

Drawing Out Theory: Art and The Teaching of Political Theory

Char R. Miller, *George Mason University*

“Even the worst picture,” Goethe pronounced, “can speak to our emotions and imagination by setting them in motion, releasing them and letting them run free” (1986, 85). As every teacher of introductory courses in political theory knows, the thought of even the worst student can be set in motion through an approach that casts their assumptions, beliefs, and known facts in a new light. The use of art in a political theory classroom can teach students to think about their world in new and intellectually invigorating ways. Just as teachers assign readings from a common set of texts to open the political imaginations of students, they can encourage critical viewing of conventional art to help students appreciate the remarkable complexity of the world they inhabit. If the strategy is successful, art can serve as a reappearing reminder to students of complex political concepts well after their college years. Instructors in political theory, a discipline sometimes accused, like art, of encouraging and rewarding dilettante escapism, can use painting and other plastic arts to make students more aware of the political and social world they inhabit. Specifically, discussing the creation, symbolism, and contemporary interpretations of pictures and sculptures can enhance the intellectual experience of the classroom by enriching the historical contexts that may pertain to both

Char R. Miller is currently a visiting professor of government and politics at George Mason University. His most recent publications are *Go Down Moses: Zora Neale Hurston and Sigmund Freud on Political Identification* in *Race and the Production of Modern American Nationalism* (Garland, 1999) and *Taylored Citizenship: State Institutions and Political Subjectivity* (Praeger, forthcoming). He is currently examining the role consumption plays in the creation of contemporary political subjectivity.

literary and painterly productions of political thought, by demonstrating the theoretical aspects of familiar objects, by raising questions about the politics of representation, by exploring the political activity of artists and their art, by bringing attention to the dependency of much of political theory on artistic conventions, and, most importantly, by demonstrating the viability of political theorization in many aspects of life. Living a political life requires more than voting. This article introduces several possible ways to use art in introductory political theory courses and provides examples that help to illustrate how analyzing art helps students learn. Because introductory courses generally cover authors from varied historical and intellectual contexts, the examples of art in this article are broadly chosen but should be typically familiar to most students.

Context

Critically viewing art introduces students to the importance of examining historical context when trying to understand the possible meanings and authorial intentions of the books they read. Showing art to be part of the social context in which thought is created also allows the teacher to break down the perception that there is a metaphysical distinction between the canon of political theory and other aspects of the social world.

The parallels one can draw between classical Greek thought and classical Greek art can be particularly instructive. Some, including Hannah Arendt, have claimed that Plato's work was an extensive attempt to create an order other than those created by violence (exemplified in Homer's *Iliad*) and persuasion (epitomized by the dialogues of Socrates) (Arendt 1954, 93). It can

also be said that Homer, Socrates, and Plato attempted to impose, create, or find order (*cosmos*) in chaos. Chaos haunted much Greek thought and art. “The truth,” wrote Democritus, “is that what we meet with perceptually is nothing reliable, for it shifts its character according to the body's dispositions, influences, and confrontations.” Archaic lyric poets explored the same sense of disorder and dread. For example, Archilochos of Paros wrote that after an eclipse of the sun “gloom-filled fear has come upon mankind. From now on anything may be believed, anything expected among men” (quoted in Pollitt 1972, 3).

Jerome Pollitt claimed that Greek thinkers and artists sought to soothe their anxieties concerning the irrationality and mutability of existence by attempting to discover or impose order on the world (1972, 5). Archaic Greek art, he claimed, is distinguishable by two aesthetic principles: breaking forms into their component parts and representing the specific as the generic, both of which involved the conception of all objects in the physical world as collections of a limited number of geometric forms. Greek art from approximately 750 BCE on clearly exemplified this response to chaos. Triangles, lines, and cylinders composed the archaic horses created in the Geometric style, which were not created to be representations of specific horses at specific moments but to serve as generic representations of horseness. “Greek artists tended to look for the typical and essential forms which expressed the essential nature of classes of phenomena in the same way that Platonic ‘forms’ or ‘ideas’ expressed essential realities underlying the multiplicity of sense perception,” claimed Pollitt (6). Greek architecture also stands as a monument to the search for generic forms. The Greeks certainly

realized that there are an infinite number of ways to make columns, that there could be more than just three kinds; they only used three because they wanted limited types to order the world.

