The Association for Art History’s 46th Annual Conference will be co-hosted by Newcastle University and Northumbria University. The 2020 Annual Conference will be held across both campuses in the city centre and will include opportunities to explore the vibrant cultural landscape of the North East of England.

In addition to academic sessions and research papers, we anticipate that the 2020 Annual Conference will include a mix of events, including artists’ film screenings, performances, roundtable discussions, and site visits.

Both universities have firm roots in the studio practice of art. Conference sessions will engage with research and questions around making and doing and the relationship between theory, history, and practice.

Newcastle and Northumbria trace different histories through the 19th-century art department and mid-20th-century polytechnic college, which prompts us to consider the evolution of art education and its intersections with other disciplines, including cultural studies, design, film, and fashion.

Annual Conference sessions will comprise of six, 25-minute papers, presented over a single day, and may accommodate alternative session formats, such as film screenings and open discussions. The 2020 Annual Conference will also host a limited number of pre-prepared panels.

The 2020 Annual Conference is organised and co-convened by:

Association for Art History
Claire Davies and Cheryl Platt

Newcastle University
Fiona Anderson

Northumbria University
Victoria Horne

TO OFFER A PAPER

Please email your paper proposals direct to the session convenor(s).

Provide a title and abstract (250 words maximum) for a 25-minute paper (unless otherwise specified), your name and institutional affiliation (if any).

Please make sure the title is concise and reflects the contents of the paper because it will appear online, in social media and in the printed programme.

You should receive an acknowledgement of receipt of your submission within two weeks.

Deadline for submissions: Monday 21 October 2019

For further details see: www.forarthistory.org.uk
A Foreign Eye: Interwar European photographers abroad

Jordan Troeller (Humboldt Universität zu Berlin; Freie Universität Berlin) jordantroeller@gmail.com

Hyewon Yoon (University of New Hampshire) hyewon.hyewon@gmail.com

This session solicits papers that examine the imagery produced by interwar European photographers as they travelled to Africa, the Middle East, Latin America, and Asia, producing travel reportages for European illustrated magazines, seeking work in foreign countries, and responding to decolonisation, exile and emigration, and the rise of the Third World movements. Above all, photography and photographic training afforded enterprising women such as Lotte Errell, Lucia Moholy, Marianne Breslauer, Ré Soupault, Annemarie Schwarzenbach, and Etel Mittag-Fodor, who worked in China, Iran, Turkey, Egypt, Israel, and South Africa, a kind of artistic freedom, even as their encounters with peoples beyond Europe’s borders raises critical issues.

The session’s aim is not only to extend geographically the parameters of interwar European photography, but also to illuminate its role in shaping discourses of gender, race, ethnicity, and cultural difference in the mid-20th century. Of particular interest are thus papers that utilise critical race studies, feminism, and visual culture studies to investigate how the interwar mobilisation of photographers unfolded in non-Western contexts. Submissions addressing well-known photographers are welcome, but we especially seek new research that draws attention to lesser known and female protagonists, inasmuch as their work may raise unusually challenging questions. Among them are: how did photographers, whose gender or political identity may have marginalised them in Europe, represent Otherness when abroad? Did modernist photography speak to the challenges of the new global era – of national identity, the ethnographic gaze, decolonisation, discourses of universalism, and gender mobility – in ways that more traditional portrait photography or reportage did not, or was the opposite the case? Were such photographers able to challenge or to transcend the exoticism that littered the pages of illustrated magazines in interwar Europe and elsewhere?

Afrotropes as an Analytical Framework to Expand Art Historical Methodologies of the Black Atlantic?

Sarah Hegenbart (Technical University Munich) sarah.hegenbart@tum.de

Levi Prombaum (Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum) levi.prombaum@gmail.com

This session will explore how the ‘afrotrope’ elucidates an art history dedicated to the artistic expressions and exchanges between the African continent and its diaspora. The notion of the ‘afrotrope’ was introduced by Huey Copeland and Krista Thompson as an analytical framework to examine the circulation of motifs that feature centrally in African Diaspora aesthetics. While ‘afrotropes’ facilitate alternative theoretical models beyond the Western epistemologies structured by time and space, they are also inspired by concepts such as Mikhail Bakhtin’s ‘chronotope’ and its subsequent adoption in the work of Paul Gilroy, as well as Hortense Spillers concept of the ‘pornotrope’.

The theoretical discourses in this thematisation raise large questions about ‘African’ art history’s relationship to ‘Western’ art history, as well as questions about the specificity and universality of image cultures across Africa, Europe, and the Americas. Since the movement of afrotropes involves an oscillation between latency and forceful recurrence in response to socio-political events conditioning black experiences, to what extent does an in-depth understanding of afrotropes and their distinctive materiality require challenging existing tendencies within theoretical discourses of Western art history? How does ‘afrotrope’ function to (or need it function to) account for traditional distinctions between fine art and the vernacular? How might the term account for the different social conditions that emerge in post-colonial and post-slavery contexts?

We will allocate one section to a panel discussion between artists.
Art Disputes: Conflict and competition across the ages

Edward Payne (Durham University) edward.a.payne@durham.ac.uk

Bernadette Petti (The Bowes Museum) bernadette.petti@thebowesmuseum.org.uk

Disputes structure the history of art, practically, intellectually, and critically. Horace’s pairing of painting with poetry was preceded by Simonides’ declaration that painting is mute poetry, while poetry is spoken painting. The battle between the sister arts exploded in the renaissance and early modern periods, extending beyond the duality of words and images to encompass other forms of paragone. Painting and poetry, painting and sculpture, sight and touch, colour and line, ancients and moderns, idealism and naturalism, realism and romanticism: all provoked heated debate.

But art disputes also concern people, their lives and livelihoods, reputations and professions. Arguments over interpretations and attributions, valuations and questions of ownership, continue to prompt conversation and controversy. This session will examine disputes across the art world, intersecting with such disciplines as law, politics, and philosophy. Potential topics may include:

✦ paragone: comparison, rivalry, and hierarchy of arts, genres, etc.
✦ plagiarism: authority and authenticity (from the Domenichino–Agostino Carracci affair to the Orlan–Lady Gaga scandal)
✦ territorialism: geographic, conceptual, and intellectual property divisions
✦ provocation: art as challenge or conflict (caricature and parody, from Bernini to Banksy)
✦ hand and mind: manual craft versus mental skill (artists legitimising their profession, from the disegno–colore debate to the David Hockney–Damien Hirst dispute)
✦ insiders and outsiders of the art world
✦ competition and collaboration: productive and destructive practices (‘correcting’ or defacing artworks)
✦ canon-building and busting: canonical versus non-canonical art and artists (Pacheco’s erasure of Zurbarán, Ruskin’s ‘editing’ of Turner)
✦ artists versus critics (Vasari–Titian; Zola–Cézanne; Greenberg–Johns / Rauschenberg)
✦ playing the game: following the rules or cheating the system

