**A Story Within a Story Within a Story Within a Story: British Art School Experience Retrieved Through Archive, Anecdote and Life Writing**

**Introduction**

‘Personal interpretations of past time’ are what the historian Carolyn Steedman calls ‘the stories that people tell themselves in order to explain how they got to the place they currently inhabit’. She has proved in her history texts that they ‘are often in deep and ambiguous conflict with the official interpretative devices of a culture’.[[1]](#endnote-1) This text offers an account fashioned from my own lived experience using anecdotes retrieved from archival materials, including my own mental archive, physical evidence located in the Special Collections at Goldsmiths Library, the sculpture archives at the Henry Moore Institute and the printed pedagogical literature of the sculptor Reg Butler.

In 2015, at Leeds College of Art, a debate took place amongst nationally gathered art school peers.[[2]](#endnote-2) In this context, as a woman artist leading a large undergraduate Fine Art programme, I was prompted to vocalize a rationale for teaching and learning in what may now be described as one of the remaining specialist relics or fabulous conservatoires for creative practice, depending on your point of view. Using ‘The Art School’ as a portmanteau term for creative practice teaching in the UK higher education context now, I exercised the spirit of Steedman’s historicizing and offered a factual story with pertinent interpretative devices fiction through this retrieval of anecdotes.

My writing as an artist is underpinned from the outset by my choice to use a feminist approach to life writing where the author does not pretend to be absent from the text herself [[3]](#endnote-3) and fulfills Marianna Torgovnick’s view of personal writing as the fundamental condition of any act of communication as ‘it makes the reader know some things about the writer’.[[4]](#endnote-4) To position myself I will retrieve Steedman’s words from where I saved them in 2001, hand scribed in one of what would be called my artist’s sketchbooks compiled as part of my practice making sculpture. Such records now constitute curriculum requirements in art education in the UK titled also as journal, research file, or studio book. Mine are a non-professionalized unfettered repository formed as a self-reflexive rehearsal space for becoming a woman artist, practiced and maintained since 1977. Steedman’s words sit on a page waiting to be used, like a swatch of colour, a brushstroke or a cartoon for a future work. This, in turn, is packed within the leaves of a book, which holds fragments of material textures, thumbnail sketches, visualizations of sculpture I will never make, and many ‘to do’ lists. Her words finally find their place of purpose for me in this act of writing which is concerned with bringing forward stories from the past in order, through the story form, to offer thought for the place of life writing in the recollection of artistic experience. I think narratives formed in this way, positioned as part of life writing as a critical practice, offer a suitable trope for writing as an artist. I believe such narratives can be viewed as life lines which within British Sculpture, and more widely within the art school, offer scope for interrogation, discovery and retrieval of the ways in which issues, such as feminism (but this is not the only one), can be repositioned as cogent in their histories.

As a participant in the Leeds symposium I was invited to publicly respond to a provocation: ‘Through consideration of historic realities, current assumptions and future possibilities of “specialism” in fine art education, how will our students learn the unteachable?’[[5]](#endnote-5) At the time, I was already busy formulating a narrative about Fine Art curricula to present at the British National Association of Fine Art Educators (NAFAE) annual symposium *The Hidden Curriculum* for January 2016, drafting a paper with the working title ‘Lost Cause?’. [[6]](#endnote-6) My intention was to use the position of my formative art school experiences to demonstrate the effects of my own learning journey in the practice, teaching and ensuing academic leadership I would come to undertake as a sculptor. In this respect, I wanted to revisit some of the pedagogic models and ideas, developed out of feminist strategies and politics of difference from the 1970s, which had framed my future from the 1980s onwards. The first example was an experimental Art Enrichment Course run by the Inner London Education Authority (ILEA) in 1977. The second involved material which archived the student-led *Women & Art Education* conference in 1982.[[7]](#endnote-7) I sought to position my retrospective reflections as possible lost causes in order to explore how and where the origins and intentions of such projects have now become misplaced in the current market aware UK higher education culture. Confronted with the untimely specialism question, my passion for the lost causes which I aimed to present as a story, wove its way through another story, the formation of my belief in the value of specialism in the fine art curriculum.

