

Urban Visual Cultures
Syllabus

Rhetoric and Culture

Spring 2164

COMMRC 1103-1200 [WRIT]

Tuesdays and Thursdays: 2:30-3:45pm

237 Cathedral of Learning

Professor Caitlin Bruce

Email: caitlinb@pitt.edu

Office hours: Wednesday 12:30 to 2:30, Thursday 2pm-3:30pm

Cathedral of Learning 1117F

“Rhetoric and Culture: The Revolution Must Be Visualized: Visual Cultures and the City”

Texts:

The Craft of Research, Third Edition (Chicago Guides to Writing, Editing, and Publishing) Paperback – Print, April 15, 2008

by Wayne C. Booth (Author), Gregory G. Colomb (Author), Joseph M. Williams (Author)

All other readings are available on Courseweb. Students must find some films through Netflix or amazon on demand.

Course Description:

Every day we are impacted by visual communication: advertisements, architecture, signage, graffiti, murals, and monuments. Sometimes used in explicitly political ways (think of Occupy signs, or protest posters) and other times operating more subtly (building facades, typography, the orientation of figures on billboards) images are crucial vehicles for public communication. Given that more and more people live in urban spaces, and the street has been a key mechanism for public communication (Tahir Square, marches on Washington, the French Revolution) it is important to understand how public visual communication uses urban space to create a message, and to generate a sense of community. This course analyzes various forms of public art and performance, to analyze how radical non-institutional art (graffiti, wheat-pasting, muralism, public performance) functions as a form of public communication about different models of community. Our focus is both global and local: we will look at the Pittsburgh campus, as well as controversies in Mexico City, Los Angeles, Philadelphia, and New York.

Learning Objectives:

- Students will learn visual ethnography, design analysis, and visual theory skills to critically analyze public art practices in urban space as part of broader cultural and political trajectories.
- Students will describe the components of prevalent public art genres and evaluate their effectiveness as rhetorical mechanism for community building.
- Students will trace key elements of debates over public art in the U.S.
- Students will develop and apply research skills (ethnographic, historical, conceptual) and apply these skills to diverse archives to further hone critical reasoning and writing skills
- Students will improve speaking skills, through discussion and formal presentations, to develop their capacities to serve as experts in this subfield. Final presentation week will offer students the opportunity to present their research in preparation for conferences and meetings.

Urban Visual Cultures Syllabus

Course Themes:

- the rhetorical construction of “community” through varying visual art forms
- how the city functions as a physical space that shapes interactions, and as an imaginative space that drives creative practice
- the ways in which public art can reveal or conceal power relations of different kinds
- how “public space” and “public art” are contested terms

Evaluation (out of 100%)

Attendance/Participation/Discussion: 50%

A level participation consists of coming to class prepared, reading other students’ discussion board posts, participating actively in discussions and showing a command of the readings, and discussion portfolio.

Additionally, I reserve the right to administer pop quizzes which will be factored into the participation grade.

Absences: Students may have two absences (on a non presentation day) without it impacting their grade. Any further unexcused absences will cause 2 points to be deducted from their grade, per class.

Discussion portfolio (every class): At the end of every class students will fill out a form demonstrating their attention to the class discussion and engagement. I will use this portfolio in combination with the discussion board on Coursweb and final presentations to assess the final discussion grade.

Although I may lecture for 10 to 15 minutes at the beginning of class each class is largely discussion driven. Everyone must do the reading and think about questions assigned for the readings. I will usually ask for one or two volunteers to summarize the readings, films, or images assigned. One volunteer will summarize the basic components of the readings. The second will point out potential connections/linkages between the reading for the day and previous themes and readings from the course. I will refer to these volunteers as the Reminder (of the readings), and the Linker, respectively. By the end of the semester everyone should have fulfilled each of these roles at least once. Other discussion roles include the Timer, the Tracker, and Conscience. If you fulfill any of these roles make sure you note it down on your concluding reflection.

I will usually cold call on people for homework questions. If the question was confusing, you may say so and explain why.

Every class discussion will address assigned questions but also build on more general course themes (above). Students must listen carefully, think about what others are saying given previous course material or discussions, and respond in ways that are reflective and encourage participation. In short, focus on developing a conversation, rather than asking closed “yes/no” style questions.

Each week at the end of class you will be given 7 minutes to reflect in writing on what we discussed, usually answering questions such as: “What was the most important or interesting comment one of your fellow students made in class today, and why? What was the most important comment you made or question you asked today in class?” The third question will vary, and might ask about the quality of the day’s discussion

Urban Visual Cultures Syllabus

compared to previous ones, or, a question we failed to address, or you wish we spent more time on.

These responses will be collected every week, and graded every five-seven weeks. Your grade will be posted on courseweb. Unexcused absences will influence your portfolio grade. I will have extended office hours week 5, where you may discuss individual discussion goals.

Discussion Board Posts (10):

Students must write a discussion board post for at least **10** of the readings the night before class.