Art History, Theory and Practice for an Ecological Emergency

Andrew Patrizio (Edinburgh College of Art, University of Edinburgh) a.patrizio@ed.ac.uk

Lucy Whelan (Humboldt University of Berlin) lucy.whelan@hu-berlin.de

How can we align art theory, history, and practice with an ontology that refuses to see human life as fundamentally set apart from nature? Art historians have recently started to respond to global environmental concerns with eco-critical approaches. Yet with the effects of abrupt climate breakdown already apparent, art history can afford neither to repeat the theoretical debates over the representation of nature explored in literary studies since the 1990s, nor to conceive the ecological as a transitory ‘turn’ or an additional category of analysis. Instead, a global existential crisis demands a wholesale rethinking of how art historians and practitioners write, curate, make, and teach. This interdisciplinary session builds on recent work by TJ Demos, Anna Tsing, Kathryn Yusoff and others, in moving towards an integrated ecological art history that is oriented towards the future, even as it examines the past. Key questions to explore may include:

✦ Faced with the reality of environmental breakdown, how can different approaches to realism attend to the more-than-human reality always constraining and exceeding human constructions?
✦ Taking a global, holistic approach, what new insights may be revealed by situating historical categories such as gender, race, or class in relation to the environment?
✦ In turning our attention to ‘deep’ or geological time, or conversely to the critically shallow time left to reduce emissions, how might we change our approach to art’s temporality?
✦ While some major museums have recently divested from fossil fuels, how can the art institution go further in resisting norms that are damaging the planet?
Art into Pop (Redux)

Gavin Butt (Northumbria University)
gavinbutt739@btinternet.com

In 1987, Simon Frith and Howard Horne published the path-breaking book Art into Pop, detailing the impact of art school on British popular music from sixties bohemianism to postmodernism in the 1980s. Bringing perspectives from the sociology of music to bear upon the subject of fine art education, their ‘cross-over’ methodology has remained largely unsurpassed in delineating the art school’s decisive role in shaping histories of popular music and culture. That is, until the recent decade whence a welter of new academic studies, popular histories, autobiographies, and exhibitions have appeared which, either wholly or in part, have served to update Frith and Horne’s original contribution: with perspectives on bands as diverse as Roxy Music, Destroy All Monsters, Gang of Four, Pylon, and Soft Cell, and institutions including Cal Arts, Newcastle University, and Leeds Polytechnic.

This session seeks contributions that continue to renew understandings of the entwined histories of art education and pop music. Proposals might consider issues such as:

* avant-garde experiment and popular audiences
* performance art and street style
* fine-art media and sound/music
* the economics and politics of art education
* pedagogy and DIY
* conceptual rock and art theory
* artistic risk and industry/commodity.

All disciplinary perspectives are welcome, and the international scope of the panel is unlimited. Papers charting the histories of art and pop outside the UK and US are particularly encouraged, as are those focusing on artists who are women, queer or people of colour.

Art, Labour and Inequality: Interdisciplinary perspectives

Dave O’Brien (University of Edinburgh) D.OBrien@ed.ac.uk
Harry Weeks (Newcastle University) Harry.Weeks@newcastle.ac.uk

Art history and art theory have become increasingly attendant to the status of art’s role as a site of labour in recent years. Julia Bryan-Wilson and Angela Dimitrakaki have sought to reconfigure the artist as ‘art worker’, while Gregory Sholette and Hito Steyerl have shed light on the unpaid ‘dark matter’ underpinning art’s economies. Parallel to this, cultural sociologists (Pascal Gielen, Angela McRobbie) have turned towards the labour of the art field as a means of unpicking the entrenched inequalities (gender, race, class) of the cultural sector, and how these might impact upon cultural and social reproduction more broadly. The 2018 ‘Panic!’ Report into cultural inequality has gained substantial traction in the museums and galleries sector, but has yet to significantly feed into art-historical and art-theoretical discussions.

In the spirit of interdisciplinary exchange, this session seeks to bring these two discourses into conversation, asking what they might learn from one another. We ask how the conjunction of sociological, historical and theoretical methodologies might serve both to enhance understandings of artistic labour, and to materially impact upon labour inequalities in the field of art. We welcome contributions from across the various disciplines concerned with artistic labour and inequality, as well as with adjacent issues including decolonisation, institutional critique and gentrification. Papers that deal with interdisciplinary conversations directly are particularly welcomed, however, we also see the panel as a whole as a moment of productive interdisciplinary dialogue. The session organisers are in conversation with Palgrave’s ‘Sociology of the Arts’ series regarding publication.

Art, Obscurity, and the Politics of Rescue

Amy Tobin (University of Cambridge / Kettle’s Yard) ajt207@cam.ac.uk

Flora Dunster (University of Sussex) fdunster@gmail.com

Over recent years artists little known in mainstream art histories have welcomed new attention from academics, institutions and publishers. Although long overdue, this often comes with the burden of being cast as novelty, undiscovered, or hidden treasure. Value resides in obscurity overthrown, and attends not just to the artist but to the curator, institution or writer who is seen to be doing the ‘good work’ of rescue, or worse, discovery. While this narrative may help introduce an artist to new and larger audiences, does it indemnify the calamities of such an approach? For instance, as Ariel Goldberg writes of the photographer Donna Gottschalk: ‘To frame Gottschalk as ‘unsung’ or finally achieving ‘fame’... fails to admit her resistance to normative culture. The commercial art world’s appetite for ‘queer images’ in the service of the market’s relentless feasting on the new has already led to Gottschalk being labelled as a ‘discovery.’

We are interested in the material repercussions and conceptual barriers this situation presents. If support is contingent on novelty than how can an artist’s work or art historical research continue following first exposure? How can the condition of so-called obscurity be re-thought beyond its potential as a space outside the mainstream waiting to be mined? How does this logic of discovery intersect with Otherness, normativity, displacement and...
gentrification? Does it operate differently between historical and contemporary sites? How do we define obscurity? How has this designation been resisted? How can support exceed marketisation? This panel seeks contributions that critically engage with these circumstances, and welcomes feminist, queer, indigenous, and post-colonial perspectives. We are open to papers considering material from any period.

Changing Approaches to Histories of British Art, 1660–1735

Lydia Hamlett (University of Cambridge) lkh25@cam.ac.uk
Claudine van Hensbergen (Northumbria University) claudine.vanhensbergen@northumbria.ac.uk

The last decade has seen a growing interest in new approaches to British visual culture in the decades around the turn of the 18th century (c. 1660–1735), addressing the art-historical imbalance that saw this period overshadowed by attention to the ages of van Dyck (the 17th century) and Hogarth and Reynolds (the 18th century). Much of this work has understood art of these decades in the context of 18th-century developments in Britain, paying less attention to its relationship with visual culture of the 17th century and the wider European context. This session invites participants to consider the extent to which this has skewed our understanding of British visual culture of this period, and to chart new directions in research and exhibition-making, resituating the period of enquiry to include the long 17th century.