The most common examples of Archaic Greek art are the *kouroi*. These ubiquitous male figures represented the human triumph over change in a chaotic world. The same basic figure could represent an endless number of people, but, according to the historian Herodotus, they represented one particular pair of brothers. In this account, Solon, the Athenian lawgiver, explains to the successful Croesus that the statues represented the sons of a woman who desired to attend a festival in honor of Hera but was detained when the oxen which were to pull her cart did not return from the field. Her sons, Cleobis and Biton, yoked themselves to the cart and hauled her six miles across hot roads to the festival. When they arrived at the festival, the public praise of her sons prompted the woman to pray to Hera “to grant Cleobis and Biton, who had brought her such honour, the greatest blessing that can fall to mortal man.” In answer, Hera fulfilled the woman’s prayer: After the ceremonies of sacrifice and feasting, the two sons died (Herodotus 1961, 24). Death may seem a poor reward for such noble behavior, but, in death, the sons triumphed over the chaos of life.

As Solon explained to Croesus, “Thus the total of days for your seventy years is 26,250, and not a single one of them is like the next in what it brings. You can see from that, Croesus, what a chancy thing life is. You are very rich, and you rule a numerous people; but the question you asked me I will not answer, until I know that you have died happily” (25). To claim victory over the transience and chaos of life, one had to die in success and glory.

The attempts by Homer, Socrates, Plato, and Aristotle to defend vari-

ous accounts of order in the world fit into a social context that included art. Examining the artistic context can help to draw out the social context of Greek and other writers. It can also demonstrate the social pervasiveness of issues addressed by political theory. Political theory is not firmly grounded in the knowledge of its own object. Therefore, political theory exists throughout life. People thinking seriously about their political and social life often do so in terms and manners that instructors of introductory courses, relying almost exclusively on literary texts, ignore.

Political Theory in Daily Life

“A Fifteenth-Century Painting,” wrote Michael Baxandall, “is the deposit of a social relationship” (1988, 1). Or, more pointedly, a painting was a part of the social and historical moment at which it was created and was addressed to many of the issues contemporary theorists sought to address. Portraying art as reflective of the larger historical moment of the production of a book like Niccolo Machiavelli’s *The Prince* can help teach students the importance of historical specificity and, as valuably, that powerful and perhaps unfamiliar philosophical assumptions contributed to the creation and contemporary appreciation of art objects they take for granted, like Michelangelo’s *David*. According to J.G.A. Pocock, Machiavelli, in *The Prince*, pre-

sented an account of the exceptional virtue necessary for a political innovator to brave Fortune’s embrace (Pocock 1975, 156–82). Through exceptional virtue (*virtu*), the political innovator could forestall or seduce the onslaught of irrational events (*fortuna*) and create and maintain a government through time. Similarly, Florentine republican thought dealt with the necessary constitution of a virtuous, or manly, citizenry. The understandings of maleness central to the historical

meaning of *virtu* (in Latin, *vir* means “man”) encouraged male representations of the republic.¹

Machiavelli expressed this concern in his famous treatise to Lorenzo de Medici. “I conclude, then,” Machiavelli offered in the penultimate chapter of *The Prince*, “that so long as Fortune varies and men stand still, they will prosper while they suit the times, and fail when they do not. But I do feel this: that it is better to be rash than timid, for Fortune is a woman, and the man who wants to hold her down must beat and bully her. We see that she yields more often to men of this stripe than to those who come coldly toward her. Like a woman, too, she is always a friend of the young, because they are less timid, more brutal, and take charge of her more recklessly” (1992, 72).

Michelangelo’s *David* (for which Michelangelo received the republic’s last major commission) replaced Donatello’s *Judith and Holofernes* in front of the Palazzo della Signoria (the Florentine city hall) because it made more sense in the intellectual world of Florence for the republic, if it was going to last and defend itself against the chaos of fortune, to be represented in the male *David* than in the female *Judith* (Brucker 1969, 269). During the public debate over the placement of the statue, Messer Francesco, the first herald of the Signoria, explained at the public hearing on January 25, 1503/04, that *David* should replace *Judith* “because the Judith is an emblem of death, and it is not fitting for the Republic—especially when our emblems are the cross and the lily—and I say it is not fitting that the woman should kill the man” (Seymour 1967, 143–45).

