



VOLUME 13 ISSUE 2

Downloaded by Luz del Carmen Vilchis Esquivel on Sun May 05 2019 at 08:01:20 AM CDT

The International Journal of

Critical Cultural Studies

Conceptualization in the Visual Arts

Another Epistemological Domain

LUZ DEL CARMEN VILCHIS ESQUIVEL

THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CRITICAL CULTURAL STUDIES
www.thehumanities.com

First published in 2015 in Champaign, Illinois,
USA by Common Ground Publishing LLC
www.commongroundpublishing.com

ISSN: 2327-0055

© 2015 (individual papers), the author(s)
© 2015 (selection and editorial matter) Common Ground

All rights reserved. Apart from fair dealing for the purposes of study, research, criticism or review as permitted under the applicable copyright legislation, no part of this work may be reproduced by any process without written permission from the publisher. For permissions and other inquiries, please contact cg-support@commongroundpublishing.com.

The International Journal of Critical Cultural Studies is peer-reviewed, supported by rigorous processes of criterion-referenced article ranking and qualitative commentary, ensuring that only intellectual work of the greatest substance and highest significance is published.

Conceptualization in the Visual Arts: Another Epistemological Domain

Luz del Carmen Vilchis Esquivel, National Autonomous University of Mexico, Mexico

Abstract: The visual arts, marginalized from other areas of knowledge through the epistemological fragmentation fostered by positivism and the desire to respond to the rapid and complex development of new technologies, have lost touch with their most important task: reflection. Speculation about artistic action and delivery of critical judgments on its manifestations requires introspection and thinking about the processes and parameters of development involved. Imagination and creation in the visual arts have become spontaneous reactions that arise from the intuition of the instant, neglecting important stages of concentration, abstraction, speculation, and transformation of esthetic experience. Today the arts provoke a chain of physical reactions—disgust, surprise, rejection, etc.—at transgressions of form, not of substance: there is a chasm between thought and reason. The content for which Klee, Kandinsky, Arnheim, and Gombrich fought and which the work of Cézanne, Duchamp, and Beuys made comprehensible has been forgotten. It is a matter of reflecting on the importance of the epistemological domain in the visual arts, calling for a return to its conceptualization and rebuilding the philosophy and theory of the visual art of our time. These disciplines have a theoretical dimension related to the concepts that underpin them, a technical dimension concerned with the means by which the work or artistic action is produced, and a poetic dimension that establishes a link between the person who creates the artwork and those who perceive and view it, as well as among the latter themselves and between them and the artwork. An indispensable requirement for this task is the knowledge to recognize and understand both the surplus of meaning in the visual arts and the socialization of cultural values. Theoretical structures and concepts are essential, because the same object or action can give rise to different interpretations that are equally valid, as long as they are cognitively supported. The visual arts are an area of learning, a body of knowledge unified by certain principles, but not a set of closed truths; on the contrary, these truths are in a constant dynamic relationship with other cognitive areas, influencing some and being influenced by others. Conceptualization of the visual arts is valuable because it has a direct impact on the way of thinking, the behavior, the actions and the decisions of human beings, by virtue of being seen as generators of values and cultural assets.

Keywords: Visual Arts, Epistemology, Conceptualization

“It is an arduous task to penetrate the real qualities of each thing.”
(Democritus, 8th century BC)

Introduction

The visual arts are creative actions that consciously fix in a medium the discursive capabilities of those signs whose manifestation is mediated by visual perception; the result, a tangible object, the art object, arises from the process of reflection the artist conducts in response to an expressive need.

The complex conditions which shape the praxis of the visual arts are underpinned by an intricate conceptual structure which makes it possible not only to explain the process, the phenomena it involves and the elements it comprises, but also to understand the special features that define its epistemological domain. The visual arts and the disciplines derived from them have for decades suffered the cognitive complications arising from the conceptual transposition of theories, methods, and techniques from other fields whose original function was to explain phenomena alien and unknown to these disciplines. The most serious consequence of this epistemological distortion is that it has made it impossible to identify and specify the fundamental principles of contemporary visual arts and associated disciplines.

Epistemological Description

Knowledge includes every explanation human beings put forward about the world and its phenomena; it is a process that involves addressing reality and apprehending it in consciousness.

It is characterized by being infinite and its only limits are those imposed by thought.

Wisdom is the result of developing knowledge, but it is manifested in various ways. There is a conceptual wisdom, which abstracts perceptions and structures in the specific form of theories, and an operational wisdom, projected in the transformation of matter.

