

Pragmatism and Creativity: Patenting the *School Art* Manifesto from Dewey's Aesthetic Experience*

Carlos Manuel Montenegro Ortiz

Secretaría de Educación del Distrito de Bogotá, Bogotá, Cundinamarca, Colombia

ABSTRACT

An original way to make sense of the *aesthetic experience* concept – in a Deweyan perspective – is from the Art-Education binomial. After studying the pragmatist philosophical category of *Experience* in John Dewey, a product of Doctoral theoretical research in education, it was possible to characterize a new art movement: School Art. Hence, this conceptual-theoretical finding will expand a wide range of art movements that emerged between the nineteenth century and contemporaneity: Art Nouveau, Impressionism, Abstract Art, Futurism, Action Painting, and Children's Art, among many others. However, because of lexical reasons and hoping to achieve greater acceptance among theorists, the so-called *School Art* will patent from this paper as a neologism named from now on as *Artscholarism*. Thus, its philosophical-historical foundations, characteristics, and description will be the article's primary purpose. In that sense, psychological and historical discussions will emerge throughout the paper. In conclusion, the new art movement – *Artscholarism* – comes from Deweyan thinking and is framed by creativity and a social context.

KEYWORDS:

art and creativity, school, aesthetic experience, pragmatism and education, art movements, John Dewey

* The approaches suggested in this paper are part of a non-published doctoral thesis in education, entitled: *From Experience to School Art: Towards an Art Education from John Dewey's Philosophical Thought* (Montenegro Ortiz, 2015, pp. 1–361). Original title in Spanish: *De la Experiencia al Arte Escolar: Hacia una Educación Artística desde el Pensamiento Filosófico de John Dewey*.

Article history:

Received: October 12, 2021

Received in revised form: January 26, 2022

Accepted: February 22, 2022

ISSN 2354-0036

DOI: 10.2478/ctra-2022-0007

Corresponding author at:

Carlos Manuel Montenegro Ortiz

E-MAIL: cmmontenegro@educacionbogota.edu.co

I believe that education [...] thus conceived marks the most perfect and intimate union of science and art conceivable in human experience [...] the art of thus giving shape to human powers and adapting them to social service, is the supreme art; one calling into its service the best of artists; that no insight, sympathy, tact, executive power is too great for such service [...], I believe that when science and art thus join hands the most commanding motive for human action will be reached (Dewey, 1897a, pp. 94–95).

INTRODUCTION

This article presents essential aspects that argue and support the proposal to be developed: analyze “School Art,” but this time from a new perspective, namely, “art school.” In other words, as an art movement. Artscholarism is all artistic activity carried out in school environments by children, young people, teachers, or even other members of a specific educational community in an arts teaching-learning context. The concept of Artscholarism emerges from a broader research problem. In its primary objective, the thesis sought to analyze the ideas of Art and Education from the perspective of Experience in John Dewey’s work. School Art (Artscholarism) as a new independent movement was one of the remarkable findings of this research. In that sense, this paper’s objective is to break down, explain, and characterize the new movement.

To this end, after the “Introduction,” there will be a first section entitled “*Artscholarism: Between Science and Philosophy*,” in which a solid theoretical framework will contextualize subsequent analysis. Next, the section entitled “Dewey’s Aesthetic Experience” will allow us to see this concept as the most significant Deweyan contribution to Artscholarism from the philosophical point of view. Subsequently, a reflection from the historical perspective – the “Historical Framework” section – will be necessary to expand this context. Finally, before providing general conclusions, the “School Art” movement will be characterized as an art manifesto: “Artscholarism Manifesto.”

Nevertheless, at first, it is essential to state the problem of art elitism, raised by Dewey (1934) in a sense that art must go beyond museums (also theaters or specialized audiences); it must be socialized, or taught to a whole community (pp. 12–15). Museums have been institutionalized “as specific places where works of art are expected to be experienced through pure contemplation [very far away from the] realm that is supposed to be valued only based on its criteria and independent principles” (Dreon, 2020, p. 174). The idea of combining art and school would be an exciting alternative in the possible solutions to this problem. Hence, Artscholarism emerges to be an art movement in a literal sense of the term. This movement will break with the classic and conventional aesthetic manifestations and will enjoy new features that qualify it as art: 1) Artscholarism is school-based art, so Child’s Art can be similar (they share features), but not necessarily the same; 2) Artscholarism emerges in an educational environment mediated by teachers; 3) Artscholarism could belong to other institutional levels, such as art academies and music conservatories, among others (since it considers most kinds of fine arts). At the same time, it will be an educational art – open to a community – that, by its very nature, is separated from current elitist spheres. It will be part of a historical record and connected to

people's emotions – say, in this case, an educational community (Dewey, 1934; Gradle, 2014). As an example, when addressing the domain of plastic arts, Dewey (1926) admits the fact that “paintings do not educate at present till we are educated to enjoy, to realize, their educative potentialities” (p. 113). Thus, art and education are concepts that frame “School Art.”

Second, it is also essential to emphasize the importance of and the reason for considering Art-scholarism as an independent art movement. A great weight has been given to the psychological factors that govern school art (not School Art with capital letters, which refers to Artscholarism in terms of an art movement), as an activity related to child, youth, and teacher's creativity in classrooms or as a critical factor in the educational field. However, the said art is not sufficiently relevant from the perspective of its contribution to the purely aesthetic field or the point of view of art. It is clear, as will be seen in the following lines, that artistic activity in school provides contributions in terms of the philosophy of art, and vice versa. Here, Pragmatism plays a vital role in a sense that Artscholarism “moves” in art history; it is not anchored to a time-lapse. Then, as *pragmatism* is based on “action” and “movement,” there is a philosophical closeness to the mentioned art. Also, the social aspect is vital because the present research sought to find points of convergence among art, education, and pragmatism. Hence, education represents that crucial social element.