Judith, originally commissioned by Cosimo Medici for the Medici courtyard, had its own meanings for the Florentines. It, along with Donatello’s *David*, provided “two traditional images of Florentine liberty [which] emphasized that the Medici were upholders of the republic; but,” Mary Hollingsworth claimed, “the statues also suggest that the family was increasingly identifying itself with the state” (1994, 69). When the

Medici family was driven out of Florence in 1495, *Judith* was taken from the Medici collection and placed in the public square of the Palazzo della Signoria and inscribed “Exemplum sal[utis] pub[licae] civis pos[uer]e] 1495,” in order to remind the Medici what could happen to tyrants (Burckhardt 1958, 79).²

The Medici answered *Judith* and *David* when they returned to power in 1513 with the addition of Cellini’s magnificent *Perseus*—using Perseus’s triumph over the Medusa to symbolize their victory over the republic.³ According to Florentine legend, Duke Cosimo I faced Cellini’s statue toward the Florentines hoping that Medusa’s head could still turn Perseus’s enemies to stone (Borsook 1991, 45–46).

In the case of Florence, an examination of the art provides a deeper understanding of Florentine political theory, gives students a sense of how Renaissance Florentines viewed and used art objects, and gives them the theoretical background for such familiar cultural objects as Michelangelo’s *David*, thereby supplying theoretical meanings to objects that are familiar and giving them convenient ways to remember complex theoretical elements. Vision is a powerful compliment to lecture and discussion; it is also a powerful aid to memory.

Politics of the Eye and Representation

“The history of painting,” Hermann Bahr wrote in 1914, “is nothing but the history of vision—or seeing” (Bahr 1992, 117). By paying attention to art, students beginning to study political theory and political thought can direct their attention to complex intellectual issues such as the history of representation and perception.

One of Thomas Hobbes first studies was of the gaits of a horse, which allowed him to explore both military issues and the trustworthiness of vision. Hobbes, like so many others of his generation, was fascinated with the study of optics and the representation of movement. Both of these pursuits mirrored activities of

an early influence, Galileo, whom Hobbes may have tried to visit in 1636 (Tuck 1993, 294).⁴ According to Richard Tuck, it was Galileo’s anti-Aristotelian claim for the “non-straightforward character of physical observation” that so recommended him to Hobbes (Tuck 1993, 287). Understanding that Hobbes distrusted sensory perception is, of course, very important for understanding Hobbes’s political theories.

In his *The Elements of Law*, Hobbes discounted Aristotelian interpretations of perception. “Every man hath so much experience as to have seen the sun and other visible objects by reflection in the water and in glasses,” wrote Hobbes, “and this alone is sufficient for this conclusion: that colour and image may be there where the thing seen is not” (Hobbes 1994, 23–24).

Convinced that perception occurs in the human head, a place particularly inaccessible to confidences of accuracy, he argued that “the said image or colour is but an apparition unto us of that motion, agitation, or alteration, which the object worketh in the brain or spirits, or some internal substance of the head” (23). Hobbes’s skepticism concerning sensual experience extended to far more than aesthetics and such doubt was elemental to his political theory. His belief that a person could never be confident of the veracity of their visual experience led him to conclude that all perceptions became equally justifiable and, furthermore, that there was no standard by which to judge the correctness of one’s opinions. This skepticism and lack of justifiability necessitated, for Hobbes, the allocation of great power to the king in order for the king to function as the judge and standard of truth.

The roles sight and perception play in shaping social and political conceptions has more recently influenced the imagining of new social communities. As Laszlo Moholy-Nagy wrote in *Vision in Motion*, “All

creative work today is part of a gigantic indirect training program to remodel through vision in motion the modes of perception and feeling and to prepare for new qualities of living” (1947, 58). Walter Benjamin’s study of the political consequences of reproducible art proposed a similar role for art in creating new ways of living. In “The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction,” Benjamin claimed that reproducible art such as photography or film created man *qua* man in much the same way that Marx claimed that “man” was being created out of the processes of capitalism. In Benjamin’s analysis, reproducible art

created the perceptual apparatuses so that “mankind, which in Homer’s time was an object of contemplation for the Olympian gods, now is one for itself” (1968, 242).⁵

Connections between art and perception draw out for students the changes in human consciousness central to many political conceptions, such as the skepticism concerning perception that buttressed Hobbes’s theory of political power and the ability to imagine humans so removed from much of their quotidian facts that it is possible to imagine them as just an element in Marxist thought.