Discussion board posts offer students writing practice, and so through these posts we will not just work through the class concepts and objects but also apply basic writing methods: designing a research question, understanding who the audience is, and explaining its significance.

Discussion posts are evaluated based on (one point for each criteria) their: thoroughness, attention to subject and the demands of the assignment, comprehensibility, and inventiveness of the readings. Late blog posts lose a point each day they are late. All *discussion posts are due by 5pm the night before class.*

Final presentation: The final two weeks of class will be a conferences style presentation of the research papers where students are responsible for presenting work, actively asking questions and giving comments, and writing one response paper to a colleague's work. You will be graded on preparedness, clarity, engagement, and use of course concepts.

Project Proposal Part 1: 5%

Students must present these proposals on time showing a command of the vocabulary, concepts and methods in the Gillian text. They should have a basic understanding of the context of their object/site.

Project Proposal Part 2: 5%

These proposals should exhibit a plan to move beyond existing archives and have a clear plan of action to create their own archive through ethnographic methods, including an awareness of the contexts in which the object/site are situated, and a series of research questions.

Draft Paper: 15%

Draft paper must include a complete introduction and thesis argument, and all of the case study materials. It must have a clear research question, and the beginnings of an explanation of the research question's significance. Cites must be listed. The focus is on making sure the student has an adequate archive, an object that offers enough depth and complexity to afford a fifteen-page paper, and the beginnings of a position.

Final Paper: 25%

Final paper must have a full introduction, case study, analysis section, and conclusion, and all citations should be in complete Chicago formatting. Papers that show a command of class vocabulary, an attention to providing careful readings of their visual objects along with dedication to providing a social, political, or cultural context for those objects, and have a strong and clear

Urban Visual Cultures Syllabus

argument will receive superior grades. These are meant to be position papers and so they are not just archives or compilations of objects, as the drafts are, but are meant to provide clear opinions and ways of interpreting objects. The final paper should not just have a clear research question but an interpretive strategy that generates some answers to the research question, even if they are not full answers.

Urban Visual Cultures Syllabus

Grading Policies

Papers will not be accepted late unless I have approved doing so for emergencies only. You are expected to supply me with a hard copy of any written work on the due date. In addition, you should send me an electronic copy of each of your papers so that I may provide commentary on it. The paper should be formatted in word (doc or docx for the file's extension).

Attendance is required in a course of this nature. Excessive absences can result in failing the course. Legitimate excuses for missing a class include such matters as an illness or serious injury, death in the family, medical emergency, auto accident, required court appearance, childbirth, marriage or divorce proceedings that directly involve you, university organization activities and sponsored trips. *You must provide me with documentation for such matters.*

Academic Integrity: Cheating/Plagiarism will not be tolerated. Students suspected of violating the University policy on academic integrity will be required to participate in the outlined procedural process initiated by the instructor. Plagiarism (presenting another person's work as your own) will result in failing the assignment. The offense will be documented and submitted to the appropriate office of the University.

Electronic devices: In order to maximize free and open discussion of ideas during class, all recording devices must be turned off during class time. Cell phones and pagers must be turned off during class (unless you are formally on duty as emergency personnel in some capacity), as should web cams, recording and/or musical devices. Sending and receiving text messages during class time is inappropriate behavior, as is surfing the web. You may use a laptop to take notes for your own use, but not for re-distribution. Unauthorized reproduction or distribution of lectures, discussions, exercises, speeches, and or any other materials from class is forbidden.

Disabilities: If you have a disability for which you are or may be requesting an accommodation, you are encouraged to contact both your instructor and Disability Resources and Services (DRS), 140 William Pitt Union, (412) 648-7890, drsrecep@pitt.edu, (412) 228-5347 for P3 ASL users, as early as possible in the term. DRS will verify your disability and determine reasonable accommodations for this course.

Copyright Notice

Course materials may be protected by copyright. United States copyright law, 17 USC section 101, et seq., in addition to University policy and procedures, prohibit unauthorized duplication or retransmission of course materials. See [Library of Congress Copyright Office](#) and the [University Copyright Policy](#).

Statement on Classroom Recording

To ensure the free and open discussion of ideas, students may not record classroom lectures, discussion and/or activities without the advance written permission of the instructor, and any such recording properly approved in advance can be used solely for the student's own private use.

Grade computation:

At the end of the term, your letter grades on the items above will be averaged using the following numerical equivalents, and then converted into a final letter grade as follows:

Item grade	Numerical equivalent	Final average	Final grade
------------	----------------------	---------------	-------------

Urban Visual Cultures
Syllabus

A+	98	97.5 to 100	A+
A	95	94.0 to 97.4	A
A-	92	90.0 to 93.9	A-
B+	88	87.5 to 89.9	B+
B	85	84.0 to 87.4	B
B-	82	80.0 to 83.9	B-
C+	78	77.5 to 79.9	C+
C	75	74.0 to 77.4	C
C-	72	70.0 to 73.9	C-
D+	68	67.5 to 69.9	D+
D	65	64.0 to 67.4	D
D-	62	60.0 to 63.9	D-

