upon Jacques Rancière, Ivan Illich, and Paulo Freire in her analysis.


political order. Furthermore, these accounts conveniently overlook the historical complexities of the school’s founding (and funding).

More negative readings pervade the literature that looks at CalArts’ evolution beyond its formative years. Thierry de Duve identifies CalArts as an archetype of the “attitude-practice-deconstruction” pedagogy that emerged in the mid-1970s, which he distinguishes from Bauhaus and nineteenth-century academic models. According to de Duve, the latter model fosters a lack of faith in artistic practice by teaching students to articulate critiques and to position themselves as artists, rather than produce works of art.\textsuperscript{10} Howard Singerman, who taught at CalArts in the mid-1980s, argues that the school exemplifies the increasingly professionalized and insular orientation of art education, which focuses on producing a language that signifies “artist,” rather than art itself.\textsuperscript{11} In attempting to codify a pedagogical paradigm, these analyses also oversimplify the various pedagogical approaches and institutional pressures at CalArts, omitting both the experimentation of the school’s formative years and the historic factors that led to its foreclosure.

Anthropologist Judith Adler takes a more nuanced approach in her study of labor at CalArts, \textit{Artists in Offices: An Ethnography of an Academic Art Scene} (1979), based on fieldwork that she undertook between 1970 and 1972. Adler argues that the trustees and faculty held increasingly conflicting notions of artistic and institutional labor during the school’s formative years. Several recent exhibitions and projects have collected and presented institutional archives and oral histories, providing additional insight into the complexities of

\textsuperscript{11} Howard Singerman, \textit{Art Subjects: Making Artists in the American University} (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999), 155–86. Singerman taught at CalArts from 1982–5.
CalArts’ early years. Adler’s book and many of these recent projects highlight the school’s support for new technologies and communication as art in the early 1970s.

Pedagogy is rarely discussed in relation to Allan Kaprow, since the bulk of the scholarship deals with the emergence and critical import of Happenings in the late 1950s and early 1960s. Contemporaneous writing—within which Kaprow’s voice featured prominently—focused on contextualizing the new artistic practice in relationship to both painting and theater. By the late 1960s many critics and art historians viewed Happenings as co-opted by mass media, leading to several decades of scant critical attention. In the last few decades, however, art historians have reclaimed Kaprow’s early Happenings and related writings as subjects for analysis. This renewed interest parallels and, in some cases, reflects the recent

---


acknowledgement of Happenings as important precedents for the “social turn” in contemporary art. Because this new literature focuses on re-addressing Happenings and Kaprow’s related writings, rather than his career as a whole, it ignores his teaching practice.

Artist and critic Jeff Kelley’s work on Kaprow represents an exception to the widespread omission of Kaprow’s work as an educator. Childsplay: The Art of Allan Kaprow (2004) provides detailed analysis of Kaprow’s life, works, and writings from childhood to the 1990s. Although Kelley focuses on artistic activities, his contextualization of the artist’s art and writing within the various institutions of higher education at which the artist was employed provides a useful background for my study, as does his discussion of Kaprow’s long engagement with the writings of John Dewey. Kaprow’s former student Suzanne Lacy has also written about Kaprow’s pedagogy, focusing on its influence on feminist performance. In addition, Lacy positions pedagogical practice.


A few exceptions to this omission of Kaprow’s teaching are Joan Marter, ed., Off Limits: Rutgers University and the Avant-Garde, 1957–1963 (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1999); Emily Ruth Capper, “Perceptual Contrast and Social Tension in Allan Kaprow’s Push and Pull: A Furniture Comedy for Hans Hofmann” (paper presented at the annual meeting of College Art Association, New York, N.Y., February 11–14, 2015). Marter’s catalog is useful in that it provides context for Kaprow’s time at Rutgers and some of the interviews included in the book offer insight into his teaching practice; however, the bulk of the research focuses on art that was produced at Rutgers, rather than pedagogy. Capper is working on a dissertation on Kaprow’s early pedagogy.


Kaprow as a forerunner to what she terms “new genre public art”: a strain of public art that prioritized engagement with community, which emerged in the U.S. in the late 1980s and early 1990s. Lacy articulates the new genre public artist’s role as one in which “media appearances, classes, exhibitions, discussion groups, consultations, and writings [are] all developed as integral to the artwork,” anticipating my argument that the pedagogy of the Halprins, Ant Farm, and Kaprow models a new artist-as-facilitator paradigm.\textsuperscript{19} Kaprow’s practice as an educator has also been discussed in the surge of writing about alternative pedagogical practice that has emerged in the past decade.\textsuperscript{20} While the recent discussions of aspects of Kaprow’s teaching practice and writing on pedagogy are useful, they do not analyze the evolution of his pedagogy, its connection to communication theory, or its relationship to institutions. Nor does the existing literature connect the artist to the larger trend towards open-ended, exchange-based teaching and learning on the West Coast, which I identify as “communication pedagogy.”

Using Kaprow’s tenure at CalArts as a case study, this chapter traces the fate of communication pedagogy practices within institutions of higher education. The first section tracks the development of Kaprow’s pedagogy through a discussion of his teaching and artistic practice at Rutgers. CalArts is the focus of the second section, which provides background on the school and then analyzes Kaprow’s notion of the “un-artist”—which I posit is his iteration of aforementioned artist-as-facilitator paradigm—as it plays out within his teaching, writing, art, and


administrative work while at the school.\textsuperscript{21} Although CalArts projected initial openness to communication pedagogy practices, tightening finances and a growing rift between faculty and conservative trustees diminished support for experimental teaching and learning at the school in the early to mid-1970s. The third and final section looks at the broader context for this retracted support. I argue that the restrictions on pedagogical experimentation, which occurred at colleges and universities across the United States in the mid-1970s, prevented communication pedagogy practices from having a long-term effect upon art education within institutions of higher education.

I. (Mis)communication

In April 1958, Allan Kaprow performed his first Happening, \textit{Communication}, at Douglass College, the women’s college affiliated with Rutgers University, where he was then teaching studio art and art history.\textsuperscript{22} The event comprised discordant noises, tape-recorded speeches played at unsynchronized times, and participants performing nonsensical actions at irregular intervals. The overarching effect was, essentially, the opposite of the title. Rather than communicate, the Happening created a jarring cacophony from which no meaning or information could be ascertained.\textsuperscript{23} Kaprow explained: “We thought that the buzzword of the day was ‘communication,’ and like so many theorists of that period, we were sure that

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{21} Kaprow coined the term “un-artist” in “The Education of the Un-Artist, Part I” (1971) and then elaborates on it in “The Education of the Un-Artist, Part II” (1972) and “The Education of the Un-Artist, Part III” (1974).
\textsuperscript{22} Kaprow designated this as his first Happening only in retrospect. He started using the term later in 1958.
\end{flushleft}
miscommunication prevailed rather than communication.” This “miscommunication” countered the positive concept of communication outlined in the media and systems theory then emerging in the United States. Propagated by Gregory Bateson, Marshall McLuhan, and Norbert Wiener, among others, this theory posited, in brief, that technologies and systems of mass communication would create dehierarchized, unmediated networks through which information could flow freely. Although Kaprow’s early Happenings rejected this understanding, I contend that he nevertheless aligned his contemporaneous teaching and extracurricular work with many aspects of media and systems theory. In contrast to his art practice, Kaprow’s pedagogy utilized nonhierarchical information exchange, networked systems, and new technologies. I trace the development of Kaprow’s pedagogy through his academic training—focusing on Hans Hofmann, John Dewey, and John Cage, all of whom have frequently been discussed in terms of their influence on Kaprow’s artistic practice, but not on his pedagogy—and at Rutgers. The disparity between Kaprow’s pedagogy and artwork reflects contemporaneous debates around how visual art operates vis-à-vis systems of communication.

As an undergraduate studying philosophy and art history at New York University (NYU), Kaprow enrolled in the Hans Hofmann School of Fine Arts in 1947. Established in 1933, the

26 I am using the term “pedagogy” to refer to the theories undergirding both his teaching and extracurricular work. By the latter I mean both required administrative work and other initiatives that Kaprow undertook at Rutgers.
27 As will be discussed below, art historians like Schapiro argued that art must remain elevated from systems of communication, while theorists influenced by communication theory contended that art objects inherently participated within these systems.
28 Kaprow received his BA from NYU in 1949. His dissatisfaction with the studio art offerings at NYU led
school had garnered a reputation for introducing European abstraction to the emerging generation of Abstract Expressionists. Hofmann employed a tripartite approach in his teaching: discussing recent developments in art, facilitating rigorous practice of contemporary techniques, and encouraging students to synthesize this historic and technical knowledge to develop individualized artistic approaches. Central to the technical component of the course was Hofmann’s “push and pull” compositional methodology, which called for the creation of visual tension through counterbalancing forces of color, light, brushstroke, and shape. Echoing the dynamics of the “push and pull” method, Hofmann fostered an animated classroom environment: he gave energetic demonstrations punctuated by performative gestures and cut apart students’ paintings so that they would rework their compositions. His classroom was frequently covered in large scraps of colored paper, used for testing pictorial arrangements.

Emily Ruth Capper argues that this active learning environment—in which both teaching and art-making occurred as intensely physical processes— influenced Kaprow’s early Happenings. It also provided a model of the classroom as an active space for experimentation, which Kaprow sought to replicate in his own teaching.

Hofmann’s energetic pedagogy contains parallels to the ideas of educational theorist him to Hofmann’s school. He received a degree in painting from the Hans Hofmann School of Fine Arts in 1948. In introducing students to recent art history, Hofmann’s curriculum focused primarily on the techniques of Cubism and Fauvism.


Kaprow argues for Hofmann’s pedagogy as a model for art education and outlines an updated version of said pedagogy for a class based on assemblage in Allan Kaprow, “The Effect of Recent Art on the Teaching of Art,” Art Journal 23, no. 2 (Winter 1963–4): 136–38. Another notable benefit of Hofmann’s class was that it put Kaprow in contact with many young artists. In 1954 he formed an alternative art space, Hansa Gallery, with several of these fellow Hofmann students. The gallery can be seen as an early instance of Kaprow’s interest in forming creative networks.
John Dewey, whose writing Kaprow encountered while taking graduate courses in philosophy at NYU. In the margins of Dewey’s *Art as Experience* (1934), Kaprow scrawled questions that shaped his approach to art throughout his career: “Art not separate from experience? … What is an authentic experience? … environment is a process of interaction.” Kaprow’s marginalia responded to Dewey’s assertion that “art product[s],” largely confined to museums and collectors’ homes, are cut off from our daily experience of life. Instead, Dewey advocated for the restoration of “continuity” between refined works of art and everyday experiences. For Dewey, this continuity must be found in quotidian moments that engage the senses and inspire wonder: “the fire-engine rushing by… the tense grace of the ball-player infect[ing] the onlooking [sic] crowd.” In order for these events to be true experiences, however, they must also involve active processing and investigation. This concept also informed Dewey’s pedagogy. He posited “that education must be conceived as a continuing reconstruction of experience; that the process and the goal of education are one and the same thing.” In other words, learning must come out of students’ own experiences of reality, rather than textbooks or rote memorization. Dewey noted that these experiences should be social processes, guided by a teacher who is part of the students’ community, not an authoritarian other. Jeff Kelley reads Kaprow’s Happenings as Deweyan experiences in that they provide immersive, multisensory encounter
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33 Kaprow was enrolled as a graduate student in philosophy at NYU between 1949 and 1950.  
34 Jeff Kelley first analyzed these marginalia in his “Introduction,” to *Essays on the Blurring of Art and Life*, Allan Kaprow and Jeff Kelley (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), xi.  
38 Dewey states: “The teacher is not in the school to impose certain ideas or to form certain habits in the child, but is there as a member of the community to select the influences which shall affect the child and to assist him in properly responding to these influences.” Dewey, “My Pedagogic Creed,” n.p.
for participants, fostering the exploration of the everyday in a new light. As will be discussed, Kaprow also sought to foster this sense of experiential learning in his teaching.

John Cage’s evening class on experimental composition at the New School for Social Research, which Kaprow attended in 1957 and 1958, also emphasized learning through experience. Cage’s aleatory, chance-based compositions, especially 4’33” (1952), were seen as providing an alternative to the subjectivism of Abstract Expressionism. As a result, his class drew many young artists including Kaprow, George Brecht, Al Hansen, and Dick Higgins. Each week students presented scores that they had created in response to prompts that Cage gave at the end of the previous class (such as a 30-second long piece, a work that uses a radio, or a work that takes a classmate’s abstract painting as a score). The resulting scores were typically chance-based compositions featuring everyday materials. The group would analyze the performances and discuss different topic each week, such as chance procedures or boredom. Cage’s contributions included sharing recent research on the technical properties of sound and playing a recording of a Zen Buddhist ceremony.

Cage’s class served as both an artistic and a pedagogical model for Kaprow. As is well
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39 Kelley, *Childsplay*, 7–8, 142.
40 Cage taught this class between 1956 and 1960. It was titled “Composition” between 1956–58 and “Experimental Composition” between 1958–60.
42 The students also included poet Jackson Mac Low, musician/composer Toshi Ichiyanagi, actress Florence Tarlow, photographer Scott Hyde, and, occasionally, artists Robert Whitman, Robert Watts, and Larry Poons. Most of the students were invited by Cage and not officially enrolled in the course, a structure that indicates its openness. Cage invited Kaprow to join the class after the latter sought out his advice on using pre-recorded sound in his environments. Kaprow had been introduced to Cage’s work when he attended David Tudor’s performance of 4’33” at Carnegie Hall in 1952.
documented, Cage influenced Kaprow to incorporate scoring and chance as compositional methods in his environments, leading to the inclusion of people as participants and, ultimately, the formulation of Happenings. The class also presented an alternative to the dominant mode of teaching art through hierarchical teacher-student relationships and circumscribed exercises. Cage adopted a role that was less of a “master” than a facilitator or conduit; he shared information with his students without dictating any preconceived outcomes. In a lecture on the technical properties on sound, for example, he outlined recent research published in the German music journal Die Reihe, rather than convey his own ideas. In this exchange-based mode of teaching, he shared his interests and encouraged students to pursue their own. Cage’s welcoming of non-musicians into the class demonstrates his privileging of experimentation over mastery—he preferred students who would embrace innovation rather than seek out technical proficiency. Kelley traces Cage’s “refusal to impose his will” upon his students to the composer’s training in Zen Buddhism. However, the open-ended,
dehierarchized nature of Cage’s teaching can also be read through his interest in cybernetic
theory. As Christina Dunbar-Hester argues, Cage was an avid reader of Wiener and McLuhan
and drew upon cybernetic ideas of human-machine integration and indeterminate systems in his
compositions.⁴⁹ Kaprow took many of these ideas into his classes at Rutgers University and
used Cage’s teaching approach as a model for his Happenings course at CalArts.

Rutgers

Kaprow’s combined background in studio and art history landed him a job teaching both
subjects at Rutgers University in New Brunswick, New Jersey in 1953. At the time, Rutgers and
Douglass had small, traditional art history and studio departments. As in many colleges and
universities in the 1950s, art was taught primarily through technical exercises and formal
imitation and students were not exposed to contemporary practice. Kaprow’s appointment was
part of a push to grow, contemporize, and professionalize the department, a trend occurring at
institutions of higher education across the United States as a result of the enrollment boom
underwritten by the G.I. Bill.⁵⁰ Between 1953 and 1960, the art departments at Rutgers and
Douglass also hired Robert Watts, Geoffrey Hendricks, and Roy Lichtenstein, emerging artists
who brought a contemporary perspective to the curriculum.⁵¹ The Bauhaus and Black Mountain
College loomed large as pedagogical models for the new faculty members and many of them

⁵⁰ I analyze the effects of this bill on studio art departments at colleges and universities in the first chapter
of this dissertation.
⁵¹ The school originally hired Watts to teach engineering, but he soon began instructing in design and
ceramics; Hendricks taught studio courses; Lichtenstein taught foundational drawing and design. Prior to
these hires, the departments consisted primarily of conservative abstract painters and watercolorists. The
on-campus presence of Watts and Hendricks meant that Rutgers became a center for Fluxus activity. See
embraced innovative teaching methods.  

Kaprow was a central protagonist in the drive to make teaching and learning at Rutgers more open-ended, flexible, and interdisciplinary. In a 1955 letter to the provost, Dr. Mason W. Gross, he railed against the standardization of course content, positing that it would “harden the already hard arteries of art courses.” In an effort to provide an alternative, Kaprow outlined his ideas for cross- and interdisciplinary learning. He requested the expansion of his semester-long “Modern Painting” course to a yearlong course, allowing for more time to draw comparisons between contemporary painting, music, and literature. His description of the cross-disciplinary investigations undertaken by his art history and studio students—the former explored artistic techniques like drip painting and assemblage, and the latter learned about recent art history—echoes Hofmann’s merging of history and practice. The letter culminates with a vision of an almost completely interdisciplinary education structure: “… why not someday consider merging the Art, Music, and Literature Departments into one bigger and more closely knit affair? … Let’s break down the isolated idea of English, History, Sociology, etc.” Kaprow’s proposal demonstrates an understanding of learning as a process that occurs across subjects rather than within the limited constraints of standardized curriculum and isolated academic disciplines.

Accounts from students in Kaprow’s studio courses reveal a nonhierarchical classroom environment similar to the one that Cage cultivated in his class. Like Cage, Kaprow frequently brought ideas from his own practice into the classroom, frustrating the traditional distinction
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52 Hendricks recounts: “Bob Watts and I took our classes out to the beach. We made sand castles, poured plaster imprints in the sand, and did a range of site-specific artwork. We were both very involved in our thinking on education—new ideas. The whole program that evolved with us was non standard art class exercise.” Geoffrey Hendricks, “Interview with Geoffrey Hendricks,” interview by Joan Marter, in Off Limits: Rutgers University and the Avant-Garde, 1957–1963, ed. Joan Marter (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1999), 136.

53 Allan Kaprow, “Letter to Dr. Mason W. Gross,” March 10, 1955, 3. Allan Kaprow Papers, series VI.A., box 56, folder 1, Getty Research Institute, Los Angeles, CA. All of the following quotes in this paragraph also come from this letter.
between “art work” and “teaching.” For example, rather than have students work at individual easels, he encouraged five or six students to share a large canvas. This active learning recalls Hofmann’s teaching approach (although Hofmann advocated individual expression) and prefigures collaborative activities in Kaprow’s early Happenings. Kaprow also invited students to take a wide-ranging, open-ended approach to their work. Student Robert Whitman recalled that, “Allan was giving us the opportunity to be as crazy as we could be.” This attitude aligns with Dewey’s concept of a teacher as a facilitator, rather than an authoritarian presence; one who supports and facilitates students’ work without dictating its processes or outcomes. The synergistic exchange described by Whitman highlights the nonhierarchical, mutually beneficial nature of the resulting learning environment.