Art as Politics

Examinations of art can expand and enrich students’ understandings of the literary context of theoretical texts, broadly conceived. Furthermore, art can exemplify nonvoting forms of political action. Artists have often conceived of their work as political theory or political action. Diego Rivera, for example, attempted to subvert the rich and powerful by securing their patronage for progressive public art that he hoped would unify the working class. “The proletariat,” he wrote in *Modern Quarterly* in 1932, “must not refuse to use the best technical de-

Artists have often conceived of their work as political theory or political action.

vices of bourgeois art, just as it uses bourgeois technical equipment in the form of cannon, machine guns, and steam turbines. . . ." (1993, 404).

In 1931, the Detroit Arts Commission hired Rivera to paint a major fresco for the inner court of the Detroit Institute of Art (Kalaidjian 1993, 115). This appointment alienated Rivera from much of the left because Edsel Ford was on the commission and had just been linked to major strike-breaking violence. Neither did the completed fresco endear Rivera to the right. Episcopal and Catholic clergy condemned his depiction of the Holy Family in a vaccination scene. In response to the clergy's condemnation, 12,000 workers united to protect Rivera's mural from the removal the clergy encouraged. This was the sort of revolutionary art that Rivera had hoped to create. At that moment, he believed that "he had arrived at an aesthetics of revolutionary power," according to Walter Kalaidjian. "His craft now functioned, he was convinced, as a potent catalyst for social agitation" (118).

With this victory under his brush, Rivera attempted an even more demanding act of activist art. "I want to use my art as a weapon," he wrote in 1932 (1993, 407). In 1933, he was given his chance when the Rockefeller estate contracted him to paint three large murals in the lobby of the RCA Building in Rockefeller Center. Nelson Rockefeller, who gave Rivera free reign on the execution of the project, tolerated much of Rivera's leftist imagery until the final panel. Conceived at the conclusion of the project, the final panel contained a tribute to Vladimir Lenin. Rockefeller put his foot and several hammers down. Seizing the work, on May 9, 1933, he sent a squad of men to cover the walls from the public's view. Rivera at-

Discussions about art permit students to engage concerns over the status of truth, its inaccessibility, its artificiality, and its own status as dependent on lies.

tempted to turn the seizure into a galvanizing event for workers similar to the fight over the Detroit Institute of Arts fresco, but his efforts did not restrain Rockefeller from destroying the murals six months later (Kalaidjian 1993, 120–22).

Mark Rothko also expressly created his large canvases to foment political and intellectual change. While his floating blocks of color epitomize for many the American avant-garde furthest reach of abstraction, he believed that they represented the feelings conveyed by tragedy and religious devotion and that the paintings could change the feelings and minds of those who viewed them and could, thus, change the world. "I do not believe that there was ever a question of being abstract or representational. It is really a matter of ending this silence and solitude, of breathing and reaching one's arms again" wrote Rothko in the winter of 1947–48 in an article titled "The Romantics were Prompted" (quoted in Breslin 1993, 240–41).

In 1958 and 1959 Rothko turned this project to less eternal and more immediate political intentions. Rothko, the son of poor Russian immigrants, agreed to paint a set of murals for the Four Seasons restaurant in New York City's Seagram Building. "I accepted this assignment as a challenge," he confirmed, "with strictly malicious intentions." Rothko hoped to make the diners, "the richest bastards in New York," feel trapped and hopeless, just as he and many others had often felt in a capitalist society. "I hope to paint something that will ruin the appetite of every son of a bitch who ever eats in that room." Not content to simply ruin their appetites, he wanted to make the "viewers feel that they are trapped in a room where all the doors and windows are bricked up, so that all they can do is butt their

heads forever against a wall" (Breslin 1993, 3). Rothko eventually decided that this project failed and purchased the works back from the Four Seasons, but even this failure exemplifies a way in which twentieth-century artists conceived of their work as political action.