Where recent exhibitions have explored the period’s art (for example, Charles I: King and Collector at the RA and Charles II: Art & Power at the Royal Collection), the focus has continued to fall on the court as the seat of the Arts in the period. We invite participants to interrogate the extent to which this was true, and propose new methodologies for research and exhibition-making. The session hopes to recover the multiple and varied histories of art taking shape in Britain in the period. We especially invite transdisciplinary contributions exploring what Mark Hallett has termed ‘intermedial’ collaborations, the influential contribution of migrant artists, as well as papers exploring the work and patronage of women. Contributions may take the form of traditional papers exploring research or museum & gallery practice (20 mins), object-in-focus presentations (15 mins) or roundtables (30 mins).

Climates of Colonialism

Julia Lum (Scripps College, Claremont, CA, USA), lum.julia@gmail.com
Gabrielle Moser (OCAD University, Toronto, Canada), gmoser@faculty.ocadu.ca

This session investigates how art and cultural production in the (former) British Empire has long charted the interdependent and co-constitutive logics of climate and colonialism. It welcomes scholarly analyses of historic and contemporary art and visual culture – from historic maps, topographical sketches, built environments and landscape painting, to 20th-century touristic views, earth art installations, film and video art – that consider how artistic treatments of environmental change can be located within broader histories of dispossession, extraction, and genocide. Not only was climate central to anthropological representations of racial differences in imperial ideologies – such as suppositions about which populations were ‘naturally suited’ to particular weather events, temperature ranges and climatic conditions – but colonial practices of extraction and commodification radically altered ecologies under colonial rule. Following calls by Indigenous, Black, post-colonial and feminist scholars to locate the history of climate change at the start of global trade and modern colonialism, rather than the Industrial Revolution, this session imagines climate change not as a new event, but rather as ‘the continuation of practices of dispossession and genocide, coupled with a literal transformation of the environment, that have been at work for the last five hundred years’ (Davis and Todd 2017: 761). Taking up the rich cross-disciplinary discussion that has emerged around the Anthropocene (which permeates nearly every academic discipline), this session seeks to consider representations of not only atmospheric pollution, extraction, flood, fire, and meteorology, but also human/animal and inter-species relations, agrarianism, deforestation, cities and transportation networks, gardening and park land, and acclimatisation as indexes of colonial intervention.

Craft and War

Jennifer Way (University of North Texas)
Jennifer.Way@unt.edu

This session investigates relationships of craft and war and considers how they compel a reappraisal of central themes in craft history. To be sure, we may not readily identify craft as a cultural form long associated with war. Nevertheless, since its emergence during the 19th century as a hand-based fabrication valued especially for its differences from machine-made goods, craft has been engaged with civil and foreign wars, cold wars, and police and military actions.

What historical examples, theoretical frameworks, and interdisciplinary approaches illuminate how and for whom
craft has mattered in these contexts or address craft’s connections to the politics of wars and to wars’ subjectivities and affects—rage, boredom, loneliness, shock, traumas of dislocation and loss? Why has craft featured in halls of diplomacy, home fronts, battlefields, internment camps, prisons, sites of rehabilitation, and spaces of memorialisation? How have technologies of wars informed craft practices? What has the mobility of craft contributed to its performance of the cultural and social work of wars?

There is also the question of why the long association of craft and war remains untheorised and understudied. What does its emergence during the era of Western modernity suggest about connections between craft and geographies of modernity and their conflicts? How does studying craft and war privilege or trouble West/non-West binaries of culture and power? Craft historiography emphasises times of peace and prioritises themes of the domestic, feminine, and indigenous. What new narratives for craft histories might attention to craft and war propose?

Creative Cartographies and Inherited Aesthetics: Craft, tradition and labour in contemporary fine art practices

Ella S Mills (Paul Mellon Centre) livingarchives.em@gmail.com
Erin L McCutcheon (Lycoming College) elmccutcheon@gmail.com

This session seeks papers that broadly discuss the fine-art practice and aesthetics of artists of the 20th and 21st centuries in relation to their diasporic parentage and heritage. How do different understandings of and approaches to creativity, craft, tradition and labour intersect and manifest in the work of fine artists? What part have feminisms played in the passing on of skills and craft across generations and geographies? How have those creative and/or cultural traditions been treated in formal institutions?

While this session is open to a variety of parent–child interactions, we are particularly interested in examining generational and geographical inheritance from mothers to their fine-art daughters. In what ways have artist–women from these contexts formulated their aesthetic, practice, and subjectivity in direct relation to the traces and influences of their mothers? How have artists negotiated institutional bias around traditional forms of creativity and notions of the ‘domestic’? What role do fathers and sons have in this inheritance?

In addition to scholarly presentations, we also welcome practice-based papers from artists, non-traditional presentations, and critiques that trouble or unpack any of the ideas and terminologies articulated here.

Yielding the Past to the Present: Reintrepreting the Classical

Melissa Gustin (University of York) mlg519@york.ac.uk

If, as Aby Warburg said, ‘Every age has the renaissance of antiquity that it deserves’, what is the renaissance of antiquity that we deserve today? And how does that differ – if it does – from earlier renaissances and antiquities? Whether it be a 3D print of Aphrodite, Antinous as symbol of gay pride or the Photoshop of Donald Trump as Perseus triumphantly holding aloft a Gorgon–portrait of Hilary Clinton, in contemporary art, t-shirts, and the internet, the material remains of the classical world continue to permeate modern visual culture.

Following on from international exhibitions, internet discourse around the use of the antique, and recent texts by scholars such as Elizabeth Prettejohn and Caroline Vout among many others, we propose a session that engages seriously with the material remains of antiquity in art to explore the ways in which the art of the ancient world has been adapted, interpreted, and repurposed throughout history. By proposing an open time frame we hope to encourage a discussion on the dialogues formed between classical art and its receptions, questioning how issues such as gender, race, status and class, as well as political, environmental and historical factors, have impacted the use and reuse of the past. This panel will explore the constant rediscovery, reinvention, and reworking of antique material, methods, and models in different media, and invites papers from any period or medium that address questions of the ‘classical’, historic or present.

Early Modern Tolerance

Edward Wouk (The University of Manchester) edward.wouk@manchester.ac.uk
Jamie Edwards (University of Birmingham) j.edwards@bham.ac.uk

The representation of tolerance was relatively rare in the visual arts of the early modern period. While imagery of bigotry and violence proliferated across media, for example in battle scenes, representations of martyrdom, and images of encounters with inhabitants of the Americas – all of which have been extensively studied in recent years – far fewer images address the theme of tolerance. Correspondingly, little scholarly work has been done on how, and to what extent, early modern artists engaged with the theme of tolerance in their works. This session therefore seeks to explore whether it is indeed possible to speak of an early modern visual culture of tolerance, and will investigate how and why artists created images that both visualised and inculturated a tolerant stance in the face of prevailing social,
religious, or ethnic differences or tensions. We are interested in papers that explore a range of visual material and welcome contributions that look across geographic and temporal boundaries, including those that address non-western traditions or explore the resonances of early modern images of tolerance in and for our contemporary world. Themes can include (but are not limited to):

- images of harmony, concord, peace, and equality, and how these provided spaces in which artists and their publics could seek alternatives to the cultures of violent intolerance in which they lived and worked
- the particular forms of participation and performance, if any, that viewers enacted in response to images of tolerance
- (visual) dissimulation and dissemblance
- why early modern tolerance matters today.