Outside of his teaching duties, Kaprow strove to make Rutgers a center for experimental practices. He organized several exhibitions and events that drew artists working in a variety of disciplines to the school, and, in doing so, helped to build a network of emerging creators. Central among these events was the Voorhees Assemblies, a series of lectures, readings, and performances (including Communication) that Kaprow co-organized with Robert Watts in 1958. The series also featured a “lecture/performance” by Cage and David Tudor, a reading by poet John Ciardi, and a dance performance by choreographer Paul Taylor. In bringing together
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54 Two painters painted on a muslin panel in Eighteen Happenings in Six Parts (1959), for example, repeating an activity in both the classroom and a happening.
56 Examples of Kaprow’s network-building include organizing an exhibition of Hansa Gallery members at the gallery of the Art House, Rutgers in 1953; organizing an exhibition of Hans Hofmann’s paintings at Art House; hiring George Segal to serve as instructor for the school’s extracurricular Art Club (also known as Sketch Club) in 1955.
57 According to Kaprow, the midday series was created upon the request of Mary Bunting, a progressive dean at Rutgers who suggested that it “arouse some sense of responsibility in the world, which was rapidly changing at that time, and a sense of where education might play a role.” The series was named for the chapel in which it was held. Attendance was mandatory for Douglass students and several
these avant-garde events on the Douglass campus, the series served both as a platform for exchange and a means to expose students to new forms of art. This focus on extracurricular learning highlights Kaprow’s (and Watts’s) belief that education can take place beyond the narrow confines of the classroom. Kaprow’s interest in creating networks of exchange—he not only brought artists to New Brunswick, but also connected his Rutgers colleagues and students to resources and exhibition opportunities off campus—can be understood through the cybernetic concept of information exchange.\(^{58}\) The notion of learning as a process that happens through actual experience and the creation of exchange networks became key pedagogic principles for Kaprow throughout his career.

In addition to connecting individuals, Kaprow also used publications to circulate his ideas at Rutgers. He served as a faculty advisor to the *Anthologist*, the undergraduate literary journal, in 1955 and 1956 and published several articles and reproductions of art in the publication.\(^{59}\) The journal had a small circulation, but it served as an important forum for artists, poets, and others to test and exchange ideas. One contributor described Kaprow as operating dually as a visual artist and writer within this forum: “Here at Rutgers, Mr. Allan Kaprow has been
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\(^{58}\) Instances of Kaprow connecting students and colleagues to people outside of Rutgers include bringing Segal and other colleagues to John Cage’s class; showing a solo show of Whitman’s work at Hansa Gallery in 1959; helping Samaras to get a solo show at Reuben Gallery in 1959; and organizing countless group exhibitions and events. For a complete list see “Chronology of Events” in *Off Limits: Rutgers University and the Avant-Garde, 1957–1963*, ed. Joan Marter (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 1999), 161–72.

prominently involved in the development of new art and in communicating its significance to a wider audience."\(^{60}\) Art News' publication of Kaprow’s essay, “The Legacy of Jackson Pollock,” in 1958, consolidated Kaprow’s status as an interpreter and advocate for contemporary art. The article, in summary, provided a context and rationale for the early environmental works of Kaprow and his peers. Kaprow described Pollock’s drip paintings as performative actions that dissolved the boundaries between the canvas and its surroundings, influencing the next generation of artists to abandon medium-specific, studio-based practice and “become preoccupied with and even dazzled by the space and objects of our everyday life.”\(^{61}\) Here again, we see Kaprow as an artist-communicator who sought to explain and publicize the context for the new art to as wide a forum as possible.

In both his network-building and his interest in information exchange, Kaprow’s extracurricular endeavors at Rutgers suggest a shifting notion of artistic labor. This can perhaps best be seen in the unrealized proposal for a “Project in Multiple Dimensions,” on which Kaprow collaborated with Robert Watts and George Brecht between 1957 and 1958.\(^{62}\) The proposal asked the school for funds to establish a research facility where artists could access “materials, technical equipment, and professional help” in pursuit of “new experiments.”\(^{63}\) It also highlighted Kaprow’s interest in investigating new technologies, especially those involving sound, light, and plastics. Although the technologies outlined in the proposal correspond to formal investigations rather than information exchange, the writers connected this interest in “multidimensional


\(^{62}\) Although Brecht was not directly affiliated with Rutgers, he worked in New Brunswick and frequently collaborated with Watts, Kaprow, and other faculty.

media” to contemporary mass communication: they compared collage to the fragmented presentation of information in a contemporary tabloid newspaper. They also legitimized their pursuit by linking it to trends in global exchange: “It is probably not inappropriate to point here to the United Nations, the many international societies devoted to exchanging cultural and scientific ideas, to studies in comparative religion and anthropology, to in fact one of the most significant developments of our age, that of the concept of a unified science.” Although overblown, this rhetoric makes clear their awareness of cybernetics research and, specifically, systems ecologist Howard Thomas Odum’s concept of “unified science” which unites biology, chemistry, geology, and physics in the analysis of whole ecosystems. Apparently unconvinced by this rhetoric, Rutgers rejected the proposal. Like the laboratories of cybernetic study, the proposed center would have drawn an interdisciplinary range of artists to the school, making it a center for exchange and experimentation. Notably, the forms of artistic labor imagined in the proposal—collaborating across disciplines, investigating new technologies and materials—represented a new paradigm that opposed the isolated, individualized, and studio-based labor of the Abstract Expressionists.

Kaprow’s *Communication* was performed in 1958, the same year that the proposal for a “Project in Multiple Dimensions” was completed. However, as discussed at the beginning of this section, Kaprow’s role in the Happening was far from this new model of artistic work. The Happening’s title corresponds to the theme of the Voorhees Assemblies, which was mid-
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64 Kaprow, Watts, and Brecht, “Project for Multiple Dimensions,” 156.
65 Howard Thomas Odum, *Ecological and General Systems: An Introduction to Systems Ecology* (Boulder: Colorado University Press, 1994). There is no indication that Kaprow and the others were familiar with Odum’s writing, but he began writing about the concept of “unified science” in the 1940s and their invocation of this term suggests, at the very least, an interest in cybernetics.
twentieth-century communication. Kaprow and Watts chose that theme because
“communication” was “the buzzword of the day.” Kaprow and Watts chose that theme because
“communication” was “the buzzword of the day.” Like the other talks in the series, the
Like the other talks in the series, the Happening took place in the college chapel in front of an academic audience. The Voorhees
Happening took place in the college chapel in front of an academic audience. The Voorhees Chapel stage was set with several plastic panels decorated with leaves, mirrors, and paint. The
Chapel stage was set with several plastic panels decorated with leaves, mirrors, and paint. The Happening commenced when Kaprow, wearing white tennis clothes, entered the room and sat
Happening commenced when Kaprow, wearing white tennis clothes, entered the room and sat in a chair onstage. He remained silent while tape recorders played three unsynchronized
in a chair onstage. He remained silent while tape recorders played three unsynchronized versions of a speech that he had pre-recorded. The speech began:
versions of a speech that he had pre-recorded. The speech began:

“Communication” is one of the most hateful words. I have dedicated my best energies to retaining this disgust. I am offended by the smug and complacent techniques designed to facilitate the passage of one man’s thought to another, served up as they are in a syrup-sauce of democracy and smiling optimism… I am only interested in that experience for which I alone am responsible and to which I alone respond.

The jumbled cacophony of the three recordings trailed off into random sounds and incoherent phrases. Actions accompanied these sounds: participants seated in the audience raised red placards, colorful silk banners unfurled from the balconies, a woman bounced a red ball in the aisles, two men in the back of the room banged tin cans on a tablecloth while reciting phrases, and a red bulb flashed on the lectern. At one point Kaprow left his seat and stared at himself in a mirror on the stage, lighting and blowing out a dozen matches before returning to a motionless position in his seat.

In foreclosing communication, the Happening did exactly what Kaprow set out to do: “an event that would be spread around the chapel which could communicate the absurdity of the

67 Kaprow, “Interview with Allan Kaprow,” 134.
68 Initially, one version began playing, but two others soon joined it.
69 Allan Kaprow, text for Communication (1958), 1. Allan Kaprow Papers, series III, box 5, folder 2, Getty Research Institute, Los Angeles, CA.
70 These included bells, whistles, and someone saying, “How d’ya do?”
71 Lucas Samaras was one of several student participants following this score of actions.
usual straightforward verbal explication of reality.”72 Expecting a lecture, the audience was shocked by what they had witnessed. Reflecting on the reception in a later interview, Kaprow described viewers as stunned and silent throughout the performance.73 The vision of Kaprow sitting silently on the stage and blowing candles out in the mirror must have seemed the opposite of the communicative, network-building professor to whom they were accustomed. So why did he create an experience that contradicted his pedagogy?

Kaprow’s Happening corresponds to one side of a debate around communication and the visual arts in the mid-to-late 1950s. This debate came to a head at the 1957 annual conference held by the American Federation of the Arts (AFA).74 Meyer Schapiro, who advised Kaprow’s graduate thesis in art history at Columbia in 1952, delivered a paper that expressed the dominant stance of U.S.-based visual artists and critics in the mid-1950s. He condemned mass communication as “impersonal, calculated and controlled in its elements, aiming always at efficiency,” arguing that it instrumentalized everyday life and lulled the masses into passive receivers of information.75 He advocated instead an art that preserves a contemplative experience, as exemplified in Abstract Expressionism:

The artist does not wish to create a work in which he transmits an already prepared and complete message to a relatively indifferent and impersonal receiver. The painter aims rather at such a quality of the

---

73 Ibid.
74 Participants at the conference included Marcel Duchamp, Gregory Bateson, art historian Meyer Schapiro, art dealer Sidney Janis, television personality and art collector Vincent Price, James Johnson Sweeney (director of the Solomon R. Guggenheim museum), and others. Although the conference was not billed as specifically focusing on communication, the connection between communication and the arts became the central concern of the proceedings. This conference is discussed in depth in William Kaizen, “Steps to an Ecology of Communication: Radical Software, Dan Graham, and the Legacy of Gregory Bateson,” Art Journal 67, no. 3 (Fall 2008): 86–107.
75 Meyer Schapiro, “Recent Abstract Painting,” in Meyer Schapiro, Modern Art: 19th and 20th Centuries (New York: G. Braziller, 1978), 223. The following quote is also from this page. For Schapiro, Abstract Expressionism represented the ideal counter to mass communication because: a) the painterly mark upheld personal artistic craftsmanship and thus fought against machine-based production, b) the nonrepresentational content did not communicate any message.
whole that, unless you achieve the proper set of mind and feeling
towards it, you will not experience anything of it at all.

Thus, for Schapiro, mid-twentieth-century technologies of mass communication represented a
threat to the artist’s “moral” aim of maintaining “the critical spirit and the ideals of creativeness,
sincerity, and self-reliance, which are indispensable to the life of our culture.” 76 Schapiro’s
conservative leftism reflected the broader political complexities of the Cold War period: an
enthusiastic Marxist in the 1920s and early 1930s, he was forced to renegotiate his political
affiliation in light of the Hitler-Stalin Pact of 1939 and the subsequent “demarxification” of
intellectuals in the U.S. 77 Schapiro’s celebration of painting’s “non-communication” was shared
by Theodor Adorno, Clement Greenberg, and many others in this generation of critics. 78

Marcel Duchamp and social scientist Gregory Bateson, who both presented papers as
part of a panel on “The Creative Act,”, argued the opposing position at the conference.
Duchamp focused on the public’s reception of works of art, and dismissed the artistic
individualism endorsed by Schapiro. Instead, Duchamp described the work of art as part of a

76 Schapiro, “Recent Abstract Painting,” 226.
77 Schapiro had embraced art as a tool for mass communication in the 1930s, as he articulated in “The
Social Bases of Art,” a talk delivered to the First American Artists’ Congress in 1936. However, by 1957
he had withdrawn from this view. For a detailed analysis of Schapiro’s changing relationship to
Communism, see Andrew Hemingway, “Meyer Schapiro and Marxism in the 1930s,” Oxford Art Journal
17, no. 1, Meyer Schapiro (1994): 13–29. For a discussion of how this shift affected Schapiro’s writing
see Robert E. Haywood, “Critique of Instrumental Labor: Meyer Schapiro’s and Allan Kaprow’s Theory of
Avant-Garde Art,” in Experiments in the Everyday: Allan Kaprow and Robert Watts—Events, Objects,
Documents, ed. Benjamin H. D. Buchloh and Judith F. Rodenbeck (New York: Miriam and Ira D. Wallach
Art Gallery, Columbia University, 1999), 27–46.
78 Adorno and Schapiro were close friends when the former lived in New York between 1938 and 1941.
Soon after his time in New York Adorno collaborated with Max Horkheimer on The Dialectic of
Enlightenment (1944), a critique of the Enlightenment that includes a diatribe against the “culture
industry,” which, according to the authors, manipulates of society into passive consumers; this sentiment
parallels Schapiro’s argument. A key earlier example of this stance is Clement Greenberg, “Avant-Garde
and Kitsch,” in The Collected Essays and Criticism, Volume 1: Perceptions and Judgments, 1939-1944,
and Schapiro is discussed in Hemingway, “Meyer Schapiro and Marxism in the 1930s,” 13–29. For the
demarxification of the intelligentsia in the United States see Serge Guilbaut, How New York Stole the Idea
system of circulation and reception that determines its meaning. Although he did not directly employ systems theory in making this argument, Duchamp’s point contained many parallels to Bateson’s understanding of art. Bateson, who had been invited to the conference as an expert in communication studies, argued that works of art hold the “special cultural value” that Schapiro and others assign to them precisely because of their ability to communicate; artworks act in a uniquely self-reflexive way. “They can reveal the grounds of their own communicability by exposing the rules through which a communication system is framed.” In other words, art supplies metacommentary on the communication system in which it participates. Thus, for both Duchamp and Bateson, art (even nonrepresentational painting) cannot be separated from systems of communication.

As Schapiro’s former student and an artist influenced by Abstract Expressionism, it is not surprising that Kaprow’s artistic practice echoed his teacher’s view. Schapiro’s ideas were reflected in the work of many of Kaprow’s contemporaries. However, Kaprow was unique in the cognitive dissonance between his pedagogy and artwork: while his art foregrounded miscommunication, he espoused communication theory in his teaching. His pedagogy at Rutgers thus anticipated a shift towards an embrace of communication theory by visual artists in the mid-to-late 1960s. By that time Kaprow’s teaching and artistic practice had begun to merge—in both he embraced an artist-as-facilitator role, communication technology, and nonhierarchical information exchange. This synthesizing of pedagogy and artwork culminated in his “Happenings” class at CalArts in early 1970.

81 Examples occurring on the East Coast of the U.S. include Andy Warhol’s Exploding Plastic Inevitable (1966-7); Experiments in Art and Technology (founded in 1967); Dan Graham’s Homes for America (1966); and Information at the Museum of Modern Art and Software at the Jewish Museum in 1970.
Kaprow’s tenure at Rutgers also prefigured another aspect of his experience at CalArts: his clashes with the administration. The chairman of the art department at Rutgers refused nearly all of his suggestions for curricular changes, and the university rejected the proposal for the “Project in Multiple Dimensions.”\textsuperscript{82} The administration also promoted other seemingly less qualified professors in advance of Kaprow, further reflecting their reluctance to support innovative teaching.\textsuperscript{83} These tensions were exacerbated in 1959, when Kaprow clashed with the administration over a controversial project by his advisee, Lucas Samaras.\textsuperscript{84} Kaprow was denied tenure in 1961, and he left Rutgers at the end of the spring semester. This tumultuous relationship would recur first at State University of New York, Stony Brook, where Kaprow taught from 1961 to 1969, and then at CalArts.

II. The Institute and the Un-Artist

“‘Art’ may soon become a meaningless word,” wrote Kaprow in 1970. “In its place, ‘communications programming’ would be a more imaginative label, attesting to our new jargon, our technological and managerial fantasies, and to our pervasive electronic contact with one

\textsuperscript{82} Kaprow’s describes his conflicts with the Art Department Chair, Helmut H. von Erffa, in a letter to Meyer Schapiro: favoring other professor’s course requests over Kaprow’s, rejecting his proposals for thematic curriculum, preventing him from teaching Modern Painting as often as he wanted (this went against students’ demands and they successfully petitioned the dean to reinstitute it), among many others. See Allan Kaprow, Letter to Meyer Schapiro, February 1, 1955, p. 6. Allan Kaprow Papers, series VI.A, box 56, folder 1, Getty Research Institute, Los Angeles, CA.

\textsuperscript{83} Von Erffa appointed Samuel Weiner, a faculty member with a less successful career as an exhibiting artist than Kaprow, to the rank of Assistant Professor ahead of him. Allan Kaprow, Letter to Meyer Schapiro, February 1, 1955, p. 6. Allan Kaprow Papers, series VI.A, box 56, folder 1, Getty Research Institute, Los Angeles, CA.

\textsuperscript{84} The project, funded in part by an honors program stipend for which Kaprow had recommended Samaras, combined photographs and poetry, some of which contained the word “fuck.” Outraged that Samaras had used state funding for such offensive material, the administration considered expelling him; Kaprow had to fight for his student’s right to graduate. See Joan Marter, “The Forgotten Legacy,” 12–15.
another.” Published in a special issue of *Arts in Society* devoted exclusively to CalArts, Kaprow’s proposal articulates a concept of the artist as communicator and facilitator, a paradigm that he embraced during his tenure at the school (1969–74.) After providing a brief background on CalArts, I will analyze this model of artistic practice through Kaprow’s writing, administrative, and teaching work at the school, contrasting it to his previously conflicted attitude towards communication. My argument is twofold: firstly, Kaprow resolved the contradiction between his pedagogy and art while at CalArts, merging the two into an “un-art” practice that fully embraced communication theory; secondly, while this approach aligned with the school’s original mission—which promised access to technology, freedom from curricular restrictions, and lateral teacher-student relationships—it met increasing opposition. This came in the form of pressure from conservative trustees to codify teaching and adhere to budgetary constraints as the school matured. The resulting regulations prevented communication pedagogy practices from having a sustained effect on institutionalized art instruction.