Rivera's and Rothko's intentions were revolutionary. Many other artists have worked to further a particular national political orientation. Nationalism, a significant topic in university courses in political theory and political thought, was explored by a vast range of artists in their attempts to make national art. American examples include Thomas Hart Benson and Thomas Moran. What made work by them and others "American" was the prominence of uniquely American land- or cityscapes. Form supplied, for other artists, another way to be American. "It was the American modernists who first sought to translate identity—that is an understanding of what makes up the national character of the United States," argued Wanda Corn, "not just into subject matter or revival styles, but into the fabrication of an indigenous modern style" (1991, 151).

Attempts to create and to understand an "American" art took many forms. Examining the conscious and subconscious structuring of individual activity encourages students to examine nationalism as affecting and ordering even unconscious behavior. Of course, nationalism is also a very conscious phenomenon. Marcel Duchamp's entry of a urinal into 1917 Independents Exhibition presented by the Society of Independent Artists was motivated by more than a desire to mock pious conceptions of art; it also represented Duchamp's regard for what he believed was the best of American culture. As he later wrote, "The only works of art America has given are her plumbing and her bridges" (cited in Tomkins 1996, 185).⁶

Art and Truth

"If we had not welcomed the arts and invented this kind of cult of the untrue," claimed Friedrich Nietzsche, "then the realization of gen-

eral untruth and mendaciousness that now comes to us through science—the realization that delusion and error are conditions of human knowledge and sensation—would be utterly unbearable” (1974, 163). Discussions about art permit students to engage concerns over the status of truth, its inaccessibility, its artificiality, and its own status as dependent on lies. For example, art can teach that its truth is inaccessible. As Picasso said when asked about *Les Femmes d'Alger*, “You must not always believe what I say. Questions tempt you to tell lies, particularly when there is no answer” (quoted in Richardson 1996, 11).

It is also certainly true that artists invest their works with their notions of what constitutes truthful representation. Max Horkheimer and Theodor Adorno critiqued the disposability and artificiality of American consumer culture, writing, “What dadaists and Expressionists called the untruth of style as such triumphs today in the sung jargon of a crooner, in the carefully contrived elegance of a film star, and even in the admirable expertise of a photograph of a peasant’s squalid hut. Style represents a promise in every work of art. . . . This promise held out by the work of art that it will create truth by lending new shape to the conventional social forms is as necessary as it is hypocritical. It unconditionally posits the real forms of life as it is by suggesting that fulfillment lies in their aesthetic derivatives” (1990, 130). Put more succinctly, artistic styles construct what the viewer can understand to be true. Art allows students to pursue the lies in “truth” and to explore the possible value of lies in a world of inexplicable mystery concerning purpose and value.

Art and the Self

Twentieth-century artists have often attempted to remove their ego from their artistic production—challenging the conflation of artist and art in much the same manner that they challenge the division of truth

and lie. In America, a case can be made that much of the recent interest in deconstructing authors and texts has precedence in the New York avant-garde movement of the 1950s. Many of the artists in that milieu produced work directed at problematizing conceptions of the self and of the power of the artist, or author. Marcel Duchamp’s “ready-mades” (everyday objects Duchamp transformed into art by applying his signature) supply one account of the removal of the self from artistic production. Duchamp, who was perhaps more concerned with transforming art from a retinal exercise into an intellectual one than any other twentieth-century artist, explored a variety of critiques of the self by producing art under aliases that suggested a remarkably plural conception of his self. For example, the works he created as Rose Sélavy explored the construction of the self as sexed.

Jasper Johns once said of his own work that “I have deliberately taken Duchamp’s own work and slightly changed it, and thought to make a kind of play on whose work it is, whether mine or his” (Johnson 1996, 205).⁷ This kind of play, which subverted the unity and isolation of the creative subject, was also carried out in texts of political theory. “The image of literature to be found in ordinary culture is tyrannically centered on the author,” claimed Roland Barthes in “The Death of the Author.” “His person, his life, his tastes, his passions, while criticism still consists for the most part in saying that Baudelaire’s work is the failure of Baudelaire the man, Van Gogh’s his madness. . . .” (1977, 143). According to Barthes, the reader must “kill” the governing idea of the author to avoid constraining reading by making its conclusive reference the author. Twentieth-century American artists such as Jasper Johns also tried to free art from being an explanation of the artist, excluding their own desires and egos from their art in a variety of ways as an attempt to free art from the perceived dead end of their intention.⁸

Artists like Duchamp parodied the power of the author by signing discovered objects like mass produced urinals. To give another example, Zolt Veress presented a project titled *Common Name* at the twenty-third Sao Paulo Bienal held at the Center for Culture and Communication in Hungary detailing how he had exchanged names with Csaba Nemes (Snodgrass 1998, 88).