The history of art generally shows that art movements follow a pattern of long or short segments within a timeline and specific stylistic characteristics. It is defined either by the same groups or activities of artists or by researchers who have dedicated themselves to systematizing all the information corresponding to the said chronological stages. In Goodman's (1978) terms, those possible worlds would be assumed in art as accents that generate sharp contrasts:

Several portrayals of the same subject may thus place it according to different categorial schemata. Like a green emerald or a grue one, even if the same emerald, a Piero della Francesca Christ and a Rembrandt one belong to worlds organized into different kinds. Works of art, though, characteristically illustrate rather than name or describe relevant kinds. (p. 11)

Regarding the last pragmatic tenet that Goodman illustrates, Innis (2018) – who analyses the Deweyan poetic language conception from Eco's perspective – affirms that “(t)he aesthetic lessons from reflecting on language as aesthetic stimulus are that the aesthetic stimulus is not purely referential. Its denotatum is global, while the stimulus itself is composed of an integration of signifying components which do not signify separately but belong to a field” (pp. 10–11). In other words, art languages usually belong to previously established styles.

In an ancient stage, human life focused on social and religious aspects; it must be borne in mind that art was neither museum art nor conceived as art at that time. Currently, what is systematized as ancient art refers to cultural customs, religious rites, and daily life situations related to ancient civilizations (hunting weapons, cave paintings, clay pots, and items produced by goldsmithing). In the tenor of Dewey (1938), “museums, often calling themselves museums, or galleries of fine art, often have in them utensils like rugs, carpets, vases, weapons, etc., that at the time of their origin were things of daily use” (p. 360) rather than works of art.

Painting, for example, is a by-product of the need for protection from cold and stormy weather; in that context, people's stability could have caused some extra time for self-expression. If someone observes vestiges of ancient populations, men used caves and rocks to protect themselves from cold and rain: "Painting was first adherent to the walls of caves" (Dewey, 1934, p. 226). Drawings of animals, other people, and scenes from everyday life allow us to verify the need for expression and communication (Cox, 1916; see also Gebhard, 1960). Writing originates from pictorial languages called hieroglyphics. In that sense, Artscholarism will break with some specific art-historical aspects. The following lines show how a new movement belonging to this art history and body of theory flourishes from academic work and how it will be characterized and contextualized.

ARTSCHOLARISM: BETWEEN SCIENCE AND PHILOSOPHY

Artscholarism was born from educational, theoretical, and philosophical doctoral research (See Montenegro Ortiz, 2015, pp. 203–230). The main objective was to analyze the concepts of art and education, considering a higher philosophical category, characteristic of Deweyan thought, called *Experience* – a topic studied from different perspectives and by various authors (Alexander 1987, 1998, 2013; Garrison 1995, 2011; Jackson 1995, 1998). In general, the methodology used during the study was hermeneutics – text analysis and interpretation. However, the philosophical method that allowed us to analyze the concepts was pragmatism, specifically by the American philosopher, psychologist, and educator, born on October 20, 1859, in Burlington, Vermont, USA: John Dewey. For the Deweyan experience of art and education concepts analysis, a comprehensive review of the thinker's complete work was necessary (*The Collected Works of John Dewey 1882–1953*, edited by Jo Ann Boydston and The Southern Illinois University Press). Since many results were obtained and developed throughout the doctoral dissertation, one of the main novel contributions to the great body of knowledge expanded. It became a sub-chapter of the work in question: the *School Art* or *Artscholarism*. This new movement comes from research, having in mind that Dewey (1896) asked himself about "definite scientific attempts" (p. 192) to understand how artistic processes occur in the human mind.

As is natural in art theory and history, movements tend to share characteristics, and Artscholarism is no exception. For example, it is related to Children's Art. Artscholarism takes elements of children's artistic production, but it will include more characters: teenagers, teachers, and others who interact during art education at schools or in diverse pedagogical contexts. However, it is worth clarifying that the main difference between Artscholarism and Children's Art lies in the "institutional context" and diverse artistic students' activities. Theorists usually see Children's Art in terms of plastic arts. Artscholarism, for its part, will encompass sound arts (music), dance arts, and theater, among others. Making an analogy, if we compare Impressionism with Pointillism, we will notice that both have almost the same theoretical bases. However, they differ in one key aspect of their technique: while Impressionism features thick juxtaposed brushstrokes, Pointillism – a sub-

school of Impressionism – is based on small dots. Hence, Children’s Art and Artscholarism are similar, but never the same thing.

In this regard, the book “Education through art,” by Read (1974), presented a complete study on the art of children in school, stating the thesis “that art should be the basis of education” (p. 1); an idea supported by Eisner (2004) who posits that “arts can serve as a model for education” (p. 9). Read, reaffirming some of the essential principles of Deweyan pragmatism, argues that art education emphasizes crucial aspects of the learner’s integrity, including morality, individuality, and, above all, democracy; processes, being provided by an excellent pedagogical process in general, that play a vital role within art education. Thus, in “Education through art,” and influenced by Platonic thought, Read did analyze perception, imagination, temperament, expression, creativity, construction, aesthetics, and the teacher-student relationship. Currently, Read is considered one of the primary references for children’s artistic aesthetics and art education.