**The Institute**

A CalArts Admissions Bulletin from the early 1970s describes the school as departing “from the conventions of the compartmentalized conservatory to create a total environment in which training, experiment, and performance encourage a crossing of traditional lines between the different disciplines, and develop special programs, such as inter-media, electronic art, video design, and world music.” The emphasis on technology, interdisciplinary collaboration, and open-ended learning in this promotional statement highlights the centrality of

---

communication pedagogy practices within the school’s initial mission. The institution was formed as a merging of the financially bereft Chouinard Art Institute and the Los Angeles Conservatory of Music. Financed by conservative backers led by Walt Disney, the initial plan for the school resembled an art and education-themed incarnation of a Disney venture. However, by its opening in 1970, the recruitment language directed at potential students described the institution as a utopian art academy modeled on the Bauhaus and Black Mountain College. Like its predecessors, CalArts sought to create a new program for training professionalized artists and to foster a bohemian community. Adler argues that by using the term “institute,” CalArts differentiated itself from a conventional “school,” which connotes restrictive, linear learning; an “institute,” on the other hand, suggested interdisciplinary learning and “scientific and scholarly prestige.” In using this label, the trustees and administration sought to promote CalArts as a contemporary alternative to East Coast art schools, which they viewed as stodgy and traditional. CalArts’ site reinforced this sense of new beginnings. The school was built in Valencia, a residential town planned in the 1960s and situated thirty miles north of Los Angeles. This location provided freedom from the pressures and influences of Los Angeles’ emerging art market and was doubly removed from that of New York. It also gave participants a sense that

87 In its most ambitious conception, CalArts was conceived as “a nucleus of music, art, dance, theater, and television schools surrounded by a commercial complex of galleries, theaters, open-air museums, restaurants and motels. The arts and the artists were to be the main attraction in a new combination of the recreation and culture industries, later described by one of its designers as ‘a kind of farmer’s market of the soul which would spin off cash flows to the school.” Adler, Artists in Offices, 54.
88 The reasons for this shift are somewhat unclear. Walt Disney died in 1966 and it seems that, in the tumult of the late 1960s, his particular brand of utopianism was translated into a much more countercultural vision. As noted by Janet Sarbanes, H. R. Haldeman, who chaired the CalArts board of trustees in the late 1960s and later became chief of staff to Richard Nixon, made many of the initial hires. Following a directive to hire top artists to direct departments, he recruited members of the avant-garde from a variety of fields. In so doing, he (unwittingly) established a relatively radical administration. Sarbanes, “A Community of Artists,” 1.
89 Adler, Artists in Offices, 102. The term “institute” frequently signifies schools where engineering and design are taught side by side, like Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Rochester Institute of Technology.
they were part of “a clearing or demolition ritual which might prepare the ground for fresh creativity.”

Many of CalArts’ initial educational aims aligned with those of the Halprins, Ant Farm, and Kaprow. The school operated on the understanding that “education should be completely noncoercive and responsive to the unique needs and developmental rhythm of each student.” This was predicated on the notion that students should be treated as artists, rather than underlings. Students and teachers should relate to each other as peers, eradicating any trace of a master-student dynamic. The faculty was expected to provide guidance and share their own work with students, rather than teach preconceived lessons on standardized topics. In addition, CalArts operated without a grading system, standardized timetable for graduation, course requirements, or enforced course sequences. According to Adler, this dehierarchized, unregulated learning structure was also intended to erase industrial society’s instrumental divisions between work and play, thereby creating a truly utopian learning community.

This open teaching and learning atmosphere was predicated on unrestricted access to new technology. Early in the planning process, the library was touted as a “research facility for the artist rivaling the one MIT offers the scientist,” a place where “information would fall into one’s lap at the poke of a button.” Because of these services, it was referred to not as a library, but as an “experience bank” or “information center.” Other early plans included “a printing press for publishing avant-garde books, a multi-media coffee house featuring continuous audio-visual shows, mobile cinemas, video environments, and even a unique drive in theater for showing Institute work to surrounding communities.” Both trustees and faculty

---

90 Ibid., 96.
91 Ibid., 102.
92 Ibid., 104.
93 Ibid., 98. The quotes in the following two sentences are also from this page.
embraced the idea that new technologies would also help to disseminate and publicize the work of teachers and students, allowing them to participate in the art world through communication, rather than through dealers, galleries, and collectors art structure. Artists at CalArts would thus be totally freed from the market constraints of producing objects and fully realize their potential as artist-communicators. In addition to high tech facilities, a commonly shared belief held that this access to communication technology would somehow minimize the need for formal administrative structures. This interest in horizontality was reflected in the title of CalArts’ magazine, *Networks* (founded in 1972). The rumored technological abundance also assumed endless financial resources, which, as discussed below, proved to be another myth.

With freedom from financial and academic constraints and access to new technology as his pitch, President Robert Corrigan hired staff to form six schools: the School of Art, School of Critical Studies, School of Design, School of Film, School of Music, and the School of Theater and Dance. The inaugural deans and faculty members were innovators in their fields. The faculty of the School of Design, for example, included Sheila de Bretteville, whose work explored nonhierarchical design, and Victor Papanek, a pioneer in the countercultural and ecological design movements. Sociologist Maurice Stein, the founding dean of the School of Critical Studies, based the school’s curriculum on his newly published guide to student-centered education, *Blueprint for Counter Education* (1970). Stein unsuccessfully tried to hire Frankfurt

---

94 Ibid., 98–100.
95 Ibid., 108.
97 *Blueprint for Counter Education*, co-authored with Larry Miller, who also came to teach at CalArts, consists of three poster-sized “blueprint” charts of groupings of theorists and ideas from the twentieth century. According to Stein and Miller, these are meant to form a “responsive environment” that stimulates students to actively learn by interacting with the organization of ideas in the charts, researching the people and things that are referenced, and creating their own blueprints. Maurice Stein and Larry Miller, *Blueprint for Counter Education* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, 1970).
School theorist Herbert Marcuse, who featured prominently in *Blueprint*, as part of his faculty.\footnote{At this point, Marcuse had become a spokesman for the counterculture, which viewed his *One Dimensional Man: Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society* (1964) as a fundamental critique of capitalist society. Stein’s thwarted attempt to hire Marcuse will be discussed below.}

Within the School of Art, the Feminist Art Program, led by Judy Chicago and Miriam Schapiro, continued the first art education program directed towards empowering female artists.

In 1968 Provost Herbert Blau offered Kaprow the position of founding dean of the School of the Art. Although he turned down the deanship initially, citing a desire to focus on teaching rather than administrative work, Kaprow accepted the position of Associate Dean of the School of Art the following year. In his original offer, the Provost highlighted the school’s prioritization of interdisciplinary learning and open-ended structures as corollaries to Kaprow’s work:

> What I am really looking for is people [sic] who can not only set up independent operations, but who can also collaborate over the borders. We have a chance to develop special power by exploring those areas where the forms cross and, while attentive to their particular business, take energy from each other. Naturally, as in your work, the possibility of that cross-breeding will acquire a nature of its own. Anyhow, the possibilities are as open as imaginations of the people who will be shaping things.\footnote{Herbert Blau, Letter to Allan Kaprow, March 18, 1968, 1. Allan Kaprow Papers, series VI.A., box 56, folder 8, Getty Research Institute, Los Angeles, CA.}

Kaprow’s response reveals that he viewed this openness as an invitation to collapse his artistic and teaching practice and to experiment in ways deemed impossible at other institutions of higher education.\footnote{See Allan Kaprow, “Letter to Herbert Blau,” March 15, 1969, 1. Allan Kaprow Papers, series VI.A., box 56, folder 8, Getty Research Institute, Los Angeles, CA.} This expectation of pedagogical freedom was widespread among the founding administration and faculty.\footnote{Adler, *Artists in Offices*, 53–92.}

**The Un-Artist**

During his tenure at CalArts, Kaprow articulated his pedagogical approach in a
discussion of what he termed the “un-artist.” I posit that Kaprow’s “un-artist” serves as an analogue for the artist-as-facilitator paradigm privileged by the Halprins: both conceive of artistic labor as an interactive process, rather than a process of production. In “The Education of the Un-Artist, Part I” (1971), Kaprow argues that contemporary artists’ attempts to “operate outside the pale of art establishments” by employing tactics or materials taken from everyday life always fail. This is so because even these “nonart” activities are contained within the system of the art world. Kaprow proposes that these artists become “un-artists” by “slyly shift[ing] the whole un-artistic operation away from where the arts customarily congregate”; instead of working within the system of art, un-artists would apply their energy and playful attitude to quotidian tasks and regular professions. Mass media, for Kaprow, represent a major outlet for these un-artists: “Agencies for the spread of information via the mass media and for the instigation of social activities will become new channels of insight and communication ... offering former artists compelling ways of participating in structured processes that can reveal new values.”

I will focus on the first two parts of Kaprow’s three-part essay: “The Education of the Un-Artist, Parts I and II,” written in 1971 and 1972, respectively. Kaprow also wrote “The Education of the Un-Artist, Part III” (1974), which outlines five core strategies within un-art practice: “situational,” “operational,” “structural,” “self-referring,” and “learning.” I am not including the essay in my analysis because it does not elaborate on how the strategies can be applied to communication or education.

Allan Kaprow, “The Education of the Un-Artist, Part I,” in Essays on the Blurring of Art and Life, ed. Jeff Kelley (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), 98. Kaprow’s examples of these attempts include “nonart” activities such as conceptual practices; the earth art of Denis Oppenheim and Michael Heizer; and the Happenings of Marta Minujin and Wolf Vostell, among others. He also describes “antiart” practices, a category for which he sees Dada as a historic precedent and Walter De Maria’s Earth Room (1968) as a prime contemporary example. He sees Antiart as distinct from nonart because it aggressively strives to jar conventions and provoke responses.

Kaprow, “The Education of the Un-Artist, Part I,” 104–5. Kaprow’s examples of these “agencies” include public video arcades and jets with monitors showing footage of the earth below, both of which resemble media environments described by McLuhan. Kaprow’s understanding of art as operated within a system of communication echoes that in Bateson’s 1957 speech. Gregory Bateson, “Creative Imagination” (1957), American Federation of the Arts Papers, Archives of American Art, Smithsonian Institution, Washington DC.
This technophilic vision contradicts Kaprow’s 1958 assertion that “miscommunication prevailed” over productive dialogue in the contemporary embrace of communication technologies.\textsuperscript{106} His altered relationship to these technologies parallels a decisive shift in an art world that was infatuated with communication theory by the late 1960s. In the press release for \textit{Information} (Museum of Modern Art, 1970), one of several exhibitions to survey this trend, curator Kynaston McShine highlights the recent focus on “communication areas,” which he attributes to the desire to “create an art that reaches out to an audience larger than that which has been interested in contemporary art in the last few decades.”\textsuperscript{107} As displayed at the Museum of Modern Art and elsewhere, these “communication areas” include exchange through the mail or telex machines, compositions utilizing mainframe computers, video art, and many other dematerialized artistic practices. Some of these practices were developed in programs that paired artists with engineers, such as Experiments with Art and Technology (EAT) at Bell Labs.\textsuperscript{108} Others reflected the production of increasingly accessible technology, like the Sony Portapak video camera and the Xerox photocopier. The popularization of communication within the art world also corresponded to the widespread dissemination of cybernetic theory in both the mainstream press and specialized art journals between the mid-1960s and early 1970s.\textsuperscript{109}

\textsuperscript{106} Kaprow, “Interview with Allan Kaprow,” 134.
\textsuperscript{108} EAT was founded in 1966 by Bell Labs engineers Billy Klüver and Fred Waldhauer with artists Robert Rauschenberg and Robert Whitman. The initiative paired artists and engineers, providing industrial sponsorship for their investigations and projects. Other examples include Los Angeles County Museum of Art’s “Art & Technology” initiative (founded in 1967), which facilitated collaborations between artists and companies working with new technologies. Kaprow anticipated these initiatives in his proposal for a “Project in Multiple Dimensions” at Rutgers.
\textsuperscript{109} Examples of the latter include Jack Burnham’s “Systems Esthetics,” published in \textit{Artforum} in 1968, which analyzes the shift from “object-oriented” art to “systems-oriented” art, provided artists with a framework for understanding and applying cybernetic theory to artistic practice. Burnham notably includes
While Kaprow’s revised reception of communication paralleled changes in the art world, his understanding of the implications of communication theory for artists’ roles in society went farther than most of his peers. In the second part of “The Education of the Un-Artist” (1972), he returns to the idea of artists’ taking from or imitating the non-art world, but reads this process of imitation through Johannes Huizinga, Herbert Marcuse, and Marshall McLuhan. “Copying,” according to Kaprow, occurs not only in art, but also in design, technology, the environment, and all other systems. In other words, it is a crucial natural process, not least because it produces feedback in the form of “knowledge, well-being, surprise.” Drawing upon Huizinga’s *Home Ludens: A Study of the Play-Element in Culture* (1955), Kaprow links this act of copying to the mimetic character of play. According to Kaprow, modern adults are so focused on “practicalities, competition, money, ... specialization” that work has subsumed play. Echoing Kaprow’s mature Happenings within his discussion, describing the “internal logic” of Kaprow’s scores as “crystallizing the systems approach to environmental situations.” Jack Burnham, “System Esthetics,” *Artforum* 7 no. 1 (September 1968): 31. Kaprow makes reference to Burnham’s *Beyond Modern Sculpture* (1968) in “The Education of the Un-Artist, Part I,” describing it as a useful, but problematic, source for communication terminology (because Burnham only applies these terms to existing art categories like ‘sculpture.’) Communication theory also became a focus for many of the artists working in video in the late 1960s and early 1970s. Many video artists were influenced by *Radical Software*, a publication founded by members of video collective Raindance Corporation in 1970, which disseminated the ideas of Bateson and other systems theorists. For more on *Radical Software* see Kaizen, “Steps to an Ecology of Communication,” 94–106.


Huizinga defines play as activities that are voluntary (or free), or that exist outside of “ordinary” or “real” life; play is contained within limited time and space, possesses an order, and an element of “tension” or “uncertainty.” Huizinga argues that play functions as a “contest for something or a representation of something.” In the latter, more complicated, function, play can operate both instrumentally, as a mode of learning or practicing, and spiritually, through ritual acts of consecration. See Johan Huizinga, *Home Ludens: A Study of the Play-Element in Culture* (Boston: Beacon Press, 1955), 7–13.

Marcuse’s notion of “surplus repression,” he posits that the prioritization of labor in postwar U.S. and Western Europe is artificial. Marcuse argued that if these societies distributed their economic surplus equally, they would reduce the need for work and eradicate the repressive norms that govern participation in the capitalist labor system. Instead, however, the elites control the surplus as a means to reinforce the existing system and maintain their power. To mitigate this alienated state and to restore a natural order, Kaprow posits that un-artists should model adult play and the concept of the world as a “potential playground.”

Kaprow argues that this utopian notion of the un-artist’s restorative role has productive implications for education, where he proposes this modeling occur. In outlining this process, he applies the aims and practices of communication pedagogy to learning in elementary and secondary schools as a means of reform. Kaprow contends that the “authoritarianism” of schools eradicates the potential for learning through play, replacing it with competition and a struggle for power. In thinking through a solution to this authoritarianism, Kaprow considers McLuhan’s belief that communication technologies have the potential to replace schools as sources of learning. However, he ultimately dismisses this belief on the grounds that the media and leisure industries that produce these technologies are too profit-driven to play a productive role. In lieu of an educational program centered on technologies of mass

---

114 Ibid., 118–9. Kaprow does not cite Marcuse directly, but his language closely matches that of the Frankfurt School theorist. Marcuse argued that in the contemporary economy, society enforces a false notion of economic scarcity in order to divert energies towards work, and away from “libidinous pleasure.” Herbert Marcuse, *Eros and Civilization: A Philosophical Inquiry into Freud* (Boston, Beacon Press, 1966), 16.
115 Ibid., 166.
116 Ibid., 120.
communication, Kaprow advocates a play-based curriculum facilitated by un-artists. He proposes that these un-artist-educators be placed in public elementary and secondary schools as a long-term experiment that fosters “play as a foundation of society.” This experiment is predicated on the idea that learning occurs through process and play, rather than on evaluation (in the form of an exam or formal assignment). This approach resembles constructivist pedagogy, which posits that each learner actively constructs knowledge, rather than passively receiving it. Kaprow also endorses collaboration between students, in contrast to the competitive individualism of standardized, test-driven learning. In this collaborative environment, the un-artist-educator would not act as a master instructor, but as an “observer-referee,” a role that exhibits Dewey’s theory of teacher as facilitator. Although idealistic, this proposal represents a significant development in terms of the potential applications for communication practices. While Ant Farm and the Halprins taught college students and adults, Kaprow imagined bringing their shared ideas into elementary and secondary education. In doing so, he also presents an educational role for the un-artist subjects of communication pedagogy that focuses on institutional reform.

The ideas that Kaprow outlined in “The Education of the Un-Artist” essays informed his plans and actions as Associate Dean of the School of Arts at CalArts. In the correspondence leading up to his appointment, he laid out three projects: to conduct a master class in the field of communication, to study and report on the history of the School of Arts, and to develop a program for the exchange of ideas with other departments of the university.

---

118 Ibid., 122–4. Kaprow’s examples of these play-activities include historic role-playing games and student-designed noncompetitive sports.
119 Dewey represents a key precedent for constructivist theory, which emerged in the early-to-mid 1900s with the work of psychologists Jean Piaget and Lev Vygotsky. Progressive educators popularized Piaget’s understanding of play as a central component of cognitive development in the 1970s.
120 Dewey states: “The teacher is not in the school to impose certain ideas or to form certain habits in the child, but is there as a member of the community to select the influences which shall affect the child and to assist him in properly responding to these influences.” Dewey, “My Pedagogic Creed,” n.p. However, this notion was not always born out in practice by Dewey’s acolytes. See Paula S. Fass, Outside In: Minorities and the Transformation of American Education (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989); and Diane Ravitch, Left Back: A Century of Failed School Reforms (New York: Simon & Schuster, 2000).
happenings, to organize an interdisciplinary symposia series with experts from “ecology, cybernetics, and social revolution,” and to conduct “Artists in the Schools,” a program that aimed to bring students into local public schools.\(^\text{121}\) While not all of these goals were carried out, they reveal an understanding of the potential for an institution of higher education to be a porous site of exchange.\(^\text{122}\) Kaprow embraced communication pedagogy practices in his administrative actions, his Happenings course, and his “Artists in the Schools” proposal.

Kaprow used his position as Associate Dean to appoint many artists working with communication technologies to permanent and temporary staff positions, including the visual artists Alison Knowles, Dick Higgins, and Nam June Paik, the artist-poet Emmett Williams, and the composer James Tenney.\(^\text{123}\) The presence of these artists, many of whom were associated with Fluxus and Cage and all of whom had been working with mainframe computers as compositional devices, reinforced Kaprow’s desire to make CalArts a center for cross-disciplinary experimentation with technology. In addition, many of these new hires did not have extensive teaching backgrounds, underscoring Kaprow’s prioritization of experimentation over teaching experience.\(^\text{124}\)

Kaprow’s approach to overseeing faculty further highlights his openness to open-ended curricula and alternative teaching and learning structures. For example, Knowles accepted her


\(^{122}\) The “Artists in the Schools” program was never implemented and, although CalArts hosted numerous visiting lecturers, there is no indication that Kaprow’s interdisciplinary symposia were realized.

