

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Studies in Art Education
A Journal of Issues and Research

ISSN: (Print) (Online) Journal homepage: www.tandfonline.com/journals/usae20

Re-framing the Past: Framing as a Stance in the Writing of History

Ami Kantawala

To cite this article: Ami Kantawala (2020) Re-framing the Past: **Framing as a Stance in the Writing of History**, Studies in Art Education, 61:3, 254-266, DOI: 10.1080/00393541.2020.1778438

To link to this article: https://doi.org/10.1080/00393541.2020.1778438

Published online: 17 Sep 2020.

Submit your article to this journal

Article views: 403

View related articles

View Crossmark data

Full Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at
https://www.tandfonline.com/action/journalInformation?journalCode=usae20

© 2020 National Art Education Association
Studies in Art Education: A Journal of Issues and Research
2020, *61*(3), 254–266
DOI: https://doi.org/10.1080/00393541.2020.1778438

Check for updates

"Framing… opens up rather than mutes the possibility of interpretation."

Re-framing the Past: Framing as a Stance in the Writing of History

AMI KANTAWALA
Teachers College, Columbia University

This article brings the work of cultural theorist Mieke Bal and historian Hayden White into a conversation, inviting the reader to consider framing, re-framing, and un-framing as historiographical dispositions. The concept of framing was used as a substitute for context in cultural analysis. The article argues that the concept of framing could be adopted as a stance or could become one's critical disposition in history writing, often coexisting, overlapping, and inseparable from context and contextualization. Time and chronology aren't necessarily the only organizing principles in history. This is where context and contextualization come together in history writing and are inherently present within framing. History is never really free from context, but the concept of framing presents an opportunity to identify and enact the frames, putting the frames themselves to work. In framing differently, other contexts might emerge. The delicate balance between framing and context will continue to remain entangled in history writing, disrupting the way history tends to be written, and thus presenting an opportunity to really get beneath it, opening our own door to imagination.

Correspondence regarding this article may be sent to the author at ak974@tc.columbia.edu.

frame (n): something composed of parts fitted together and joined; a structure composed of constructional members (e.g., girders and beams) that gives shape or strength (e.g., to a building); an open space or structure made for admitting, enclosing, or supporting something; a limiting, typical, or appropriate set of circumstances; an event that forms the background for the action of a novel or play; (infl) a frame-up. (Bal, 2002, Ch. 4, para. 1)

Framing: A Concept

The definitions of *framing* in Mieke Bal's (2002) text, *Traveling Concepts in the Humanities: A Rough Guide* resonated with me in the context of doing historical research within the field of art education. The use of narrative and storytelling in the writing of history fits into these definitions quite eloquently. The concept of framing, according to Bal (2002), was used as a substitute for context in cultural analysis. The concept of framing could be adopted as a stance or could become one's critical disposition in history writing, often coexisting, overlapping, and inseparable from context and contextualization. In other words, framing, context, and contextualization are inherently present within one another for a historian who often strives to balance these subtle nuances in history writing.

Bal (2002) amplified the concept of framing as an act that "produces an event" (Ch. 4, para. 8). Karen Hamblen (1985) has defined an event as an occurrence in which a person or persons convene in a physical entity or a place of any size, which includes speeches, publications, seminars, or the presentation of works. Pushing forward the notion of an event as a moment of knowledge creation opens up spaces for new ways of constructing and expressing ideas, occurrences, undertakings, and actions (Sinner, 2014). History opens up the possibility for researchers to bring forward stories and events from the past, carving out new spaces to include in the historical record the experiences and perspectives of individuals who might otherwise linger in the shadows of more prominent figures or become veiled from sight and scrutiny (Bolin & Kantawala, 2017). In this sense, an effective historian, besides documenting what happened, is framing, reframing, and un-framing the past using interpretation, imagination, and objectivity while working with historical data; making the writing of history a creative practice—often unfinished like a work of art, crafting the narrative based on what might be available or accessible.[1]

Juxtaposing historians with artists, the late Hayden White (1973), in his text *Metahistory*, challenged a traditional historian to think of history as an art and approach historical research with aesthetic and moral purpose, thus questioning the accuracy of scientific history (Dean, 2019). Arguing for a literary turn in

history writing, and developing distinct events into narratives with plot structures—referred to as *emplotment*—White (1973) developed a concept of "true" historical accounts whose meanings were bigger than the sum of their parts (Dean, 2019, p. 1339). With a sharp focus on how a historian tells stories and a deep linguistic structure of historiography, White (1973) recommended using modes of emplotment that employ explanatory paradigms, moral and ideological values, and figures of speech or tropes, stretching the historian's imagination.