Discussion portfolio rubric

	A	B	C
Listening	Student is able to recall a comment made by another student in some detail and explain why that comment was significant in the context of the day's discussion as a whole	Student reproduces another student's comment in general terms without specific detail, or does not explain the importance of that comment in terms of the discussion content overall	Student gives vague or inaccurate account of another's comment and does not discuss significance at all
Thinking	Student's written reflection draws new connections: between two or more points raised in class whose commonalities or contradictions were not discussed; between this day's discussion and a previous one; between; between issues raised in discussion and assigned readings for the course.	Student's written reflection accurately reports several of the issues raised in class discussion, or discusses several different aspects of a single issue raised.	Student's written reflection does not discuss any specific topic covered in discussion or does so in such general terms that the reflection could have been written before the day's class started.
Responding	Student reports comments that combine original thinking with attention to other people's ideas (e.g., ideas expressed by other students; ideas suggested by the course instructor; ideas expressed by the authors of assigned readings); student reports questions that compare, contrast, or point out internal contradictions in course materials or discussion content.	Student reports comments that give personal opinions but do not link them to evidence drawn from course materials or classroom discussions; student reports questions that refer to a single input (reading, image, film scene, or fellow student's comment) and a single level of meaning.	Student reports having made no comments or questions at all.
Skill-building	Student sets specific goals for frequency and content of discussion participation and reflects on progress toward those goals by analyzing feedback from others and evaluating personal role in group dynamics.	Student sets specific goals for frequency and content of discussion participation and comments on progress to those goals with reference to specific examples.	Student does not set specific goals for discussion participation or comments on progress to those goals only in superficial or general terms.

Urban Visual Cultures
Syllabus

Final Presentation Rubric:

The final presentations will be presented conference style in thematic panels. You should prepare an 8 minute talk with powerpoint, and prepare for follow up Q&A where you will speak to similarities, differences, promising elements and problems with your colleagues' papers. You are responsible for providing detailed feedback in written form on 1 of your co-panelists' papers. Print two copies, and hand in one of them to me on the day you are presenting. Your grade also includes participation as an audience member: active listening, question asking, and attendance at all of the panels is part of this grade.

Assessment criteria:

Presentation of a clear thesis and supporting evidence: Excellent Good Fair Poor

Engaging audience/Speaking Clearly: Excellent Good Fair Poor

Preparation for Q&A: Excellent Good Fair Poor

Interaction as audience member for other 4 panels: Excellent Good Fair Poor

Written feedback for 1 of co-panelists: Excellent Good Fair Poor

Final Paper Rubric:

Section/Grade	A	B	C	D	F
Overall paper	A level papers analyze a visual object arguing that that object plays a key role in public culture. They will make sure that their analysis is specific to the object, will have specific parameters for what constitutes evidence for their thesis, will have consulted key sources in visual communication literatures, and will not just include all of the required sections for the papers, but will demonstrate the ability to take sources and course concepts and both correctly deploy the concepts, and go beyond mere definition to synthesize existing concepts in a unique analysis of their visual object. There are no grammatical or stylistic errors.	B level papers will analyze a visual object arguing that that object plays a key role in public culture. They will consult necessary articles in communication studies, and include all required elements of the paper. They will correctly draw on course concepts, using them to analyze the object, but will not offer a new or unique perspective. There are no major grammatical or stylistic errors.	C level papers use a visual object only as an example about a broader practice they seek to affirm or criticize. The visual object is only ancillary to their analysis, not central. They have all required elements of the paper, but do not draw on key sources in visual communication, nor do they offer a unique synthesis between course concepts and their analysis of the object. There are some grammatical and stylistic errors.	D level papers use a visual object only as an example of a broader practice they seek to affirm or criticize. The visual object is ancillary to their analysis. They have most required elements of the paper. They use some course concepts but incorrectly. There are some grammatical and stylistic errors.	F level papers use a visual object only as an example of a broader practice they seek to affirm or criticize. The visual object is ancillary to their analysis. They have some required elements of the paper. They use some course concepts but incorrectly. There are substantial grammatical and stylistic errors.
Introduction	Begins with the visual object	Includes the visual object.	Raises the topic, question, and	Raises the topic for the paper.	