Barbara Kruger’s work engages issues of the sexual construction of the self particularly well by undermining the positioning of the viewer as male and by criticizing social conceptions that oppress women. Her strategy involves “using . . . fashion and journalistic photography, advertising, film, television, and even other artworks (photos, painting and sculpture), [to] . . . suggest a consideration of a work’s ‘original’ use and exchange values, thus staining the appearance of naturalism” (1993, 1070). This subversion is particularly evident in her *I Shop Therefore I Am*, and *I Will Not Play Nature to Your Culture*, both of which underline the assumed male spectatorship—particularly by marking the “I” as feminine and the “You” as male—and revise it through skillful denaturalization of gendered behavior and discourse. Kruger uses art to explore social construction of norms for women and their behavior.

Conclusion

Theory is a powerful discipline in that it offers the possibility of changing the ways that people view their world. By encouraging and teaching students to examine their beliefs and opinions in a demanding and critical manner, the study of theory engages students at a fundamental level. Art aids in extending this project into the classroom. Critiquing art can force students to explain an element of their social lives as if it had meaning and possibilities they had perhaps never before considered. Art, like theory, has the potential to make students see things in a brand new light and examine seemingly natural or benign elements in their lives.

Notes

1. Randolph Starn and Loren Partridge (1992) do an excellent job of exploring visual signification of republicanism in Siena and Mantua. The paintings in the Sala dei Nove in the Sienese Palazzo Pubblico provide striking examples of the artist Ambrogio Lorenzetti's attempts to visually represent good government, bad government, city, country, vice, and virtue. Also see Quentin Skinner (1986).

2. The Medici were given, "An example of the greeting offered to citizens who get out of their station."

3. Benvenuto Cellini told of another artistic representation of virtue in his autobiography. His father, Giovanni Cellini crafted a mirror for Lorenzo de' Medici that "was exquisitely designed and executed, in the shape of a wheel, with the glass in the middle; and round it were seven circles in which he had carved in ivory and black bone the seven Virtues. The looking-glass itself and these Virtues were balanced in such a way that when the wheel was spun all the Virtues revolved

with it but, as they were weighted at the base, stayed upright all the time. As he knew a little Latin he had inscribed around the mirror a verse in Latin which ran: 'For all the turns of Fortune's wheel, Virtue remains erect'" (1956, 21).

4. Richard Tuck has reported that one of the earliest records of Hobbes's interest in philosophy was his January 1634 attempt to purchase a copy of Galileo's *Dialogues* for the Earl of Newcastle (1993, 283-84).

5. For Benjamin, related results included a perceptive revolution comparable to that worked by Freud. "The camera introduces us to unconscious optics as does psychoanalysis to unconscious impulses" (Benjamin 1968, 237).

6. The Society of Independent Artists in New York rejected the urinal, called *Fountain*, submitted under Duchamp's alias, R. Mutt, even though they had guaranteed that they would exhibit the work of any artist who paid the five dollar membership fee.

7. Mike Bidlo has taken Johns's project one

step further; "scrupulously replicating," in Robert Rosenblum's words for *Art in America*, "with exact dimensions and cloned textures, the icons of our collective faith. . . . Bidlo's uniqueness as an artist is already defined by his apparent refusal to create anything that had not already been enshrined in the pantheon of modern art" (1999, 103).

8. Barthes argued that an interpretation predicated on more than a critique of the author "liberates what may be called an anti-theological activity, an activity that is truly revolutionary since to refuse to fix meaning is, in the end, to refuse God and this hypostasis—reason, science, law." Barthes also reminded the reader that the subject does not preexist the act. That is, the act of writing creates the subject that writes. "The modern scriptor is born simultaneously with the text, is in no way equipped with a being preceding or exceeding the writing, is not the subject with the book as predicate; there is no other time than that of the enunciation and every text is eternally written *here and now*" (1977, 147, 145).