Thus, in this article, I focus specifically on bringing the work of Mieke Bal and Hayden White into a conversation, inviting the reader to consider framing, re-framing, and un-framing as historiographical dispositions. I begin with an overview of Bal's concept of framing and White's linguistic turn in history writing using emplotment, followed by a critical reflection on what Bal's concept of framing offers that White's does not and vice versa. In the final section of the article, I offer a conceptual analysis of framing, re-framing, and un-framing as dispositions in my work. Finally, in bringing the article to a close, I hope to lure the reader to further consider their own dispositions of framing, re-framing, and un-framing in their own reading and writing of the past.

Mieke Bal on Framing as a Concept

The concept of context, according to Bal (2002), has been replaced by framing, and she articulates this through three specific arguments, which are threaded throughout this article. In her first argument pertaining to context as nonconceptual data, she argues for contextualizing in the interpretation of cultural artifacts to uncover their meaning. While the intention of contextutalizing might be interpretation, contextualizing often gets muddled with explaining, losing its grounding (Bal, 2002). Bal's (2002) second argument relates to framing and language. Context, says Bal, is a passive noun housing reliable data once the validity of the data's sources is confirmed. For researchers and historians, there is always going to be some form of historical data they may have access to—from archives, oral histories, memories, etc. Often, a historians' need to interpret is acknowledged but easily overlooked. Bal (2002) argued that the act of framing produces an event, and the verb form of framing (indicating an activity) is as important as its noun form (indicating the product). The act of framing is performed by an agent who is accountable for their acts, and in the case of historical research, this agent actor is the historian. Her final argument continues to analyze the verb form of framing, pointing to process, which requires time and fills time, resulting in change and differences over time. It is here where the acts of interpretation and analysis ground a historian (Bal, 2002).

While Bal's (2002) use of framing in relation to cultural analysis and history may seem entangled, there is merit to this approach for historical work. She stated, "the historical is the stuff of the past which by being remembered in the present, desists from being in the present: it is what cannot be reconstituted in the present" (p. 153). This is where she argued that the frame links the present to the past by squarely separating and ratifying that separation and thereby infusing subjects in the present with the temporal density that history offers, making framing a practical concept. Inviting the historian to consider a reversed perspective where one begins with and in the present, Bal (2002) encouraged the historian to consider her traveling concept of framing to remedy the static concept of context. For a historian, context surrounds a set of circumstances in which an event may have occurred; when considered, context allows for a more nuanced interpretation and analysis of the past. Using Bal's concept of framing, historical contexts themselves can be seen as frames through which one can interpret and analyze the past, giving meaning to less prominent

details and buried frames that might be present between and behind the predominant contextual frames.

Hayden White on History Writing

Muddled together like ocean waves, history and literature are entwined together. Despite the times when one thinks they might be seen as separate entities, a gigantic wave comes forth, blurring those edges yet again. Given that literature is written in a particular moment in time, one could easily say that it becomes a work of the past. Therefore, literature itself becomes a pinpoint in history. Turning assemblage of events into plots using four rhetorical tropes (metaphor, metonymy, synecdoche, and irony), and four genres (romance, tragedy, comedy, and satire), White (1973) called attention to historical accounts as specific kinds of stories. Combining these tropes, which I argue can be frames themselves in various ways, each writer selects these frames, together or independently, by juxtaposing them to frame, re-frame, and un-frame their stories.

A historian typically frames chronological data, for example, to craft a historical narrative, which is presented as having a beginning, middle, and end. However, White (1973) suggested that the aim of the historian is to explain the past by finding or uncovering stories that lie buried in the chronological accounts—the difference between history and fiction being that historians *find* their stories while the fiction writer *invents* them. This conception of a historian's task, however, obscures the extent to which imagination, innovation, and interpretation play a part in how historical data might be framed. In other words, the same event can be framed in a variety of ways within a wide range of historical stories, depending on the role it is assigned in the specifically characterized narrative set to which it might belong. For example, the death of a king may be framed as a beginning, an ending, or simply a transitional event in three different stories (White, 1973, p. 7). Put another way, through framing, re-framing, or un-framing, historians can open up the possibility for their readers to reinterpret or reimagine the chronological beginning, middle, and end in historical moments and events.