Urban Visual Cultures
Syllabus

	explaining how it raises the topic, question, and significance that the paper seeks to resolve. Includes a thesis and a roadmap for the paper.	Sets forth the topic, question, and significance that the paper seeks to resolve, though, without clearly explaining how the visual object is central to the analysis. Includes a thesis and a roadmap for the paper.	significance that the paper seeks to resolve. Includes a thesis and a roadmap for the paper. The visual object is referenced but not given prominence.	Does not include a roadmap, thesis, or significance. The visual object may be mentioned but is not framed as central.
Literature Review	Defines topic area. References landmark and specific studies relevant to the paper. Offers a brief summary of each work, as well as an explanation of what existing studies fail to uncover, and how the student's paper fills those existing knowledge gaps.	Defines topic area. References landmark and specific studies relevant to the paper. Offers a brief summary of each work. Does not explain what existing studies fail to cover, nor what the paper contributes.	Defines topic area. References some studies, not necessarily landmark or specific. Offers some studies. Does not consistently explain, or assess shortcomings in existing literature. Does not explain how student paper addresses knowledge gaps.	Does not define topic area. References some studies, not necessarily landmark or specific. Does not consistently summarize, explain, or assess works. Does not clearly indicate the student's own scholarly contribution.
History	Student clearly explains the origins of the visual artifact including who created it, when, the exigencies and context for its production, in what mediums it appears, and public reception at the time. Student is able to link this analysis to their larger argument about the significance of	Student clearly explains the origins of the visual artifact including who created it, when, the exigencies and context for its production, in what mediums it appears, and public reception at the time. Student attempts but is not wholly successful to link this analysis to their larger argument about	Student clearly explains the origins of the visual artifact including who created it, when, the exigencies and context for its production, in what mediums it appears, and public reception at the time. Student does not attempt to link this analysis to their larger argument about the significance	Student explains some of the origins of the visual artifact including who created it, when, the exigencies and context for its production, in what mediums it appears, and public reception at the time. Student does not link this analysis to their larger argument

Urban Visual Cultures
Syllabus

	the visual artifact, including information that is germane to the argument.	the significance of the visual artifact, including information that is germane to the argument.	of the visual artifact, including information that is germane to the argument.	about the significance of the visual artifact. Information is spotty.
Audience Reception/Circulation	Student explicates audience receptions of the visual artifact in order to support their argument about the object's significance. Treatment of reception is comprehensive, and clearly linked to the argument.	Student explicates audience receptions of the visual artifact. They are not fully successfully in linking reception to their argument about the argument's significance.	Student explicates audience reception. Treatment is comprehensive but student does not attempt to link reception to their larger argument about the significance of the object.	Student explicates audience reception. Treatment is not comprehensive.
Description of Object	Student analyzes how the image is composed, addressing the subjects of the image, the role colors plays, the directionality of the image, how is action organized within the frame, and/or, whether it extends outwards calling to the viewer. This analysis focuses on the elements of the image that will be critical to the student's argument in a way that is clearly unified and framed.	Student analyzes how the image is composed, addressing the subjects of the image, the role colors plays, the directionality of the image, how is action organized within the frame, and/or, whether it extends outwards calling to the viewer. This analysis attempts to focus on the elements of the image that will be critical to the student's argument, but does so in a way that is scattered and unfocused.	Student analyzes how the image is composed, addressing the subjects of the image, the role colors plays, the directionality of the image, how is action organized within the frame, and/or, whether it extends outwards calling to the viewer. This analysis does not attempt to focus on the elements of the image that will be critical to the student's argument.	Student analyzes some elements of composition, color, address, and directionality, but in a way that is not coherent, and not clearly linked to the argument.

Urban Visual Cultures
Syllabus

Utilization of Key course concepts	Student invokes course concepts germane to the visual object under analysis. Student correctly defines and deploys the concepts in ways that help to unpack the meaning of the visual artifact to support the paper's larger argument.	Student invokes course concepts germane to the visual object under analysis. Student correctly defines and deploys concepts. It is not clear how the concepts support the student's larger argument.	Student invokes some course concepts germane to the visual object under analysis. Student correctly defines some of the concepts though not all. Unclear how the concepts support the larger argument.	Student fails to invoke core course concepts or define them, or use them in service of the larger argument.
------------------------------------	--	--	--	---

Weekly Schedule: (subject to change)

1. January 5, Urban Visual Communication: Sight, Space, and the City

The course will begin with a discussion of how the city is a communicative realm impacted heavily by visual arguments. During this first class period we will discuss the objects that students encounter in their built environments, the methods they already have at their disposal for analyzing such objects, and turn a critical eye to such “direct” or “functional” communication to understand how it operates rhetorically, i.e., persuasively and partially. We will watch “Urbanized,” to understand some of the history of urban planning and the relationship between spatial design and interaction.

We will also discuss the course curriculum, expectations and guidelines for blog posts, and discussion about paper expectations.

Watch: “Urbanized”

January 7, Urban visual Communication: Sight, Space and the City

Today we pair our understanding about general communication and planning challenges facing different cities with an initial investigation about the role that public space plays in collective culture.

Read:

Amin, Ash. "Collective culture and urban public space." *City* 12, no. 1 (2008): 5-24.

2. January 12: Sight and the City: Social Control/Political Action

Week two turns to more critical readings of urban vision, understanding how public space hosts different kinds of political acts. These conversations will be contextualized via articles/blog posts about the recent Occupy movement, and the way public/urban space was turned into a communicative realm. Students will watch a movie about segregation and control, “District 9,”

Urban Visual Cultures Syllabus

and contextualized by an article on public space in South Africa (Minty) to bolster discussions about how space can be mediated and controlled in everyday life, and raise questions about the limits and possibilities for communication in present day public space, or rather, if public space even exists any more.