**Story 1: The frame of the unteachable – where is the student?**

This is what I stood and said at the lectern that day:

This is a very interesting question and I have a position to take from the beginning. The question sets out the contradictions we face now daily in the Higher Educational environments we offer and, if anyone now is thinking about teaching in further and higher education, they will encounter pre-set frameworks and the ‘unteachable’ is facilitated in these spaces.[[8]](#endnote-8) The ‘unteachable’ is possibly a conundrum in itself as an adjective that in creative practices seems to have now become a noun. In James Elkin’s reflection on *Why Art Cannot Be Taught: a handbook for art students*, he set out to examine the ‘curious endeavor of teaching the unteachable’.[[9]](#endnote-9) In 2014 an article in the UK’s leading contemporary art magazine titled ‘Teaching the Unteachable’[[10]](#endnote-10) triggered a flurry of deliberating letters from learned readers after the author questioned with passion what should be taught in our institutions stating: ‘Art education must face up to the non-specificity of its discipline or it is in danger of reverting to an abstract and fanciful pedagogy’. The language in these considerations has helped to crystallize as shorthand for fine art pedagogy, the moniker ‘unteachable’ in the much put upon higher education art community now. Using this term, we have migrated the studying of fine art casually into learning the ‘unteachable’ and this results in a new problem where creativity, talent and subjectivity sit back on a high and unachievable pedestal, as it is likely there is no one amongst us omnipotent enough to hold the secret of the unteachable. How does the elevation of Fine Art to something which cannot be taught sit with the period of democratization in higher education that most of the participants in the symposium have lived through?

The democratization to which I referred is not simply the opening of the academy’s doors to widening participation. It is that which was formed within it, from the charge of feminism in Britain in the late twentieth century. This was not merely a campaign for equality, but a major institutional intervention in and against the Art School, its cultures and keepers. The core of this movement is retrospectively summarized in Griselda Pollock’s 1996 introduction to *Generations & Geographies in The Visual Arts: Feminist Readings*:

Feminist theory and feminist history have attuned us to notice what is important for women and to them: motherhood, sexuality, location, memory and trauma, history and death, and critical and theoretical ways of understanding the process of subjectivity, ideology and the production of meaning.[[11]](#endnote-11)

At this point in British Art School history, women wanted and had made a difference through this early version of what we educators now call the student voice. It was a serious societal demand for the recognition of gendered subjectivity within the academy. Teaching Fine Art now clearly embraces conceptions of the production of art to include social and geographic histories, psychoanalysis and subject positions and yet, the notion of unteachable crosses genders in common parlance and acceptance. As a woman with a current responsible role in an art school and the sector, I feel it is essential to challenge the unteachable and its undisclosed frame as a dangerous term which tempts a return to the ‘divine discontent’, ‘compulsive necessity’ and ‘arrested adolescence’ once presented as model requirements for the (male) art student.[[12]](#endnote-12) We must remind ourselves as feminists that the idealized art student of yester-year is now a real agent of the world. If we now adopt and accept the notion of ‘the unteachable’ in our core business we are relinquishing our relatively new share in contemporary Fine Art learning and teaching.

Psychoanalysis is one of the ways that feminists rethought the art practices we own and teach now. As a researcher who explores the meeting of psychoanalysis, life writing and making sculpture, I continue to use Christopher Bollas’s seminal work of 1987 *The Shadow of The Object: Psychoanalysis of the Unthought Known* [[13]](#endnote-13) as a deliberate strategy for thinking back and through the history of my own pedagogical inheritance. I use this psychoanalytical idea of object relations – ‘“the shadow of the object” as it falls on the ego, leaving some trace of its existence in the adult’[[14]](#endnote-14) – as an analogy for an art pedagogy that includes the subjectivity of the teacher and learner within its construction. Such coupling of individual psychic formations and creativity is at the centre of my own approach to facilitating the learning, where the student’s own perspectives, the field of practice and specialism are all in play. Our problem as educators now is not about capturing ‘unteachable’, it must be about facilitating learning, by providing the grounding for the right conditions so as to innovate within the pre existing framework. The framework provides the necessary grounding and it is my own belief that we embed this within specialisms, in whatever dimensions, for the possibility of students to understand where they come from within the histories of their own practices. Broadly, this could be an art school or a university art faculty, or, more intimately, within a painting studio. As an artist, a feminist and an educator I would argue that what is being mistakenly named as ‘the unteachable’ is part of the complex psychic being of the student, which is at minimum classed, gendered, ethnic, and so on. It is not a free floating noun with a given definition. It is about the student, and their personal engagement, taking place within the underpinning framework of the specialism. Therefore, ‘the unteachable’ is a term I would like to discard.

