



A Consideration of Criticism

Terry Barrett

Journal of Aesthetic Education, Vol. 23, No. 4. (Winter, 1989), pp. 23-35.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0021-8510%28198924%2923%3A4%3C23%3AACOC%3E2.0.CO%3B2-P>

Journal of Aesthetic Education is currently published by University of Illinois Press.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/illinois.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to creating and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

A Consideration of Criticism

TERRY BARRETT

This article is about visual art criticism, with many examples drawn from the criticism of photography.¹ There are several accounts of criticism, and this one adds to them from different perspectives—from within and without, from practicing criticism and teaching art. It is both about reading criticism and doing criticism as a means of better understanding critical activities and how they can aid in appreciating works of art. Unfortunately students and the public usually don't equate criticism with appreciation because in everyday talk the term "criticism" has pejorative connotations: it is used to refer to the act of making judgments, usually negative judgments, and the act of expressing disapproval. Mass media also reinforce the notion of critics as judges of art: movie reviewers give out one to four stars, and the words of critics most often quoted are judgments—"The best play of the season!" "Dazzling!" "Brilliant!"—because these are the words that sell tickets.

Some critics don't even want to be called critics because of the negative connotations of the term. Art critic and poet René Ricard, writing in *Artforum*, says: "In point of fact I'm not an art critic. I am an enthusiast. I like to drum up interest in artists who have somehow inspired me to be able to say something about their work."² Similarly, Lucy Lippard is usually supportive of the art she writes about, but she says she is sometimes accused of not being critical, of not being a critic at all. She responds, "That's okay with me, since I never liked the term anyway. Its negative connotations place the writer in fundamental antagonism to the artists."³ Critics do judge artworks, and sometimes negatively, but often their judgments are positive; as Ricard says, "Why give publicity to something you hate?"⁴ Abigail Solomon-Godeau, who writes frequently about photography, says there are instances when it is clear that something is nonsense and should be called nonsense, but she finds questions about

Terry Barrett, who is an associate professor in the Department of Art Education, Ohio State University, is the author of *Criticizing Photographs*, a coeditor of *The Arts Education Review of Books*, and the editor of *Columbus Art*.

Journal of Aesthetic Education, Vol. 23, No. 4, Winter 1989
©1989 Board of Trustees of the University of Illinois

meaning more beneficial to ask than evaluative questions about aesthetic worth.⁵

In his study of *Hamlet* criticism Morris Weitz defines criticism as “a form of studied discourse about works of art. It is a use of language designed to facilitate and enrich the understanding of art.”⁶ Weitz draws several conclusions about what critics do when they criticize: any one of the four procedures of description, interpretation, evaluation, and theory constitute criticism, and evaluation is neither necessary nor sufficient for criticism. Edmund Feldman has written much about art criticism in art education and simply defines it as “informed talk about art.”⁷ He also minimizes the act of evaluating art, saying that it is probably the least important of the critical procedures for education.⁸ A. D. Coleman, a pioneering critic of recent photography, defines what he does as “the intersecting of photographic images with words.”⁹ He adds: “I merely look closely at and into all sorts of photographic images and attempt to pinpoint in words what they provoke me to feel and think and understand.”¹⁰ Coleman’s notions are reminiscent of Harry Broudy’s “enlightened cherishing,”¹¹ a compound concept that combines thought and feeling and reminds us that considering art critically is not a coldly intellectual endeavor.

Sources of Criticism

Published criticism appears in books, art magazines, and in the popular press. Susan Sontag’s criticism of photography began as a series of articles and ended up to be the controversial and influential book *On Photography*.¹² Much critical writing occurs in books of another type, namely, exhibition catalogues such as *The New Color Photography* by Sally Eauclaire¹³ and *Mirrors and Windows* by John Szarkowski.¹⁴ The majority of art criticism, however, is found in the art press—the large art magazines from New York such as *Artforum* and *Art in America* and regional art journals such as *Dialogue* published in Columbus, Ohio, *New Art Examiner* published in Chicago and Washington D.C., and *Artweek* from California. Much criticism is also published in journals devoted to specific media such as *Aperture* and *Exposure* for photography and *Afterimage* for photography, film, and video. Reviews of exhibitions can be found in daily newspapers of national import such as *The New York Times* and in local newspapers.