\(^{123}\) Knowles, Higgins, and Paik had all participated in Tenney’s 1967 workshop on the computer programming language FORTRAN and Emmett Williams also worked with computerized texts. See Hannah Higgins and Douglas Kahn, eds., *Mainframe Experimentalism: Early Computing and the Foundations of the Digital Arts* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2012). These individuals were all hired between 1970 and 1972. Tenney, who was appointed to the School of Music, was the only one to remain on the faculty in a long-term capacity.

\(^{124}\) Paik and Knowles, in particular, had very little teaching experience upon joining the faculty.
teaching position with the caveat that she could bring her architectural sculpture, *The House of Dust* (1968), to campus (figure 4.3). Kaprow used School of Art funds to finance the cross-country transportation of the large cement “house.” Once installed on the campus grounds, this geomorphic structure became an alternative classroom, performance site, and meditation space. When Knowles wanted to assign her students to make posters for an event involving the sculpture, the department allowed her to purchase a large-scale graphic arts camera with which the students could work. The actions in and around *The House of Dust*—and Kaprow’s willingness to fund them—highlight what Knowles described as Kaprow’s “vision of a school based on what artists wanted to do rather than what the school wanted them to do.”

Kaprow carried this vision into his Happenings course, in which, I argue, he taught students to be un-artists. The course was structured in much the same way as John Cage’s Experimental Composition course at the New School. In each class, participants enacted a score that was created by a student, or by Kaprow. These enactments were followed by feedback sessions in which the participants discussed their experiences. Kaprow also presented an overview of the recent history of Happenings and related practices to his students. Rather than teach specific technical skills, as in the academic model of art education, or foster investigation into materials and forms, as in the Bauhaus model, Kaprow’s course emphasized “studying and utilizing the everyday environment” and facilitating similar

---

125 Alison Knowles, “A School Based on What Artists Wanted to Do: Alison Knowles on CalArts” in *East of Borneo* (August 7, 2012): accessed March 26, 2015, [http://www.eastofborneo.org/articles/a-school-based-on-what-artists-wanted-to-do-alison-knowles-on-calarts](http://www.eastofborneo.org/articles/a-school-based-on-what-artists-wanted-to-do-alison-knowles-on-calarts). Knowles recalls holding her classes and meetings in *The House of Dust*, as well as readings, food events, her own art events and students’ art events. The event, which her students created silkscreened posters for, was a helicopter drop of the printed poem form of *A House of Dust* over the physical sculpture.

126 There is no record of Kaprow connecting his teaching in the Happenings course to the un-artist model.

127 This balance of history and practice echoes Kaprow’s plan for a seminar on Assemblage, which he described in “The Effect of Recent Art on the Teaching of Art” (1963–4). The Assemblage seminar’s design was inspired by Hans Hofmann’s pedagogy.
experiences for others.  

Many of the students’ scores exemplify the “copying” and play strategies described in the “Un-Artist” essays. Several involved everyday actions or activities, such as Bob McCarn’s Cadre Memorial Fence (November 16, 1971), in which participants worked in four construction crews to build a wire fence (figure 4.4). Another student score provides instructions for a group trip to a Denny’s restaurant (figure 4.5). Other Happenings took place on campus lawns, freeways, parking lots, stairwells, and a football field, locations that reveal investigation into the everyday environment. Play also represents a central theme in the scores produced and executed by the class. A student-created Happening called Crawl Space involved crawling through a tie-dyed fabric tunnel on various level and slanted grounds (figure 4.6). Others echo the simple absurdity and meditativeness of Fluxus instructions and event scores: “eat a glass of hot water with a soup spoon” or “walking in light, walking in soil, walking in sand.” These Happenings manifest Kaprow’s call for un-artists to frame their surroundings as potential sites for play.

Kaprow also participated in the course, creating and facilitating new works that he and his students carried out. In Easy (1972), for example, Kaprow and the students performed a simple, repetitive procedure that involved wetting a stone and carrying it downstream (figure 4.7). This activity illustrates a shift toward more intimate interactions and smaller scale processes in Kaprow’s artistic practice. It also demonstrates a new approach to teaching:

---

128 Kaprow, “Letter to Herbert Blau,” 1. In describing the “academic” and “Bauhaus” models of art pedagogy, I am referring to the paradigms of art education described in de Duve, “When Form Has Become Attitude — And Beyond,” 23–40.
129 The first score is from Roger Robertson, Untitled Scores, 10. The second is from D. T., “Walking,” 1971. Allan Kaprow Papers, series VI.B, box 57, folder 9, Getty Research Institute, Los Angeles, CA.
130 Works like Basic Thermal Units (1973), Time Pieces (1973), and 3rd Routine (1974) exhibit this shift towards smaller groups of participants to explore more personal interactions, which Kaprow frequently referred to as ‘events’ or activities.”
enacted solely with students, Easy serves as both a class exercise and an artwork. In other words, the activity represents a complete unification of Kaprow’s teaching and artistic practices. This merging reinforced CalArts’ central pedagogical principles—that students are treated like professional artists and that faculty teach based on their current work—but it also reveals a maturation in Kaprow’s pedagogy. At Rutgers and Stony Brook, he used assignments to explore activities that he would then employ in his Happenings, but did not go so far as to enact scores with students. In merging his teaching and his artistic practice at CalArts, Kaprow directly modeled the role of an un-artist-educator for his students.131

By creating a structure in which he and his students took turns facilitating class Happenings, Kaprow dehierarchized the conventional classroom power dynamic. As the originator of Happenings, he might have been expected to run the class in the manner of a traditional master teacher who bestows his knowledge of the topic upon his passive students. This model of education views students as objects, regulating them within an imposed structure that oppresses them in order to maintain existing power dynamics.132 However, by participating in the class alongside his students, Kaprow sought to forego his mantle of mastery, creating a structure where each participant could contribute and learn from each other in equal measure. Similar to Dewey’s notion of a teacher who facilitates learning “experiences,” this dynamic encouraged students to drive their own intellectual inquiry and art practice.

Feedback sessions, in which participants discussed their experiences of the enacted Happenings, reinforced this horizontality. The sessions were loosely modeled after feminist consciousness-raising circles, to which Kaprow was exposed through the Feminist Art Program

---

131 Suzanne Lacy, who studied with Kaprow at CalArts, describes this practice as turning “teaching into artworks.” Lacy, “Between Radical Art and Critical Pedagogy,” 34.
(FAP). However, in contrast to Chicago and Schapiro’s “intensely personal and highly politicized” dialogues, Kaprow’s feedback sessions were focused on dispassionate observations, led by general questions such as: “What did you experience?” While the FAP’s consciousness-raising sessions sought to assess their work’s potential for creating social and political change, Kaprow’s interrogated only the subjective experience of participation, and was far less politicized. It is also not clear that he adhered to the gender order of feminist consciousness raising sessions, in which women always spoke first. Despite these differences, the Happenings course feedback sessions nevertheless enabled Kaprow and his students to better understand participants’ experiences. They thus created the feedback loop that Kaprow theorized in “Educating the Un-Artist, Part II,” producing corrective knowledge and insight leading to improvements in the facilitation process.

While the course fostered the facilitation skills necessary to be an un-artist, it did not provide students with a platform to step outside the circumscribed domain of visual art. There is no indication that Kaprow encouraged students to include participants from outside the course cohort in their Happenings. That said, students who were enrolled simultaneously in Kaprow’s course and more politically- and socially-engaged CalArts programs—such as the Feminist Art Program, the Design School, or the Critical Studies Department—found ways to carry Kaprow’s ideas into direct public practice. Suzanne Lacy cites Kaprow’s expanded definition of art as a

---

133 The FAP used consciousness-raising sessions to exchange personal experiences and responses. Kaprow started using them in his Happenings class in 1972, after leading a workshop with Judy Chicago in which participant Faith Wilding rebuked him for not considering the gendered associations of the activities that he included in his Happenings. He began to employ consciousness-raising as part of his personal (off-campus) Happenings practice around 1973. For more see on the FAP’s consciousness-raising sessions in contrast to Kaprow’s, see Gourbe, “The Pedagogy of Art as Agency,” 159–82.
135 For more on Kaprow’s relationship to feminism, see Kelley, Childsplay, 154–55.
136 This conclusion is based on the folder of student work held at the Getty Research Institute: Allan Kaprow Papers, series VI.B, box 57, folder 9, Getty Research Institute, Los Angeles, CA.
crucial model for feminist and activist artists who sought to frame “domestic life, political life, relational life, and public life” in ways that “challenge public culture.”  

However, direct outreach did occur in Kaprow’s “Artists in the Schools” proposal, which sought to create training partnerships between CalArts students and middle and high school art teachers. These partnerships were predicated on what Kaprow saw as a mutually beneficial relationship: art curriculum for secondary schools was either nonexistent or “out of touch with professional art” and recent BFAs and MFAs earned meager incomes. The program would pair CalArts students with in-service teachers at public schools. The pairs would participate in training sessions at the Institute and the students would also lead “experiments” in the classrooms. Thus equipped, the students would go on to serve as artists-in-residents at other schools. If realized, the “Artists in the Schools” program would have provided Kaprow’s students with an ideal venue for applying their practice to a teaching situation.

The proposal represented a continuation of Project Other Ways, a program that Kaprow co-founded in Berkeley in 1968, the year before he came to CalArts. Kaprow’s partner in the project was Herbert Kohl, a proponent of the open schools movement and visiting professor of

---

138 Allan Kaprow, “Artists in the Schools.” Allan Kaprow Papers, series VI.A., box 56, folder 8, Getty Research Institute, Los Angeles, CA.

The proposal states that this initiative would be conducted in conjunction with the College Entrance Examination Board’s Advanced Placement art program, for which Kaprow was a committee member. The training workshops at CalArts would be documented “for packaging and distribution as teaching aids.” Artists in the Schools can be contextualized within the development of contemporaneous museum-led initiatives such as the Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum’s “Learning Through Art” program. Founded in 1970 in response to cuts to the budgets for arts and music programs in New York City Schools, Learning Through Art places artist in-school residencies to “collaborate with classroom teachers to develop and facilitate art projects integrated into the school curriculum.” “What is Learning Through Art?” Accessed April 18, 2016, http://www.guggenheim.org/new-york/education/school-educator-programs/learning-through-art/about.

139 Kaprow’s interest in bringing new artistic practices into schools began when he served on a presidential commission on arts education during the Kennedy administration, alongside Robert Motherwell and George Segal. The commission recommended what would later become the NEA sponsored Artist-in-Schools program.
education at University of California, Berkeley. Project Other Ways sought to bring artists into secondary schools in the racially and economically stratified Berkeley Unified School District. Like “Artists in the Schools,” the initiative aimed to introduce teachers to interdisciplinary art forms as alternative pedagogical techniques. The Project’s teaching staff comprised artists working in a range of media including happenings and other forms of experiential art, poetry, storytelling, inflatable architecture, filmmaking, and music. Headquartered in a West Berkeley storefront, Project Other Ways’ offerings included weekly teacher education seminars and in-school and after-school workshops. Like the experiment Kaprow proposed in “The Education of the Un-Artist, Part II,” Project Other Ways’ pedagogy championed the creative process—and its ability to foster “imaginativeness and self-fulfillment”—as an antidote to “competition for grades and specialized skills.”

One of several Happenings that Kaprow enacted while at the Project, *Shape* (1969), required high school students to paint the silhouettes of their bodies in public spaces, photograph the outlines, and send the reports to police (figure 4.8). The process highlighted the ongoing clashes between protesters and police currently underway in the Berkeley streets. By using the playful, investigative process of Happenings as a pedagogical device, *Shape* also illustrates the realization of un-artistic labor for a “nonart” audience.

Kaprow left Project Other Ways after the first year. His stated reason for departure—

---

140 A Carnegie Foundation Grant helped to fund Project Other Ways. Kaprow had originally applied for the grant for a similar program at Stony Brook, but the school rejected the proposal. In addition, the Ford Foundation funded the Berkeley Experimental Schools Program, which includes Project Other Ways. Project Other Ways artist-educators included poet Victor Hernandez Cruz, architect Sim van der Ryn, photographer Bob Wilson, and poet-athlete Mike Spino, among others. See Herbert Kohl, *The Discipline of Hope: Learning from a Lifetime of Teaching* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1998), 176-231; and Kelley, *Childsplay*, 143–6.


142 By this point, Project Other Ways had begun to operate as an alternative school and by late 1969, the Berkley School board had granted it status as a public school for seventy students. Over the next few years the school frequently relocated, inhabiting several different spaces including storefronts, an abandoned school, and faculty’s homes. See Kohl, *The Discipline of Hope*, 202—06.
the job at CalArts—belied tensions between the two founders. While Kohl sought to employ Happenings and other artistic tactics to “create political and social statements about equality and justice,” Kaprow merely wanted to bring artistic imagination and play into the classroom as an alternative, apolitical pedagogical tool. This disjunction highlights a major rift between communication pedagogy and the then emerging model of critical pedagogy, which sought to empower students to challenge the dominant power structure. While critical pedagogues educated disempowered populations for social transformation, Kaprow and the other protagonists of communication pedagogy practices worked primarily with white, middle class populations who already had access to abundant resources. Despite the tensions between its founders, Project Other Ways served as a key model of artist-led education, which Kaprow strove to continue at CalArts. The school ultimate rejection of his proposal demonstrates its larger failure to support communication pedagogy practices.

In 1972, Kaprow entered into conflict with President Robert Corrigan over a new contract that specified a shortened term and smaller salary. The contract changes reflected broader financial tensions and an increasing reluctance on the part of the trustees to fund experimental teaching practices. Although many of the faculty, like Kaprow, understood the Institute to epitomize a post-scarcity economic model, in reality, it was spending more money than the budget allowed. Furthermore, the conservative trustees, who were disturbed by the school’s

---


144 Like that of the Halprin Workshops and Ant Farm’s projects, Kaprow’s pedagogy did not foster direct political engagement or seek to educate against oppression. Critical pedagogy began to emerge in the United States after 1970, when Freire’s Pedagogy of the Oppressed (1968) was translated into English, but did not coalesce into a school of thought until the end of the decade. In the U.S. it is associated with Michael Apple, Henry Giroux, bell hooks, and Ira Shor, among others.

145 Kaprow ultimately agreed to the contract, conceding, “in view of the instability at CalArts now, I’ve decided to sign it under protest and as a matter of self-protection, not as a concession to your terms.” Allan Kaprow, Letter to President Robert Corrigan, May 1, 1972. Allan Kaprow Papers, series VI.A, box 56, folder 8, Getty Research Institute, Los Angeles, CA.
countercultural ethos, tightly controlled the existing, inadequate funds. The school postponed the construction of CalArts’ campus because fundraising lagged. During the first year, the school was housed at a temporary campus, the Villa Cabrini, a former Catholic school for girls in Burbank. Once in session, faculty found themselves competing for access to limited technological equipment. The restricted access to technology crushed faculty’s fantasies of working solely as artist-communicators. Tensions increased when the trustees blocked Herbert Marcuse’s appointment to the School of Critical Studies. Fearing the theorist’s radicalism, they refused to hire him, thus creating an unbreachable rift with the faculty.

Budgets decreased as the school matured, resulting in heightened competition among faculty members, who suddenly had to vie for contracts and funds. This undermined the community-minded ethos fostered during the recruitment period and initial years. The decrease in funds also led to an administrative push for more formalized curricula, the establishment of course requirements, and standardized matriculation. By 1975, the first president, provost, three deans, and many faculty members had either been fired or chose to resign and the trustees shut down the Schools of Critical Studies and Design. Kaprow was among the faculty members who quit; he accepted a position at the University of California, San Diego in 1974.

Ironically, it was as the dream of a technophilic, utopian learning community grew increasingly irreconcilable with the reality of school governance and structure that CalArts initiated an aggressive public relations campaign that drew directly on that myth. As Adler notes,"

---

146 For more details on the trustee’s relationship to the more radical factions at the school see Sarbanes, “A Community of Artists.”
147 Adler, Artists in Offices, 102.
148 Ibid., 108.
149 Ibid., 146–7. Between the 1972–73 and the 1973–74 school year, the teaching budget was cut nearly in half (from $2,322,440 to $1,375,000.)
150 Among those who resigned or were fired were Maurice Stein, Herbert Blau, Sheila de Bretteville, and Judy Chicago.
“the production of inspirational rhetoric became an economic imperative disengaged from ‘belief.’”\textsuperscript{151} A spectacular Happening created at the behest of CalArts administration, Kaprow’s Publicity represents an early example of the shift from building an experimental learning community to creating a simulacra of one. Although it is tempting to condemn this shift as a failure on the part of the school, the situation at CalArts must be contextualized within larger changes in U.S. economy and society that occurred in the mid-1970s.

III. Cleaning Up

In 1966, Ronald Reagan was elected as governor of California on a platform that promised to “clean up” Berkeley.\textsuperscript{152} This event signaled the beginnings of a shift away from state support for expansion and growth in higher education. By the mid-1970s, many colleges and universities were in similar positions to that of CalArts: financially strapped and working to codify and consolidate programs and curriculum. A variety of economic, political, institutional, and social factors led most U.S. institutions of higher education to suppress communication pedagogy practices and other modes of dehierarchized, interdisciplinary, and open-ended teaching and learning. Chief among these factors were bloated institutional structures, the economic downturn, changes in government funding for higher education, and shifts in the status and attitudes of campus constituencies. These developments, which affected art and architecture pedagogy, connect to an inward turn taken by the counterculture at large. The shifts of the early to mid-1970s—many of which heralded the emergence of neoliberalism at the end of the decade—prevented the efflorescence of communication pedagogy practices within

\textsuperscript{151} Adler, Artists in Offices, 108.
\textsuperscript{152} The former actor had recently become a spokesperson for the Republican party.
colleges and universities.