Bal and White: Interconnected Concepts of Imagination and Framing

In an interview with Jacob Lund in 2011, Mieke Bal reminisced about the time in 1973 when White published his text on metahistory. Sharing her excitement about the actualization of White's work, Bal recognized, "The key that opened all doors was the word imagination" (p. 75). White's influence seems to be evident in Bal's work when she imagines her text on traveling concepts as a rough travel guide, presenting readers with an opportunity to work through their own methodological toolbox. White's work can be seen as more definitive in terms of how one might explore imagination in historical research using literary connections, whereas Bal's work challenges historians to consider a concept-based methodology. One could see White's (1973) notion of imagination itself as using Bal's rough travel guide metaphor. Carrying out a lively and meaningful framing, re-framing, or un-framing using framing as a disposition, study of the past calls for a profound sense of the imagination (Bolin, 2009; Tervo, 2018), which strengthens the narrative and the frame in itself.

Bal (2002) invited the reader to think about concepts as being dynamic rather than static. However, one does not encounter this in White's work, which primarily tends to operate in combinations of fours—four tropes, four modes of emplotment, four ideological positions—and White sometimes employs a vague characterization of irony (Dean, 2019). In defining concepts provisionally and partially, one gains an insight into what they might do. It is in this grouping that the valuable work lies, according to Bal (2002). Like gardening tools, concepts end up bearing the scratches and stains of use without the wear and tear. Put another way, concepts do

not become dull; rather, they replenish their energy continually to stretch their analytical reach when used (Rigney, 2010). Thus, I see the use of imagination, framing, re-framing, and un-framing as dispositions that shape my scholarly work, and through which I appreciate White's argument that historians are fundamentally artists who imbue historical action with aesthetic and ethical purpose (Dean, 2019).

Bal (2002) broadened the concept of framing as an act that produces an event. White (1973) argued that an event in itself was raw material until a historian turned the event into a story using emplotment, which in turn gave the event its true meaning. I find these two perspectives intricately linked in history writing, where the concept of frame (noun) and framing (verb) come together. Referring back to the definitions of *frame* at the beginning of this article, I argue that using the various modes of emplotment as frames creates a condition for the narrative to be composed of parts fitted together and joining; and Bal (2002) argued that framing with a structure composed of constructional members gives the frame shape and strength. In addition, F. Graeme Chalmers (1993) specifically articulated framing as a metaphor in history writing and argued that to frame is to gain ground, make progress, give shape to, put together, compose, form, or articulate—all of which are moves that go beyond simply documenting a historical moment and making framing what Bal (2002) called a *workable concept*.

While both Bal (2002) and White (1973) presented opportunities to engage with historical imagination and concepts, Ann Rigney (2010) argued that these discourses, despite their detached and changeless characteristics, are seldom tarnished by one's discipline, which might be in itself emergent rather than stable. Rigney, in pushing this analysis further, asks readers to consider cultural context as a factor in constructing narratives. In considering the writing of history, methods and mechanisms may have remained the same over time, but how a historian tells stories has evolved significantly, thereby offering alternative ways to consider history writing. In this vein, I argue that both Bal and White have some blind spots, but when seen together, their ideas of historical imagination and concepts are closely intertwined, giving the reader an opportunity to deconstruct and engage in a deeper inquiry by extending their work and stretching the reader's own imagination. In considering how framing as a concept has guided my work, I share three examples of using a variation of framing that I call *re-framing* and how the work of White and Bal gives more meaning to my own research and teaching.

Art Education in Colonial India: Implementation and Imposition

In my 2012 *Studies in Art Education* article, "Art Education in Colonial India: Implementation and Imposition," I attempted to *re-frame* the past of art education in colonial India within the broader context of art education histories. At the time I wrote the 2012 article, I was not familiar with Bal's work. Almost a decade later, when I revisited my work through the lens of Bal and White, the concept of framing, re-framing, and un-framing, as well as White's modes of emplotment, became evident, highlighting the stories within stories.

While much work has been done on Indian art history, not much has been written in the context of Indian art education. My article raised questions about the teaching of drawing and negotiation of teaching practices in between the cultures of the colonizer and the colonized while analyzing the similarities and differences between the art education practices of England and India from the mid-19th to the early 20th century. The study offered a powerful reference point from which present-day practices for the teaching of drawing and issues of culturally embedded pedagogy in art schools in India could be examined. It was a historical, theoretical, and comparative analysis,

providing an opportunity to examine Indian art education from the position of both the colonizer and the colonized. I argue these histories are intertwined rather than accepting the idea that the colonizer alone shaped Indian colonial history. I see the intertwined colonizer–colonized relationship as a frame in itself, and my 2012 article reframes this frame by producing yet another event of art education in colonial India, allowing the reader and researcher to uncover the tensions that otherwise would not be visible.