Students will engage readings on how the city functions as a communication network through signage (a chapter from David Henkin) and the built environment (Ash Amin's work on culture and public space).

1) Zayd Minty, "Post-apartheid public art in Cape Town: Symbolic reparations and public space." *Urban Studies* 43, no. 2 (2006): 421-440.

2) "District 9"

January 14: Sight and the City: Social Control/Political Action

1) Henkin, David M. *City Reading: Written Words and Public Spaces in Antebellum New York*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1998. Pp. 39-68

Study Questions:

- How was New York organized socially before official signage developed in the 19th century, according to Henkin? How did the arrival of signal change how people navigated the streets, and interacted with each other?
- What is the role of public space for civic life, according to Amin?
- According to Minty, what social role did public art play in post-apartheid South Africa?
- How does District 9 reflect the themes of spatial division and social exclusion discussed by Bauman and Minty?

Optional:

Ash Amin, "The Good City," *Urban studies* 43, no. 5-6 (2006): 1009-1023.

Doss, Erika Lee. 2007. *Memorial Mania: Public Feeling in America*. University of Chicago Press. Selection.

Bauman, Zygmunt. 1999. "Urban Space Wars: On Destructive Order and Creative Chaos." *Citizenship Studies*, 3:2, 173-185. What examples does Bauman give of how spatial design impacts social interaction? What qualms does he have, if any, about designs such as those of Brasilia?

Garland Reading

Polley Reading

3. January 19: Public Art Theory: Museum to Street

This week moves the discussion forward in asking "Why public art?" Contemporary public art practices are historically situated within institutional critiques of the museum and gallery which were more "private" than "public", against which many argued that the museum was dislocated from communities, and argued for more robust forms of "site specificity" (Douglas Crimp, On the

Urban Visual Cultures Syllabus

Museum's Ruins, "Redefining Site Specificity," and Miwon Kwon "Notes on Site Specificity"). We will then discuss canonical controversies over public art, in particular the "Tilted Arc" controversy in New York (Rosalyn Deutsche Evictions, chapters: III. Public Space and Democracy. Tilted Arc and the Uses of Democracy. Agoraphobia.) These debates illuminate conceptual issues about who the public is, what rights exist about public space, and how public space and public art intersects with questions of democracy and citizenship.

Trip: The Carnegie Museum to see Richard Serra's 1985 "Carnegie" piece

1) Crimp, Douglas. *On the Museum's Ruins*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1993. "Redefining Site Specificity" pp. 149-182

January 21, Public Art Theory: Museum to Street

1) Kwon, Miwon. *One Place after Another: Site-Specific Art and Locational Identity*. Boston: MIT Press, 2002. "Notes on Site Specificity" pp 85-110

Optional:

Deutsche, Rosalyn. 1998. *Evictions*. Boston: The MIT Press. chapters: III. Public Space and Democracy. Tilted Arc and the Uses of Democracy. Agoraphobia.

Study Questions:

- How does Kwon define site specificity? How does Crimp? What are the similarities, or differences?
- What was significant about Tilted Art, according to Crimp, for how we understand the concept of site specificity and who controls public space?

4. January 26/January 28 Visual Analysis Methods, Part I: Design Analysis/Semiotics

Having achieved a basic grounding in the contours of major public art controversies, the ways they reflect different kinds of democratic practices and public cultures, the fourth week students will turn in project proposals, where they will choose an object (controversy, project) and a site (location). Students will also read the introductions to the Visual Methodologies: An Introduction to The Interpretation of Visual Materials Chapter 1, 2, 4, 6 and 7 on Semiotic, Content/Compositional Analysis, Quantitative Analysis, and Discourse Analysis.

Class visitor: Dr. Gordon Mitchell, Associate Dean of the Honors College to discuss research resources and opportunities.

1) Read: Rose, Gillian. 2001. *Visual Methodologies*. SAGE Publications. Pp.1-27, *skim* chapter 2, 4 (**available on University Library System online books**)

Study questions:

- What methodologies does Rose offer? How is the semiotic approach different than compositional analysis? What the strengths and weaknesses of the former? Of the latter?
[Project proposal 1 due]

5. February 2: Visual Analysis Methods, Part II: Rhetorical Analysis of Visual Arguments

Urban Visual Cultures Syllabus

To contextualize these different methodological strategies they will read rhetorical theory articles about the capacity of images to argue, including but not limited to Cara Finnegan's Article, "The Visual Enthymeme" to understand a rhetorical application of discourse analysis to images, and will workshop in groups in class how they might apply a Semiotic, Compositional and Quantitative analysis to their different visual objects.

[Assignment: Object/Site proposal with outlines of how to apply discourse analysis, semiotic analysis, compositional and quantitative analysis to objects.]

Read:

1) Rose, Gillian. 2001. *Visual Methodologies*. SAGE Publications. Skim chapter 6 and 7.

February 4: Visual Analysis Methods, Part II: Rhetorical Analysis of Visual Arguments

1) Finnegan, Cara. 2001. "The Naturalistic Enthymeme and Visual Argument: Photographic Representation in the 'Skull Controversy'." *Argumentation and Advocacy* 37.