Some critics choose to write for very large audiences and publish in mass-media circulations: Abigail Solomon-Godeau has published her criticism in *Vogue*, Carrie Rickie publishes film criticism in *Seventeen* and *The Village Voice* as well as art criticism in *Artforum*, and Robert Hughes and Douglas Davis write art criticism for *Time* and *Newsweek*, respectively. Each of these publications has its own editorial tone and policy, and critics some-

times choose their publications according to their style of writing and their critical interests; they also adapt their styles to fit certain publications. Editors often provide direction, sometimes quite specifically. The *New Art Examiner*, for instance, instructs its reviewers that “the writer’s opinion of the work is the backbone of a review. Set up your thesis by the third paragraph and use the rest of the space to substantiate it.”¹⁵ These editors add: “Keep descriptions brief and within the context of the ideas you are developing.”¹⁶ *Dialogue* editors similarly request “personal assessments” of shows¹⁷ and also ask that writers include description sufficient for intelligibility but add: “Use descriptions to help the reader see the work in a new way and/or to illuminate connections between the exhibited work and the larger art world.”¹⁸ Both publications distinguish short reviews from feature articles and have different guidelines for each.

Different Audiences

When critics write for these different publications, they are aware that they are writing for different audiences. Their choices of what to write about and their approaches to their chosen or assigned topics vary according to which publication they are writing for and whom they imagine their readers to be. Grace Glueck, an art critic for *The New York Times*, explains that the paper covers important museum shows and important gallery shows because that is what is expected by its readers.¹⁹ Because the magazine he writes for is national and devotes comparatively little space to art, Mark Stevens of *Newsweek* also covers museum shows almost exclusively, but he says that he tries to write about as many museum shows of contemporary art as possible.²⁰ Kay Larson, however, says, “I write about what interests me.”²¹ She writes for the weekly *New York* magazine and, like some other critics, has editorial independence about what she covers. She explains that she tries to see everything in New York City that she can manage to see, looks for things that she likes, and then chooses those things about which she has something to say: “Ultimately I base my decisions not only on whom I like but whom I feel I can say something about. There are many artists every week whom I do like and whom I feel I can’t say anything about.”²² A. D. Coleman’s choice of publications with different editorial guidelines allows him a greater variety of approaches and subjects. When he was writing regularly for the *The New York Times* he usually reviewed the current shows of recent work by contemporary photographers exhibited in New York City. He was limited to about 1,500 words, sometimes with one reproduction.²³ When he occasionally writes for *Artforum*, however, he has at least three times the space, more reproductions, and can develop larger themes and bigger ideas such as his identification and definition of a whole

genre of photography, "The Directorial Mode: Notes Toward a Definition."²⁴

Kinds of Criticism

In an editorial of this journal, Ralph Smith²⁵ broadly distinguishes two types of aesthetic criticism, both of which are useful, but for different purposes: exploratory aesthetic criticism and argumentative aesthetic criticism. In doing exploratory aesthetic criticism, one delays judgments of value and attempts rather to ascertain an object's aesthetic aspects as completely as possible, to ensure that all that can be seen in a work of art will be experienced. This kind of criticism relies heavily on descriptive and interpretive thought. Its aim is to sustain aesthetic experience. In doing argumentative aesthetic criticism, after sufficient interpretive analysis has been done, critics estimate the work's goodness, or deficiencies, and give a full account of their judgments based on explicitly stated criteria and standards. The critics argue in favor of their judgments and attempt to persuade others that the object is best considered in the way they have interpreted and judged it, and they are prepared to defend their conclusions.

Andy Grunberg, a current photography critic for *The New York Times*, has offered some other, more specific distinctions about criticism. He identifies two basic approaches to the mission of criticism as it is currently being practiced regarding photography: the applied and the theoretical. Applied criticism is practical and immediate and directed at the work; theoretical criticism is more philosophical and attempts to define photography and uses only photographs as examples to clarify its arguments. Applied criticism tends toward journalism, and theoretical criticism tends toward aesthetics.²⁶ In his schema, reviews such as those by Coleman would be examples of applied criticism. Examples of theoretical criticism would be the writings of Allan Sekula, such as his essay "The Invention of Photographic Meaning,"²⁷ in which he explores how photographs mean and how photography signifies and in which he refers to specific photographs and individual photographers only to support his broadly theoretical arguments; and Roland Barthes's *Camera Lucida: Reflections on Photography*,²⁸ in which he distinguishes photography from other kinds of picture making.