Furthermore, in my 2012 article, I illustrated the crucial role that formerly ignored histories of art education play in shaping all art education histories. What implications does this kind of study hold for the writers of education histories in general, and of art education histories more specifically, which have mostly excluded Southeast Asia? Can the recovery of ignored histories of art education play a significant role in the making and writing of South Asian history and other international histories? As I reengage in these questions almost a decade later, they present an opportunity to un-frame and re-frame, as well as interpret and analyze other events. Bal (2002) mentioned framing as a verb that indicates movement from point to point in a process. Un-framing and re-framing the frame allows a disruption of these narratives and offers fresh and promising avenues and perspectives.

When I engaged in this deeper comparative analysis to understand the dynamic of colonial art education in India and England in the postcolonial present, the purpose of the art schools in India became exceedingly clear. The South Kensington system and its pedigrees tended to be associated with art education for social control, with instruction in the arts serving the economic needs of the colonizer. And it can be argued that art education contributed to cultural imperialism by teaching young people in colonial societies that their traditional arts were not as highly ranked in an aesthetic hierarchy as were European arts, nor were their artistic tastes as finely cultivated as those of European experts (Stankiewicz, 2007). The early schools in India operated largely as vehicles for a kind of cultural imperialism in which curiously misplaced models of Western academic art were imposed on Indian students to the detriment of any training in native techniques (Tarapor, 1980).[2] Given this, drawing instruction in the art schools in India revolved around precision and accuracy so that techniques could be transferred to supposedly improve Indian crafts. I see this as a classic example of a satirical frame using White's (1973) mode of emplotment, where a European drawing master, trained in England and therefore naïve in the knowledge of Indian indigenous arts and crafts or culture, could be thought competent to effectively teach the application of Western methods to Indian traditions. To understand the plot of colonial education, it is necessary to recognize that art schools established in the colonies reflected the power and educational needs of the colonizers, and the education offered was significantly different in the colony in comparison to the Empire.

When viewed from the multiple perspectives of researcher, historian, and art educator in the postcolonial present, the pedagogical practices that unfolded in the educational system in the British Empire and the Indian colony were necessarily influenced by the cultural vein of the time. In that context, the European was generally prized over the Indian, and when seen through the frames of satire, irony, and comedy, as suggested by White (1973), it became evident that the original plot of introducing the teaching of drawing in Indian art schools—that of reviving moribund Indian crafts—was swiftly set aside, making the art schools repositories of British art. This raised the question: Whose interests did the art schools really serve (Kantawala, 2012)?

Revitalizing History: Recognizing the Struggles, Lives, and Achievements of African American and Women Art Educators

During the 1980s and 1990s, a series of three conferences directed toward historical topics and issues in art education attracted many art educators to the Pennsylvania State University. In the 2 decades since the last of these conferences, only a few visual art educators have made historical research their primary focus. The last History of Art Education conference took place at the Pennsylvania State University in 1995, following two similar-themed conferences in 1985 and 1989. No other conferences have occurred on history or historical research within art education since then, nationally or internationally. These conferences can be seen as frames and within these frames; there were expansive gaps in continuing historical conversations, thus exposing a need to reframe historical research within the field. Building on Bal's (2002) notion of framing, one could consider the coming together of history of art education scholars at the Brushes With History: Imagination and Innovation in Art Education History (BWH), a conference held in November 2015 at Teachers College, Columbia University, as an event that resulted from the act of re-framing past conferences. One result of this re-framing was *Revitalizing History: Recognizing the Struggles, Lives, and Achievements of African American and Women Art Educators* (2017), a book that Paul Bolin and I edited, based on some of the papers presented at the BWH conference.[3]

The chapters in Bolin and Kantawala's (2017) *Revitalizing History* are framed with the idea of inviting new inquiries into the unknown life stories of women and African Americans, opening up as well as complicating the possibilities for readers to re-frame and un-frame these narratives. The stories presented in Bolin and Kantawala (2017), when viewed using Bal's (2002) work, can also be seen as frames themselves, even as they are being framed by their being written. For example, Heidi C. Powell (2017), a descendant of the Lenni Lenape (Indigenous people of Northeastern Woodlands), examined how historians might better reflect local memory in art education history by noticing that what we (re)collect shapes how we see the world, a view of history that acknowledges our relative subjectivity and its influences on the stories we tell. I see Powell's (2017) work as a frame that allows thinking about memory as a romantic approach to history writing; focusing on the positive use of memory.