Study Questions:

- How would you characterize Finnegan's method, given the vocabulary that Rose has provided us? How do her methods depart from prevalent methods described by Rose?
- How does Finnegan build her evidence?

6. February 9/February 11: Visual Analysis Methods, Part III: Visual Ethnography Theory

After discussing different image and text-based strategies with their objects/sites, students will workshop different ethnographic strategies to learn about their controversies. They will be responsible for coming to class with two paragraphs on method, a set of interview questions, and parameters for field notes. They will skim *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes* by Emerson, Fretz, and which will serve as a guide-book for the rest of their ethnographic work over the semester.

Read: Emerson, Fretz and Shaw. 1995. *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes*. University of Chicago Press, Chapter 1 and 2

7. February 16: Public Art History I: Monuments

This week returns to case studies about public art work beginning with institutionally supported work: public monuments. Students will read the first chapter and conclusion of Kirk Savage's *Monument Wars* about the Washington D.C. national Mall, and a chapter from Deutsche entitled: "I. The Social Production of Space. Krzysztof Wodiczko's Homeless Projection and the Site of Urban "Revitalization." to analyze conflicting understandings of who monuments speak for.

Guest Lecture: Education Director at the Office of Public Art

Trip: look at local monuments in Schenley park

Read:

1) Deutsche, Rosalyn. 1998. *Evictions*. Boston: The MIT Press. chapters: I. The Social Production of Space. Krzysztof Wodiczko's Homeless Projection and the Site of Urban "Revitalization." Pp 3-49

February 18: Public Art History I: Monuments

Urban Visual Cultures Syllabus

1) Savage, Kirk. 2009. *Monument Wars*. Berkeley: University of California Press. (Selection)

Study Questions:

- What is the relationship between Wodiczko's "Homeless Projection" and the statues in Grant Park? What kind of site specificity did he enact?
- How does Deutsche define public space?
- What did the new design of the Washington monument, according to Savage, promote in terms of collective national memory?

Trip: Neu Kirche in East Deutscheland

Optional:

Sarah Schrank, *Art and the City: Civic Imagination and Cultural Authority in Los Angeles* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2009).

[Project Proposal 2 due]

8. February 22: Public Art History II: Muralism

Week eight we turn to a vernacular public art tradition: muralism. Grounding it in its most famous moment, the Mexican Mural Movement we will read about the relationship between muralism and national identity production from Bruce Campbell's text on the afterlife of Mexican Muralism. We will return to the U.S. to understand how muralism functioned during three periods of social unrest: the Great Depression, with WPA muralism, and the controversy at Rockefeller Center over Diego Rivera's mural there. We will discuss the constituent elements of the Rockefeller Center controversy to outline major recurring issues in public art creation.

Trip: Mural walk around Oakland Meet at the Oakland bike shop at the beginning of class for the mural tour.

Guest Lecturer: (possible) Chris St. Pierre, local Pittsburgh muralist

Read:

1) Campbell, Bruce. 2003. *Mexican Murals in Times of Crisis*. Pheonix: Arizona Board of Regents. (Intro)

February 24: Public Art History II: Muralism

1) Cockcroft, Eva, John Weber, and Jim Cockcroft. 1977. *Toward a Peoples Art: The Contemporary Mural Movement*. New York: E.P. Dutton and Co., Inc. (Intro)

Study Questions:

- How do Cockcroft et al. define muralism? What role did the "Wall of Respect" play?
- How does Campbell understand muralism? How does his understanding of "peoples art" differ, at all, from that of Cockcroft et al.?

Optional:

Marling, Karal Ann. 1982. *Wall-to-wall America: post office murals in the Great Depression*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. (Intro)

Urban Visual Cultures Syllabus

Bruce, Caitlin F. "The Controversy at Rockefeller Center: Phantom Publics, Aesthetic Barbarians" In a special issue of *Advances in the History of Rhetoric: Rhetoric and Its Masses.* Volume 17, Number 1, Spring 2014.

9. March 1: Public Art History III: Muralism

We will continue our analysis of U.S. mural history by turning to the Black Arts movement in the 1960s in Chicago, and the Chicano movement, with carry-overs to Chicago's neighborhood of Pilsen in the formation of diasporic identities. We will discuss the way that muralism and public images can create community unity and movement, epideictic visual rhetoric that can be official or vernacular.

Trip: Randyland on the North Side

Read:

1) LaWare, Margaret R. 1998. "Encountering Visions of Aztlan: Arguments for Ethnic Pride, Community Activism and Cultural Revitalization in Chicano Murals." *Argumentation and Advocacy* 34 (3).

Study Questions:

- How does LaWare define visual epideictic?
- What is the relationship between public space and community identity according to LaWare?