Grundberg identifies another type of criticism as "connoisseurship," and he rejects it as severely limited.²⁹ The connoisseur, of wine or photographs, asks, "Is this good or bad?" and makes a proclamation based on his or her particular taste. This kind of criticism, which is widespread in use in casual speech and is found in professors' offices and university classrooms and sometimes in professional writing, is extremely limited because the judgments it yields are usually proclaimed without supporting reasons, without

the benefit of explicit criteria, and thus are neither very informative nor useful. Statements based on taste are simply too idiosyncratic to be worth disputing. As Grundberg says, "Criticism's task is to make arguments, not pronouncements."³⁰

Backgrounds of Critics

Critics come to criticism from varied backgrounds. Before she began writing photography criticism, Abigail Solomon-Godeau, with an undergraduate degree in art history, was a photo editor with her own business of providing pictures for magazines, textbook publishers, educational film strips, and advertisers. She eventually became bored with her work and also became aware that she was part of what culture critics were deriding as the "consciousness industry." About that she says: "Here was an enterprise that was literally producing a certain reality that people, or students, or whomever, wouldn't question because it was perceived as real [because it was photographed]. That's when I started thinking that I would really like to write about photography."³¹ For two years in New York she tried to make a living as a critic by writing a lot but realized that she probably could not survive economically solely as a critic. She decided to teach to support her writing, so she earned her Ph.D. in art history to gain access to jobs in higher education and has been teaching and writing criticism for several different publications.

Many art critics have advanced degrees in art or in art history and support themselves by teaching as they write criticism. Some critics are exhibiting artists who write criticism, such as Peter Plagens who is a painter. René Ricard is a poet and an art critic. Carrie Rickie writes film criticism for the popular press and art criticism for the art press. A. D. Coleman became a full-time, freelance critic of photography after writing theater criticism for the *Village Voice*. Coleman was never formally schooled in photography and declares: "I am not a photographer. I am a writer."³² He began writing about photography because he was fascinated by photographs and curious about the medium's impact on contemporary culture. He thinks of himself as a voice from the audience of photography and wrote well over four hundred articles from that vantage between 1968 and 1978 for different publications. Grace Glueck believes that to educate herself she needs to look at as much art as possible, and "anything that deals with form including architecture, movies, dance, theater, even street furniture."³³ Mark Stevens agrees and stresses the importance of spending time in museums: "Immersion in excellent examples of different kinds of past art is the best training for the eye."³⁴

Stances Toward Criticism

Criticism is a complex activity, and critics take various stances on what criticism should be and how it should be conducted. Abigail Solomon-Godeau views her chosen critical method as one of asking questions:

Primarily, all critical practices—literary or artistic—should probably be about asking questions. That’s what I do in my teaching and it’s what I attempt to do in my writing. Of course, there are certain instances in which you can say with certainty, “this is what’s going on here,” or “this is nonsense, mystification or falsification.” But in the most profound sense, this is still asking—what does it mean, how does it work, can we think something differently about it?³⁵

Grace Glueck sees her role as being one of most informed members of the public: she aspires to “inform, elucidate, explain and enlighten,”³⁶ and she wants “to help a reader place art in a context, establish where it’s coming from, what feeds it, how it stacks up in relation to other art.”³⁷ She is quick to add, however, that she needs to take stands “against slipshod standards, sloppy work, imprecision, mistaken notions, and *for* good works of whatever stripe.”³⁸

In 1975 A. D. Coleman specified his premises and parameters for critical writing:

A critic should be independent of the artists and institutions about which he/she writes. His/her writings should appear regularly in a magazine, newspaper, or other forum of opinion. The work considered within that writing should be publicly accessible, and at least in part should represent the output of the critic’s contemporaries and/or younger, less established artists in all their diversity. And he/she should be willing to adopt openly that skeptic’s posture which is necessary to serious criticism.³⁹

He is arguing for an independent, skeptical criticism and for critics who are independent of artists and the museums and galleries which sponsor those artists. He is very aware of possible conflicts of interest between critic and artist or critic and institutional sponsor: he does not want the critic to be anyone’s mouthpiece, but rather an independent voice that is not owned by anyone. He argues that criticism is a public activity and thus the critic’s writing should be regular and public and the artwork that is criticized should also be publicly accessible and able to be seen by the interested reader. This would presumably preclude a critic visiting an artist’s studio and writing about that work, because that work is only privately available and not open to public scrutiny.