Other important figures, such as Lowenfeld, Brittain, Cizek, and Cooke, have also been pioneers in art education. For example, in their book “Creative and Mental Growth,” aware of the importance of art in education, Lowenfeld & Brittain (1987) carried out a Piagetian-style study. They also proposed an approach of clear stages in which creative – and artistic – capacity manifests itself in children according to the stages of development: the Scribbling Stage (two-four years), the Preschematic Stage (four-seven years), the Schematic Stage (seven-nine years), the Gang Age (nine-twelve years), the Pseudo-naturalistic Stage (twelve-fourteen years), and the Period of Decision (fourteen-seventeen years). In that sense,

[a]lmost every child enjoys the opportunity for creative activity. The preschool youngster, the sixth grader, and the young adult in high school all look upon art as something that is enjoyable [...] Within each work of art a youngster portrays feelings, intellectual abilities, physical development, perceptual sensitivities, creative involvement, social development, and aesthetic awareness. Although individual children vary considerably, there are general growth characteristics that are typical of any age, and the art products of these youngsters also change in predictable ways. (Lowenfeld & Brittain, 1987, p. 470)

In addition, Cizek, who, according to Smith (1985), “never published a book” (p. 28), is also recognized as another pioneer of art education. Through interviews, most of Cizek’s students emphasized his simplicity (or minimal teaching), in a sense of giving them a certain freedom to paint what they wanted, under the thesis that all children had an “inner creative self” (Smith, 1985, p. 28). Along the same lines as Cizek, Cooke, another pioneer of artistic education and defender of free and spontaneous drawing, tended to exalt the concept of self-expression (Hernández, 2002). Nevertheless, returning to the tradition that guides this article, the importance of *Art as Experience* (Dewey, 1934) as a work of pragmatism that provides meaning and support to Artscholarism should be highlighted with a particular intention. Without a doubt, a book should be read from a philosophical point of view and the “educational” perspective of the famous thinker John Dewey (Campeotto & Viale, 2021).

On the other hand, with Action Painting and Futurism, Artscholarism shares the concept of “action.” Dewey (1934) finds points of convergence between art, movement – as action – and science:

The painting as picture is itself a total effect brought about by the interaction of external and organic causes. The external causal factor is vibrations of light from pigments on canvas variously reflected and refracted. It is ultimately that which physical science discovers – atoms, electrons, protons. The picture is the integral outcome of their interaction with what the mind through the organism contributes. (p. 255)

Furthermore, here really lies a critical point: Artscholarism is not about action (or movement) in making works of art as such, but about their constant movement in time (action in time). As is clarified later, Artscholarism is not anchored to a specific time but has been moving within the time-space relationship, as a continuous Heraclitean *becoming*. As Heraclitus would have argued in ancient Greece, nothing is static; all events come from behind, pass, and continue (Montenegro Ortiz, 2020). Henceforth, Artscholarism comes from pragmatism.¹ The following section raises philosophical aspects that frame Artscholarism, primarily known as Deweyan Aesthetic Experience.

DEWEY’S AESTHETIC EXPERIENCE

The aesthetic experience concept is generated from action – in a pragmatic sense. It is based on radical English empiricism (Locke, 1656 [1952]; Bacon, 1620 [1952]; Berkeley, 1710 [1952]; Hume, 1748 [1952]).² The Deweyan experience is contrary to the Kantian concept of *a priori* judgments (Kant, 1781 [1952]).³ However, Dewey accepts that these come to the mind via the senses, that is, *via* experience. Thus, he takes both aspects, Kantian rationalism, and English radical empiricism, to define the pragmatist experience as “the result, the sign and the reward of that interaction of organism and environment which, when it is carried to the full, is a transformation of interaction into participation and communication” (Dewey, 1934, p. 28).

In other words, according to the last quotation, experience comes from continuous *becoming*. A product of the interaction between man and nature (empiricism), with the feature that after each interaction, a meaning flourishes – rationalism will remain as a result (Dewey, 1896, 1910, 1934; Granger, 2003, 2006). As Alexander (1987) also affirmed about Dewey’s thinking, there is a “tension between a biologically functional [...] worldview and the inherent spirituality and creativity of the cosmos” (p. 18). Alexander’s quotation clarifies human aesthetic experiences concerning nature and environmental context. In Dewey’s words, the experience is:

1 It is crucial to bear in mind that the word pragmatism derives from the Greek root *pragma*, which has action in one of its meanings.

2 In *Great Books* (1952), reprinted version.

3 In *Great Books* (1952), reprinted version.

[...] primarily a process of undergoing: a process of standing something; of suffering and passion, of affection, in the literal sense of these words [...] The organism has to endure, to undergo, the consequences of its own actions [...] Experience, in other words, is a matter of simultaneous doings and sufferings [...] is primarily what is undergone in connection with activities whose import lies in their objective consequences –their bearing upon future experiences [...] The only power the organism possesses to control its own future depends upon the way its present responses modify changes which are taking place in its medium. (Dewey, 1917, pp. 8–15)

In the last extract, the thinker explains how experience appears when a person interacts with the exterior environment. Thus, Dewey presents the same experience in terms of art, but now with a different tint, attributing to it a new aesthetic quality (Montenegro Ortiz, 2014a); he refers to “the general philosophy of experience of which the treatment of the aesthetic is one variety” (Dewey, 1950, p. 396). This is how the aesthetic experience concept was born (Irvin, 2008). Dewey (1934) affirms that aesthetic experience is a typical experience in a literal sense, but it links to an aesthetic feeling, which connects again to human individuality (Dewey, 1887; see also Hammer, 2019; Shusterman, 1989, 2000, 2008), and therefore, to everyday life (Haskins, 2019; Haubert, 2019). Dewey’s art and aesthetics are two different things, but they remain united. In other words, aesthetics lies within being, while art is an external product of a human (Alexander, 1998). Art is then the result of that interaction between a human (the live creature), internal energies, and the final work – the work of art (Dewey, 1944). This experience is also consummated (meaning that a cycle finalized) by the public or those who appreciate the work at a particular moment (Dewey, 1934; Montenegro Ortiz, 2014a). As mentioned previously, that is the clue in terms of why art should be open to a community. In fact, “art is the key to how the experiences of humanity can be meaningfully formed or intensified and thus shared in common across culture and time” (English & Doddington, 2019, p. 431).