Learning now is inherently framed by the complex post enlightenment object relations of the individual student and it is important that conveners of learning also explore their own subject specific historic realities with new tools in the complex field of contemporary knowledge. Bollas’s theory, for me, serve~~s~~ as one approach or channel through which to do this. Within specialisms, students today can come to know the inheritances of their own area. As a result, some will know what knowledge and disciplines are exchanged within the evolution of ‘trans’, ‘inter’ and ‘cross’ disciplinary practices, and they are also able to knowledgeably engage with current and contemporary debates. It is my belief that only from within the framework for teaching specialisms can educators have this freedom. Specialisms are important, but how they are defined, enhanced and supplemented is also important. By whom, from where and containing what – these are essential starting points for the interrogation of what are deemed to be the historic realities of specialism in order to inform, develop and challenge current assumptions. I would further argue that this student-centered shift is a result of the feminist intervention made against older models of master – pupil art school teaching. My own recollection of this is a call to debunk any return to the past through a casual acceptance of ‘the unteachable’ as an implicit social structure. Engaging in feminist critique will help to generate the future possibilities of what is called specialism in Fine Art.

Using the feminist concept ‘The Autobiography of The Question’, as outlined by Jane Miller in her 1995 text ‘Trick or Treat? The autobiography of the question’[[15]](#endnote-15), I offer my own story as an example of this. The feminist educationalist Penny Jane Burke rewording this concept explains this as the moment where the agent begins:

with the story of [her] own interest in the question [she] is asking and planning to research into. From that initial story she may move towards the mapping of her developing sense of the question’s interest for [her] onto the history of more public kinds of attention to it. [[16]](#endnote-16)

**Story 2: British Sculpture and the ‘Laws of Development’**

My story about the need for specialization starts when I am at a secondary school in the Inner London Education Authority (ILEA) and take part in the first of a short lived experimental art pedagogy experience in 1977. Sixth formers from across the demographically diverse local education authorities were selected on the basis of talent and the cohort was mixed to positively include different social and ethnic backgrounds. It was a two-week project and we were taken away from our schools to spend one week in rural Wales and one week in the Foundation department of Camberwell School of Art & Crafts. The project was pushed, supported and overseen by two gentlemen in suits: Norman and Bob, who I came to discover later on, were Norman Binch, Staff Inspector for Art and Design, ILEA, and Robert Hedley-Lewis, Principal, London College of Printing. Both were members of the advisory committee for the influential publication *The Arts in Schools: Principles, Practice and Provision* published by Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation in 1982. [[17]](#endnote-17) They, with the staff from the Foundation Department at Camberwell and the specialists teaching art in the metropolitan authority’s schools, created my first experience of learning in a community of practice where the principles of tacit knowing were in play and where learning was through shared common purpose and ‘know how’. This was significant and formative for me. It awakened my understanding that learning and teaching could be differently experienced and not the ‘chalk and talk’ method I was used to.

I came to discover later that I was inhabiting a conflation of ideas about learning in action: Ivan Illich’s notion that learning ‘is the result of unhampered participation in a meaningful setting’ [[18]](#endnote-18), was in play with Michael Polyani’s personal knowledge and ‘know-how’, capitalizing on the value of ‘community’, which as a concept for learning, was then still to be articulated in print by Lave & Wenger in the 1990s. It is important to note however, that these ideas are not specifically formed within an art specialism. The ILEA Art Enrichment course was an introduction, through experience, to art pedagogy the stories of which are not written up in their full diversity. Within this experience or framework, I sensed my own ‘unteachable’ as it was supportively coaxed through action learning into a safe public domain. It was ‘out there’ entering into the psychic matrix that is, for me, art pedagogy.

As a consequence of the experience I ran away to Art College to do a Foundation course at Camberwell School of Art and Crafts, ultimately joining the Sculpture Department there in 1979. I was the first in my family to do a degree and totally unaware at that time that I was an agent in what would become the Widening Participation agenda. In retrospect, I now see that the Art Enrichment Course team followed my progress, turning up in their suits at degree and postgraduate shows and I was the youngest selected artist in *53 83: Three Decades of Artists from Inner London Art Schools*, an exhibition held at the Royal Academy of Arts in 1983 to celebrate the teaching of art in London.