Jessica Baker Kee (2017) challenged the Eurocentric metanarrative in art education history by examining the Hampton Institute, a teaching institution for Black and Native Americans whose intellectual tradition of Black aesthetic and narrative histories is underrepresented in American art education, except for its presence in most historical accounts of the life and work of Viktor Lowenfeld prior to his going to Penn State. Debra A. Hardy (2017) examined a vital community organization and African American cultural center, the South Side Community Art Center of Chicago, a Black art institution and the lone survivor of the Works Progress Administration. Kee (2017) and Hardy (2017) could be seen as challenging the master narrative as a frame and their approach to history writing as a radical frame.

Depending on one's disposition of framing, when framing is seen through the lens of White's (1973) theory of emplotment and Bal's (2002) theory of framing, each of these chapters might offer a different type of frame for the reader. While reading through these alternative frames, the derived meanings the reader might get or give will be driven by what comes before or after. This coming together of the concept of frame (noun) and framing (verb) invites new possibilities for re-framing and un-framing the meanings generated from these frames. Additional knowledge may be buried within these chapter frames, expanding the reader's imagination and

uncovering what might be hiding beneath, behind, or between these frames.

Historical Foundations of Art Education

Historical Foundations of Art Education is a course that I teach to masters and doctoral students at Teachers College, Columbia University, where the concepts of framing, re-framing, and un-framing remain as an undercurrent of all content covered. This course introduces students to the idea of actively engaging with framing in reading and conducting historical research. The very act of doing history itself involves a creation of a deliberate frame, which then allows for distortion to re-frame and un-frame the narrative. This act invites looking outside the frames for meanings they might offer (Schutte & Berry, 2011).

One of the approaches I use in the course is a visual exhibit to frame, re-frame, or un-frame historical narratives. In 2014, Ashley Mask, a doctoral student then, and I curated the exhibit Aesthetic Spaces: Imagining and Interpreting Art Education History. This show focused on the visual representations of historical accounts. We argued that these visual presentations serve as an invitation to think further about re-framing and un-framing the forms of written histories and stories buried within established chronicles, thereby presenting, as O'Donoghue (2010) eloquently said, opportunities for posing new and different types of research questions and generating new inquiry and representational practices in the history of [art] education research. Two examples from the exhibition that exemplify re-framing and un-framing include Alexander, Byrne, Hwang, Kim, and Raneri's (2014) interactive installation, *The Hotel Chelsea: The Walls Still Talk*, which re-framed connections between the famous residents of Hotel Chelsea and their influence on art education history, thus engaging the viewer with the artistic practices of the postwar era in New York City. The installation, *The Personal Lives of Materials* (Cavadas, Cissel, Lokken, & Reiss, 2014), looked into the curious story and pedagogy of Mabel D'Amico (1909–1999), a found object artist, art educator, and wife of Victor D'Amico (1904–1987). This exhibit gave the viewer a glimpse of Mabel D'Amico as an artist-teacher (Figures 1 and 2).

The visual histories created by the students align with Dustin Garnet's (2017) notion of historying the past; he primarily drew from Munslow's (2015) idea that narrative is not bound by literary constructions but rather uses aesthetics and creative judgments to re-frame the past. Garnet (2017) further articulated two key attributes to historying: imagination and dissemination, which result in the creation of a visual narrative—in my students' case, the student work employed the concept of imagination as a visual frame. While the students had adequate historical context for their installations, and they seldom blurred boundaries between contexts and frames, the use of context can be seen here as building materials for the frames. The contexts and frames continually challenge the researcher and viewer to shift and juxtapose, and often, they operate alongside each other or become entangled. Further, the frames determine the context that might be re-framed or un-framed by looking behind, on the sides of, in between, or beneath the frames (Schutte & Berry, 2011). Bal's (2002) concept of framing serves as an invitation to think further about its use as a stance or disposition, articulating new possibilities with written histories and alternative ways of reimagining and reinterpreting these histories (O'Donoghue, 2010, p. 410).