Concerning the “elitist” conception of art, the role that capitalism has played is clear; hence, museums as a business have sometimes kept people far from culture (Campeotto & Viale, 2019). In other words, works of art prices, galleries, and opera houses building, become a real business: “(g)enerally speaking, the typical collector is the typical capitalist” (Dewey, 1934, p. 14). Nowadays, most investors consider prestigious works of art a real opportunity to generate revenue, neglecting art’s most important aspect: the value of art itself as a cultural symbol. However, not everything is pessimistic about museums. A pragmatist thinker also knows about art’s educative function. Works of art have much to teach about civilization, as long as they are not simply merchandise (Dewey, 1934; see also Campeotto & Viale, 2019, p. 160). In terms of Artscholarism, and making an analogy to close this discussion, school as a social scenario will be an open museum. As shown in the next section, a historical background permits understanding the roots of the Artscholarism movement.

HISTORICAL FRAMEWORK

Art History: A Brief Context

Hunting weapons found by archaeologists allow us to observe first humans' technical talent for carving; and not only a technical skill but also a creative one. People carved ornaments and faces related to their daily lives, which, as Dewey affirms, were a symbol of "tribal union" (Dewey, 1934, p. 330). In other words, artifacts were used by ancient tribes in a family context.

Architecture – of monumental proportions – is a representative legacy of antiquity. It is worth highlighting the identity of Greek architectural heritage, such as the Parthenon, underscored by Dewey (1934) as one of the tremendous and representative creative works on a universal level; the last addition to the vast existence of sculptures that beauty and human values highlight. Romans were also a source of a vast collection of works, primarily architectural, that are positioned as icons of universal art: the Roman Colosseum, the Roman Forum, the Temple of Vesta, the cobbled streets of Pompeii, in addition to a series of technological advances, such as the aqueduct system, which, while it could be considered rustic, has served as inspiration for those used today. Hence, Dewey (1940), marveling at the monumentality and survival of art through the centuries, primarily architectural, affirms during his most mature academic stage that:

It is by creation of the intangibles of science and philosophy, and especially by those of the arts, that countries and communities have won immortality for themselves after material wealth has crumbled into dust. What has been true of other peoples will be true of our own. Creation, not acquisition, is the measure of a nation's rank; it is the only road to an enduring place in the admiring memory of mankind. (pp. 255–256)

Here, in the last quotation, Dewey recognizes the value of creativity over the simply material luxury of nations. In terms of music, there was a desire for communication among people to protect against innumerable dangers. Attacks by animals, attacks by other men, and risks related to natural phenomena allowed the creation of whistles, which came from shells or bone parts of hunted animals: "creative intelligence is not creative if it is not effectively communicative" (Colapietro, 2019, p. 91). It is not strange to remember, whether from famous movies, cartoons, or parodies, the image of the caveman producing sounds through a horn, representing first musical instruments, although, of course, from a more basic or rustic contextual plane. This desire for communication reinforces the idea of Deweyan pragmatism as utilitarianism, since art becomes the means to satisfy some needs (Frega, 2020; Montenegro Ortiz, 2014a).

However, later (during the Middle Ages), the idea of art as a discipline consolidates. The Christian era marks a significant period that combines religion with art. Just look at the frescoes and mosaics with faces alluding to characters in sacred history: "the frescoes were there to inspire faith, revive piety and instruct the faithful in relation to the saints, heroes, and martyrs of their religion" (Dewey, 1934, p. 226). Each type of art's characteristic features is beginning to exhibit, for example,

figures of Jesus Christ with large eyes, which instilled God's fear. From architecture, great temples appear, whose height allows the proximity to God in the skies. Later, those temples will become great cathedrals with their domes, and characteristic semicircular arches will demarcate styles such as the popular Gothic art. Generally motley, sculptures, and paintings are always allusive to Jesus Christ, the Virgin Mary, or significant Christian doctrine events. The still naive handling of the vanishing points, or the basic knowledge of proportion, allows the medieval works to be identified quickly (Sánchez Ramón, 2001, pp. 6–13).

All those shortcomings in proportion and knowledge are left behind during the well-known Modern Age. It begins with the ideals of the Renaissance. As its name indicates, human values are reborn, taking precedence over Puritanism and the Church's dominance, which instilled the fear of God and kept the scientific field and artists' creativity stagnant for a long time (Dewey, 1932, p. 147). This rebirth in which a person prevails over the spiritual values imposed by the Church brings about a series of scientific advances and discoveries, inventions, new knowledge, and domains. Fine arts acquire a new tint regarding proportion, space, time, and color. Among many others, DaVinci, Michelangelo, Botticelli, Titian, Tintoretto, and Raphael become representative artists. On the level of music, the polyphonic texture, a composition in which several voices execute simultaneously, is consolidated (Sánchez Ramón, 2001, pp. 14–62; see also Dewey, 1934, pp. 226–232).