References

- Arendt, Hannah. 1954. *Between Past and Future*. New York: Penguin Books.
- Bahr, Hermann. "Expressionism." Trans. R.T. Gribble. In *Art in Theory: 1900–1990*, ed. Charles Harrison and Paul Wood. Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Barthes, Roland. 1977. "The Death of the Author." In *Image Music Text*. Trans. Stephen Heath. New York: Hill and Wang.
- Baxandall, Michael. 1988. *Painting and Experience in Fifteenth-Century Italy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Benjamin, Walter. 1968. *Illuminations*. New York: Schocken Books.
- Borsook, Eve. 1991. *The Companion Guide to Florence*. New York: Harper Collins.
- Breslin, James. 1993. *Mark Rothko*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Brucker, Gene. 1969. *Renaissance Florence*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Burckhardt, Jacob. 1958. *The Civilization of the Renaissance in Italy*. New York: Harper Colophon Books.
- Cellini, Benvenuto. 1956. *Autobiography*. New York: Penguin Classics.
- Corn, Wanda. 1991. "Identity, Modernism, and the American Artist after World War I: Gerald Murphy and Americanism." In *Nationalism in the Visual Arts*, ed. Richard Etlin. Washington, DC: National Gallery of Art.
- Goethe, Johann Wolfgang. 1986. *The Collected Works, Volume 3: Essays on Art and Literature*. Ed. John Gearey. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Harrison, Charles, and Paul Wood, eds. 1993. *Art in Theory: 1900–1990*. Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Herodotus. 1961. *The Histories*. Trans. Aubrey De Selincourt. Baltimore: Penguin Classics.
- Hobbes, Thomas. 1994. *Human Nature and De Corpore Politico*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hollingsworth, Mary. 1994. *Patronage in Renaissance Italy*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Horkheimer, Max, and Theodor W. Adorno. 1990. *Dialectic of Enlightenment*. New York: Continuum.
- Kalaïdjian, Walter. 1993. *American Culture Between the Wars*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Kruger, Barbara. 1993. "'Taking' Pictures." In *Art in Theory: 1900–1990*, ed. Charles Harrison and Paul Wood. Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Machiavelli, Niccolò. 1992. *The Prince*. Trans. N.H. Thomson. New York: Dover.
- Moholy-Nagy, Laszlo. 1947. *Vision in Motion*. Chicago: Paul Theobald.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich. 1974. *The Gay Science*. Trans. by Walter Kaufmann. New York: Vintage Press.
- Pocock, J.G.A. 1975. *The Machiavellian Moment*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Pollitt, J.J. 1972. *Art and Experience in Classical Greece*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Richardson, John. 1996. *A Life of Picasso, Vol. II: 1907–1917*. New York: Random House.
- Rivera, Diego. 1993. "The Revolutionary Spirit in Modern Art." In *Art in Theory: 1900–1990*, ed. Charles Harrison and Paul Wood. Cambridge: Blackwell.
- Rosenblum, Robert. 1999. "Bidlo's Shrines." *Art in America* 87(February): 103–04.
- Seymour, Charles Jr. 1967. *Michelangelo's David: A Search for Identity*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Skinner, Quentin. 1986. "Ambrogio Lorenzetti: The Artist as Political Philosopher." *Proceedings of the British Academy* 72:1–56.
- Snodgrass, Susan. 1998. "In a Free State." *Art in America* 86(October): 85–89.
- Starn, Randolph, and Loren Partridge. 1992. *Arts of Power: Three Halls of State in Italy, 1300–1600*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Tomkins, Calvin. 1996. *Duchamp: A Biography*. New York: Henry Holt.
- Tuck, Richard. 1993. *Philosophy and Government: 1572–1651*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