In the end, most colleges and universities either resisted or were unable to substantially accommodate the critiques offered by the student protests and the surge of alternative education initiatives of the late 1960s. The uncurbed and often haphazard growth of higher education institutions in the postwar period rendered them inflexible and cumbersome by the 1970s. Although institutional governance had been somewhat democratized in the previous two decades (shifting from a hierarchical model where the administration made all decisions to a more lateral model in which faculty had input into curriculum and other institutional matters), faculties had been divided into myriad departments and specializations. Compounded by each faculty member’s personal commitment to professional advancement, this fractionalization frustrated decision-making unity at many institutions. Departments also found themselves increasingly in competition for resources, which further aggravated inter-departmental relationships. Institutional structures thus became so diffuse that they could not generate cohesive missions or implement large-scale modifications. Demands for change were acted upon only by individual departments or faculty members and often not sustained into the mid-1970s. ¹⁵³

The economic downturn exacerbated this inertia in the early 1970s. In the postwar period, the U.S. economy (and that of most advanced capitalist countries) had been regulated by policies marked by “embedded liberalism.”¹⁵⁴ These included Keynesian fiscal and monetary policies that controlled business cycles and maintained relatively high employment levels, the

¹⁵⁴ David Harvey defines “embedded liberalism” as “a web of social and political constraints and a regulatory environment that sometimes restrained but in other instances led the way in economic and industrial strategy.” David Harvey, A Brief History of Neoliberalism (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 11.
construction of welfare systems such as health care and education, and the relative political integration of trade unions. However, these policies began to weaken by the end of the 1960s. Advanced capitalist economies entered into a phase of economic “stagflation” in which surges in unemployment were accompanied by high rates of inflation. The global flow of capital, and especially of U.S. dollars, put too much strain on Keynesian policies, leading to the abandonment of fixed exchange rates in 1971. The debate over how to manage the freely floating exchange rates and stagflation centered on two opposing strategies: the left sought to intensify state control and regulation while the right strove to liberate markets in favor of corporate and business power. The latter strategy won out by the mid-1970s, leading to the emergence of a neoliberal economy at the end of the decade.\textsuperscript{155} The 1973 oil crisis also stymied the U.S. economy; Arab members of the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) instituted an embargo against the United States as a response to aid offered to the Israeli military during the Arab-Israeli war.

Even before the oil crisis, most institutions of higher education were spending beyond their annual operating budgets and long-term endowments. The economic stagflation meant that college revenues had flattened while the prices of goods and services were increasing. In addition, many new construction projects undertaken on campuses in the 1960s had sophisticated maintenance systems that required abundant energy, which became exorbitant to maintain in the wake of the surge in oil prices caused by the OPEC embargo. The budgets for these projects also assumed a continued increase in enrollment, but, by the mid-1970s, the

\textsuperscript{155} Harvey, \textit{Neoliberalism}, 10–13. As defined by Harvey, neoliberalism “proposes that human well-being can best be advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional framework characterized by strong private property rights, free markets, and free trade.” The state’s role within this system includes securing rights to private property, guaranteeing the proper functioning of the market, and creating markets in areas where they do not already exist (such as education, land, water, healthcare, and social security). Ibid., 2. The effect of neoliberalism will be further discussed in the conclusion.
boom of the previous decade began to taper off, creating further financial strain.\textsuperscript{156} Congress lost trust in administrations’ abilities to maintain control over their institutions after the on-campus unrest and critiques of collusion between campuses and government that occurred in the late 1960s. As a result, Congress reduced government funds for research, which colleges and universities had depended on as a constant revenue stream. Thus financially strapped, institutions were far less likely to fund experimental programs.

Although the government decreased its funding for large-scale research projects, it increased its spending on student financial aid. The student protests of the 1960s had emboldened student lobbyist groups to agitate for “portable student financial aid”—funds that are awarded to the student, rather than to the institution.\textsuperscript{157} In response to this petitioning, Congress amended the 1964 Higher Education Act to include the Basic Educational Opportunities Grants program (later renamed Pell Grants) in 1972. These grants awarded financial aid to full-time students in need of assistance who maintained good academic standing. That these awards could be applied to any college led to increased competition between schools for student “customers.”\textsuperscript{158} However, while this new generation could, to some extent, influence the offerings and curriculum of universities in their selections, it had become politically disillusioned. This disillusionment arose in response to campaigns launched by the FBI and by Richard Nixon—who was elected to the presidency on an anti-counterculture

\textsuperscript{158} Riesman’s uses this term to highlight the fact that colleges and universities had to adopt marketing strategies in order to attract students. Riesman, \textit{On Higher Education}, 105. The student-as-consumer model features prominently in current critiques of the neoliberal university, as will be discussed in the conclusion.
platform in 1968—to suppress the New Left and Black Power movements. These brutal campaigns utilized surveillance, infiltration, and, in some instances, perpetrated assassinations against radical leaders. Meanwhile, Nixon’s withdrawal of troops from Vietnam and phasing out of the draft quieted national anti-war sentiment (while concealing a secret bombing campaign). In reaction to this political climate, students lost hope that they could enact substantial structural change. The Students for Democratic Society (SDS), which had been a major coalition for activist politics on campuses, broke into factions in 1969. The antiwar movement staged massive uprising against the war in Cambodia in the spring of 1970, but then began to lose momentum after the summer of 1970. Faculty also began to waver in their support of student revolt. By the 1970–1971 school year, many student activists abandoned antagonistic strategies, exhibiting instead a “sense of futility and despair.”

Meanwhile, shifts in funding priorities and the increased need for recruitment led to an expansion and consolidation of power within administrative offices. Admissions and marketing offices became more important, as did campus fundraising offices, which mitigated declining government funding for research by cultivating donors and private foundations. The latter established a new mode of entrepreneurship in higher education and a new cadre of campus

---

160 In one of the most brutal of these assassinations, the police killed Fred Hampton, the state chairman of the Illinois Black Panthers, while he was in bed on December 4, 1969. See Todd Gitlin, The Sixties: Years of Hope, Days of Rage (New York: Bantam Books, 1993), 403–8.
162 See Gitlin, The Sixties, 377–408.
163 The former president of the Students for Democratic Society (SDS), Todd Gitlin, wrote that “activism never recovered from the summer vacation of 1970.” Gitlin, Sixties, 411. This loss of momentum may have arisen as a response to the student deaths that occurred during the antiwar protests at Jackson State College in Mississippi and at Kent State in Ohio.
164 Fashing and Deutsch, Academics in Retreat, 5.
development professionals who monitored and advanced fundraising through data collection and tracking.\textsuperscript{165} State schools came under additional administrative oversight: the 1972 amendments to the Higher Education Act of 1964 also called for the establishment of federal funding incentives that would encourage states to create higher education coordinating agencies.\textsuperscript{166} Administrative concerns like strategic plans, program reviews, management skills training, and data-driven reports created myriad new administrative offices across campuses. These initiatives represented a further strike against open-ended and interdisciplinary teaching practices, which administrators viewed as difficult to track and to justify in strategic plans.

The declining status of faculty within institutions of higher education also rendered them less able to implement alternative pedagogies. The academic hiring boom of the 1950s and 1960s ended in the early 1970s, creating a surplus of recent PhDs who soon flooded the academic job market.\textsuperscript{167} This surplus resulted in an increasing reliance on adjunct faculty labor and a decrease in administrations’ responsiveness to faculty needs.\textsuperscript{168} In the mid-1960s, faculty had the power to effect decisions made by trustees and administrators (many of whom were themselves former faculty members.)\textsuperscript{169} However, by the 1970s, this influence had greatly diminished and young, untenured faculty, who might previously have pursued alternative pedagogies, felt that their voices were no longer heard.

\textsuperscript{165} This shift to data-driven fundraising corresponded to increasing emphasis on privatization in federal and state governments’ allocation of funding. Ibid., 332–7. Data-driven fundraising is discussed in George Keller, Academic Strategy: The Management Revolution in American Higher Education (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1983).

\textsuperscript{166} These agencies would liaise between institutions and the federal government, consult in long-term planning initiatives, and reduce duplication in academic programs. They had their own reporting structures, creating more bureaucratic work for universities. In some states, they were able to build successful “intersegmental cooperation;” in others their recommendations were rejected or overridden by schools. Thelin, A History of American Higher Education, 338–40.

\textsuperscript{167} According to David Riesman, in the 1960s graduate and research programs grew at an even faster rate than the rapidly growing undergraduate populations. Riesman, On Higher Education, 2.


\textsuperscript{169} Riesman, On Higher Education, 1.
pedagogies and programs, instead had to struggle to hold on to their jobs.\footnote{Thelin, A History of American Higher Education, 332–9}  

Reagan's election as governor in 1967 and again in 1971 exacerbated the rejection of alternative learning initiatives and pedagogies in California. The University of California (UC) system became a major target of Reagan's administration. One of his first acts as governor was to pressure the Regents to pass a regulation that allowed him to activate National Guard and police troops to combat protests on campus.\footnote{Fashing and Deutsch, Academics in Retreat, 69–71.} Reagan also influenced the Regents’ decision to fire Clark Kerr in 1967 from the position of President of UC (because of his tolerance of radicalism), and to dissolve the successful but controversial Experimental College and Black Studies Department at San Francisco State.\footnote{The Experimental College, briefly discussed in the introduction to this dissertation, was successful in terms of enrollment and interest, but plagued by disagreements over how courses would be accredited so that faculty could be paid and students could gain credits. When Reagan became governor in 1967, he encouraged the Board of Trustees to put pressure on the college to prove legitimacy of course content. Communications broke down after a 1969 strike led by the Black Student Union over the potential dismissal of a professor in the ethnic studies program. The school’s newly appointed conservative president reacted by voiding student government elections and punishing strikers. Under President Hayakawa’s leadership, both the Experimental College and the Black Studies department soon dissolved. See Fashing and Deutsch, Academics in Retreat, 76–113.} Fashing and Deutsch argue that Reagan can be seen as a “counterrevolutionary leader,” who was voted into office on his promise to defeat the counterculture.\footnote{Ibid, 71–4.} He appealed to a broad segment of California’s population (mostly living inland from the coastal regions that the counterculture inhabited) who saw countercultural values as a moral threat.\footnote{Ibid., 73–4.}  

In California and elsewhere in the U.S., faculty in art departments and schools were pressured to codify and formalize curriculum in order to adhere to administrative requirements. Thierry de Duve has labeled the resulting pedagogical paradigm, which began to emerge in the mid-1970s, as “attitude-practice-deconstruction.” Students learned to position themselves as
artists, instead of to produce art objects. De Duve attributes this change in part to the inundation of critical theory, starting in the 1970s and expanding in the 1980s, which encouraged students to critique and deconstruct, rather than invent or imitate.\footnote{De Duve, “When Form Has Become Attitude – And Beyond,” 27.} Although de Duve does not account for the vast differences between schools and instructors, his concept provides a useful framework for looking at what happens to open-ended, communication-based art pedagogy once it is codified and institutionalized. Taking a more nuanced approach, John Miller describes art pedagogy in the late 1970s as following a dialogic model, in which “students and teachers co-produce a discourse.”\footnote{Miller, Mike Kelley: Educational Complex, 30. Miller brings up the dialogic pedagogy model in his discussion of Mike Kelley’s Educational Complex (1995), an architectural model of all of the educational institutions that Kelley attended (including his home and CalArts, from which he received his MFA in 1978).} At CalArts, Michael Asher’s “Post-Studio” critique class epitomized this dialogic model. Begun in 1973, the class consisted of lengthy meditations on the “critical position” of students’ work, which could last up to 12 hours in duration.\footnote{Mark Allen, “Notes Toward Socratic Gardening,” in In the Canyon, Revise the Canon, ed. Géraldine Gourbe (Annecy, France; Lescheraines, France: ESAAA Editions; Shelter Press, 2015), 83. For a detailed description of Asher’s class see Sarah Thornton, Seven Days in the Art World (New York: W.W. Norton, 2008), 41–74.} This concept of art education as a dialogue between teachers and students parallels Kaprow’s emphasis on lateral exchange. However, unlike the practices advocated in “Education for the Un-Artist,” this later pedagogy strives to produce verbal discourse between artists rather than facilitate embodied experiential interaction.

Architecture education also turned inward in the 1970s. According to architectural historian Mary McLeod, after the 1968 generation of architecture student activists graduated, “most of the more radical educational experiments in learning came to a halt.”\footnote{Mary McLeod, “The End of Innocence: From Political Activism to Postmodernism” in Architecture School: Three Centuries of Educating Architects in North America, ed. Joan Ockman (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2012), 170. However, McLeod notes that many schools maintained somewhat dehierarchized teacher-student dynamics and an increased awareness of social issues.} A new
academicism characterized by the embrace of a formal architectural vocabulary and an understanding of "architecture as art" emerged in their place.\textsuperscript{179} Often labeled "postmodernist" this formalism was initiated by a handful of faculty members in elite schools.\textsuperscript{180} McLeod has pointed out that although many of the protagonists of postmodernism were concerned initially with housing, the preservation of urban neighborhoods, and the rejection of high modernism, their focus shifted to issues of form and style over the course of the 1970s.\textsuperscript{181} Historical precedents, cultural meaning, formal vocabularies, and critical theory became central themes within studio instruction in the later part of the decade and in the 1980s. Schools reinstated architectural history classes, neglected in the Bauhaus-influenced programs of the postwar period, as a central part of the curriculum. The financial crisis curtailed building opportunities for young architects in the mid-to-late 1970s, elevating the role of drawing, writing, and teaching within architectural practice. Many recent graduates turned to teaching, resulting in the rapid spread of postmodern tendencies to architecture programs across the country and into mainstream architecture practice.\textsuperscript{182}

The retrenchment of art and architecture education corresponds to a shift within the counterculture in the 1970s. Many former radicals began to prioritize personal transformation, lifestyle, and spirituality over political and societal change.\textsuperscript{183} This inward turn resulted in a proliferation of new age religions, agrarian communes, and DIY lifestyle practices. Cultural historian Sam Binkley argues that the counterculture’s pursuit of self-improvement and lifestyle-
fulfillment was transmitted to mainstream U.S. society by the late 1970s, resulting in a cultural “loosening,” in which an interest in self-development and relaxed social mores replaced the regimented lifestyle of the immediate postwar period.\textsuperscript{184} Binkley acknowledges that this investment in “self-realization and personal autonomy” resembles the neoliberal “ethic of personal accountability and flexibility,” but cautions that the loosening process of the 1970s was more communal, more caring, and more opposed to existing cultural mores than the “flattened out” practices of the 1980s and beyond.\textsuperscript{185}

Meanwhile, the collaborations between Bay Area engineers and technophilic countercultural groups like Ant Farm, led to the emergence of personal computing in the early 1980s. Although many of the collectives and communes had dissolved as organizations by the late 1970s, they imparted their vision of a dehierarchized, cybernetic society into the development of information technology.\textsuperscript{186} While communication pedagogy practices did not take hold in institutions of higher education, threads of it have resurfaced in our present technological moment. Kaprow’s teaching and administrative work at CalArts thus remains a potent example of an effort to bring communication pedagogy practices into a school. He advocated interdisciplinary symposia to create connections and exchange beyond disciplinary boundaries; developed a dehierarchized teaching practice in which he taught his students to be facilitators; and outlined a program through which “un-artists” could extend communication practices.

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{184}{Binkley describes this loosening as a shift from “conformity and self-regimentation” towards a more “authentic” understanding of self, a more immediate pursuit of desires, and a more relaxed lifestyle. Binkley analyzes this loosening through the widespread dissemination of lifestyle publications focused on topics ranging from permissive childrearing to guides to DIY architecture. Sam Binkley, \textit{Getting Loose: Lifestyle Consumption in the 1970s} (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2007).}

\footnote{185}{Binkley, \textit{Getting Loose}, 14.}

\footnote{186}{Turner defines ‘New Communalists’ as counterculturalists who “turned away from political action towards technology and the transformation of consciousness as the primary sources of social change.” Fred Turner, \textit{From Counterculture to Cyberculture: Stewart Brand, the Whole Earth Network, and the Rise of Digital Utopianism} (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2006), 4. For more on the New Communalists’ work on personal computing see ibid.,103–40.}
\end{footnotes}
\end{footnotesize}
pedagogy practices beyond higher education to elementary and secondary schools in his “Artists in Schools” proposal. Although he did not achieve all of these goals, he and other faculty members at CalArts imagined and tested a model for an institution shaped by communication pedagogy practices. As discussed in the conclusion, many contemporary artist-driven initiatives are realizing aspects of this project.
Conclusion

Today, the technologies and networks imagined by the Halprins, Ant Farm, and Kaprow are pervasive: the “facilitator” role dominates both contemporary corporate management structures and much of contemporary artistic practice, while neoliberal economies privilege the flexible, network-based labor paradigm modeled in communication pedagogy. However, the policies that shaped this economy have engendered precarious working and learning conditions that are impossible to reconcile with the dehierarchized practices advocated by my protagonists and their peers. These policies have converted institutions of higher education into privatized, market-driven financial entities, whose metrics-based curricula make the “multiversities” of the postwar period look like academic utopias. The last decade has witnessed an outpouring of new experimental artist- and educator-driven initiatives that attempt to counter this neoliberalized higher education system. Many of these initiatives revive the communication pedagogy practices used by my protagonists, including facilitation, workshops, networks, interdisciplinary exchange, an emphasis on process and dialogue, and the use of communication technology. This concluding chapter looks at neoliberal reforms to higher education and contemporary attempts by artists and educators to educate against these reforms. In placing the latter in

---

1 This is not to suggest a direct equivalency between facilitation in contemporary corporations and artistic practice. As John Roberts has shown, while many artists align their work with the “productive labor” done by non-art workers, the social and economic forces that control the latter are not actually imposed on the former. John Roberts, The Intangibilities of Form: Skill and Deskilling in Art After the Readymade (London: Verso, 2007), 86–87. Roberts makes this distinction in his discussion of the difference between deskilling in art and deskilling in labor.

2 In the United States, these include 16Beaver (founded in 1999), Machine Project (founded in 2004), The Mountain School of Arts (founded in 2005), AAAARG.ORG (founded in 2005), Fritz Haeg’s Sundown Schoolhouse (founded in 2006), Sean Dockray’s The Public School (founded in 2007), Trade School (founded in 2009), Anhoek School (founded in 2009), Bruce High Quality Foundation University (founded in 2009), the TEACHABLE FILE (tTF) (founded in 2010), Brooklyn Institute for Social Research (founded in 2011), School for Creative Activism (founded in 2011), New York Arts Practicum (founded in 2012), Pioneer Works’ Education program (founded in 2012), School for Poetic Computation (founded in 2013), BFAMFAPhD (founded in 2014), The Black School (founded in 2016).
dialogue with the work of my protagonists, I ask: what can contemporary artist and educators learn from the communication pedagogy initiatives of the 1960s and 1970s?