Baroque flourished after Renaissance, dating to the 15th and 16th centuries (whose art movements were Quattrocento and Cinquecento, respectively). Chiaroscuro in painting, mannerism, and excessive ornamentation feature the new art. Chiaroscuro consisted of a technique that contrasted light with darkness. Great painters and sculptors such as Velázquez, Van Dyck, Rubens, Rembrandt, and Vermeer, stand out (Sánchez Ramón, 2001, pp. 72–100).

Finally, the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries' art arrived. The trends of the twentieth century, increasingly shorter in duration and faster in appearance, allow us to see styles such as Neoclassicism, Realism, Romanticism, Impressionism, Post-Impressionism, and Symbolism. During the 20th century, movements known as *avant-gardes* flourished: Cubism, Expressionism, Futurism, Abstract Art, Dadaism, and Surrealism, among others. The beginning of an "abstract" art sparks a discussion between those who believe such works are not art and those who consider it the pinnacle of art (Dewey, 1934, p. 99). Nationalism bridges Romanticism and Contemporary Music: the movement introducing indigenous and folkloric values typical of each country to classical or cult music, with composers such as Villalobos, Bartók, Borodin, Granados, Bizet, and Ravel. Romanticism, which precedes it, marks a critical point in the history of art since the work of art does not focus on itself. However, the created sensations generate a close relationship with the concept of experience (see Dewey, 1925, p. 282).

A series of styles emerge from that point on. They appear and disappear from one moment to the next, generating eclecticism typical in 20th-century music and, in general, contemporary art. Plastic arts are *avant-garde*, and music, accompanied by rare characteristics like sounds of nature, pot lids, and synthesized sounds, seems strange. According to Dewey (1934), "[a]rtists always have used and always will use all kinds of techniques" (p. 148). This quotation lets us see Dewey's

knowledge of art techniques. He felt empathy toward poetry and theatre (Dewey, 1903, 1910, 1913; Jackson, 1982), among others. They are also part of a new art movement patented in this paper and whose historical features will show in the next section.

Artscholarism and Art History

The non-chronological character. The art proposed here has a “non-chronological” character. In other words, Artscholarism does not belong to a specific period defined within time frames; that is, to the history of art as such. This new movement will emerge at one point as an academic idea (today). For example, Renaissance Art lasted over two centuries (XV and XVI).

On the other hand, Middle Ages Art can be located within a range of approximately ten centuries. If the evolutionary path of art is briefly analyzed, a temporary contraction can occur when a specific school remains in vogue. For example, without going very far, if we take all the conventionalized segments as periods in the history of art from the Middle Ages, it will be possible to discover that, as the timeline advances in the right direction, movements are getting shorter and – sometimes – even fleeting. The last could result from scientific and technological development and many political and social changes.

Phenomena such as the knowledge and information society itself shorten the times in which an idea, knowledge, or information, remain current. This is evident in all consequences and aspects (scientific advances in telecommunications, discoveries, or the Internet with all its mobile derivatives and powerful speeds) of this modern society. Likewise, the various positions and new possibilities of making art became the so-called *eclecticism*.

Note, again, that the duration of art movements has been shorter throughout history as time progresses. Returning to the Middle Ages example, if looking at this period as a significant historical moment, it will be known – by general culture – that it lasted approximately ten long centuries. The key here is that the Modern Age’s subsequent stage shortens considerably to six centuries. Furthermore, curiously, the Modern Age’s sub-styles, such as the Renaissance, Baroque, and Romanticism, lasted approximately two centuries each. Until the appearance of Impressionism (at the level of the fine arts) or nationalism (in the musical arts), a moment in which a series of short-lived movements lasted only a few years triggered, as is the case of Impressionism, Pointillism, and the avant-garde. Moreover, from the second half of the twentieth century, there is no longer talk of specific art movements followed by other art movements; instead, they coincide.

However, Artscholarism is not trapped in a specific timeline since, although it is academically proposed today, its origin or permanence in time depends on the existence of “the school.” Hence, if the concept of school has existed during continuous or discontinuous times, and even more so, art (or art education) stayed within it. Art, then, has also existed since that moment.

The dynamic multi-temporal character. Artscholarism will also have a “dynamic, multi-temporal” character. The term “dynamic, multi-temporal” might seem confusing and somewhat far-fetched. However, it is another property of Artscholarism, meaning that: 1) although the Artscholarism has been named or – preferably – theoretically proposed today, it has already existed.

2) It exists today. 3) There are possibilities that it will continue to exist. It is worth mentioning that the “dynamic, multi-temporal” character is a shared feature between Child Art and Artscholarism.

As time passes, historians and critics have synthesized several qualities observed at different times, also known as art history periods. This series of characteristics are grouped to create new art knowledge or appreciation. Each period, school, or movement shows a similar and consistent pattern in its entirety, which differentiates it from another.

On the other hand, many schools, styles, or movements spring from artists or academic communities dedicated to art. Such is the case of those already mentioned, namely Cubism, Impressionism, and Pointillism, in fine arts. Similar schools are present in dance and theater. A series of contemporary movements that propose new forms and tendencies of a kinesthetic type can be modern dance, the new theater, and the absurd theater. In short, the number of schools that emerged throughout the 20th and 21st centuries would be innumerable.

Returning to the “dynamic, multi-temporal” character of the new proposal – Artscholarism – let it be clear that it is not being discovered or developed for the first time. On the contrary, School Art exists, has existed, and will probably continue to exist for a long time. Hence, Artscholarism is not a product of the past. However, on the other hand, it is not a recent trend either, as it is no longer born (although it is novel as a theoretical-artistic proposal and, in turn, connected with the current pragmatist concept of education). For this reason, it attributes this property to have a “dynamic, multi-temporal” character.