Framing as a Critical Disposition in History Writing

In recent years, the field of history has undergone significant changes (Burke, 2001; Burton, 2005; Carretero, Berger, & Grever, 2017; Hughes-Warrington, 2013). Influences within and outside the discipline have transformed how scholars research, teach, and theorize history. Ways of





The Hotel Chelsea: The Walls Still Talk

Amanda Alexander, Ann Byrne, Hannah Hwang, Diane Kim & Nicole Raneri

The Hotel Chelsea in New York City is known as a legendary hotel and commune that once housed some of the world's most celebrated artists like Andy Warhol (1928–1987), Jackson Pollock (1912–1956), Robert Mapplethorpe (1946–1989) and Patti Smith (1946–present). These artists shared ideas and fed off one another's creativity at The Hotel Chelsea, and became influential figures in visual culture in the U.S during the late sixties and early seventies.

Our visual history project draws connections between the famous residents of Hotel Chelsea, and their influence on art education history. Artists during the sixties and seventies were concerned with critiquing the consumerist culture that they lived in. Their works neglected the distinctions between fine and commercial art, unveiling radical traditions. The study of their art provides contemporary students in art education with a broader horizon of possibilities, and allows for the exploration of diversity and the recognition of ideologies within their culture. We explore art in New York City during the postwar decades of the 1960s, the rise of commercial and visually powerful art and the importance of visual culture in art education then and now.

Figure 1. ***The Hotel Chelsea: The Walls Still Talk*** **(Installation from Aesthetic Spaces, Teachers College, Columbia University, November 2014).**

treating historical data have incorporated a wide range of topics and theories ranging from art to social theory to psychology. In the early years of educational historiography, a historian's primary task was to investigate information and corroborate the actions of people in the past (Bolin, Blandy, & Congdon, 2000; Cohen, 1999; Soucy & Stankiewicz, 1990, as cited in Daichendt, Funk, Holt, & Kantawala, 2013). Contemporary historians and scholars, however, are concerned with history through the eyes of everyday individuals as they experience social change (Burke, 2001). Informed by and recognizant in multiple perspectives of history-writing (Bolin et al., 2000; Hamblen,





Mabel D'Amico (1909-1999): Discovering the Personal Lives of Materials

Ashley Cavadas, Katherine Cissel, Hannah Lokken & Alden Reiss

This installation looks into the curious story and pedagogy of Mabel D'Amico (1909–1999), a found object artist, art educator, alumna of Teachers College Art & Art Education Program and wife of Victor D'Amico (1904–1987). She believed that materials inspired creation and saw beauty in the most misshapen pieces of driftwood, peg boards, or discarded hubcaps; which motivated her to create new pieces continually. We were fortunate to visit Mabel's home in Amagansett, NY where we got a glimpse into her life and studio practice. Her home was filled with her hand crafted jewels, collection of found objects and repurposed material. Mabel's powerful spirit inspired her peers, students, and friends. Her empathy, positive outlook, and sensitivity were infectious and continue to be so even after her death.

We chose to respond to Mabel's process of creating by using the materials we employ in our own artwork and allowing them to guide our project, ultimately constructing a collaborative collage piece. The idea of exploring and responding to the material is central to the philosophy of Art & Art Education Program at Teachers College. Given that the materials and the process are just as important as the final product; we also showcase a time lapse of our project along with the materials we used.

Figure 2. ***Mabel D'Amico (1909–1999): Discovering the Personal Lives of Materials*** **(Installation from Aesthetic Spaces, Teachers College, Columbia University, November 2014).**

1985), more and more historians view their work as interpretive, critical, and fluid as they take up the challenge to recognize and investigate relationships not only within the past but also between the past and present. These works implicitly imagine possible futures of art and design education, mapping ever expanding and diverse historiographies of education and miseducation through art, along with an array of issues including gender, race, and ethnicity (Bolin et al., 2000; Cohen, 1999; Hamblen, 1985). Hence, today's art educational histories reflect not only a single course of the evolution of schooling; they also include multiple sites where art pedagogy happens, from inside classrooms to outside on the streets. As historians search for new data, methodological tools, and interpretations, the findings of what are often ambiguous facts about the past do not automatically present rich and meaningful histories (Bolin et al., 2000). These ambiguities and complexities—the very idiosyncrasies of the social and cultural construction we call art education—actually become the strength of these histories.