Coleman makes a distinction between curators, historians who write about art, and critics. He argues that curators who gather work and show it in galleries and museums, and historians who place older work in context,

write from privileged positions: the historian's is the privilege of hindsight; the curator's is the power of patronage. Coleman cautions that the writer, historian, curator, or critic who befriends the artist by sponsoring his or her work will have a difficult time being skeptical. He is quick to add, however, that skepticism is not enmity or hostility. His goal is one of constructive, affirmative criticism, and he adds: "The greatest abuses of a critic's role stem from the hunger for power and the need to be liked."⁴⁰ Mark Stevens of *Newsweek* agrees that there should be distinctions maintained between writing criticism and writing history: "The trouble with acting like an art historian is that it detracts from the job critics can do better than anybody else, and that is to be lively, spontaneous, impressionistic, quick to the present—shapers, in short, of the mind of the moment."⁴¹

Lucy Lippard is a widely published independent art critic who assumes a posture different from Coleman's, and her personal policies for criticism are in disagreement with those of his just cited. She terms her art writing "advocacy criticism."⁴² As an "advocate critic" Lippard is openly leftist and feminist and rejects the notion that good criticism is objective criticism. Instead she wants a criticism that takes a political stand. She seeks out and promotes "the unheard voices, the unseen images, or the unconsidered people."⁴³ She chooses to write about art which is critical of mainstream society and which she thinks is therefore not often exhibited. Lippard chooses to work in partnership with socially oppositional artists to get their work seen and their voices heard. She also rejects as a false dichotomy the notion that there should be distance between critics and artists. She says that her ideas about art have consistently emerged from contact with artists and their studios rather than from galleries and magazines. She acknowledges that the lines between advocacy, promotion, and propaganda are thin, but she rejects critical objectivity and neutrality as myths and thinks her approach is more honest than that of critics who claim to be removed from special interests.

Critics and Artists

Lippard and Coleman raise a key question in criticism about the critic's relation to the artist. They each have different answers: Coleman advocates a skeptical distance between critic and artist and Lippard a partnership. These are two polar positions, and critics take various positions between them. Kay Larson of *New York* magazine, for example, feels that to be informed she is required to study history and also to "talk to artists."⁴⁴ She struggles with the issue of responsibility and states: "Your responsibility to the artist is to be as fair as possible,"⁴⁵ and in a second thought adds: "You have a responsibility to your taste and values."⁴⁶ Stevens sees his primary

responsibility being "to his own opinion." He also tries "to be fair, and not to be nasty," and he regrets the few times he has been sarcastic in print.⁴⁷ He thinks that knowing artists makes things difficult because he does not want to hurt their feelings but also does not want to champion work that he thinks is not good. He states that "it's probably a bad idea to know artists too well, to accept works of art or to know dealers too well."⁴⁸

Editors of criticism publications are also sensitive to issues of integrity and possible conflicts of interest between a critic and an artist or institution. The *New Art Examiner*, for example, declares in bold type in its reviewer's guidelines: "Under no circumstances are manuscripts to be shared with outsiders (the artist, dealer, sponsor, etc.)."⁴⁹ *Dialogue* disallows reviews from writers who have a business interest in a gallery where the show is located, a close personal relationship with the exhibiting artist, any position within the sponsoring institution, and previous experiences with the artist or sponsoring institution.⁵⁰ These policies are instituted to avoid damage to a publication's and a writer's credibility.