This session is co-sponsored by the Renaissance Society of America (RSA)

Exploring Diversity in Public Sculpture

Klairi Angelou. (PMSA – Public Monuments and Sculpture Association, London) klairi@pmsa.org.uk / kamp.angelou@gmail.com

In recent years, scholarship and society have become increasingly sensitised to the issue of diversity and inclusivity. We believe that questions around the depiction and representation of diversity in public sculpture have become increasingly hard to ignore and should, therefore, be addressed and thoroughly discussed. There may have been an increase in public sculpture commemorating women’s achievements (eg the statue of Millicent Fawcett in London) and memorials acknowledged by queer culture (eg Kiss Wall in Brighton), and Marc Quinn’s Alison Lapper Pregnant in Trafalgar Square (2005) may have put disability, femininity and motherhood on the map, but there is still a long way to go. This session aims to promote the value of diversity in sculpture and challenge hegemonic narratives and approaches to it. It will address issues of marginalisation and explore in what ways diversity is understood and reflected in public sculptures.

We welcome contributions from all periods and geographic locations and invite interdisciplinary approaches, as well as fresh interpretation of existing knowledge and/or presentation of new material emerging from research, conservation or archival discoveries. Possible areas of enquiry can include, but are not limited to:

- Queer approaches to public sculpture, as well as perceived politicised uses of queer memorials
- Sculpture representing ethnic diversity
- How the employment of different materials/techniques is involved in representing diversity
- The role of museum and institutions towards diversifying sculpture
- Case studies through which gender/sexual/social/national identity is explored and challenged through sculpture.

Open and inclusive in scope, our session will attract a range of speakers concerned with broadening the understanding of public sculpture and become the topos of an exciting and challenging discussion, drawing upon a range of diverse sculptural practices.

Exploring the Plurality of Artists’ Practices: Artists as dealers and agents

Adriana Turpin (IESA, Paris) pluralpractices@gmail.com

Marie Tavinor (Christie’s Education, London) pluralpractices@gmail.com

Tropes from the Romantic era depicted artistic practice as an expression of the artists’ ‘isolated genius’ which, in sociological terms, translated into the ‘autonomisation of intellectual and artistic production’, as a form of ‘auto-normativity’. This session, however, aims to subvert such compartmentalisation of artistic activities and think about artistic practices – in the plural – which extend beyond the intellectualisation of ‘disegno’. In particular, we would invite papers that seek to bridge seemingly disparate areas of artistic practice and explore the activities of artists as commercial agents.

Artists were involved in negotiating the complex art worlds of their day, cultivating patrons, creating support networks or supplementing their incomes through dealing in art. From the Renaissance, artists often acted for the patrons in both the primary and secondary market for collecting, shaping the taste and opportunities for artists other than themselves. Indeed, their knowledge and experience as artists was highly valued as Giovanni Maria Sasso or Gavin Hamilton operated simultaneously as restorers, dealers, agents or collectors.

This session thus invites papers covering all periods of art history and exploring plural notion of ‘artistic practices’ as means to expand its meaning and application. We are particularly interested in how artists shaped taste and collections, acted as dealers, or revised their own practices in response to an increasingly international art market.
**From Keeper to Maker: British curatorial practices**

Laia Anguix (Northumbria University)
laia.anguix@northumbria.ac.uk

Elisabetta Fabrizi (Newcastle University)
e.fabrizi2@newcastle.ac.uk

Massimiliano Papini (Northumbria University)
Massimiliano.papini@northumbria.ac.uk

Scholarly research is giving growing importance to curatorial practices. Publications such as the *Museum History Journal* (8:1, 2015) have discussed how, since the mid-to-late 19th century, curators worldwide have adapted from the scholarly and administrative art expert archetype (George, 2015) to one that ‘possesses an authorial/artistic function’ (O’Neill, 2012), in which the ‘making’ takes centre stage (Acord, 2010).

Have British curators followed the same evolution or are there distinctive characteristics that set British curators apart from their colleagues abroad? This panel aims to cover a gap in curatorial research by discussing the history of curators in Britain, reflecting on how they have engaged with their economic, political, and professional contexts since Victorian times (Black, 2000). It will analyse the role of professional associations such as the UK Museums Association (1889) as a forum for exchanging ideas and practice, the emergence of training programmes in the mid-20th century, the creation of the first HE curatorial course in the Royal College of Art (1992) and the potential professional challenges of a post-Brexit scenario.

We invite papers on the following possible topics:

- distinctiveness of British curatorial practices
- peculiarity of British curators’ training in different periods and its impact upon practice
- isolation and connection in the relations with foreign artists, institutions, colleagues, critics, connoisseurs, private collectors, commercial art galleries and public powers
- internationalism and Britishness in curatorial discourses
- class and gender inclusion in the profession compared to other countries
- the impact of curation on the art market and art education in the UK and abroad.

**Hybrid Marines**

Gabriel Gee (Franklin University, Switzerland & TETI Group – Textures and Experiences of Trans-Industrialty)
ggee@fus.edu

Bryan Biggs (Bluecoat, Liverpool)
bryan.b@thebluecoat.org.uk

The marine emerged as a pictorial genre in Europe in the early modern age. Painters turned their eyes to the sea, to ships, coasts and harbour scenes, while European maritime commercial networks extended their reach across the oceans. In the 20th century, the standardisation of containers in maritime transportation induced a separation of port cities and their inhabitants from port infrastructures. The perception of the maritime realm and the identities of port cities significantly changed, as aerial channels took over passenger transportation, while former inner-city harbours were converted into leisure areas away from the seas’ silent economic machinery.

In parallel, hybrid forms and narratives in artistic practices emerged with the capacity to interrogate the cultural and industrial textures underlying our present interconnected world. This session aims to look at the production of hybrid marines, inviting papers engaging with maritime representations in the visual arts. Hybridity opens two (potentially overlapping) paths of enquiry into the marine: first a hybridity in form, considering how practitioners exploring maritime realms have developed new formats, new techniques, and new strategies transcending traditional medium boundaries; the session will aim to reflect on the specificity of these formal researches as they pertain to the maritime. Second, a representational hybridity, investigating the extent to which seascapes could integrate multifocal points of view, as opposed to more traditional linear perspectives. In this vein, the session aims to reflect on the criticality of the contemporary marine, in its capacity to unfold maritime heritage and discourses, as well as draw alternative imaginaries for the present.