The Autonomous Multidisciplinary Character. This concept alludes to the property that Artscholarism has had, of course, and will have to concentrate within it a series of events, situations, and particularities that, although they belong to different artistic trends and techniques, also belong to this movement. More straightforwardly, everything that has to do with art made within the school will finally be Artscholarism (art classes, staging, culture days, presentations made by students at different events, and art exhibitions of students, teachers, or educational community members).⁴

There could be innumerable possibilities of Artscholarism, from that which occurs in institutions whose curricula exclude art education to those that have made this academic area the emphasis and center of their philosophy. In the hypothetical case that an institution excludes art from its curricula, or for example, a university does not offer higher studies in the arts, Artscholarism will be given as an extracurricular activity and not for that reason lose its status. On the contrary, those institutions whose philosophy revolves around art will be practically raw material in this movement’s intricate and delicate fabric. Plastic works, audiovisual products, musical groups, art, and culture weeks, are examples of school art. The techniques, new and classic in all their presentations and forms, belong to the latest trend. However, one might wonder if styles (for example, when a student creates a work that simulates Cubism, albeit for learning purposes) belong to these

4 See Montenegro Ortiz (2014b) regarding the importance of “My Pedagogic Creed,” an essay published by Dewey in January 1897. The concepts of school and education – from that moment on – were the axis of his philosophical thought in subsequent years.

styles. As a rule, established in this work and following common sense, it will be apparent that the type and artistic technique worked in an educational institution will be Artscholarism. First, it is made (filmed or performed) within the school, and second, it is art.

ARTSCHOLARISM MANIFESTO

1. Whatever artistic activity or artwork made at school will be considered Artscholarism due to its "autonomous multidisciplinary character." Therefore, it is a school-based art.
2. Artscholarism is a movement mediated mainly by educators.
3. Students, teachers, and those others who create or perform arts in a school environment will be, from now on, artists, as will those who did it in the past.
4. Artscholarism is and has been a process full of aesthetic experiences.
5. Child Art and Artscholarism are compatible but are not the same art movement.
6. Whenever artists, educators, psychologists, historians, philosophers, and other theorists refer to school art "as an independent movement," they shall write the term with capital letters (School Art or Artscholarism).
7. Artscholarism is a "non-chronological" movement: it does not belong to a specific period defined within time frames. Art teaching has been present since art does exist.
8. Artscholarism comes from and is framed by pragmatism, creativity, and a social context.
9. Movement and action are the axes of Artscholarism.
10. John Dewey's thought and philosophy of education provide – and will continue to provide – the basis for Artscholarism.
11. As Artscholarism was a concept born from science, education, and philosophy, it can be studied from most perspectives, methods, or theories in the future.
12. New research on art education will enrich Artscholarism and derive from it.

CONCLUSION

It is pertinent to make a theoretical proposal for art and education from Deweyan pragmatism standpoint until one knows how to adjust to the current context without necessarily changing the theory's principles. Thus, these principles can be approached prospectively for art, creativity, and education in different contexts. This character (for today and tomorrow) has manifested itself with a new art style's theoretical approach based on movement and action concepts in an authentic way and following technological advances as well as current educational contexts. Following the sincere desire of John Dewey to socialize art and remove it once and for all from elitist spheres, it has been decided to merge it with education. Henceforth, it begins to lose that elitist quality facet that people have woven around them. Therefore, it concludes that the

art-education relationship proposed here through Artscholarism is a way of solving this limiting pretentious (elitist) quality.

At this point, it is worth clarifying an aspect of great relevance concerning the Artscholarism proposal as an art movement. While art movements have been viewed as long or short segments within a timeline in the conventional way traditional art history does, the new school contradicts this perspective. Artscholarism is proposed here as an idea that began at some point in history, which still exists and can continue to exist while schools exist. The last Artscholarism feature lets us get closer to Deweyan pragmatist ideas of action and movement, since it lets us see Artscholarism as a non-static style (and a school that meets innumerable aesthetic experiences between diverse characters). That is, it is not stagnant at some point in history, again corroborating the Heraclitean becoming *existence*.

Finally, the proposal, as such, has not been to provide a new method in education, didactics of the arts, or pedagogical model. Instead, the request itself has consisted of proposing a series of theoretical, philosophical, and scientific reflections, which, from a given perspective (John Dewey's theoretical postulates regarding aesthetic experience, art, and education in current view), should allow to consider School Art as an independent art movement. In summary, the proposal of Artscholarism suggested here is broadly related to pragmatism and, therefore, to action and movement. Moreover, as has already been argued through multiple examples, including music, sculpture, poetry, and painting, among other fine arts, it possesses the rhythmic quality typical of the art languages mentioned above (see Dewey, 1897b, p 202); poetry being one of Dewey's favorites (Dewey, 1890, 1903, 1913).

What is the boundary between Artscholarism and Children's Art? What field of knowledge supports this new movement? The history of art and aesthetics? Art education? Creativity? Is college art Artscholarism or could this be patented as a new movement? Are students just doing *school art*, or are they artists who are creating a new "art school"? Many questions can arise from this article. The objective is to generate new ideas and questions that allow expanding and continuing this research. Questions such as those mentioned above are provocative suggestions to continue contributing new theses that enrich the great wealth of universal knowledge in art, education, creativity, and aesthetics.