There are no easy answers to questions of the ethics of criticism and of deciding personal or editorial policy for criticism. The question about the critic's relation to the artist is somewhat less of a problem, however, if one realizes, as critics do, that criticism is written for readers other than the artists whose works they are considering. Critics do not write criticism for the painter or photographer who is exhibiting, they write for a public. Grace Glueck thinks that, at most, the critic gives the artist an idea of how his or her work is being perceived or misperceived by the public.⁵¹

Possible and imagined antagonisms between the critic and the artist become less sharp when one also realizes that criticism is much more than the negative judgment of art. This point is easily forgotten because in art studios, in schools of art, and in art classrooms criticism is often understood solely as judgment, and it is often negative. The primary purpose of school art criticism is usually seen very narrowly as the improvement of student art making, and little time is spent in describing student work or interpreting it, or in examining assumptions about what art is or is not.⁵² Thus students of art tend to think wrongly that published professional criticism is judgment and judgment for the artist and the improvement of art making.

Criticizing Criticism

Although the critics cited here have seriously considered their positions regarding criticism, their positions differ, and their theories and approaches do not combine into a cohesive and comprehensive single theory of criticism.⁵³ Quite the contrary; critics frequently take issue with each other's ideas. Hilton Kramer has dismissed Lucy Lippard's writing as "straightout political propaganda."⁵⁴ John Szarkowski is frequently accused by socially

minded critics of “aestheticizing” photographs, turning too many of them into “art,” particularly socially oppositional photographs. Allan Sekula’s writing is so suspicious of photography that it has been called “almost paranoid” and has been likened to a history of women written by a misogynist.⁵⁵ These conflicting views contribute to an ongoing, interesting, and informative dialogue about criticism and art that enlivens the reading of criticism as well as the viewing of artworks.

In the series of books he is editing on the writings of contemporary art critics, Donald Kuspit⁵⁶ provides some criteria for criticism. He thinks Lawrence Alloway, Dore Ashton, Robert Pincus-Witten, Peter Plagens, and others chosen for his series provide sophisticated treatment of complex art. He says they have all thought deeply about the nature of art criticism and have seriously considered how they should go about doing it. He praises the independence of their points of view and their self-consciousness about their work. Kuspit claims they have all expanded their criticism well beyond journalistic reporting and have avoided promotional reporting of the artist stars of their day. He admires these critics for their passion about art and their criticism but also because they depend on reason to prove their points. In their passion and reason they “sting us into consciousness,” but they have avoided becoming dogmatic.⁵⁷ Mark Stevens succinctly offers criteria of his own for criticism: critics should be “honest in their judgment, clear in their writing, straightforward in their argument and unpretentious in their manner.”⁵⁸ He adds that good criticism is like good conversation—“direct, fresh, personal, incomplete.”⁵⁹

Not all criticism is good criticism, however, and even if all criticism were good criticism, critics would have differing points of view and would want to argue them. Those in the business of criticizing art and criticizing criticism understand that what they do is tentative, or “incomplete” in Stevens’s term, open to revision, and vulnerable to counterargument. The best of critics realize that they cannot afford to be dogmatic about their views because they can always be corrected.⁶⁰

The Value of Criticism

The value of reading good criticism is increased knowledge and appreciation of art. Reading about art with which we are unfamiliar increases our knowledge. If we already know and appreciate an artwork, reading someone else’s view of it may expand our own if we agree or may sharpen our own if we choose to disagree and formulate counterarguments. There are also considerable advantages for doing criticism. Marcia Siegel, dance critic for *The Hudson Review* and author of books of dance criticism, talks about the value for her of the process of criticizing: “Very often it turns out that as I write about something, it gets better. It’s not that I’m so enthusiastic that I

make it better, but that in writing, because the words are an instrument of thinking, I can often get deeper into a choreographer's thoughts or processes and see more logic, more reason."⁶¹ Likewise, Coleman wanted to know more about photography and "came to feel that there might be some value to threshing out, in public and in print, some understandings of the medium's role in our lives."⁶² For him the process of doing criticism was valuable toward understanding photographs, and his hope was that his thinking in public and in print would help him and others better to understand photographs and their effects.

If the process of doing criticism is personally valuable even for frequently published professional critics, then it is likely that there are considerable advantages for others who are less experienced in criticizing art. An immediate advantage of engaging thoughtfully with an artwork is that the observer's viewing time is slowed down and measurably prolonged. This point is obvious but important: most people visiting museums stand before an artwork for less than five seconds. Five seconds of viewing compared to hours and hours of making by the artist is woefully out of balance. Considering descriptive, interpretive, evaluative, and theoretical questions about an artwork significantly expands one's attention to an artwork and alters one's perception of it.