**Jewish Visual Culture in Modern Europe (c.1840–1940)**

Tom Stammers (University of Durham)
t.e.stammers@durham.ac.uk

The question of whether it is possible or desirable to define ‘Jewish’ art or ‘Jewish’ taste remains contentious. According to Dominique Jarrassé, to even ask the question invites suspicion of essentialism, generalisations or even anti-Semitism. Yet the contribution of Jewish artists, architects, critics, dealers and collectors to the formation of modern European culture is as unavoidable as it is elusive. This session draws on the conference themes to examine different methodological approaches to the ‘Jewishness’ of visual
culture in the era of emancipation, secularisation and assimilation. How far can we identify recognisably Jewish forms of making art — whether in the relationship between text and image, the production of sacred space, or the encoding of cultural difference? In what ways have Jewish scholars intellectually reframed the narratives of art history? And what, if anything, is salient about the ways that Jewish patrons commissioned or ‘consumed’ art in both the private and public domain?

Timed to coincide with the beginning of a major AHRC-funded project on Jewish Country Houses, the session invites applications from scholars working on Jewish artists or Jewish collections in Britain and Europe in the period 1840–1940, broadly conceived as collections with Jewish stories to tell. How has the Jewishness of artists and art practices been understood? How can the practice of collecting shed light on the history of Jewish identities/identifications, as well as on how these identities/identifications should be theorised by scholars today? The Jewish case is at once exceptional and highly suggestive about the interpretive challenges of locating religious and ethnic minorities within art history.

Organised with the support of the Society for the History of Collecting

Material/Immaterial: The lives (and afterlives) of objects

Lynn M Somers (Independent Scholar & Drew University, Madison, NJ) lmsomers@mac.com

Recent work on matter, materiality, and materialisms has enriched the study of objects in the aesthetic, and more broadly, cultural spheres. Beyond formal considerations, artists have mined materials as complex, affective carriers of communication (as recent exhibitions of Bruegel, Hilma af Klint, Henry Moore, Ruth Asawa, and Doris Salcedo suggest). But what precisely is the relationship between medium and materiality, the latter of which Michael Ann Holly has called ‘the meeting of matter and imagination’? Panofsky wrote that the melancholy task of humanists ‘isn’t to arrest what would otherwise slip away but enliven what would otherwise remain dead’. How might we understand the powerful tug-of-war between tangible surface and the immaterial — psychological, emotional, and spiritual — that the ‘stuff’ of objects transmits?

The obdurate materiality of the works we study are both lost and found, past and present. Equally important, they are embedded to varying degrees with the lives of their makers, carrying their own narratives across time and space in ways that are often difficult to untangle from the stories of people who produced them. Perhaps scholars needn’t shy away from their desires to recapture the ineffable that imaginative endeavours offer. What, for instance, makes one object forgettable and another arresting? There’s a difference, both psychoanalysts and connoisseurs say, between an ordinary object and an evocative one, but the aforementioned questions are open to other sociocultural, anthropological, and theoretical inquiries. This panel explores dialogues between material and materiality while engaging with issues of making viewed through the lenses of history, theory, and practice.

Matter, (Im)materials and Materiality: On the life of digital artworks

Beryl Graham (University of Sunderland) beryl.graham@sunderland.ac.uk
Alexandra Moschovi (University of Sunderland) alexandra.moschovi@sunderland.ac.uk

In recent years, the ‘material turn’ in contemporary art has re-activated critical debates around the matter and materials of art objects and their affective properties, expanding to consider their physical encounter and spatio-temporal parameters as well as the idiosyncrasies of process-oriented forms and participation. Echoing the impulse of the dematerialisation of the art object that dominated Conceptual art, process-led practices and happenings in the 1960s and 1970s, digital art has often been discussed in terms of processes, systems and networks, and thus as immaterial. Yet, as Christiane Paul argues, the ‘myth of immateriality’ that surrounds digital artworks fails to address not only the materialisation of digital works in gallery contexts, their collection and preservation, but also the very materiality of digital technologies and their impact on physical reality. Paul (2015) proposes the concept of ‘neomateriality’ to capture on one hand, ‘the confluence and convergence of digital technologies in various materialities’, and on the other hand, ‘the ways in which this merger has changed our relationship with these materialities and our representation as subjects’.

This session seeks to explore how the (neo)materiality of digital artworks provides such points of exchange for artists, curators and publics. We welcome contributions by art historians, theorists, curators, artists, makers and conservators that consider how the modularity of digital technologies, the convergence of media and the new forms of materiality that come into being in contemporary digital art practices in a post-internet era may renegotiate the experience of beholding within and beyond the physical.
Museum for the Global Majority: Expanding the limits of museum practice

Jennifer Reynolds-Kaye (Yale Center for British Art) jennifer.reynolds-kaye@yale.edu
Maryam Ohadi-Hamadani (Yale Center for British Art) maryam.ohadi-hamadani@yale.edu

Restructuring methodologies and practices that can liberate the art museum from its colonial past is ever more urgent in the wake of our current global environment. Traditional museums are receptacles for the material traces of culture, and are inextricably linked to our pasts; in our present, they are the narrators and educators of this history. But what past and present moments are represented in the museum, in its exhibition and collecting practices?

The ‘past conditional temporality’ of ‘what could have been,’ as Lisa Lowe writes, ‘symbolizes aptly the space of a different kind of thinking, a space of productive attention to the scene of loss, a thinking with twofold attention that seeks to encompass at once the positive objects and methods of history and social science, and also the matters absent, entangled and unavailable by its methods.’ Is it possible to exceed or negotiate the constitutive limits of the museum? What counter-models and counter-histories might we use to rethink the museum as a space for community and inclusivity when its foundation is predicated on rendering certain histories and viewpoints as absent or othered? How might the museum share narrative authority and agency with historically underrepresented or unrepresented communities?

We welcome contributions from scholars, artists, museum educators and curators that offer methodological and practical methods for decolonising the museum. This session is also open to ways of decolonising the very premise of a ‘panel’ of experts, and looks for participants willing to co-create spaces of open dialogue, problem-solving, and imaginative experimentation.

Political Appropriations

Lara Perry (University of Brighton) lara.perry@brighton.ac.uk
Elke Krasny (Academy of Fine Arts, Vienna) elke.krasny@gmail.com

In this session we invite papers that consider the appropriation or reappropriation of art in political movements. In the current moment the paths of political agency are being transformed by a resurgence of right-wing politics and the devolution of political agency to popular movements constituted with the aid of social media and the internet. Art and other forms of image have played a central role in the communication of political values in these new circumstances, as new political actors have addressed their audiences through the production, reproduction and destruction of art. In some cases, the reappropriations of art’s language and imagery have been radical: on her network news programme in 2015, Sarah Palin described Donald Trump’s Presidential campaign as ‘avant garde;’ in others, such as the siting of a new Bauhaus museum opposite a Nazi -built administration office (Weimar, 2019), there has been a more historically conscious deployment of the politics of art and design. We are seeking papers that address such (re) appropriations of art in current or relevant past political formations.