**Story 2: British Sculpture and the ‘Laws of Development’**

Jon Wood, Research Curator at the Henry Moore Institute, tells us that in the 1960s and 1970s there was a shared problematic lived out by British sculptors through their performed practices, which he describes as ‘the complex space of sculpture in Britain’[[19]](#endnote-19). In 2011, the *United Enemies* exhibition opened at Henry Moore Institute in Leeds and sought to address:

[h]ow relevant the issues of sculpture were to the advanced art of the time and to underscore the role sculpture played in artistic change and art-theoretical thinking in these years that laid the ground both for the “New British Sculpture” of the1980s and for subsequent generations. [[20]](#endnote-20)

Wood informs us that British Sculpture can be viewed as an ‘art historical narrative of inter-generational rivalry and succession'.[[21]](#endnote-21) When I entered the Camberwell Sculpture Department as a student, I was entering this problematic, much of which is now being articulated as historical research today. As a student at Camberwell drawing was taught as a distinct mode of sculptural thinking. It is part of my pedagogical inheritance and was how I was taught to think sculpturally as a student where as part of the sculpture course one might be making an observational drawing for an entire two-week period. The sculptor Paul de Monchaux taught one method of analysis that developed a two-dimensional drawing into a three-dimensional material transformation. My Camberwell teachers were alumni of the Slade where De Monchaux tells us:

Measurement was taken very seriously by painters and sculptors alike. In painting it looked to me as though it was being used to test the particularity of a given view while in sculpture the aim was to use it as a tool to arrive at a more generalized understanding of the total and largely hidden geometry of the figure. Either way it slowed down reactions and allowed time to bring each passage of work into conscious control.[[22]](#endnote-22)

He recalls in an email to me in April 2014 how ‘the project was all in my head beforehand and my interest was to see what would actually happen, a bit like doing one’s own work in the studio’. This was a typical method then at a time when student groups were small in number and each art school was viewed as a locally different territory in the geography of art education. As students at Camberwell we were mildly aware we inherited the deep dispute in sculpture between St Martins and the rest of us, which also lingered within St Martins itself as legacy of the two courses known as ‘A: openness to what sculpture could be, and B: a more fixed modernist belief in what good sculpture was and what made sculpture good’.[[23]](#endnote-23) When learning to make sculpture at Camberwell I was unaware of what ‘system’ was being taught. I think, on reflection, I was taught the many personally developed different systems of sculptural thought from the various artists, through living it with them in the simulations that art school teaching offered. It could therefore be argued that the particular nature of any specialist art pedagogy can be further defined by the genealogy relative to an art school.

During the period when my sculpture tutors were pursuing their own ‘unteachables’ as Slade students, through their agreed science of measurement, the sculptor Reg Butler was teaching at the school. Butler has a legacy in the canon of British Sculpture as one of the Geometry of Fear sculptors, but also in the British art school as the orator of notorious opinion delivered as pedagogy. His sculptural epistemology published as *Creative Development: Five Lectures to Art Students* in 1962 stated:

Again I am quite sure the vitality of a great many female students derives from frustrated maternity, and most of these, on finding the opportunity to settle down and produce children, will no longer experience a degree of passionate discontent sufficient to drive them constantly toward the labours of creation in other ways.[[24]](#endnote-24)

At this point, my decision to introduce this contentious anecdote is not to revive belief in such unacceptable ethos. It is to recall an aspect of the art school that is not often tabled now – a place of elitism where classed entitlement, not only classed but gendered entitlement and the two need to be viewed together, was reinforced rather than challenged. Butler’s first lecture ‘The Laws of Development’ evidences existence of thought within the art school that is generally not remembered or captured in the current necessary but possibly romanticized overviews of the 1950s and 1960s. Butler’s 1961 lectures address an audience of students which, from page one refers consistently to ‘he’. The term ‘genius’ is also cited frequently. Butler defines his audience in particular terms: ‘Those of you who look forward to becoming art teachers or hope to enrich your lives between now and marriage do not, in my opinion deserve the sort of support I had in mind’[[25]](#endnote-25). He asserts that: ‘Separating the men from the boys at the beginning and during the early stages of any course should be handled more ruthlessly’[[26]](#endnote-26) and ‘I do not think we should waste our tears on those whose needs to create have been satisfied by maternity, by diploma, or by positions of responsibility’[[27]](#endnote-27). His textual Sheela Na Gig of moral warnings continues: ‘However much skill and experience an artist may develop in later life, it cannot result in great work if, so to say, he has by that time settled down, discovered a measure of contentment, and philosophically adapted himself to realities’[[28]](#endnote-28) and on the very next page adds the caveat ‘There are biological differences between men and women which it has become fashionable to ignore; the high proportion of female art students is a consequence of this’. [[29]](#endnote-29)