As I wrap up this article reflecting on framing as a disposition in history writing, I continue to be enthralled by its power and possibility. In an

interesting analysis, Juuso Tervo (2018) synthesized Tyson E. Lewis's (2013) understanding of Agambenian educational thought, inviting a *study* of the past rather than what might one *learn* from the past (as cited in Tervo, 2018, p. 34). Pushing this further, Tervo (2018) argued that, instead of focusing our attention on what historical research can offer in the present, historians ought to engage with *studying* the past, which draws attention to what history cannot do, in what Tervo calls the "darkness of the present" (p. 39). In order for historians to articulate historical moments to those buried in the dark side of the present, Tervo (2018) provokes historians to first grapple with the absent past in the present in order for it to become a knowledge source. This grappling and *study* of the past can be seen as a frame in itself, which in turn allows art education historians to re-frame and un-frame historical moments in the present. Making the past meaningful through the linguistic turn in historical writing using White's (1973) modes of emplotment and Bal's (2002) concept of framing complicates the writing of history. Yet it is this very tension and the intersections between Bal and White that allow for imagination, unframing, and re-framing in history writing.

Both authors attract and challenge the historian to consider framing as a sound methodological disposition whereby it opens up rather than mutes the possibility of interpretation to travel between disciplines and across boundaries (Bal, 2002). According to Bal (2002), framing as a verb points to process, and in this case the process of studying the past, starting with and in the present, thus taking a reverse perspective in historical thinking, as well as considering a nonlinear perspective in the writing of history. When framing as a verb is juxtaposed against framing as a noun, it gives shape and strength to the many elements from the past. Time and chronology are not necessarily the only organizing principles in history. This is where context and contextualization come together in history writing and are inherently present within framing. History is never really free from context, but the concept of framing presents an opportunity to identify and enact the frames, putting the frames themselves to work. In framing differently, other contexts might emerge. The delicate balance between framing and context will continue to remain entangled in history writing, disrupting the way history tends to be written, thus presenting an opportunity to really get beneath it, opening our own door to imagination.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I extend a sincere thank you to Dónal O'Donoghue for his guidance through the development of the article and the invitation to present a version of it at the Council for Policy Studies in Art Education annual meeting in March 2017, to Mary Ann Stankiewicz and Paul Bolin for responding to the paper presentation in 2017, and to Amy Barnickel for her careful proofreading and copyediting to see this article through to be in print.

DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author.

REFERENCES

Alexander, A., Byrne, A., Hwang, H., Kim, D., & Raneri, N. (2014, November). *The Hotel Chelsea: The walls still talk* [interactive installation]. In Aesthetic spaces: Imagining and interpreting art education history [Exhibition], Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, NY.

Bal, M. (2002). *Traveling concepts in the humanities: A rough guide*. Toronto, Canada: University of Toronto Press.

Bolin, P. E. (2009). Imagination and speculation as historical impulse: Engaging uncertainties within art education history and historiography. *Studies in Art Education*, *50*(2), 110–123. doi:10.1080/00393541.2009.11518760

Bolin, P. E., Blandy, D., & Congdon, K. G. (Eds.). (2000). *Remembering others: Making invisible histories of art education visible*. Reston, VA: National Art Education Association.

Bolin, P. E., & Kantawala, A. (Eds.). (2017). *Revitalizing history: Recognizing the struggles, lives, and achievements of African American and women art educators*. Wilmington, DE: Vernon Press.

Burke, P. (Ed.). (2001). *New perspectives on historical writing*. State College: The Pennsylvania State University Press.

Burton, A. (Ed.). (2005). *Archive stories: Facts, fictions and the writing of history*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Carretero, M., Berger, S., & Grever, M. (Eds.). (2017). *Palgrave handbook of research in historical culture and education*. London, England: Palgrave Macmillan.

Cavadas, A., Cissel, K., Lokken, H., & Reiss, A. (2014, November). *Mabel D'Amico (1909–1999): Discovering the personal lives of spaces* [interactive installation]. In Aesthetic spaces: Imagining and interpreting art education history [Exhibition], Teachers College, Columbia University, New York, NY.

Chalmers, F. G. (1993). "Doing" histories of art education. *Studies in Art Education*, *34*(4), 254–256. doi:10.2307/1320409

Cohen, S. (1999). *Challenging orthodoxies: Toward a new cultural history of education*. New York, NY: Lang.