By criticizing an art object for some other person, critics must struggle to translate their complex jumble of thoughts and feelings about art into articulate words that can be understood by others. Casual viewers of art can walk away from a picture or an exhibit with minimal responses, unarticulated feelings, and incomplete thoughts. Critics who view artworks as professionals, however, have a responsibility to struggle with meaning and answer questions that the artwork poses or raise questions that the artwork does not. Critics usually consider artworks from a broader perspective than the single picture or the single show. They put the work in a much larger context of other art by the artist, art by other artists of the day, and art of the past. They are able to do this because they see much more art than the average viewer—they consider art for a living.

Criticism and Students

The procedures of describing, interpreting, evaluating, and theorizing that Morris Weitz identified in *Hamlet* criticism provide a very usable framework for teaching the reading of criticism and the doing of criticism. With the risk of oversimplification, the four procedures of description, interpretation, evaluation, and theory can be presented to students as answers to four basic questions: What is here? What is it about? How good is it? Is it art? Students can use these questions as a heuristic matrix with which they can read criticism so that they can discover how critics go about

criticizing art. These questions, and many variations thereof, can be understood and given answers by all students, of few and many years, in critically examining art, their own and that made by established artists.

Considering these questions and practicing these procedures expand discussion beyond pronouncements of judgment and would bring school art criticism more in line with professional art criticism by emphasizing the interpretive aspects of criticism. The critics quoted here explicitly agree that discussions of meaning are more important than pronouncements of judgment. Interpretive discussion increases understanding and thus deepens appreciation, whether that appreciation is ultimately of a negative or positive sort. A thorough understanding of a work of art requires adequate and accurate description and implies a judgment; a judgment rendered without understanding, however, is irresponsible and irresponsible.

Students can be taught that criticism cannot afford to be dogmatic but that some criticism is more enlightened and enlightening than other criticism. Students can also be taught to criticize criticism. If criticism is taught as informed discourse about art to increase the understanding and appreciation of art, criticism by students can be tested according to whether it is informed and whether it does increase understanding and appreciation of that which it criticizes. Students who begin to consider art as critics consider it will likely increase their own understanding and appreciation of criticism and of art.

NOTES

1. This article is the basis of a chapter of a forthcoming book, Terry Barrett, *Criticizing Photographs* (Palo Alto, Calif.: Mayfield Publishing Co.).
2. René Ricard, "Not about Julian Schnabel," *Artforum* 19, no. 10 (Summer 1981): 74-80.
3. Lucy Lippard, "Headlines, Heartlines, Hardlines: Advocacy Criticism as Activism," in *Cultures in Contention*, ed. Douglas Kahn and Diane Neumaier (Seattle, Wash.: The Real Comet Press, 1985), pp. 242-47.
4. Ricard, "Not about Julian Schnabel."
5. Abigail Solomon-Godeau interviewed by Vince Leo, "What's Wrong with This Picture?" *Artpaper* (Minneapolis, Minn., December 1987): 12-14.
6. Morris Weitz, *Hamlet and The Philosophy of Literary Criticism* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1964), p. vii.
7. Edmund B. Feldman, "The Teacher as Model Critic," *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, 7, no. 1 (1973): 50-47.
8. *Ibid.*
9. A. D. Coleman, "Because It Feels So Good When I Stop: Concerning a Continuing Personal Encounter with Photography Criticism," originally published in *Camera* 35, October 1975, reprinted in Coleman, *Light Readings: A Photography Critic's Writings 1968-1978* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1979), p. 204.
10. *Ibid.*
11. Harry S. Broudy, *Enlightened Cherishing* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1972).
12. Susan Sontag, *On Photography* (New York: Farrar, Straus, Giroux, 1977).