There was no space in this art school for the gaining of cultural capital as part of living life. Indiscriminant encouragement of creative practice was, in Butler’s opinion, morally and socially wrong. He finished his first lecture with a set of questions, one of them being: ‘Can a woman become a vital creative artist without ceasing to be a woman except for the purposes of census?’[[30]](#endnote-30). A recent article in the popular press magazine *Harper’s Bazaar* corroborates the existence of this culture in an interview with the sculptor Phyllida Barlow (who I representing the UK at the Venice Biennale in 2017) describing how: ‘She remembers, painfully clearly, the moment one of her tutors at the Slade said to her: “I won’t be having many conversations with you about making work, because I know by the time you’re 30 you’ll be making jam and having children”.’ [[31]](#endnote-31)

These comments contributed to an historic reality of art school. Ideas, like Butler’s, were in the ether. Sculpture as a specialism and contested territory for practice in the late twentieth century was not just resistant to the notion of self, but as the sculptor Alison Wilding put it in her 2015 Henry Moore Institute lecture to students in Leeds: ‘It was macho’. [[32]](#endnote-32) Consequently, within sculpture as a microcosm of British fine art practice and art school it is no surprise that there was social as well as conceptual unrest afoot.

**Story 3: Feminism and Art Education in the 1980s**

When Roszika Parker’s and Griselda Pollock’s alternative history *Old Mistresses: Women, Art and Ideology* was launched at the ICA in 1981, an enlivened conversation took place and was the spark for a small but important social movement. I was one of the group of female art students in London who, with the Women Artists Slide Library, mobilized to create the first, and maybe only conference on *Women in Art Education.* The conference reported that the Department of Education & Science figures for Polytechnics in 1982 showed only 14% of their total teaching force were women and yet women made up 50% of the art student population, which was apparently consistent since 1945. It calculated that the typical British art school had a half a woman tutor each. Six hundred people attended the two days of papers, workshops, performances and shared practices, and this event became a ‘platform’ for a groundswell of indignation around this reality in our specialist environments. In true conference spirit students from Goldsmiths stood up and made challenges:

We do not leave our sexual roles outside the door each morning when we come to college – we still behave more or less as women and men. Our identities do not fly out of nowhere. We are all to a very large extent made up of our sexual and social conditioning. The very idea of free, balanced, uncensored, cosmopolitan education in our present society is unrealistic.[[33]](#endnote-33)

Academics voices contributed. Pam Skelton from St Martins stated that: ‘The emergence of feminist practice in the arts (as in society) cannot be ignored, but in art schools it can be suppressed and often is…. and all too often prefers the safety of its establishment ivory tower’.[[34]](#endnote-34) The art historian and theorist Dinah Dosser who was part of the Fine Art department teaching team at Liverpool Polytechnic rallied:

We are concerned that our women students should be freed from the restrictions and silences from which we suffered. By virtue of our gender we are able to overcome one of the divisions which weaken radicalisation, the division between staff and student.[[35]](#endnote-35)

This was a dynamic lobby, showcasing the activism in the London art schools. Both the Slade Sculpture Department and the Royal College of Art were represented by Women’s Groups who ran workshops that weekend, enacting alternative critiques, courses and teaching styles. Workshop reports at the plenary session returned calls for the importance of collective work, alternative criticism, feedback and the exchanging of minds, not the changing of minds, as an approach to learning.

As we are now aware these debates and discussions have had impact. However, feminism has become a body of knowledge from the past which is now taught in the present as a history. To take on the act of retrieving this in the context of the ‘historic realities’ on specialization, there are now unanswered questions. How, where and if, is feminism significantly but implicitly active within the structures of current HE fine art pedagogies? How and where does the gendered and classed position of the convener in studio practice learning, that so-called space for ‘the unteachable’, make impact in the structures of UK fine art pedagogies? Reflecting on my own experience of developing and making learning environments for fine art, is it reasonable to conclude that feminist pedagogy might now indeed be an undercover curriculum that deserves iteration as one of our historic realities?