March 3: Workshop Day, bring in two copies of final papers, one to hand in, one to work with in a group

[Assignment: Draft of final paper due]

[Spring Break March 6-13]

10. March 15: Public Art History IV: Graffiti

This week we turn to vernacular, but largely more controversial art: graffiti. We will create historical context by reading about its 1920s beginnings in the United States with train-car graffiti, and will read articles discussing its relationship to hip-hop. We will have an in class discussion about similarities and differences between graffiti and muralism.

Trip: Carrie Furnace

Guest Lecturer (either/both March 15/17): Miguel Aguilar, Professor, long time graffiti practitioner and founder of the Graffiti institute in Chicago; (possible) Lavie Raven, graffiti practitioner, educator, founder of the University of Hip Hop; (possible) Stefanie Garland, long time graffiti practioner, educator, member of the XMen crew, among others.

Read:

- 1) Austin, Joe. 2001. *Taking the Train: How Graffiti Art Became an Urban Crisis in New York City*, Columbia University Press.

March 17: Public Art History IV: Graffiti

Urban Visual Cultures Syllabus

1) Watch: "Bombit"

Study Questions:

- How does Austin develop his argument about how graffiti "becomes...an urban problem"? What does he mean by this claim?
- What model of community and public space do the different interview subjects elaborate in "Bombit"?

11. March 22: Public Art History V: Street Art

This week contrast contemporary understandings of graffiti (as "bombing"), and the global street art movement. Students will watch a documentary on transnational street art, "Beautiful Losers."

Read:

1) Hahner, Leslie A., and Scott J. Varda. "Yarn Bombing and the Aesthetics of Exceptionalism." *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies* ahead-of-print (2014): 1-21.

March 24: Public Art History V: Street Art

- 1) Watch: "Beautiful Losers"
- 2) Guest Lecturer: Jeremy Raymer, street artist and Pitt Grad!

Study Questions:

- How does the model of community elaborated by the interview subjects in "Beautiful Losers" differ at all from that articulated in "Bombit"?
- What role does yarn bombing play as a kind of social critique according to Hahner and Varda?

12. March 29: Public Art History V: I Movement Images

Week thirteen will be our last week of reading and we will try to link our archive of different kinds of public art with the conceptual vocabulary we developed during weeks one through three to understand how images work persuasively. To do so we will focus on social movement images, begging with environmental politics, using Michael Kevin DeLuca's text *Image Politics*, focusing on the "Image Event" chapter, and Jacques Ranciere's text *Disagreement* to analyze news images of the Occupy movement, to discuss when images are legible and when they are illegible, and the relative political merits of both.

Read: DeLuca, Kevin Michael. 1999. *Image Politics: The New Rhetoric of Environmental Activism*, Guilford press. (Selection)

March 31: Public Art History V: I Movement Images

Ranciere, Jacques. 1998. *Disagreement: Politics and Philosophy*. Translated by J. Rose. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press. (Selection)

Study Questions:

- What is Jacques Ranciere's understanding of the "distribution of the sensible"?
- What is an image event, according to DeLuca? What model of political action does this support?

Urban Visual Cultures Syllabus

Students will receive back drafts of their final papers.

13. April 5/7: Paper workshops

During this class students will work in writings groups of four, having circulated their corrected drafts to group members, and will do group critiques of each paper to prepare for the final draft.

14. April 12/April 14: Paper Workshops

During this class students will work in writings groups of four, having circulated their second round of corrected drafts to group members, and will do group critiques of each paper to prepare for the final draft.

15. April 19/21 Final Paper presentations

During this final class students will do seven-minute presentations of their final papers, along with visual aids, and then field a five minute question and answer period.

[Final paper due by email and hard copy in mailbox and e-mail box of professor at 3pm Monday April 25]

Additional Resources

Pittsburgh public art compendiums;

<http://pittsburghartplaces.org/>

Films:

“Bombit,” 2007.

5Pointz Documentary

Websites:

Sixty Inches From Center, www.SIFC.com

5Pointz Website, www.5ptz.com

Chicago Public Art Group, www.cpag.com

Philadelphia Mural Art Group, www.muralarts.org

Books and Articles:

Austin, Joe. 2001. *Taking the Train: How Graffiti Art Became an Urban Crisis in New York City*, Columbia University Press.

Bauman, Zygmunt. 1999. “Urban Space Wars: On Destructive Order and Creative Chaos.” *Citizenship Studies*, 3:2, 173-185.

Campbell, Bruce. 2003. *Mexican Murals in Times of Crisis*. Pheonix: Arizona Board of Regents.

Cockcroft, Eva, John Weber, and Jim Cockcroft. 1977. *Toward a Peoples Art: The Contemporary Mural Movement*. New York: E.P. Dutton and Co., Inc.