Portraiture in Digital Culture

Fiona Johnstone (University of Warwick) Fiona.johnstone@warwick.ac.uk
Scott Wark (University of Warwick) s.wark@warwick.ac.uk

Digital culture – defined here as the omnipresence of digital technologies in every aspect of our lives – is rapidly producing new configurations of subjectivities and selves. Historically, developments in portraiture have been closely tied to shifting notions of personhood. The genre has been crucial to the articulation of the modern western subject as a unique, coherent, and self-determining individual (Woodall, 1997), whilst challenges to figurative portraiture made by the artistic avant-garde from the early 20th-century onwards can be understood as part of a drive to dismantle an outmoded concept of ‘humanist bourgeois subjectivity’ (Buchloh, 1994).

This session invites papers that explore how portraiture is responding to emerging conceptions of subjectivity and personhood generated by our contemporary digital condition. The digitalisation of culture has led contemporary artists to experiment with innovative new modes of portrait-making (Johnstone & Imber, 2019); this session actively seeks papers that address portraiture in its most expanded sense. There is a considerable literature on social media and self-representation, particularly the selfie, but what other forms might digital (self-)representation take, and how else might the connections between digitality, subjectivity, and portraiture be conceptualised? For example, how has portraiture responded to the datafication of the human? The ‘digital subject’ (Goriunova, 2018) or ‘shadow self’ produced by recommender systems and other techniques of online personalisation exists in a recursive relation with the living self; what might contemporary art practices reveal about this relationship? How have artists experimented with self-tracking devices, ‘data selfie’ apps, facial recognition software, or health and/or ancestry testing services? How can concepts such as ‘likeness’ or ‘indexicality’, which have been central to discourse about portraiture, be reconceived in the context of digital culture?

Theo Gordon (University of Sussex) theogordon2@gmail.com

How can the history of art and fine-art practice in Britain trouble our understanding of the development of queer theory? The significance of disciplines such as literature, philosophy or sociology to the place of ‘queer’ in the academy appear unequivocal; that of art and art history, less so. Similarly, the contributions of cultural producers in France and the United States appear foundational to ‘queer theory’, whilst that of those in Britain seems under-articulated.

This panel invites papers exploring the synergies, overlaps and influences between art produced in Britain and the emergence of queer theory since 1970. Attention to the socio-cultural circumstances of ‘queer’ artistic production in Britain, the porosity and particularity of national boundaries, and the transnational movement of artists and writers, will be welcome. Papers may touch on:

- national, regional, local and community funding sources
- polytechnic and university art departments
- cultural studies and centres of radical critique
- migration and black diaspora
- post-coloniality
- regional and national trade union movements and strikes
- Marxist and socialist movements
- radical feminism
- urban and rural networks of fags and dykes
- underground radio and music scenes
- leather and S/M cultures
- responses to HIV/AIDS
- activist groups
- ephemera and print cultures
- transgender and intersex identities
- communes and sectarian communities
- artist collectives, and exhibition histories.

Not content with any hegemonic or hermetic national narrative, this panel asks how to queer the historiography of queer theory by practising what Briony Fer has recently called ‘a history of detail’, that attends to the circumstances of how art and artists in Britain have contributed to a transnational discourse of queerness.

Representing the Nation: The historic and continuing role of national art institutions

Freya Spoor (Assistant Curator, ‘Celebrating Scotland’s Art’ The Scottish National Gallery Project) FSpoor@nationalgalleries.org

Neil Labeled (Amgueddfa Cymru – National Museum Wales) Neil.Labeled@museumwales.ac.uk

In late 18th-century Europe, a number of royal art collections were nationalised. The purpose of such institutions was to house significant collections of art that would be representative of the nation and its cultural aspirations. The best way to achieve this aim has been subject to continual debate. Some institutions have prioritised displays of recognised masterpieces in order to elevate local art production and the perceived cultural status of the nation. Others have provided a national forum for art either by resident artists or that depicts subjects of national interest. With large, historic collections these strategies are rarely distinct and often overlap. Factors that shape the display policy might include the political climate, economic considerations and social necessity. The physical space available and location of the gallery can also determine the presentation made and whether or not it is seen as successful. More recently, the development of new technologies has broadened audiences for national art collections to a global scale. By analysing the historic and continuing role of national art institutions, it is possible to view in microcosm many of the processes involved in creating and presenting a collected image of the nation. Thus, this session welcomes papers that examine but are not limited to the following themes:

- nationalism/globalism
- collection formation past and present
- pedagogical purpose
- the role of culture in society
- community engagement
- physical space and location of the gallery
- new technologies
- audiences for art
- representativeness of collections
- ownership
- partnerships.
‘The Book of the Future’: Photobooks between disciplines

Fiona Allen (University of Exeter) F.Allen@exeter.ac.uk
Simon Constantine (University College London) ucwgcsc@ucl.ac.uk
Daniel Hartley (Durham University) daniel.j.hartley@durham.ac.uk

From self-published volumes to digital projects, the 21st century has witnessed a renewed interest in the photobook. Indeed, whilst the decision to combine text, photography and archival materials is a product of the 19th century, the term photobook is a somewhat more recent invention. This revival has also given rise to an increased scholarly and institutional interest in the topic – developments exemplified by Tate’s recent acquisition of Martin Parr’s photobook collection. In many respects, these events echo a claim made in a 1937 review of Margaret Bourke-White and Erskine Caldwell’s You Have Seen Their Faces: the volume embodied ‘what the book of the future will be like’ – that is, one in which the established hierarchy between text and image has been dissolved. What is less clear, however, is whether the term photobook indicates the realisation of this goal or, as David Campany has argued, an attempt to ‘impose unity where once there was none’.

Although the photobook has generated a substantial body of scholarship, the majority of this material has chosen to focus on its visual components. As such, this panel will explore the possibility of adopting a more interdisciplinary approach. How useful are literary analogies, such as the comparison between the photo sequence and the sentence, when engaging with this material? What type of methodological framework would do justice to the collaborations between photographers and writers that underpin these books? How does literary form affect, imitate or trouble photographic form, and vice versa? By pursuing these (and other) questions, we hope to stage a dialogue on the photobook that brings together scholars from art history, literary studies and other related disciplines.