The Halprins, Ant Farm, and Kaprow provide a prehistory for the current efflorescence of pedagogical art projects. Communication pedagogy developed in coastal California in the mid-1960s as a response to both the expanded, technocratized higher education system of the postwar period—a phenomenon that was especially prevalent in the West Coast state—and the alternative forms of lifestyle, community, and organization embraced by California’s extensive counterculture. The extra-institutional beginnings of communication pedagogy can be traced to Anna and Lawrence Halprin’s *Experiments in Environment* workshops, which initiated a model of arts education that focused on process, experience, and interdisciplinary collaboration, rather than specialized curriculum and finished products. The Halprins established a new paradigm for artistic labor, in which the artist serves as a facilitator of learning, rather than as a producer of objects. Building on this model, many of the protagonists of communication pedagogy became interested in network-based forms of information exchange as rhizomatic, student-driven alternatives to the linear “banking model” of education that typically occurs in schools. Ant Farm’s speculative proposals exemplify this trend, anticipating the dehierarchized forms of exchange and collaboration that characterize contemporary digital communication. The collective focused on designing extra-institutional networks after architecture departments rejected their early proposals. Allan Kaprow’s experience at CalArts illustrates the tensions around and ultimate suppression of communication pedagogy practices that occurred in art departments in the mid-1970s. Restrictions on pedagogical experimentation—which occurred at colleges and universities across the United States as a result of the economic recession and the conservative turn in state and federal politics—prevented these and other alternative teaching and learning practices from having a long-term effect on education within institutions. However, I
argue that the de-emphasis on critical and creative thinking in the neoliberal higher education system, in combination with the widespread availability of digital communication technology, and the prevalence of the artist-as-facilitator paradigm in contemporary art practice, have led to a reemergence of communication pedagogy practices.³

I. Neoliberalism and its Higher Education System

Although the circa-1970 communication pedagogy initiatives did not gain traction within educational institutions, the new paradigm for artistic practice that they initiated—the artist as facilitator, communicator, and network-builder—presaged (and indirectly influenced) the model of the flexible, network-driven laborer essential to the neoliberal economy. Luc Boltanski and Eve Chiapello argue that the neoliberal labor model—and the larger ‘spirit of capitalism’ within which it developed—resulted from the corporate sector’s accommodation of the critiques issued by the New Left and the counterculture in the 1960s and 1970s.⁴ These critiques denounced the oppressive dehumanization, loss of autonomy and authenticity, and lack of creativity experienced by workers in the increasingly technocratic and hierarchized Cold War era.

³ Although this concluding chapter focuses on artistic practice, it is worth noting that the facilitation role is also prominent in contemporary architectural practice, especially in participatory planning initiatives. I am not discussing architecture here because the phenomenon of experimental education initiatives is much more prevalent in artistic practice than it is in architecture, where the demands of professional accreditation restrict experimentation. One exception is the Free School of Architecture, which will launch in 2017.

⁴ Luc Boltanski and Eve Chiapello, The New Spirit of Capitalism (London; New York: Verso, 2005). Drawing on Max Weber’s assertion that participation in capitalist systems requires strong moral justification, Boltanski and Chiapello use the term ‘spirit of capitalism’ to denote the “ideology that justifies engagement in capitalism.” Ibid., 8. They argue that this “new spirit of capitalism” proceeds two earlier spirits: the first spirit of capitalism, which emerged at the end of the nineteenth century and emphasized bourgeois entrepreneurialism, industrialization, and a belief in technological progress; the second, which developed between the 1930s and 1960s, prioritized centralized organization and long term planning. Ibid. 16–8.
corporate system. After 1968 and the strikes throughout the 1970s, businesses began to incorporate these critiques by making changes to institutional structures and management discourse in the late 1970s. The resultant ‘new spirit of capitalism’ (fully in effect since the 1990s) rejects the strict hierarchy and bureaucracy of Cold War management in favor of horizontal, network-based forms of organization; it replaces rigid planning with a prioritization of flexibility and innovation; and it reconceptualizes the role of the “expert” manager as a visionary facilitator, who serves as “project head” or “team-coordinator.” In this new model of labor, individuals participate in small, interdisciplinary teams focused on specific projects. Work and social relationships thus take the form of reticular, temporary connections, and the size of one’s personal network determines one’s status. In its prioritization of autonomy, personal development, facilitation, networks, and mobility, this paradigm of labor recalls the alternatives created by the Halprins, Ant Farm, and Kaprow. However, this flexibility comes at the cost of financial precarity and job insecurity, as risk and responsibility are transferred to the individual. While my protagonists viewed communication and exchange as means to transform teaching and learning, the neoliberal paradigm sees these processes as vehicles for increasing the economic value of a person or firm. Furthermore, my protagonists chose to adopt these practices, while the contemporary economy imposes them on workers.

Neoliberal economic policies deny contemporary workers long-term contracts, benefits, and finite work hours, and instead expect them to feel a sense of personal achievement and

---

5 Boltanski and Chiapello label this type of critique “artistic” because it is tied to a vision of the freedom and authenticity of a bohemian lifestyle. They differentiate artistic critiques from “social critiques,” which attack capitalism’s exploitation of working class populations and destruction of solidarity between rich and poor. Boltanski and Chiapello, *The New Spirit of Capitalism*, 37, 169–70.

6 Ibid., 70–88.

7 Ibid., 104.

growth by completing one project and moving to the next.\textsuperscript{9} Neoliberalism seeks to “liberate individual entrepreneurial freedoms” by fostering free markets, free trade, and private property rights even in industries which had previously functioned outside of said markets, including higher education. It assumes that escalating market transactions will maximize the social good and therefore promotes market exchange as an ethical imperative.\textsuperscript{10} Yet, as David Harvey argues, this rhetoric belies neoliberalism’s negative effects on wealth distribution, job stability, and welfare benefits. Market-driven economic policies concentrate wealth within the top one percent of society, reinforcing class distinctions that had started to blur in the post-World War II period.\textsuperscript{11} Meanwhile, companies have turned to temporary or contracted workers, part-time employees, and outsourced labor to fulfill the needs of specific projects.\textsuperscript{12} The state has gradually withdrawn funds from health care, public education, and social services and weakened trade unionism, all of which previously acted as supports for workers.\textsuperscript{13} Political scientist Wendy Brown argues that the neoliberal rationality has extended beyond states and firms to individuals, compelling people “to comport themselves in ways that maximize their capital value in the present and enhance their future value.”\textsuperscript{14} Following this order of reason and its attendant policies, colleges and universities have increasingly adopted corporate business models.

**Academic Capitalism**

\textsuperscript{9} Ibid., 90, 107.  
\textsuperscript{10} David Harvey, *A Brief History of Neoliberalism* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2005), 2–3.  
\textsuperscript{13} Harvey, *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*, 76.  
The deleterious effects of this shift towards what higher education scholars Sheila Slaughter and Larry L. Leslie label “academic capitalism” have inspired countless proclamations of “crisis” in higher education.\(^\text{15}\) Although critiques of the neoliberalized higher education system abound, the major charges—which include exorbitant tuition, privatization of research, de-emphasis on teaching, and the corporatization of academic administration—bear repeating as they highlight the disparity between this system and the goals of my protagonists. Crucially, the former disincentivizes dialogic, inquiry-based, and experimental pedagogies, creating an academic culture that is especially toxic to arts education.\(^\text{16}\)

Just as government funding played a significant role in the higher education boom of the post-war period, state governments have facilitated the shift towards academic capitalism by dramatically reducing funding for higher education, forcing institutions to deploy entrepreneurial economic models and to seek philanthropic gifts from donors. Public schools have had to raise tuition and student fees in order to augment shrinking state subsidies.\(^\text{17}\) Within the City University of New York (CUNY) system, for example, undergraduate tuition has risen by 31 percent over the last five years.\(^\text{18}\) Most private schools have responded to funding cuts by


\(^{16}\) Although this section focuses on the changes to higher education in the United States, these changes are occurring internationally. In Europe, for example, the Bologna Accords seek to align the structure of higher education across Europe.

\(^{17}\) See Christopher Newfield, *Unmaking the Public University: The Forty-Year Assault on the Middle Class* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2008).

\(^{18}\) These changes were implemented at all four-year colleges within the CUNY system.
cultivating large endowments through private donations, but they hold these endowments in investment portfolios that market slumps can easily destabilize.\(^{19}\) Both public and private schools compete with a new crop of for-profit institutions such as the University of Phoenix and the now defunct Trump University, which offer stripped-down degrees in in-demand fields taught by minimally qualified faculty.\(^{20}\)

The push to privatize has also reshaped academic and campus culture. Administrators serve as the central on-campus agents in the process of aligning institutional culture with neoliberal models.\(^{21}\) The number of administrators has increased exponentially in the last three decades, as has their pay and dominance within campus power structures.\(^{22}\) As it has grown, this managerial cadre has become increasingly distanced from the intellectual and educational efforts of the faculty.\(^{23}\) Legislation enacted in 1980 allowed universities to apply proprietary restrictions to federally funded research, creating a system in which research can function as a


\(^{23}\) In contrast to the postwar period, when administrators frequently rose from the ranks of faculty, contemporary administrators come to higher education from other fields of managerial work including the corporate sector, professional schools, or from long-term careers in full-time higher education administration. Today, many universities select presidents based on their ability to fundraise and cultivate ties to the corporate sector. Calhoun, “Is the University in Crisis?,” 9.
privatized asset. This and subsequent policies restrict knowledge exchange between researchers and encourage college and university administrations to slash budgets in subject areas that do not have commercial potential. Administrations also promote and, in some cases, enforce faculty’s engagement in profit-seeking behaviors, such as competition for merit pay. This creates an academic culture that prioritizes research over teaching, as tenure and salary depend on publications. Yet faculty must balance this work with a litany of administrative duties. In addition, institutions of higher education rely increasingly on an “academic star system,” which awards the bulk of the teaching budget to an elite minority of faculty members, creating vast differentials in terms of salary, workload, and benefits. The majority of the teaching workforce occupies the opposite side of this differential, working as adjunct laborers. Many faculty members also end up performing a role that one professor describes as “customer

24 Before the Bayh-Dole Act (1980) passed, all federally funded research was available in the public domain. As of 2001, universities earned over $2 billion per year in profits by selling licensed intellectual property to industries (five times more than in 1980). Subsequent congressional acts have strengthened the potential for alliances between universities and industry. See Jennifer Washburn, University, Inc.: The Corporate Corruption of American Higher Education (New York: Basic Books, 2005), 9.
25 For an example of restricted exchange between researchers see Washburn, University, Inc., 151–2. For a discussion of how budget cuts have affected humanities research see Monika Krause, Mary Nolan, Michael Palm, and Andrew Ross, “Introduction,” in The University Against Itself: The NYU Strike and the Future of the Academic Workplace, eds. Monika Krause, Mary Nolan, Michael Palm, and Andrew Ross (Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 2008), 3.
26 Slaughter and Leslie, Academic Capitalism, 8.
27 These duties include mandatory participation in committees and the development of quantitative assessment criteria.
29 Since 1985, the number of tenured or tenure-track faculty has dropped from 75 percent to 25 percent of all college teachers; three-quarters of all college teachers currently work in adjunct, part-time, graduate teaching fellow, or non-tenurable positions. Bousquet, How the University Works, 3. These contingent faculty members often teach several courses at different institutions each semester, all for shockingly low pay rates. See the Coalition on the Academic Workforce, “A Portrait of Part-Time Faculty Members,” June 2012, accessed September 8, 2016, http://www.academicworkforce.org/CAW_portrait_2012.pdf. In response to these changes, a strong graduate employee and adjunct teaching union movement has emerged since the early 1990s, yet administrations have largely succeeded in suppressing the unions’ fights for more equitable contracts. For more on this movement see Krause, Nolan, Palm, and Ross, The University Against Itself; and Randy Martin, ed., Chalk Lines: The Politics of Work in the Managed University (Durham: Duke University Press, 1998).
service” in order to cater to students who are treated like “consumers” by campus recruiting and marketing teams. Schools compete to attract students by vying for positions in rankings systems that rate schools based on quantifiable factors that further reinforce market-driven behaviors. The student-as-consumer ideology also acts as justification for schools to “sell” degrees for increasingly staggering tuition rates. Meanwhile, most financial aid awards are based on academic merit (i.e. grades and test scores), rather than need, creating a structure that perpetuates economic and racial inequities by favoring those who can access and afford expensive test prep classes and tutoring. The students without access to aid take on unprecedented amounts of debt.

---

30 David M. Perry, “Faculty Members are not Cashiers,” The Chronicle of Higher Education, March 17, 2004, accessed September 8, 2016, http://chronicle.com/article/Faculty-Members-Are-Not/145363/. These recruiting teams operate under the assumption that students seek to purchase ‘real world success,’ rather than intellectual development. Ratemyprofessor.com, a website where students rank professors according to overall quality, difficulty, and hotness, can also be seen as an indicator of this trend.


33 Guinier argues that the higher education system in the U.S. privileges “testocratic” merit over democratic merit. In other words, it privileges competition over collaboration. She shows how high SAT scores correlate with high family income: white, upper-middle class students receive the highest average SAT scores. For more see Lani Guinier, The Tyranny of the Meritocracy: Democratizing Higher Education in America (Boston: Beacon Press, 2015).

34 The outstanding federal student loan balance has quadrupled in the last twelve years and currently exceeds $1.1 trillion. Adam Looney and Constantine Yannelis, “A crisis in student loans? How changes in the characteristics of borrowers and in the institutions they attended contributed to rising loan defaults,” Fall 2015, accessed September 8, 2016, http://www.brookings.edu/about/projects/bpea/papers/2015/looney-yannelis-student-loan-defaults. Marc Bousquet, the founding editor of Workplace: A Journal for Academic Labor, has traced the ways in which the high cost of tuition necessitates students’ participation in both on-campus workforces and a new form of off-campus partnerships, which are contracted by local businesses or corporations working in partnership with student employment offices. Bousquet, How the University Works, 125-156. Significantly, this arrangement also allows administration to save money on labor costs and minimize the presence of
Pedagogically, academic capitalism privileges hierarchical approaches to teaching and learning that foreground pre-professional skills through standardized curriculum and quantitative assessments. This metrics-driven system discourages any curriculum that is not easily measurable, such as analytic thinking, interpretation, critical inquiry, and dialogic engagement. These modes of thinking are central to the liberal arts model, the curricular paradigm that dominated higher education in the United States throughout most of the twentieth century.\textsuperscript{35} This model privileges the study of literature, history, language, philosophy, and the arts alongside more career-oriented fields like social and natural sciences, engineering fields, and math. It cultivates discussion, interpretive writing, research-based analysis, meta-cognitive reflection, and creative expression. As higher education scholar Christopher Newfield argues, a liberal arts education produces “cultural knowledge about the psychological, interpersonal, and cultural capabilities that allowed society to evolve.”\textsuperscript{36} This qualitative knowledge is crucial in that it fosters an understanding not only of the past and present, but also can be applied to critically shaping the future. However, as this curriculum does not directly translate to economic gain, it is currently being defunded in all but the elite private schools.\textsuperscript{37}

\footnotesize


\textsuperscript{35} Although originally directed towards elites, liberal arts education became widespread in twentieth-century United States. Brown sites the postwar period as the high point of mass access to liberal arts education. This seems to contradict the critiques made by dissenting students during that period, which framed the higher education system as a “meat grinder,” producing subjects for technocratic, corporate America. However, as Brown argues, all of these critiques must be understood as signs of the success of the push for mass access to liberal arts learning—the critiques were raised by the civically-engaged subjects that the liberal arts curriculum sought to produce. Brown, \textit{Undoing the Demos}, 180–88. See also Newfield, \textit{Unmaking the Public University}, 24–25.


\textsuperscript{37} Brown, \textit{Undoing the Demos}, 193.
"The Age of $120,000 Art Degrees"38

The pedagogical imperatives of academic capitalism—in conjunction with shifts in funding, labor, and academic culture—have been especially damaging to art schools and departments, reflecting a disjunction between the neoliberal drive to capitalize on education and the intellectual and financial realities of pursuing degrees and careers in the visual arts. At best, art schools and departments teach what Luis Camnitzer calls "art thinking": "a meta-discipline that is there to help expand the limits of other forms of thinking."39 An extreme realization of liberal arts education, ‘art thinking’ is a problematic commodity within academic capitalism because it depends on experiments, research, and dialogues that evade quantification. Today, seven out of ten of the most expensive colleges in the country are art schools, and students in BFA, MFA, and visual art PhD programs face unprecedented amounts of debt.40 While one hundred thousand students with arts-oriented degrees graduate each year, only 10 percent of

38 This title comes from Art Collective BFAMFAPhD, which poses the following question (a play on Walter Benjamin’s "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction," 1936) in its research into the effect of economic precarity on the lives of creative laborers: “What is the work of art in the age of $120,000 art degrees?” BFAMFAPhD, “About,” accessed November 20, 2016, http://v2.bfamfaphd.com/#artists-report-back.

39 According to Camnitzer, ‘art thinking’ “creates itself while it allows the play with taxonomies, the making of illegal and subversive connections, the creation of alternative systems of order, the defiance of known systems, and the critical thinking and feeling of everything. More than any other means of speculation it allows us to travel back and forth seamlessly from our subjective reality to consensus and possible but unreachable wholeness. It allows a mix of the megalomaniacl delirium of unbound imagination with the humbleness of individual irrelevance.” Luis Camnitzer, “Thinking About Art Thinking,” e-flux journal 65 Supercommunity (May–August 2015), accessed November 19, 2016, http://supercommunity.e-flux.com/texts/thinking-about-art-thinking/.

these graduates are likely to make their primary earnings through artistic careers.\textsuperscript{41} This occurs despite a booming art market, which art students immediately strive to enter in order to pay off their loans. The resulting market-driven cycle inhibits ‘art thinking’ and experimentation, engenders debt, and also perpetuates racial inequality.\textsuperscript{42}

The disconnect between art education and academic capitalism frequently results in conflict between administrators who uphold metrics-driven neoliberal policies and faculty and students seeking to defend ‘art thinking.’ A recent clash at the University of Southern California’s Roski School of Art and Design in Los Angeles exemplifies this disjunction.\textsuperscript{43} In 2013, the Roski School appointed a new dean, Erica Muhl, who has no background in studio art, but possesses strong ties to major potential donors. At the time of her appointment, the Visual Arts MFA program was one of a small handful that offered funding and teaching experience to all of its students (in the form of guaranteed teaching assistantships, which provided tuition remission and a small stipend). As described by former Roski School faculty member Charlie White, this funding rendered students “better equipped to establish their own studios, continue their practices, engage the art world, teach, test, take risks, on more stable terms than most of their peers in other programs.”\textsuperscript{44} Muhl’s administration changed the funding

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{42} According to BFAMFAPhD, 81 percent of arts grads are (non-Hispanic) white. In comparison, at the time of the study, 63% of the population of the US is (non-Hispanic) white. BFAMFAPhD, “Artists Report Back: A National Study on the Lives of Arts Graduates and Working Artists,” 9.
\item \textsuperscript{43} This is one of several recent clashes between administrators and art students and faculty. Another significant dispute occurred when the administration imposed tuition at Cooper Union for the Advancement of Science and Art in New York, historically a tuition-free institution. See Steve Kolowich, “Cooper Union’s Leadership Crisis, in 5 Damning Allegations,” \textit{The Chronicle of Higher Education}, September 3, 2015, accessed September 8, 2016, \url{http://chronicle.com/article/Cooper-Union-s-Leadership/232837/}.
\item \textsuperscript{44} However, students still left the program with debt incurred by the costs of housing and food. Charlie
structure of the MFA program so that students had to compete for a reduced number of teaching assistantships. It also altered the faculty structure and curriculum, eliminating typical mainstays of contemporary visual art education, such as studio visits with visiting lecturers.45 These changes created a competitive (rather than collaborative) learning atmosphere and reduced the potential for diverse critical dialogue around students’ work. Faculty and students tried to fight these changes, but the attempts at negotiations stalled. Several faculty members quit after negotiations broke down, and the MFA class of 2016, which had arrived in fall 2014 to find that the administration had reneged on their initial admissions offer, collectively dropped out.46 Notably, the restructuring of the Roski School coincided with the founding of the Jimmy Iovine and Andre Young Academy for Arts, Technology and the Business of Innovation at USC in 2013, also under the jurisdiction of Muhl’s administration. Funded by a $70 million gift from its rap mogul namesakes, the school aims to prepare creatively minded students for careers in industry and business through metrics-driven courses on topics like “Mobile App Development,” “Venture Management,” and “Business and Professional Communication.” This privileging of vocational education over creative experimentation epitomizes shifts occurring across the United States.