Daichendt, G. J., Funk, C., Holt, A., & Kantawala, A. (2013). Critical re-framing of art education histories. *Visual Inquiry: Learning and Teaching Art*, *2*(3), 197–200. doi:10.1386/vi.2.3.197_2

Dean, C. J. (2019). *Metahistory: The Historical Imagination in Nineteenth-Century Europe* by Hayden White. *American Historical Review*, *124*(4), 1337–1350. doi:10.1093/ahr/rhz863

Garnet, D. (2017). Historying the past: New histories of art education. *Studies in Art Education*, *58*(1), 39–50. doi:10.1080/00393541.2016.1258527

Hamblen, K. (1985). Historical research in art education: A process of selection and interpretation. In B. Wilson & H. Hoffa (Eds.), *The history of art education: Proceedings from the Penn State Conference* (pp. 1–11). Reston, VA: National Art Education Association.

Hampson, N. (1976). Subjectivity and objectivity in history. *Journal of the British Society for Phenomenology*, *7*(3), 184–188. doi:10.1080/00071773.1976.11006467

Hardy, D. A. (2017). The detrimental effects of McCarthyism on African American art institutions. In P. Bolin & A. Kantawala (Eds.), *Revitalizing history: Recognizing the struggles, lives, and achievements of African American and women art educators* (pp. 141–152). Wilmington, DE: Vernon Press.

Hughes-Warrington, M. (2013). *Revisionist histories*. Abingdon, England: Routledge.

Kantawala, A. (2012). Art education in colonial India: Implementation and imposition. *Studies in Art Education*, *53*(3), 208–222. doi:10.1080/00393541.2012.11518864

Kee, J. B. (2017). Uncovering hidden histories: African American art education at the Hampton Institute. In P. Bolin & A. Kantawala (Eds.), *Revitalizing history: Recognizing the struggles, lives, and achievements of African American and women art educators* (pp. 123–140). Wilmington, DE: Vernon Press.

Lund, J. (2011). An ethically nonindifferent aesthetics: An interview with Mieke Bal. *Nordic Journal of Aesthetics*, *23*(42), 69–86.

Munslow, A. (2015). Fiction, imagination and the fictive. In A. L. Macfie (Ed.), *The fiction of history* (pp. 31–39). New York, NY: Routledge.

O'Donoghue, D. (2010). Classrooms as installations: A conceptual framework for analyzing classroom photographs from the past. *History of Education*, *39*(3), 401–415. doi:10.1080/00467601003764819

Powell, H. C. (2017). Becoming a curator of memories: Memorializing memory as place in art making for art education. In P. Bolin & A. Kantawala (Eds.), *Revitalizing history: Recognizing the struggles, lives, and achievements of African American and women art educators* (pp. 27–40). Wilmington, DE: Vernon Press.

Rigney, A. (2010). When the monograph is no longer the medium: Historical narrative in the online age. *History and Theory*, *49*(4), 100–117. doi:10.1111/j.1468-2303.2010.00562.x

Schutte, S., & Berry, M. (2011). The haunted photograph: Context, framing and the family story. *Current Narratives*, *1*(3), 35–53.

Sinner, A. (2014). The contingency of events: Knowledge creation and scholarly action [Editorial]. *Canadian Review of Art Education*, *41*(1), 1–7.

Soucy, D., & Stankiewicz, M. (Eds). (1990). *Framing the past: Essays on art education*. Reston, VA: National Art Education Association.

Stankiewicz, M. (2007). Capitalizing art education: Mapping international histories. In L. Bresler (Ed.), *International handbook of research in arts education* (pp. 7–31). New York, NY: Springer.

Tarapor, M. (1980). John Lockwood Kipling and British art education in India. *Victorian Studies*, *24*(1), 53–81.

Tervo, J. (2018). Studying in the dark: Notes on poetic historiography for art education. *Visual Arts Research*, *44*(1), 32–44. doi:10.5406/visuartsrese.44.1.0032

White, H. (1973). *Metahistory: The historical imagination in nineteenth century Europe*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press.

ENDNOTES

1 Explaining the difference between fact (objective) and opinion/interpretation (subjective), Norman Hampson (1976) argued that objective information has the ability to be counted or described, whereas subjective information usually consists of statements of judgment, assumption, belief, suspicion, or rumor. Objective information may not vary and might be close to the truth, whereas subjective information differs among individuals and is far away from the truth. As the focus of my article is on framing, I do not go into detail about historical objectivity or subjectivity.

2 For an in-depth understanding of the history of art education in India, see Kantawala (2012).

3 For more on this conference, see www.tc.columbia.edu/conferences/brushes-with-history.