The Institutionalisation of Critique? - Artists’ interventions in the field of heritage

Nick Cass (Centre for Critical Studies in Museums, Galleries and Heritage; University of Leeds) N.Cass@leeds.ac.uk
Joanne Williams (Leeds University Library Galleries) J.Williams1@leeds.ac.uk

Works of artistic intervention, such as the now seminal works by Hans Haacke, Fred Wilson and Andrea Fraser, made visible the institutional politics of authorised discourses within museums and galleries, disrupting systems of power and knowledge production. Hal Foster theorised these earlier forms of critical intervention with respect to the paradigm of ‘artist as ethnographer’ (1995), echoed in James Clifford’s analysis of interventions as a site-specific ethnographies which ‘decentred established centres of art and cultural production and display’ (2000). More recently, Claire Robins interrogated the pedagogic potential of interventions in museum- and gallery-based learning where they are called upon to perform interpretive tasks (2013).

While it has become increasingly common to encounter contemporary artworks in local and national museums, country houses and landscapes, these projects are often subsumed within organisational and curatorial strategies as alternative forms of interpretation or as elements of audience development in heritage contexts. Andrea Fraser conveyed concerns regarding the consequences of the ‘institutionalisation of institutional critique’ and the resulting necessity to re-examine the history and aims of this form of art practice as a means by which the urgent stakes of the present can be restated (Fraser, 2005). This panel will bring together artists, art historians, and museum and gallery professionals, in response to Fraser’s call to action. It welcomes papers that bring into contact contemporary and historical aesthetic discourses, cultural policy, and current concerns of museum and heritage practice, in order to explore the possibilities of artistic critique and intervention within the contemporary cultural and political landscape.

To offer a paper

Please email your paper proposals direct to the session convenor(s).

You need to provide a title and abstract (250 words maximum) for a 25-minute paper (unless otherwise specified), your name and institutional affiliation (if any).

You should receive an acknowledgement of receipt of your submission within two weeks.

Please make sure the title is concise and reflects the contents of the paper because the title is what appears online, in social media and in the printed programme.

Deadline for submissions: Monday 21 October 2019

For further details see: www.forarthistory.org.uk/
The Real Price: Between art and the (art) market

Bill Balaskas (Kingston University) b.balaskas@kingston.ac.uk

The global financial crisis of 2008 caused widespread political and social turmoil, whose consequences can still be felt around the world. Yet, as the Lehman Brothers investment bank was collapsing in New York in the early autumn of 2008, an auction of works by Damien Hirst in London was fetching record prices. The fact that on the eve of the most severe economic crisis for eight decades a contemporary artist could, as Maev Kennedy put it, make ‘more money in two days than all the artists in the National Gallery earned in a lifetime’ (Guardian, 2008), raised important questions not only about the way in which the (art) market functions, but also about the way in which we evaluate culture at large. Today, a decade after the end of the Great Recession, art organisations and artists continue to struggle, while policymakers systematically overlook culture and art education.

This session aspires to explore the relationship between art and the economy in different historical periods and from diverse points of view. Proposed topics might include, but are by no means limited to:

- Artworks as commodities: use and exchange values
- The art circuit: economic actors and networks
- Marketing and the spectacularisation of art
- Contribution of culture to the economy
- Artists’ productivity and subsistence
- The artist as a businessperson
- The value of cultural capital
- Art’s reaction to economic crises
- Depictions of marketplaces, transactions and enterprises in art
- The role of patrons and collectors
- Cultural policies and economic institutionalisation
- Intellectual property
- Art education, employability and the creative industries.

The Visual Politics of Independent Print Media in the 20th Century

Louise Siddons (Oklahoma State University) louise.siddons@okstate.edu

Victoria Bazin (Northumbria University) victoria.bazin@northumbria.ac.uk

Throughout the 20th century, independent publications were produced by individuals, communities, and organisations around the world. This session seeks papers that explore the visual culture of newspapers and magazines intentionally produced outside the institutional borders of mainstream media. Often advocating oppositional politics through lenses of gender/sexuality, race, carceral status, etc, activist periodicals were the product of editors, artists, and designers who took advantage of inexpensive technologies of reproduction and dissemination, as well as resources such as the Liberation News Service, to build wide-ranging networks through print. The carefully curated interplay between text and images offered readers opportunities for self-definition that reflexively consolidated group identifications. Formally, intellectually, and politically intersectional, this vernacular press often confounded publishing conventions, promiscuously blending genres and audiences. Intentionally blurring the boundaries between art and design, literature and journalism, these publications made cultural and political space for their readers, while occupying diverse real-world spaces. In this session, we will consider the global vernacular press in order to discover the shared structures and intersectional visual networks of 20th-century independent publishing.

We invite papers from artists, designers, and historians that explore every aspect of the visual culture of independent publishing in the 20th century. Papers might address, among other topics:

- practices of production, and how they were informed by politics, economics, and technology
- reader/audience networks and dissemination
- the invention, appropriation, or amplification of specific aesthetics of protest and resistance
- self-fashioning and the authentication of readers’ lives and experiences.
Theatre, Art, and Visual Culture in the 19th Century

Patricia Smyth (University of Warwick) p.m.smyth@warwick.ac.uk
Jim Davis (University of Warwick)
Kate Newey (University of Exeter)
Kate Holmes (University of Exeter)

Convened on behalf of the three-year AHRC-funded project, ‘Theatre and Visual Culture in the Long Nineteenth Century’, this session seeks to create cross-disciplinary dialogue between scholars of art history, visual culture and theatre history. The 19th century is known as a period of blurred boundaries between previously distinct media, as evidenced by the growing importance of spectacle in stage productions, the circulation of images and motifs between media, and also by the frequent application of the term ‘theatrical’ to a certain type of narrative painting. This trans-medial visual culture operated through a range of new technologies, from printing methods such as lithography, to optical toys and spectacular entertainments like the panorama and the diorama, the visual effects of which were also attempted on stage. In looking laterally across media (and disciplinary) boundaries, we hope to offer new insights into contemporary debates about spectatorship, cultural legitimacy, popular taste, the relationship between high art and entertainment.

We invite proposals from researchers working on any aspect of the relationship between theatre and the visual arts in this period. We particularly welcome considerations of the Northumberland-born artist John Martin. The theatricality of Martin’s work was foregrounded by the 2011–12 Tate Britain exhibition, which used special effects to convey its status as the 19th-century equivalent of the blockbuster movie. This example raises questions about how inventive curatorial practices might convey the experience of 19th-century spectators to 21st-century viewers in the midst of our own technological revolution.

Toxic Masculinity (Classical to Contemporary)

Carol Richardson (University of Edinburgh) c.m.richardson@ed.ac.uk
Lucy Weir (University of Edinburgh) lucy.weir@ed.ac.uk

Performatve acts of ritualised violence (purification and mortification, torture and execution) are usually given visual form to justify their deterrent effect. The aestheticisation of violence in this context reflects a complex individual and/or collective desire for absolution – positing the body as a site of ritual sacrifice, sadomasochistic manipulation, and, ultimately, spiritual sanctification.

Masculinity is, we are repeatedly told, enmeshed in a perpetual state of crisis: the destabilising of patriarchal norms set in motion by feminist movements of the 1960s and 70s is continually restated in contemporary debates around toxic masculinity and issues of privilege. It is perhaps unsurprising that the rhetoric of populist, right-wing politics consistently returns to this dual anxiety, lamenting the twin evils of terrorism and feminism.