**Conclusion:**

As a student within the sculpture debates in Britain in the 1970s and 1980s, empowered therefore on many levels, I have learned that sculpture was a shared imaginary between sculptors who, through their art practices, were proving it to be a cultural practice that was not ornamental but instrumental in the world. The teaching of sculpture depended upon action and conversation between learner and teacher, and between learner and sculpture. My formative years were in a community where reflecting upon work produced was the governing ethos. My art practice came of age in a period when the sculpture community, more widely in Europe and the USA, embraced notions that sculpture had its own internal logic which ‘can be applied to a variety of situations’[[36]](#endnote-36) and the practice known as social sculpture had emerged. This merging of art and life has been at the core of my practice both as an educator and a sculptor. My own work moved into being about space, place, and situations where people became a key material focus. Subsequently, I approached my career in teaching, leading and managing learning, empowered by an extended notion of how different elements can be raw material for crafting.

In 2006, I had the opportunity to found my own Fine Art department, which not many people get the chance to do within an art school. My light bulb moment in the art school experience was learning I could make abstract ideas into tangible, manufactured, crafted, real objects, situations and experiences. Being a sculptor enabled me to see social structures as raw material. Bringing forward my creative self into the role, I viewed modular conventions, teaching environments, institutional estate, studio spaces, staff, workshops and support areas as materials with which to craft an environment for learning and employing imagination. As a sculptor, I mentally modelled to make the learning experience appear to be and feel what it should be – an art school. Being also a graduate of the feminist lobby I approached the challenge with insight formed from collaboration and dialogue, dispensing with modular boundaries between theory, practice and types of art and with the student placed at the centre of it all. I used the concept of ‘place-making’ which originated in the 1960s when American urbanists turned their thoughts to people in their city planning. Place-making is a multi-faceted approach to the planning, design and management of public spaces following its principle of capitalizing on a local community's assets, inspiration, and potential, to purposefully create public spaces that promote people’s health, happiness, and well-being. It is both a process and a philosophy where the 3 Ps - pathways, place and personal networks - are key components. As a feminist and a sculptor, with the body of the larger college presented to me, I crafted my Fine Art department with these values. In my cultural creation, I muscled my way along and through all the structures and the rules (the pre-set frameworks), devising situations to ensure students were all comfortable in their differences, but also enable them to materialize their thinking and capture ‘the unteachable’, so that we could start to see what it is and move it on. Although this is a British story locked within the locale of our island art I believe it fits within the broader field of feminist work pioneered in the 1980s. In retrieving these anecdotes I am raising a flag to say that the past is not always a better place. When we, who own the sites of art training now come together to consider native legacies of teaching styles and studio processes, revisit Basic Design, Thubron, Hudson, Pasmore, Hamilton et al, and re-read ‘The Developing Process’, Butler or Coldstream, it is clear that other new considerations are still to be made.

In writing through and within these fine art related initiatives, using Steedman’s example to ‘rework what has happened to give current events meaning’[[37]](#endnote-37), and taking on board ‘The Autobiography of the Question’, I have modelled my position on specialization and offered another way of historicizing the question I was tasked with. Setting my life and educational history within contexts more capacious than my own, I believe that the 1970s and 1980s in Britain was an important focus for sculpture. It is this historic framework, for my own research and my development as a sculptor, that has enabled me to demonstrate how my subject specific position has influenced my leadership and management in an art school.

As a result of writing out this engastration of stories I now believe that a different line of conclusion can be made. This narrative utilizes what Jane Gallop has termed ‘Occasional Theory’, articulated in response to situation and question.[[38]](#endnote-38) As a result of weaving ‘The Autobiography of the Question’ together with ‘Occasional Theory’ is a research method that relates to the unique and impinged upon delicate, unteachable of the author. Using anecdote to retrieve personal interpretation, through the filter of a question I have found difficult, namely ‘how will our students learn the unteachable’, I put my cards on the table, tell my own story and offer verification – it has affect. Through and within the practice of life writing, shifting from archive to anecdote, I continue to shape a viewable field of British sculpture; the purposeful teaching of art in Britain in the 1970s, and feminist activism in the Art School, reading the accounts for the theoretical insights they afford ‘pointed or rooted towards the real’.[[39]](#endnote-39) My concern has been to bring forward stories from the past to offer new thought for moving forward. Two feminist concepts are in play in this temporal thinking, and now present another way to think through an answer to my earlier question - how, where and if, feminism is significantly but implicitly active within the structures of current HE fine art pedagogy?
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