While the Roski School, in its pre-Muhl configuration, produced creative, critical thinkers, the Jimmy Iovine and Andre Young Academy prepares student-consumer subjects for the neoliberal marketplace. Brown articulates a trenchant definition of this subject, whom she labels “homo oeconomicus”: an individual “tasked with improving and leveraging its competitive positioning and with enhancing its (monetary and nonmonetary) portfolio value across all of its

---

45 The administration made these changes to the curriculum without faculty input and implemented the changes in the lead up to the Fall 2014 semester.

46 Among the faculty members who quit were artists Frances Stark and A.L. Steiner.

endeavors and venues.” Like the neoliberal state, this subject models herself after a contemporary firm and strives to maximize her value through “practices of entrepreneurialism, self-investment, and/or attracting investors.” She approaches education and knowledge-acquisition as an investment in her economic future, and prioritizes courses that clearly and immediately enhance her value. *Homo oeconomicus* contrasts sharply with her predecessor, the subject of liberal arts education, who is prepared for “both individual sovereignty (choosing and pursuing one’s ends) and participation in collective self-rule.” Comparative literature scholar Bill Readings argues that the liberal arts university also served to produce and protect national culture, thereby binding its subjects to the modern nation-state. Although liberal arts education reflects this nationalist and patriarchal aim, its replacement is far more damaging. The substitution of the political subject for the economic subject signals an abandonment of the belief in the university as a site for critical thinking, civic literacy, national identity, and democratic modes of thought. Brown argues that this abandonment represents a threat to the entire democratic political system: “the survival of democracy depends upon a people educated for it.” In other words, if universities no longer defend and educate for participation in a democracy, the political system will crumble. While Brown describes this as a dangerous “casualty” of neoliberalism, critical pedagogue Henry Giroux charges that the neoliberalization of universities is a coordinated attack on democracy, which colleges and universities had previously represented one of the few cultural apparatuses for maintaining.  

---

48 Ibid., 22.  
49 Ibid., 185.  
51 Brown, *Undoing the Demos*, 200.  
52 Giroux argues that “the right-wing war on critical literacy is part of an ongoing attempt to destroy higher education as a democratic public sphere that enables intellectuals to stand firm, take risks, imagine the otherwise, and push against the grain.” Henry Giroux, *Neoliberalism’s War on Higher Education* (Toronto,
II. The Return of Communication Pedagogy

In a statement outlining their decision to drop out, the Roski School MFA class of 2016 express their withdrawal from the higher education system as a search for “supportive and malleable spaces conducive to criticality and encouragement.” This desire for flexible, supportive, and critical learning has become a pressing goal for frustrated participants and critics of the higher education system. Many have turned to communication technologies as tools for fostering these aims, creating alternative networks that resemble those cultivated by communication pedagogy. In addition to networks, the protagonists of these contemporary initiatives also use facilitation, workshops, and interdisciplinary exchange as a means to actively oppose the neoliberal higher education system by fostering modes of thought and dialogue that it excludes.

Although most of these initiatives take place outside of institutions, some educators are working to bring updated communication pedagogy practices into the academy. An emerging academic discourse promotes the Internet as a vehicle and model for horizontal exchange, student-driven learning, and open public access, which has the potential to counter the neoliberalized higher education industry. Many schools and academic communities have created digital commons, where participants can exchange ideas and share resources.

---

Ontario: Between the Lines, 2014), 19. See also Brown, Undoing the Demos, 175.
Commons often follow implicit ideological missions to reform or work against the growing privatization of the education industry. One such organization, FemTechNet, is a network of feminist scholars, students, and activists which describes itself as follows:

Fueled by our civil rights, anti-racist, queer, decolonizing, trans- feminist pedagogies as we work within the belly of the beast of neoliberal austerity, normalized precarity, neo-colonial techno-missionary evangelism and MOOC fever towards the radical redistribution, reinvention, and repurposing of technological, material, emotional, academic, and monetary resources.55

Students and teachers also use open digital platforms as means to offset the privatization of research. Some academics publish their work online as Open Educational Resources (OERs): documents, books, and other academic media, which are openly licensed so that they can exist in the public domain. Wikipedia has also become a popular teaching and learning tool that functions much like the database imaged by Ant Farm in their “Enviro-Communications” course proposal. For example, Wikipedia-editing (“Wiki-storming”) assignments—in which students edit or add to an existing article or create new articles about underrepresented topics—foster research skills and encourage contribution to a platform that makes knowledge public. These assignments function as alternatives to hermetic research assignments, in which students reproduce knowledge for the sole audience of a teacher.

**Artist-Driven Extra-Institutional Initiatives**

The recent spate of artist-driven extra-institutional initiatives also operate in opposition to neoliberal higher education systems. These initiatives have been contextualized within the “pedagogical turn”—the recent outpouring of art projects that adhere to the methods and forms

---

of education. In the United States, this turn has largely taken the form of semi-institutional initiatives like unaccredited artist-run schools and digital learning networks, many of which use practices and strategies that echo those of communication pedagogy. Although art historians and critics sometimes link these initiatives to the educational experiments of the 1960s and 1970s, there has yet to be an art historical account that teases out the parallels between the two moments. Notably, these parallels signify a return, not an unbroken lineage between then and now. Pedagogical projects by artists have been relatively rare in the interim, and seldom aligned with the practices and aims of communication pedagogy, as demonstrated by the following examples.

Joseph Beuys’s Free International University for Creativity and Interdisciplinary Research (FIU) and related pedagogical projects are frequently cited as a precursor to the pedagogical turn. Beuys’s pedagogical work arose in response to the same international protest wave as my case studies; however, his approach diverges from their communication-centered strategies. He founded the FIU in 1973, after he was expelled from his teaching

---


57 Gregory Sholette describes artist-driven initiatives that take on an institutional form as “mock institutions,” arguing that they mimic liberal institutional structures, which Neoliberal policies have damaged or eradicated, and, at best, intervene in the fields and realms that they mimic. He includes The Public School and BHQFU in his discussion of mockstitutions that take the form of higher education institutions. While Sholette’s framing is useful in its pairing of the damaged liberal institutions and their contemporary doubles, it implies a sense of parody or counterfeit that I believe undermines the sincerity of these contemporary initiatives. See Gregory Sholette, Dark Matter: Art and Politics in the Age of Enterprise Culture (New York: Pluto Press, 2011), 152-185.

58 See Bishop, Artificial Hells, 243–46. In addition to Tim Rollins and K.O.S., discussed below, other precedents include the work of Lygia Clark and Luis Camnitzer.

59 Although the Free International University officially disbanded in 1988, various individuals and collectives have revisited and resurrected it since then.
position at the Düsseldorf Kunstakademie for protesting against restrictions to admissions. Predicated on his belief that “everyone is an artist,” the university had no tuition, open admissions, and an interdisciplinary curriculum. Beuys rejected durational limitations (he would spend up to ten hours per day in the classroom), disciplinary distinctions (he often lectured on social and political topics), and fostered a sense that “Anything goes. Just go for it.” However, in contrast to the artist as facilitator role adopted by the protagonists of communication pedagogy initiatives, Beuys maintained an authoritative pedagogical persona. Although, his performative approach to teaching has been read as a parody of the modernist master professor, Beuys never completely relinquished his authority over his students. His intention thus diverges from that of my protagonists, who sought to undo teacher-student hierarchies.

Pedagogical practices also became a focus for a few of the members of the activist art collectives that emerged in New York City in the late 1970s and early 1980s as a response to the reactionary and inflated art market, the AIDS crisis, gentrification, and other social concerns of the Reagan era. In 1984, Tim Rollins, a founding member of Group Material, initiated a project that echoes aspects of Kaprow’s “Artists in the Schools” proposal. While leading an arts and literacy initiative at an intermediary school in the South Bronx, Rollins started making art with a group of students who called themselves K.O.S. (Kids of Survival). Using a collaborative strategy that combined reading and drawing (often directly on the pages of text), Rollins and K.O.S. produced works of art that were displayed in galleries, museums, and biennials.

---

63 Rollins and K.O.S. participated in the Whitney Museum of American Art’s Biennial (1985, 1991), Documenta in Kassel, Germany (1987), and the Venice Biennale (1988), and had solo shows at the Walker Art Center, Minneapolis (1988) and the Institute of Contemporary Art, Boston (1988), among other
collective is still in existence, and members continue to lead workshops on these techniques. This blurring of distinctions between teaching and art making, as well as the collaborative process, resemble communication pedagogy strategies. However, Rollins and K.O.S. diverge from my case studies in their production of finished art objects for display. Furthermore, both Beuys’s and Rollins’s pedagogical projects were outliers within their artistic milieus, rather than part of an extensive network of educational initiatives.

The re-emergence of the artist-as-facilitator paradigm in the early 1990s represents a more direct precedent for the return of communication pedagogy practices in the following decade. The emergence of a global biennial culture created a demand for what artist Andrea Fraser terms “project work”: projects commissioned by arts organizations for specific situations or sites. Fraser describes the labor required by this type of work as “service provision” and highlights the “unrecognized and uncompensated” processes that it requires. These include “the work of interpreting, the work of presenting, arranging, and installing, the work of educating, and the work of advocating and organizing.” This notion of intangible artistic labor resembles the dematerialized practices of my protagonists. (Indeed, Fraser traces the lineage of “services provision” in art to the late 1960s.) However, while practitioners of communication pedagogy

museums. They were represented by Jay Gorney Modern Art from 1986 to 1991, followed by Mary Boone. Another Group Material member, Doug Ashford, brought some of the collective’s ideas and practices into the classroom when he was invited to teach an undergraduate course at Antioch College in 1997. See Doug Ashford, “The Exhibition as an Artistic Medium,” Art Journal 57, no. 2 (Summer 1998): 28–37.

64 Andrea Fraser, “What’s Intangible, Transitory, Mediating, Participatory, and Rendered in the Public Sphere?,” October 80 (Spring 1997): 115. Drawing upon Fraser’s text, Miwon Kwon terms this the “cultural-artistic service provider.” In addition to Fraser, Kwon also cites Renée Green, Christian Philipp Müller, and Fred Wilson as examples of this artistic role. Miwon Kwon, One Place After Another: Site-Specific Art and Locational Identity (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press: 2004), 4.

65 Fraser, “What’s Intangible, Transitory, Mediating, Participatory, and Rendered in the Public Sphere?,” 112.

66 Ibid., 116.

67 Fraser connects ‘service provision’ to the appropriation of “service occupations” in feminist and performance art, and in institutional critique; the designer and managerial roles assumed by minimalists;
focused on facilitating learning, Fraser frames ‘service provision’ as a self-conscious critique of
the economic and cultural structures that determine the commodity value of artistic labor. 68
Notably, she developed this critical stance at the Whitney Independent Study Program (ISP) in
the 1980s. 69 Founded in 1968, the ISP evolved from a program intended to introduce art and art
history students to contemporary art in New York into an exemplar of the critical theory-centered
educational paradigm that Thierry de Duve calls “attitude-practice-deconstruction.” 70 In the
1980s, the ISP introduced Fraser and her peers to semiotics, poststructuralism, psychoanalysis,
among other critical frameworks. Informed by this discourse, many participants developed a
facilitative practice as a means of critique. These forms of critique contrast with the search for
alternatives that characterizes communication pedagogy initiatives. For instance, Fraser
provided a pseudo-educational service in Museum Highlights: A Gallery Talk (1989), a
performance at the Philadelphia Museum of Art in which she delivered a parodic gallery talk
while assuming the persona of Jane Castleton, a fictional docent. The talk—which included
effusive praise for an exit sign and musings on taste—called attention to the elitist historic
functions of museums, rather than actually educating the audience. Despite these differences,
“service provision” forwarded a notion of artistic labor as a discursive practice that established
an important foundation for artists to once again view teaching as art.

The artist-as-facilitator paradigm is also reflected in the “social turn” that has emerged
since the 1990s, in which artists embrace projects that foreground collaboration and audience

dematerialized conceptual practices and policies created by the Art Workers Coalition; and the “service
functions” embraced by artists with activist and community-based practices. Ibid., 112–13.
68 Ibid., 115.
69 See Howard Singerman, “A History of the Whitney Independent Study Program,” Artforum 42, no. 6
70 Thierry de Duve, “When Form Has Become Attitude – And Beyond,” in The Artist and the Academy:
Issues in Fine Art Education and The Wider Cultural Context, ed. Stephen Foster and Nicholas deVille,
participation.\textsuperscript{71} Often labeled as “social practice” or “participatory art,” such projects range from artist-prepared dinners to temporary community centers to activist political parties.\textsuperscript{72} In creating these participatory projects, artists work with individuals, communities, or local organizations to produce social situations. As described by Claire Bishop, this orchestration process centers around collaboration and facilitation:

\begin{quote}
the artist is conceived less as an individual producer of discrete objects than as a collaborator and producer of situations; the work of art as a finite, portable, commodifiable product is reconceived as an ongoing or long term project with an unclear beginning and end; while the audience, previously conceived as a ‘viewer’ or ‘beholder,’ is now repositioned as a co-producer or participant.\textsuperscript{73}
\end{quote}

Most of the social practice projects in the 1990s focused on facilitating convivial experiences, rather than teaching and learning. However, the current proliferation of educational projects grew out of these practices.\textsuperscript{74} As Bishop argues, the pedagogical turn arose in response to both the neoliberalization of higher education and the “desire to augment the intellectual content of relational conviviality.”\textsuperscript{75} I posit that the widespread availability of digital technology and the need for alternatives to institutionalized art education led to the

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{72} Examples include Rikrit Tiravanija’s untitled solo show at 303 Gallery in New York, during which the artist cooked Thai food for gallery visitors; Thomas Hirschhorn’s \textit{The Gramsci Monument} (2013) a temporary, participatory sculpture that functioned as a community center, radio station, and library in a New York City housing project; and Tania Bruguera’s \textit{Immigrant Movement International} (conceived in 2006, implemented between 2010-2015), an “artist initiated socio-political movement” that operated out of a community space in Queens, New York.
\item \textsuperscript{73} Bishop, \textit{Artificial Hells}, 2.
\item \textsuperscript{74} Social practice became a program of study in United States universities around the same time. California College of the Arts in San Francisco initiated a social practice concentration in 2005, and several other schools soon followed, including Portland State University, Queens College, and Otis College of Art and Design, in Los Angeles.
\item \textsuperscript{75} Bishop, \textit{Artificial Hells}, 241. Bishop cites the effort to reorganize \textit{Manifesta 6} (2006) as an art school as a pivotal moment in this shift.
\end{itemize}
reemergence of communication pedagogy practices within this turn. A brief overview of three emblematic contemporary initiatives—Fritz Haeg’s *Sundown Schoolhouse* (founded in 2006), *The Public School* (founded in 2007), and Bruce High Quality Foundation University (BHQFU, founded in 2009)—reveals several shared practices that parallel those of the Halprins, Ant Farm, and Kaprow: facilitation, workshops, networks for the exchange of information and ideas, and a reliance on communication technology to foster those networks.

Los Angeles-based artist Fritz Haeg (b. 1969) conceived of *Sundown Schoolhouse* (2006 to present) as an “evolving education environment.” It was developed out of *Sundown Salon*, a series of gatherings, happenings, performances, and other events that he had organized in the geodesic dome attached to his home in Glassell Park, Los Angeles between 2000 and 2006. Initially, *Schoolhouse*, which also took place at Haeg’s dome, took the form of a twelve-week program that convened once a week for a day of collective activities including morning yoga, group meals, and seminars led by visiting artists. Titled “tobeapart,” the program investigated collective and individual agency in contemporary society. Seminars included “Moving Vegetation & People, Changing Topography, and Sci-fi Mobilities” led by artist-urbanists Deena Capparelli and Claude Willey, which explored urban infrastructure through a field trip on Los Angeles public transportation and a discussion of mobility issues in sci-fi literature; “Ecstatic Resistance,” a seminar led by artist Emily Roydson on “the limits and uses of pleasure in organizing;” and “Intersubjective Communications: Psychic Journalisms,” an

---

78 The nine *Schoolhouse* participants were artists, many of whom were currently enrolled in or recent graduates of undergraduate or graduate art programs. *Sundown Schoolhouse* should therefore be seen as a supplement to institutionalized higher education, rather than as a replacement. I will return to this issue below.
experimental writing class led by editor Robby Herbst. The structure of the *Sundown Schoolhouse* “sessions” closely resembles that of the Halprin’s workshop, as do the interdisciplinary thrust and facilitative roles that Haeg and the other instructors play. The interdisciplinarity, experiential learning, and critical questioning in these seminars also contrasts sharply with the forms of learning that tend to occur in accredited schools. The *Schoolhouse* website includes an archive of seminar descriptions alongside comments and reflections from the participants, demonstrating Haeg’s openness to student feedback and commitment to sharing the knowledge built during the session. Following the 2006 iteration, *Schoolhouse* became itinerant—Haeg staged similar workshops and seminars at museums and other art institutions around the United States and Europe. Seeking to foster dialogue, community, and learning in a city with a diffuse art scene, other Los Angeles-based artists and groups have created initiatives similar to *Schoolhouse*, bringing together small cohorts of self-selecting participants for workshops, reading groups, and seminars. The drive for community, which is central to many of these Los Angeles initiatives, reflects a desire to preserve or recreate the sense of collectivity that many of the founders (and participants) experienced in art school.