References

- Alexander, T. (1987). *John Dewey's theory of art, experience and nature: the horizons of feeling*. New York: State University of New York.
- Alexander, T. (1998). The art of life: Dewey's aesthetics. In L.A. Hickman (Ed.), *Reading Dewey: interpretations for a postmodern generation* (pp. 1–22). Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.
- Alexander, T. (2013). *Human Eros: eco-ontology and the aesthetics of existence*. New York: Fordham University Press.
- Bacon, F. (1620 [1952]). *Novum organum*. In R.M. Hutchins (Ed.), *Great books of the western world, encyclopedia Britannica, Inc. 1952* (pp. 105–195). Chicago: The University of Chicago.
- Berkeley, G. (1710 [1952]). *The principles of human knowledge*. In R.M. Hutchins (Ed.), *Great books of the western world, encyclopedia Britannica, Inc. 1952* (pp. 399–444). Chicago: The University of Chicago.

- Campeotto, F., & Viale, C.M. (2019). Educar a través de la experiencia estética. El museo según John Dewey. *Diálogos Pedagógicos*, 17(34), 152–177. [https://doi.org/10.22529/dp.2019.17\(34\)08](https://doi.org/10.22529/dp.2019.17(34)08)
- Campeotto, F., & Viale, C.M. (2021). Arte como Experiencia. Pasado y presente [Art as experience. Past and present]. *Ideas y valores*, 70(175), 117–138. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15446/ideasyvalores.v70n175.66898>
- Colapietro, V. (2019). Pragmatist portraits of experimental intelligence by Peirce, James, Dewey, and others. In: S. Fesmire (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of Dewey* (pp. 75–98). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Cox, K. (1916). What Is Painting? I: Painting as an Art of Imitation. *The Art World*, 1(1), 29–73. <https://doi.org/10.2307/25587649>
- Dewey, J. (1887). Psychology. In J. Boydston (Ed.), *The early works 1882–1888*, vol. 2 (pp. 1–366). Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Dewey, J. (1890). Poetry and philosophy. In J. Boydston (Ed.), *The early works 1882–1898, early essays and outlines of a critical theory of ethics, 1895–1892*, vol. 3 (pp. 110–125). Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Dewey, J. (1896). Imagination and expression. In J. Boydston (Ed.), *The early works 1882–1898, early essays 1895–1898*, vol. 5 (pp. 192–202). Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Dewey, J. (1897a). My pedagogic creed. In J. Boydston (Ed.), *The early works 1882–1898, early essays 1895–1898*, vol. 5 (pp. 84–96). Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Dewey, J. (1897b). The aesthetic element in education. In J. Boydston (Ed.), *The early works 1882–1898, early essays 1895–1898*, vol. 5 (pp. 207–209). Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Dewey, J. (1903). Ralph Waldo Emerson. In J. Boydston (Ed.), *The middle works 1903–1906*, vol. 3 (pp. 184–192). Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Dewey, J. (1910). Tolstoi's art. In J. Boydston (Ed.), *The later works 1925–1953. 1885–1953 Miscellaneous writings*, vol. 1 (pp. 381–392). Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Dewey, J. (1913). The enjoyment of poetry. In J. Boydston (Ed.), *The middle works 1899–1924*, vol. 7 (pp. 98–103). Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Dewey, J. (1917). The need for a recovery of philosophy. In J. Boydston (Ed.), *The middle works 1899–1924, Essays on philosophy and education 1916–1917*, vol. 10 (pp. 3–48). Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Dewey, J. (1925). Experience and nature. In J. Boydston (Ed.), *The later works 1925*, vol. 1 (pp. 3–403). Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Dewey, J. (1926). Art in education—and education in art. In J. Boydston (Ed.), *The later works 1925–1927. Essays, reviews, miscellany, and the public and its problems*, vol. 2 (pp. 111–116). Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Dewey, J. (1932). Ethics. In J. Boydston (Ed.), *The later works 1932. Essays, reviews and miscellany*, vol. 7. (pp. 1–509). Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Dewey, J. (1934). Art as experience. In J. Boydston (Ed.), *The later works 1934*, vol. 10 (pp. 1–459). Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Dewey, J. (1938). The philosophy of the arts. In J. Boydston (Ed.), *The later works 1938–1939. Experience and education, freedom and culture, theory of valuation, and essays*, vol. 13 (pp. 357–368). Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Dewey, J. (1940). Art as our heritage. In J. Boydston (Ed.), *The later works 1925–1953. 1939–1941 Essays, reviews and miscellany*, vol. 14 (pp. 255–257). Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Dewey, J. (1944). By nature and by art. In J. Boydston (Ed.), *The later works 1925–1953. 1942–1948 Essays, reviews and miscellany*, vol. 15 (pp. 84–96). Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Dewey, J. (1950). Aesthetic experience as a primary phase and as an artistic development. In J. Boydston (Ed.), *The later works 1925–1953. Essays, typescripts, and knowing and the known*, vol. 16 (pp. 395–398). Carbondale and Edwardsville: Southern Illinois University Press.