2000 Annual Meeting Sessions on Teaching and Current Issues for Undergraduate Courses

Comparative Politics and International Relations

10-4	Using Technology in Teaching Comparative Politics	18-14T	Roundtable on Power and International Politics: How Much Power is Enough?
11-33	Survival and Stability of Democratic Regimes	18-18T	What is Good Judgment in Foreign Policy?
12-33	Institution Building, Globalization, and Democratization	18-22	Roundtable on New Deterrence Dilemmas
12-5	Poverty, Inequality and Democracy	19-3	New Directions in Alliances and Coalitions
13-10	A Decade Since the Collapse of the Soviet Union: Comparative Lessons and Perspectives	39-7	Participatory Democracy and Environmental Protection
14-13	Citizenship and Identity in the New Europe	44-4	Grawemeyer Roundtable: Ideas for Improving World Order
14-17	Public Opinion and European Integration	SC-4	Using Problem Based Learning in Political Science and International Relations
14-6	Immigration, Political Behavior, and Participation	T-9	Political Science as Discipline? Comparative Politics and Political Institutions
15-16	Citizenship, Gender, and Work		
17-11	Globalism, Cooperation and International Agreements		
18-11	Roundtable on Immaculate Warfare: Combat Without Casualties, Kosovo and Beyond		

This is a brief overview of panels to be held at the 2000 Annual Meeting highlighting sessions on teaching and current issues in political science. The following sessions feature panel presentations and poster sessions given by political scientists, public officials and journalists on current political, policy and theoretical issues of broad interest. Many other 2000 Annual Meeting sessions address core topics on politics and government, such as: the presidency, the 106th Congress, voting behavior, regional and national politics. You will find times and locations for each panel in the Official Program and Detailed Listings of the Final Annual Meeting Program. Detailed listings on each panel can be found online at: www.apsanet.org/mtgs.

Teaching and Civic Education

	<i>Poster Session on Teaching and Learning</i>
SC-10	Teaching Political Philosophy Through Film
SC-16	The Internet and Political Science Teaching: Making the Most of the New Technology
3-18	Gender, Race, and Class Perspectives on Citizenship
3-23	Roundtable on Culture, Community and Citizenship
9-1	Power, Equality, and Democratic Education
9-2	Re-envisioning the Pedagogy of Citizenship
9-3	Information Technology and Political Science: New Paradigms for Understanding Community, Political Participation and How to Teach About These in Virtual Space
9-4	Constituting and Challenging the "Canon" of Political Science
9-5	Beyond the Classroom: Teaching Political Science
9-6	Innovative Approaches to Teaching Political Science
9-7	Challenges to the Conventional Curriculum: Reports Across the Discipline
10-1	Demonstration Panel: Web Based Courseware Applications
10-6	Enhancing Undergraduate Education Through Use of the Internet
10-7	Putting the Educational Spotlight on Civic Involvement
10-9	Roundtable on Political Engagement and Political Science Education: Where Are We? And Where Do We Need to Be?
10-10	International Perspectives on Undergraduate Education
26-14	Citizens, Groups, and Courts: Opportunities for Influence
31-11	Citizenship, Gender, and Work
40-2	Assessing the Use of Technology in the Classroom
40-4	Using Technology in Teaching Comparative Politics

American Politics and Government

T-5	Political Science as Discipline? American Politics and Institutions
7-8	Parties and Civil Society in American History
10-5	Undergraduate Moot Court
20-11	Presidential Leadership in Foreign Policy
22-8	Congress and the Public
23-5	Roundtable on Evaluating the Clinton Presidency
23-9	Historical Approaches to the Presidency
23-11	Presidents and Public Opinion
23-12	Roundtable on Richard Neustadt's Presidential Memos
25-9	Is Democracy Intelligent? Elites, Masses and Public Policy
26-19	The US Supreme Court, Congress, and the President
28-5	Current and Enduring Intergovernmental Issues in American Federalism
29-8	The Consequences of Term Limits in State Legislatures
30-12	Political Empowerment and Racial Minorities
32-6	The New Majority's Participation: African Americans, Latinos, and Immigrants
33-10	Religion and Electoral Politics in the United States
35-3	Money in the 2000 Presidential Primaries
35-12T	Parties and Groups in American Politics
36-14	The Recipe for Winning Elections
36-15	US Electoral Reforms and Their Impact on Voter Turnout
36-20	The Importance of Political Trust
36-8	Money and Elections
38-1	Roundtable on the Best Campaign Ads of the 2000 Election

Detailed listings on each panel can be found in the Annual Meeting Program and online at: www.apsanet.org/mtgs

Advising Students

SC-3	The Political Scientist as Pre-law Advisor
------	--



Century Tower on the University of Florida campus.

Photo by Ray M. Carson