In considering the lengthy and global history of public violence, we are led to question the motivation of such actions. Are these simply criminal acts that have been explained away by commentators, historians and journalists intent on emotive and sensationalist institutional and collective narrative by means of which one group defines itself in opposition to another? More ‘polite’ societies (academies, churches, lodges, orders and clubs) might use subtler means of group formation, but they are nevertheless exclusive and illusive.

This session will explore the intersection of spectacle and suffering in relation to issues of gender, especially the notion of toxic masculinity. We invite contributions that are as inclusive as possible, explicitly calling for papers from medieval to the contemporary, and especially looking for broad international range.

Troubling Borders: Art worlds in sites of conflict

Edwin Coomasaru (Courtauld Institute of Art) edwin.coomasaru@courtauld.ac.uk
Sarah Kelleher (University College Cork) sarah_kelleher77@yahoo.ie
Rachel Warriner (Courtauld Institute of Art) rachel.warriner@courtauld.ac.uk

Borders, bound up with the politics of gender, race, sexuality, and sectarian identity, are troubling. There is a long history of anxiety about corporeal or geopolitical boundaries which has led to their framing in our current political moment as sites of crisis. When contested, borders can become threatening, as seen in recent rhetoric around migration and calls for militarised walls. Conventionally understood as relating to nationhood, borders exist in broader terms between communities and bodies, and thus invite tropes of complexity ‘typically assembled under the prefixes inter, trans, bi and cross’ (Michaelson and Johnson ‘Border Secrets’). As such, the border as an intellectual entry point signals a locus of possibility, creativity and complex alliance as well as antagonism and complicity. While art history has often explored those individual practices that seek to rethink the borders that define personal and political experience, what has been less considered is the ways in which borders impact the operation of art worlds. Art worlds, here understood in
Howard Becker’s terms as the networks and communities who facilitate the production of art according to shared understandings of its value, are also impacted by borders national, social and aesthetic. Thinking about troubled borders, this panel invites papers that will consider how art worlds are made under contested conditions, how focus on particular identities offers productive and supportive opportunities for creative work for anti-racist, feminist, and queer communities and how identifying across national borders helps develop new forms of collectivity.

Walking on Images

Michael Tymkiw, University of Essex, mtymkiw@essex.ac.uk

For millennia, floors have served as an important site for displaying imagery, as evidenced by mosaic pavements, tomb slabs, rugs, and, more recently, floor-based works of fine art. In many cases, human beings have been encouraged to walk on such imagery – a mode of viewing that not only results in direct physical contact with images but also means that a spectator cannot view ground-based images without simultaneously seeing parts of his or her own body. In this respect, a spectator’s body at once completes and interrupts the imagery being viewed.

This proposed session seeks to explore a range of issues broadly related to the theme of walking on images. Some possible topics for consideration include:

- the motivations for making and/or commissioning particular examples of ‘walkable’ imagery
- the conservation and restoration of floor-based imagery that has been effaced through walking
- theoretical or transdisciplinary discussions of the figure-ground relationship during the act of walking on images
- the dialogue between figuration and abstraction in floor-based decorative arts
- the extent to which the act of walking on imagery problematises the very notion of the image, which is closely associated with resemblance and similitude.

What’s love got to do with it? Queer-feminist desires in researching and writing art histories

James Bell (Northumbria University)
j.c.bell@northumbria.ac.uk
Aleksandra Gajowy (Newcastle University)
a.gajowy2@newcastle.ac.uk

Desire and sexuality have been widely discussed in art history in a variety of contexts: from the sexualising male gaze, exoticisation and fetishisation of non-whiteness, to explorations of the male nude in coded homoerotic argot. Looking into queer archives, feminist and queer art practices and histories pay particular attention to how desire may forge kinship and communities ‘across time and space’, and how desiring and affective modes of research and intellectual inquiry can become driving forces for uncovering silenced and overlooked narratives. Fantasy and turned-on imagination infused with tenderness and care may be considered effective modes of approaching the research subject and the responsibility for telling stories from the archive. This desiring approach grants the subject agency beyond the status of an object to be looked at and enables an affective, attentive relationship between researcher and the research subject.

This session calls for papers that explore affective and entangled approaches to research in artistic practice and art history. Of particular interest are papers that consider the desiring, turned on approaches to art history from any time and place. We ask, what gets you off (in art)? Or, more specifically, what drives us in selecting a research subject? How does desire shape our relationships with living subjects? How do desiring approaches translate onto art writing? What might the ethics of such queer-feminist approaches be? Moreover, what are the political efficacies in such approaches?

We particularly welcome practice-based interventions and submissions that disrupt abled, white, heteronormative, and Western-orientated narratives.
Working Together to Expand the Pool of Art History Students

Hilary Robinson (Loughborough University)
H.Robinson@lboro.ac.uk

Joanna Woodall (Courtauld Institute of Art)
joanna.woodall@courtauld.ac.uk

This workshop is sponsored by the Association for Art History’s Higher Education Committee, a UK-wide body that serves the dual function of advising the Association for Art History on matters of concern within the HE sector and organising, within a broader network, advocacy efforts regarding such matters.

Recruitment to art history and visual culture degrees in the UK is under pressure. Colleagues often complain about competing with other universities for students from a limited pool of applicants. The Office for Students ‘equality, diversity and inclusion’ agenda, and our own ethics, challenge us to recruit a greater number of students who are more diverse in gender, class, ethnicity, age and dis/ability.

This workshop is for colleagues in the UK HE sector to share experiences, good and bad, relating to student recruitment at a time of crisis in HE. We shall think collectively about effective models and new initiatives, building on mutual strength and collaboration.

There will be short, informative presentations, followed by a structured discussion amongst all who attend. The aim is to learn from each other and to formulate specific, collaborative plans to widen the pool.

Topics for discussion may include:

- case-studies of attempts to ‘widen participation’: successes and failures
- experiences of working with state schools and/or FE colleges
- the foundation year and/or summer schools as strategies to ‘widen the pool’
- ideas for expanding student intake, including inter-institutional collaborations
- financial and other material incentives
- attracting and retaining more students by changes to the curriculum, pedagogies, and profiles of academic staff.

We seek:

- proposals for the short presentations
- expressions of interest from individuals and/or university departments that would like to contribute to the discussion.

TO OFFER A PAPER

Please email your paper proposals direct to the session convenor(s).

Provide a title and abstract (250 words maximum) for a 25-minute paper (unless otherwise specified), your name and institutional affiliation (if any).

Please make sure the title is concise and reflects the contents of the paper because it will appear online, in social media and in the printed programme.

You should receive an acknowledgement of receipt of your submission within two weeks.

Deadline for submissions: Monday 21 October 2019

For further details see: www.forarthistory.org.uk