13. Sally Eaulaire, *The New Color Photography* (New York: Abbeyville Press, 1981).
14. John Szarkowski, *Mirrors and Windows: American Photography Since 1960* (New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 1978).
15. *New Art Examiner*, "Reviewer's Guidelines," editorial office, Chicago, 1988.
16. *Ibid.*
17. *Dialogue: An Art Journal*, "Writer's Guidelines," editorial office, Columbus, Ohio, 1987.
18. *Ibid.*
19. Glueck quoted by Amy Newman, "Who Needs Art Critics?" *Art News* (September 1982):60.
20. Stevens quoted in *ibid.*
21. Larson quoted in *ibid.*
22. *Ibid.*
23. Coleman, "Because It Feels So Good When I Stop."
24. Coleman, "The Directorial Mode: Notes toward a Definition," in *Light Readings*, pp. 246-57.
25. Ralph A. Smith, "Teaching Aesthetic Criticism in the Schools," *Journal of Aesthetic Education* 7, no. 1 (1973): 38-49.
26. Andy Grundberg, "Toward a Critical Pluralism," *Afterimage* (October 1980), reprinted in *Reading into Photography: Selected Essays, 1959-1982*, ed. Thomas Barrow et al. (Albuquerque: University of New Mexico Press, 1982), pp. 247-53.
27. Allan Sekula, "On the Invention of Photographic Meaning," in *Photography against The Grain: Essays and Photo Works 1973-1983* (Halifax, Nova Scotia: The Press of The Nova Scotia College of Art and Design, 1983), pp. 3-21.
28. Roland Barthes, *Camera Lucida: Reflections on Photography* (New York: Hill and Wang, 1981).
29. Grundberg, "Toward a Critical Pluralism," p. 248.
30. *Ibid.*, p. 253.
31. Solomon-Godeau, "What's Wrong with This Picture?"
32. Coleman, "Because It Feels So Good When I Stop," p. 203.
33. Glueck quoted by Newman, "Who Needs Art Critics?" p. 58.
34. Stevens quoted in *ibid.*
35. Solomon-Godeau, "What's Wrong with This Picture?"
36. Glueck quoted by Newman, "Who Needs Art Critics?" p. 56.
37. *Ibid.*
38. *Ibid.*
39. Coleman, "Because It Feels So Good When I Stop," p. 207.
40. *Ibid.*, p. 208.
41. Stevens quoted by Newman, "Who Needs Art Critics?" p. 58.
42. Lippard, "Headlines, Heartlines," p. 243.
43. *Ibid.*
44. Larson quoted by Newman, "Who Needs Art Critics?" p. 59.
45. *Ibid.*
46. *Ibid.*
47. Stevens quoted in *ibid.*, p. 59.
48. *Ibid.*
49. *New Art Examiner*.
50. *Dialogue: An Art Journal*.
51. Glueck quoted by Newman, "Who Needs Art Critics?" p. 56.
52. For a fuller discussion of the studio critique in the teaching of art, see Terry Barrett, "A Comparison of the Goals of Studio Professors Conducting Critiques and Art Education Goals for Art Criticism," *Studies in Art Education* 30, no. 1 (Fall 1988).
53. For a fuller discussion of the definitional complexities of the term "criticism," see George Geahigan, "Art Criticism: An Analysis of the Concept," *Visual Arts Research* 9, no. 1 (1983): 10-22.

54. Hilton Kramer, in *The New Criterion*, 1982, quoted by Lippard in "Headlines, Heartlines, Hardlines."
55. Terence Pitts, book review of *Mining Photographs and Other Pictures 1948-1968*, ed. Robert Wilke and Benjamin Buchloh (Cape Breton, Nova Scotia: Nova Scotia College of Art and Design, 1983), in *Exposure* 22, no. 3 (Fall 1984), pp. 48-53.
56. Donald Kuspit, series editor, *Contemporary American Art Critics* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Research Press).
57. Donald Kuspit in Peter Plagens, *Moonlight Blues: An Artist's Art Criticism* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Research Press, 1986), p. ix.
58. Stevens quoted by Newman, "Who Needs Art Critics?" p. 57.
59. Ibid.
60. Michael Parsons, "Talk about a Painting," *Journal of Aesthetic Education* 21, no. 1 (1987): 54.
61. Marcia Siegel quoted by Irene Ruth Meltzer, *The Critical Eye: An Analysis of the Process of Dance Criticism as Practiced by Clive Barnes, Arlene Croce, Deborah Jowitt, Elizabeth Kendall, Marcia Siegel, and David Vaughan* (Master's thesis, The Ohio State University, 1979), p. 55.
62. Coleman, "Because It Feels So Good When I Stop," p. 204.