80 These initiatives include The Mountain School of Arts, a weekly conversation group that meets in a bar, founded in 2005 by artists Piero Golia and Eric Wesley; and Machine Project, a non-profit storefront that houses workshops and events, which was started by artist Mark Allen in 2004.
Dockray (b. 1977) in 2007, *The Public School* is a web platform that functions as a framework for “autodidact activities.” As artist and writer Gregory Sholette points out, the platform’s name “calls the bluff” of the public school system. Unlike public schools, the platform adheres to an open and democratic structure: it invites anyone to post a proposal for a topic or question that they would like to learn more about (after first registering as a user). If enough local participants show interest in the proposal, an organizing committee establishes it as a class and schedules one or multiple meetings. The meetings are open to the public and take place in a variety of locations. Past classes range from a reading group on the early work of philosopher Giorgio Agamben to a workshop on “Open Hardware for Artists.” Many are free; some ask participants to pay a small fee for supplies or to hire an instructor. The organizing committee serves as a means to minimize administrative chaos but also to introduce variety. In order to prevent a singular curricular vision, the members of the committee rotate every three months, writing a new statement of priorities and goals upon each rotation.

---

83 The Public School, “The Public School,” last modified July 13, 2015, accessed September 8, 2016, http://thepublicschool.org/about-2. Dockray describes his own role as akin to a facilitator or gardener, who helps to generate and “lubricate” a project. But he also highlights the importance of ultimately being able to walk away from the project so that it can continue to grow (or end) without his influence. Sean Dockray, “Interview with Sean Dockray/The Public School,” David Elliot, accessed October 26, 2016, http://hadto.net/writing/public-school-interview/.
84 Sholette, *Dark Matter*, 182.
85 The former was a five-session class organized in the Bay Area in 2014. The latter example was a two session class organized in New York in 2012.
86 Founder Sean Dockray describes the committee as “more or less open to the public.” However, the committee chooses the new members, so the process is not entirely democratic and the committee risks replicating itself. According to Dockray, “The school has been influenced by Chantal Mouffe’s idea of democracy, of cultivating agonism in public space. If consensus-based democracy is a problem because it necessarily evicts alternative hegemonic views, the idea instead is to encourage people to propose their alternative hegemonies so they have a chance to replace the old one. The Public School is an attempt to try to perform some of these things that Mouffe is talking about. The public school as a public space; it’s trying to maintain a situation where there can be competing agendas and new ideas for what the school
meetings often generate new proposals, creating a cycle of inquiry (figure 5.1). Since the platform’s founding, new chapters have formed in cities around the world and participants from geographically-distant chapters are invited to implement proposals generated elsewhere.\textsuperscript{87} The Public School thus enacts aspects of Ant Farm’s proposals for pedagogical networks using contemporary communication technologies. While the former uses an online platform to organize participants into in-person meetings, other contemporary initiatives exist solely online, such as the TEACHABLE FILE (tTF), a user-generated online database for resources on alternative art schools and experimental pedagogies.\textsuperscript{88} In creating spaces for free exchange of ideas and information, as well as user-generated learning, these initiatives explicitly seek to counteract the restrictions to access imposed by academic capitalism.

Finally, the Bruce High Quality Foundation University (BHQFU), launched by New York-based collective Bruce High Quality Foundation (BHOF) in 2009, describes itself as “New York’s freest art school.”\textsuperscript{89} The emphasis on the financial burden of art school reflects both the educational backgrounds of BHOF’s founders (who studied at Cooper Union, which was tuition free until 2013) and the influence of the Occupy Wall Street movement. The latter served as a catalyst for many New York-based artist-driven educational initiatives seeking to ameliorate the
economic precarity of artistic labor. Based in Brooklyn, New York, BHQFU offers tuition-free critiques and seminars that operate on a loose semester schedule, as well as public talks, exhibitions, and a studio residency program. The “university” was informed in part by a cross-country road trip that resembles Ant Farm’s Truckstop tour: BHQF’s Teach 4 Amerika tour (2011) sought to engage in dialogue about the future of art schools. Travelling in a limousine painted to look like a school bus, the collective initiated conversations and rallies at art departments, art schools, and alternative spaces. BHQF documented Teach 4 Amerika on a blog that includes video footage of the stops and written entries, both of which highlight the widespread concern over the lack of funding for experimental arts education. BHQFU’s mission statement echoes this anxiety: “when artists have to take on debt so that they might spend time learning from each other, conversations about art are overwhelmed by conversations about art careers.” Instead, BHQFU provides a space for artists to converge and enter into dialogue around diverse areas of inquiry. Taught primarily by artists and critics, BHQFU’s offerings have included a seminar on “Sculpture and Intimacy,” a sex-ed clinic, a course exploring interconnections between poetry and digital media, and a painting critique called “The Good the Bad and the Ugly.” Like The Public School, many of the classes are structured as seminars with reading lists to guide class discussions. Although classes

---

90 These include the previously mentioned BFAMFAPhD and Trade School, among many others.  
91 There is no indication that BHQF knew about Ant Farm’s Truckstop Network. Teach 4 Amerika was sponsored by Creative Time.  
94 These courses are all taken from the two Fall 2015 sessions. Bruce High Quality Foundation University, “Classes,” accessed September 8, 2016, http://bhqfu.org/classes.php. Participants register for classes on the BHQFU website.
occasionally take a lecture format, they typically have a horizontal structure in which both participants and instructors enter equally into dialogue. BHQFU’s range of disciplinary and interdisciplinary offerings, and privileging of dehierarchized dialogue parallels CalArts’ initial aim to provide an alternative education for and by artists. Of course, BHQFU is much smaller, and unlike CalArts, neither it nor the other aforementioned initiatives are accredited. As unaccredited institutions, these initiatives can remain flexible and unburdened by a cumbersome administration. By modeling an alternative structure for an art school that is driven by curiosity rather than careerism, they also fight against the trend exemplified by USC.

_Sundown Schoolhouse, The Public School,_ and BHQFU demonstrate the prevalence of updated forms of circa-1970 communication pedagogy practices within contemporary initiatives. Fritz Haeg, Sean Dockray, and BHQFU conceptualize themselves and their instructors as facilitators of learning, rather than as administrators or teachers. As facilitators, they strive to create structured, but horizontal learning experiences that resemble the formats of the workshops offered by the Halprins and Ant Farm. Indeed, workshops are so popular among the participants in these and other initiatives that Mark Allen, who founded Machine Project in Los Angeles, has even offered a “Workshop on Workshops” that shared strategies for designing effective workshops. The creation of learning and exchange networks is also central to these initiatives. Web-based platforms give these initiatives the potential to reach and include learners of all ages and backgrounds, thereby building networks that cross geographic, generational, and class-based divisions. Although these contemporary initiatives rely on online platforms to gather participants and promote programs, most of the resulting learning actually occurs in small, in-person groups, much like the workshops and classes led by my protagonists. Notably, however,  

\[95\] Instead, the members of the BHFQU administration are practicing artists who also teach occasional classes.  
\[96\] This was held at the James Gallery at the Graduate Center, City University of New York in April 2014.
many contemporary initiatives offer classes on a much broader range of topics than my protagonists—sex-ed, philosophy, sci-fi literature, and open computer hardware, to name just a few. These diverse offerings mirror the range of subjects and modes of critical inquiry fostered by the liberal arts tradition, as does the privileging of a dialogic format.

However, several questions remain about the efficacy of these contemporary initiatives. Although they aim to open barriers to access by providing free or low-cost learning experiences with no admissions requirements, the majority of participants already have some higher education and many have already received degrees from art schools or liberal arts colleges. Therefore, most of these initiatives operate as supplements to institutionalized higher education, rather than as replacements. The myriad course or workshop offerings that focus on obscure or theoretically advanced topics reinforce this tendency. As unaccredited institutions, these initiatives also do not confer any official status—participants may gain a broader network and accrue knowledge, but these benefits do not enable them to teach college-level courses or fulfil other typical employment prerequisites. What type of subjects, then, do these initiatives aim to engender?

Pedagogical Subjects

In his 1969 curriculum vitae, with which this dissertation began, Ant Farm member Chip Lord coined a term that aptly describes the subject of communication pedagogy circa 1970: “communicationist.” For Lord and his peers, to be a communicationist meant to be a collaborator who brings people together across disciplinary lines and a facilitator who prioritized information exchange over the production of objects or buildings. Inspired in part by Lord’s

---

97 A few contemporary initiatives do, however, offer certificates.
participation in the 1968 Halprin workshop, this role aligned with the “new profession” of the facilitator that Jim Burns and Lawrence Halprin promote in *Taking Part: A Workshop Approach to Collective Creativity* (1974) as well as the “un-artist”—who applies creative approaches to non-art professions—that Allan Kaprow called for in his essays of 1971 and 1972. Influenced by cybernetic theory and new communication technologies, communicationists saw themselves as actors within cybernetic systems. They viewed the cultivation of more efficient, horizontal communication as means to break down the hierarchical bureaucracies and specialized workforces that marked postwar society. They applied this rationality not only to artistic labor (including teaching, which they viewed as inseparable from their art), but also to social interactions, and lifestyle. However, in conceptualizing themselves as cybernetic subjects, communicationists prioritized experimentation and exchange over sustained institutional intervention and reform. Furthermore, as privileged, white members of the middle class, most of the protagonists of communication pedagogy believed that more efficient communication—regardless of content, diversity of participants, and level of direct political engagement—would engender social, political, and economic equity.

This focus on process over reform and content enabled the easy incorporation of communicationist practices—including flexibility, project-based employment, fluid divisions between leisure and labor—by corporate firms following the strikes of the 1970s. Yet the ‘new spirit of capitalism’ has engendered a higher education system whose market-driven subject has

---


100 This tendency was compounded by the government’s violent repression of protests and other forms of dissent in the late 1960s. Although Kaprow spent several years pushing for the latter at CalArts, he ultimately grew frustrated and left.
little in common with the communicationist. While some of *homo oeconomicus*’s practices may resemble those of her predecessor (such as an embrace of network-based forms of exchange and communication technologies), her sole purpose in adopting these is to enhance her value as human capital. Rather than utilize social networks as modes to exchange information—as imagined by Ant Farm’s *Truckstop Network*, for instance—*homo oeconomicus* uses social networks as means to gain connections and rankings in the form of “followers” and “likes,” the better to build her personal brand and attract future investors.101

Many of the protagonists of contemporary initiatives fight this situation by employing facilitation, workshops, networks, and other communication pedagogy practices to cultivate dialogue, critical analysis, and art thinking. These are conceived as strategies to counter the privatization of information, the foreclosure of critical thought and the market-driven rationality that characterizes neoliberal economics. In contrast to their predecessors, they utilize communication pedagogy as a means to continue the project of the liberal arts, rather than viewing teaching communication as an end in and of itself. The subjects of these initiatives therefore might be called “tactical learners” as they approach their education as a tactical effort against neoliberalization.102 Tactical learners (and the initiatives that shaped them) thus represent what Tim Ivison and Tom Vandeputte describe as “practical, even necessary steps towards post-neoliberal learning”—in other words, they are potent potential models for the future of higher education.103 However, the relationship between these initiatives and institutions of higher education remains murky. While some of the teachers work in both realms, using their

---

101 The latter actions are described by Brown, *Undoing the Demos*, 33-34.
time in unaccredited institutions to practice experimental pedagogies that they then bring into
schools, others eschew work in higher education. The latter scenario raises a larger question:
do these initiatives serve as promising alternative models to the higher education system, or,
are they, as artist and educator Michael Mandiberg asks, “complicit in a neoliberal agenda of
dismantling the social functions of society, especially including the state university?”

The history of communication pedagogy teaches us that the major shifts in higher
education from the second half of the twentieth century to the present—the massive expansion
of colleges and universities in the postwar period and the privatization that followed—resulted
from actions taken by federal and state government. I write this conclusion in the aftermath of
the 2016 presidential election, when the founder of the now-defunct, fraudulent, for-profit Trump
University, defeated Hillary Clinton, whose higher education plan called for tuition-free access to
state colleges and universities for low- to middle-income families. Trump’s Secretary of
Education, Betsy DeVos, has investments in for-profit education and is expected to reverse
rules and restrictions that regulate for-profit colleges and universities. These results suggest a
bleak near future for federal reforms to the higher education system. They also render the work
of tactical learners even more crucial.

In response to this election, and the “post-truth” media that played an instrumental role in
its outcome, critical thought, visual and media literacy, experiential learning, humanities
subjects, speculative inquiry, and other modes of ‘art thinking’ are more essential than ever.
Tactical learners need to continue to harness communication technologies and networks to

---

forward these teaching and learning practices, both within and outside of institutions. Communicationists like Ant Farm and faculty at CalArts turned away from institutions when they could not convince administrations to support communication pedagogy practices. By contrast, tactical learners need to continue and intensify their struggle to bring experimental pedagogy into institutions, even if they are only making change at the level of their individual classrooms. As Cathy Davidson argues, while institutional reform is a massive and incremental process, educators can incorporate dialogic and collaborative pedagogical practices immediately—and even those required to teach standardized curriculum can implement brief, student-centered activities that foster dialogue and critical reflection. At the same time, artist-driven extra-institutional initiatives could be strengthened by broadening their accessibility, and working to attract and serve learners of all backgrounds, including students in the K-12 public education system, whose already meager access to art education is at risk of total eradication. In pursuing these goals, tactical learners need to band together, sharing resources, strategies, and support. Operating simultaneously as oppositional forces and as future models, their initiatives might continue to shape a more democratically-engaged citizenry, with the hope that this citizenry will in turn shape the institutionalized education systems of the future.

Appendix I

Charles L Lord Jr cont.

Production of a 20 minute program for WNET-TV Behind the Lines: Rolling Stone Magazine February 1973

Production of ADLAND, a 60 min. program about the advertising business and its personalities, to be distributed nationally on the Public Broadcasting System November 1973

Lectures and Workshops
University of Colorado School of Architecture
University of Tennessee School of Architecture
Pratt Institute School of Architecture
Goddard College
Yale University College of Architecture
Rice University College of Architecture (Workshop: Convention City)
Case Western Reserve School of Architecture
San Francisco Art Institute
Knox College
University of Minnesota College of Architecture
UCLA College of Architecture
Calif Institute of the Arts (Truckstop Workshop)
University of Kansas School of Architecture
North Dakota State University Department of Architecture
University of Arkansas Department of Architecture

Articles and Published work
Progressive Architecture October 1968 Interiors
Domus December 1968 Cover
Architectural Design May 1969
Architectural Design October 1969 Cosmorama
Whole Earth Catalog July 1969
Rolling Stone December 13 1969 page 36
Progressive Architecture July 1970 Structuring Architectural Alternatives page 86
The Nation November 1970 Work Communes
Whole Earth Catalog January 1971 Production in the Desert Design Quarterly 78/79 Conceptual Architecture
Newweek April 19 1971 Art page 88
Radical Software Summer 1971 Cover
Print December 1972 page 28
Saturday Review January 1973 Science page 25
Progressive Architecture January 1973 page 95
Casabella 376/1973 page 27
Domus Maggio 1973 House of the Century page 28
Progressive Architecture June 1973 House of the Century pg 26
Playboy December 1973 Texas Time Machine page 221
PERSONAL DATA

Name: Thomas L. Lord Jr.
Address: 217 Gate 5 Rd., Sausalito, Calif. 94965
Phone: 415 333-8055

CURRENT ACTIVITY

President of ART PACE, an extended family of events/organizations involved in the areas of interactive art, emerging technologies, and art/technology. ART PACE's current project, "Environments" an exhibit on "Environmental Art" at the 7th Annual Art Festival. The exhibition was sponsored by B.A.T. (415) 333-8055

ENVIRONMENTAL ART EXHIBITION

- The Environment for a Living Exhibit by Bob's Shaw, sponsored by Earth People, Inc., April 12, 1979
- The Art Pace Foundation's development of several environmental projects for creating "Eco-museums" for educational purposes.

ENVIROMENTAL ART EXHIBITION

- The development of multi-dimensional environments to be shown at the Art Pace Foundation, to activate interaction within and without.

MEDIA COVERAGE AND PUBLISHED WORK

- Diverse Feb., 1979, containing information about the School of Architecture, Tufts University, 1967 - author
- Progressive Architecture, October 1964 - co-author
- Architectural Design, June 1968 - extensive conference
- The Earth Catalog, MIT 69-summer annual
- Architectural Design, Dec. 69 - "The Electronic City"
- Rolling Stone, Dec. 69 - "Art Pace"
- The Earth Catalog, 1970 - "Earth Catalog"
- Architectural Design, April 1970

TEACHING AND LECTURE

- Visiting Critic, University of Houston, College of Architecture, Feb. 1967 - Aug. 1969
- Lectures: Duke University, May 1968
- University of San Francisco, Dec. 69
- San Francisco Art Institute, December 1968
- University of Texas at Austin, December 69
- C.T.S.C. at Jonya, March 1964

MARCH 1969

- Bachelor of Architecture, Tufts University, New Orleans, La.
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PUBLICITY

CREWS MAKING STRUCTURES OF 2X4'S AMONG THE ROCKS

ROVING BAND OF 4 VIDEO CAMERAMEN

WORK CREWS WAVING FROM THE PEAKS CALLING THRU BULLHORNS FOR THE VIDEO PEOPLE--WANTING THEM TO SEE AND RECORD

VIDEO PEOPLE TRYING TO COVER EVERYTHING--ACTION, OOH'S, WOO'S, AHS, SMALL TALK--ALL ON TAPE

PLAYBACKS OF EVERYONE'S WORK AT EACH SITE--CAUSING MAYBE NEW IDEAS, CHANGES, RECONSTRUCTIONS--MORE RECORDINGS

CALLS AGAIN AND AGAIN ON BULLHORNS, VIDEO PEOPLE MOVING FAST, MAYBE WORK CREWS START EXCHANGING, MAYBE STRUCTURES START COMBINING

GOING ON TILL SUNDOWN OR TILL EVERYONE'S TIRED

(AT VASQUEZ ROCKS, CALIF. 10/6/70)

Figure 4.1
Allan Kaprow, Publicity Score, 1970. Allan Kaprow Papers, series III, box 18, folder 8, Getty Research Institute, Los Angeles, CA. Photograph by author.
Figure 4.2
Figure 4.3
Figure 4.4
Figure 4.5
Untitled Student Work from Kaprow's Happening Class, c. 1971. Allan Kaprow Papers, series VI.B, box 57, folder 9, Getty Research Institute, Los Angeles, CA. Photograph by author.

Figure 4.6
Unidentified student, Crawl Space, 1971. Allan Kaprow Papers, series VI.B, box 57, folder 9, Getty Research Institute, Los Angeles, CA. Photograph by author.
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Figure 5.1