Urban Visual Cultures Syllabus

- Crimp, Douglas. *On the Museum's Ruins*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1993. Print.
- DeLuca, Kevin Michael. 1999. *Image Politics: The New Rhetoric of Environmental Activism*, Guilford press.
- Deutsche, Rosalyn. 1998. *Evictions*. Boston: The MIT Press.
- Doss, Erika Lee. 2007. *Memorial Mania: Public Feeling in America*. University of Chicago Press.
- Emerson, Fretz and Shaw. 1995. *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes*. University of Chicago Press.
- Finnegan, Cara. 2001. "The Naturalistic Enthymeme and Visual Argument: Photographic Representation in the 'Skull Controversy'." *Argumentation and Advocacy* 37.
- Henkin, David M. *City Reading: Written Words and Public Spaces in Antebellum New York*. New York: Columbia University Press, 1998. Print.
- Kwon, Miwon. *One Place after Another: Site-Specific Art and Locational Identity*. Boston: MIT Press, 2002. Print
- LaWare, Margaret R. 1998. "Encountering Visions of Aztlan: Arguments for Ethnic Pride, Community Activism and Cultural Revitalization in Chicano Murals." *Argumentation and Advocacy* 34 (3).
- Macdonald, Nancy. 2001. *The Graffiti Subculture: Youth, Masculinity and Identity in London and New York*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Marling, Karal Ann. 1982. *Wall-to-wall America: post office murals in the Great Depression*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Ranciere, Jacques. 1998. *Disagreement: Politics and Philosophy*. Translated by J. Rose. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Rivera, Diego. 1933. Workers Age, June 15, 1933, Rivera Supplement, "The Radio City Mural," http://xroads.virginia.edu/~ma04/hess/rockrivera/newspapers/WorkersAge_06_15_1933.html
- Rose, Gillian. 2001. *Visual Methodologies*. SAGE Publications.
- Savage, Kirk. 2009. *Monument Wars*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Scott, R.L. 1977. "Diego Rivera at Rockefeller Center: Fresco Painting and Rhetoric". *Western Journal of Communication* 41 (Spring):70-82.
- Weber, John Pitman. 2003. *Politics and Practice of Community Public Art: Whose Murals Get Saved?* The Getty Institute.

Optional reading:

Week 1: Functional Communication

- Makagon, Daniel. 2007. "Sloths in the Street: Loitering and Public Life" in *The Urban Communication Reader* ed. Burd, Drucker, Gumpert. New York: Hampton Press.

Urban Visual Cultures Syllabus

-----, 2000. "'Got Meat?' Guerilla's and the Art of Aggravation," *Text and Performance Quarterly*, 20, no. 2: 203 – 214.

Weber, Rachel. 2002. *Extracting Value from the City: Neoliberalism and Urban Redevelopment*. www.akira.ruc.dk/~akt/.../09-Weber-Extracting-Value-from-theCity.pdf.

Week 2: Urban Sight: Surveillance and Resistance

Gandy, Matthew. 1999. "The Paris Sewers and the Rationalization of Urban Space." *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*. 24:1, 23-44.

Week 3: Museum to Street

Fraser, Andrea, 2005. "From the Critique of Institutions of the Institution of Critique." *Artforum*.

Lucienne Peiry and James Frank, *Art Brut: The Origins of Outsider Art* (Paris: Flammarion, 2001) (Intro)

Gregg M. Horowitz, "Public art/public space: The spectacle of the Tilted Arc Controversy." *The Journal of Aesthetics And Art Criticism* 54, no. 1 (1996): 8-14

Week 8: Monuments

Blair, Carole.. 1999. "Contemporary U.S. Memorial Sites as Exemplars of Rhetoric's Materiality," in *Rhetorical Bodies*. Ed. Jack Selzer and Sharon Crowley. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press.

-----and Neil Michel. 2000/ "Reproducing Civil Rights Tactics: The Rhetorical Performances of the Civil Rights Memorial." *Rhetoric Society Quarterly*.

-----and Michel. 2007. "The AIDS Memorial Quilt and the Contemporary Culture of Public Commemoration." *Rhetoric and Public Affairs* 10.

Week 9: Murals

Coffey, Mary Katherine. 2002. "Muralism and the People: Culture, Popular Citizenship and Government in Post-Revolution Mexico." *Communication Review* 5 (7).

Golden, Jane, Monica Yant Kinney, David Graham, and Jack Ramsdale. 2002. *Philadelphia Murals and the Stories They Tell*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Goldman, Shifra. 1982. "Mexican Muralism: Its Social-Educative Roles in Latin America and the United States." *Aztlán: A Journal of Chicano Studies* 13 (1-2).

Rochfort, Desmond. 1993. *Mexican muralists: Orozco, Rivera, Siqueiros*. San Francisco: Chronicle Books.

Week 11: Graffiti

MacDowell, Lachlan. 2006. "In Praise of 70k: Cultural Heritage and Graffiti Style." *Continuum: Journal of Medium and Cultural Studies* 20 (4).

Edbauer, Jennifer H. "(Meta)Physical Graffiti: 'Getting Up' as Affective Writing Model." *JAC*, 25.1 (2005): 131-160.

Urban Visual Cultures
Syllabus

Week 13: Social Movements

Darrel Enck-Wanzer. 2006. "Trashing the System: Social Movement, Intersectional Rhetoric, and Collective Agency in the Young Lords Organization's Garbage Offensive," *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 92, no. 2: 174-201.