- Dreon, R. (2020). Dewey's fully embedded ethics. In R. Frega y S. Levine (Eds.), *John Dewey's ethical theory: The 1932 ethics* (pp. 210–228). New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis.
- Eisner, E.W. (2004). What can education learn from the arts about the practice of education? *International Journal of Education & the Arts*, 5(4), 1–13. <http://www.ijea.org/v5n4/v5n4.pdf>
- English, A.R. & Doddington, C. (2019). Dewey, aesthetic experience, and education for humanity. In S. Fesmire (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of Dewey* (pp. 411–441). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Frega, R. (2020). Dewey's independent factors in moral action. In R. Frega & S. Levine (Eds.), *John Dewey's ethical theory: The 1932 ethics* (pp. 33–59). New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis.
- Garrison, J. (1995). Deweyan prophetic pragmatism, poetry and the education of Eros. *American Journal of Education*, 103(4), 406–431. <https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/abs/10.1086/444109?mobileUi=0&>
- Garrison, J. (2011). Walt Whitman, John Dewey and primordial artistic communication. *Transactions of the Charles S. Peirce Society*, 47(3), 301–318. doi: 10.2979/trancharpeirsoc.47.3.301
- Gebhard, D. (1960). The Diablo Cave Paintings. *Art Journal*, 20(2), 79–82. <https://doi.org/10.2307/774351>
- Goodman, N. (1978). *Ways of worldmaking*. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Company, Inc.
- Gradle, S.A. (2014). John Dewey and Henry Schaefer-Simmern: The wholeness of artistic activity. *International Journal of Education through Art*, 10(1), 71–84. https://doi.org/10.1386/eta.10.1.71_1
- Granger, D. (2003). Expression, imagination and organic unity: John Dewey's aesthetics and romanticism. *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 37(2), 46–60.
- Granger, D. (2006). Teaching aesthetics and aesthetic teaching: Toward a Deweyan perspective. *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 40(2), 45–66. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3527454>
- Hammer, E. (2019). Dewey, Adorno, and the purpose of art. In S. Fesmire (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of Dewey* (pp. 471–488). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Haskins, C. (2019). Dewey's Art as experience in the landscape of twenty-first-century aesthetics. In S. Fesmire (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of Dewey* (pp. 445–470). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Haubert, L. E. (2019). Notes on aesthetic experience and everyday experience in John Dewey. *Cognitio-Estudios: Revista Electrónica de Filosofía*, 16(2), 222–232. <https://doi.org/10.23925/1809-8428.2019v16i2p222-232>
- Hernández Belver, M. (2002). Introducción: El Arte y la Mirada del Niño. Dos Siglos de Arte Infantil [Introduction: the Art and the Gaze of the Child. Two Centuries of Children's Art]. *Arte, individuo y sociedad*, 14 (Anejo I), 9–43. <https://revistas.ucm.es/index.php/ARIS/article/view/ARIS0202110009A/5901>
- Hume, D. (1748 [1952]). An enquiry concerning human understanding. In R.M. Hutchins (Ed.), *Great books of the western world, encyclopedia Britannica, Inc.* (pp. 445–509). Chicago: The University of Chicago.
- Innis, R.E. (2018). The Lost Trail of Dewey. *European Journal of Pragmatism and American Philosophy*, X(1). <http://journals.openedition.org/ejpap/1159>; DOI: <https://doi.org/10.4000/ejpap.1159>
- Irvin, S. (2008). The pervasiveness of the aesthetic in ordinary experience. *British Journal of Aesthetics*, 48(1), 29–44. <https://doi.org/10.1093/aesthj/aym039>
- Jackson, P. (1982). John Dewey's poetry. *American Journal of Education*, 91(1), 65–78. <https://www.journals.uchicago.edu/doi/pdf/10.1086/443665>
- Jackson, P. (1995). If we take Dewey's aesthetics seriously, how would the arts be taught? In J. Garrison (Ed.), *The new scholarship on Dewey* (pp. 25–34). The Netherlands: Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Jackson, P. (1998). *John Dewey and the lessons of art*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Kant, I. (1781 [1952]). The critique of pure reason. In R.M. Hutchins (Ed.), *Great books of the western world, encyclopedia Britannica, Inc.*, (Translated by J.M. Dow Meiklejohn), (pp. 1–250). Chicago: The University of Chicago.
- Locke, J. (1656 [1952]). An essay concerning human understanding. In R.M. Hutchins (Ed.), *Great books of the western world, encyclopedia Britannica, Inc.* (pp. 93–395). Chicago: The University of Chicago.

- Lowenfeld, V. & Brittain, W.L. (1987). *Creative and mental growth*. 8th Ed. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Montenegro Ortiz, C.M. (2014a). Arte y experiencia estética: John Dewey. *REVISTA NODO*, 9(17), 95–105. <https://revistas.uan.edu.co/index.php/nodo/article/view/620>
- Montenegro Ortiz, C.M. (2014b). Mi credo pedagógico: una aproximación a la filosofía educativa en el primer Dewey. *Escritos*, 22(49), 415–429. <http://www.scielo.org.co/pdf/esupb/v22n49/v22n49a07.pdf>
- Montenegro Ortiz, C.M. (2015). *De la experiencia al arte escolar: Hacia una educación artística desde el pensamiento filosófico de John Dewey [From experience to School Art: Towards an art education from John Dewey's philosophical thought]*. (PhD diss., Universidad Santo Tomás, Bogotá, Colombia). <https://repository.usta.edu.co/bitstream/handle/11634/3391/Montenegrocarlos2015.pdf?sequence=1&isAllowed=y>
- Montenegro Ortiz, C.M. (2020). Dewey as Experience. *Escritos*, 28(61), 62–77. <https://doi.org/10.18566/escr.v28n61.a05>
- Read, H. (1974). *Education through art*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Sánchez Ramón, M. (2001). *Short guide*. Museo del Prado. Madrid, Spain: Aldeasa.
- Shusterman, R. (1989). Why Dewey Now? *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 23(3), 60–67. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3332763>
- Shusterman, R. (2000). *Performing live: Aesthetics alternatives for the ends of art*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Shusterman, R. (2008). *Body Consciousness: A philosophy of mindfulness and somaesthetics*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