One of the conditions of thinking lies in the structure of knowledge, that is, in the systematic organization and hierarchical ordering which enable us to distinguish the nature and importance of ideas in qualitative terms so as to make them graspable and accessible. The phenomenon of knowledge brings into play the subject and the object, which each period has interpreted in its own way. Cassirer argues that:

The process of knowing does not develop in such a way that the spirit, like a predisposed being, confines itself to taking possession of the external reality with which it is confronted as something delimited and circumscribed, appropriating and assimilating it piecemeal. On the contrary, the concept of the self, like that of the object, is only expressed and shaped as scientific experience progresses and is subjected to the same internal changes. Not only does the content shift [...] the meaning and function of the two fundamental elements are displaced. (Cassirer 1979, 18–19)

Rupert de Ventós (De Ventós 1989, 523–541) describes the epistemological attitudes over the course of history corresponding to these displacements in form. Before the fifteenth century the term *description* appears: it involves perceiving and observing the object and detailing its characteristics. In the sixteenth century there was *analogy*: the object of knowledge is deciphered through its similarity with something else, using highly detailed comparative models of physical and tangible features. In the eighteenth century there was *order*: knowing involves placing the object within a classification; there was a sense of urgency about taxonomies in every discipline. In the nineteenth century, there was *life and history*: understanding the origin and historical evolution of the object amounts to knowing it; this approach, however, develops the vices of historicism and chronology. In the twentieth century, there was *system*, in which understanding is equivalent to a grasp of the system in which the object acquires meaning.

Another important issue to consider is the fragmentation of knowledge. From the time of the Greeks it was possible to distinguish subjects of study, and although it is true that until the Renaissance it was possible to speak of universal knowledge, history shows us that the unity of learning became increasingly difficult to sustain, and consequently diversity and dispersal gave rise to disciplines that increasingly defended their epistemological independence. The effect of this was that many of them abandoned the basic forms of understanding that they had shared with all other fields. One of the gravest losses resulting from this fragmentation was the sense of philosophical reflection and therefore an understanding of the connections with logical systems and theoretical contributions from other areas of knowledge that give rise to what are recognized nowadays as interdisciplinary relationships.

The visual arts have not been unaffected by this phenomenon, and as a field of knowledge developed on the epistemological basis of maturity and the interrelationship of arts and technology they been subjected to that isolating vision which reveals an incomplete and inadequate image of their conceptual structure. This has been constructed, necessarily in principle, through transpositions from theories of architecture and from incipient and immature theories in other analogous areas.

The Problem of Ideologies

In order for phenomena in the visual arts to be seen as meaningful entities, we must start from certain objective principles of appraisal and from set criteria of selection, location, and definition.

It is essential that our research should be articulated from the outset by relating the phenomenon with the categories through which it is to be studied. This can only be achieved by

recognizing the discipline as part of a network of conceptual relationships which constitutes the total field of knowledge, and out of all those variables we must choose the relevant ones for resolving the issues involved in the problem.

Our research methodology must not fail to take account of such important concepts as ideology, since research projects tend to be conditioned by the influence of dominant social structures.

It was Destutt de Tracy who adopted the term *ideology* to refer to the study of ideas, following the mechanistic method, designed to find the laws that govern them, in the direction pursued by Comtean positivism. Napoleon, opposing Tracy and his group of followers, used the word *ideologues* in a pejorative sense, describing them as sinister, metaphysical, seditious poisoners of the people; since then the history of ideology, which is full of paradoxes, has been associated with political militancy, sloganeering, and faith in a particular way of grasping social phenomena that guide behaviour towards the objectives propounded and justified by the ideology itself, so that its emotional content prevents it from being fully determined conceptually. Ideology, propagated in all human spheres, becomes the mode of thought of an alienated society.

According to historical materialism ideology is always an intellectual conception based on the position one occupies in social relationships and it always involves a kind of deception, whereby the images of visual arts conceal the material origin that determines them and the interests they respond to, so that ideas are apparently detached from the economic interests they serve.

Ideology [in other words] is a false consciousness of reality, a vision that does not go beyond appearances to discover the true causes of social relationships, and that is determined by history and inseparable from the capitalist system of exploitation [...]. Ideology is a system of legal, political, economic, moral, religious, and other values, which ultimately justify social domination by a particular class, presenting it as the necessary consequence of the “laws” of culture—as inevitable as the laws of nature which, in Freudian terms, shape the unconscious layers of the general mentality and social aspirations. (Marx 1968, 55–59)

Ideology is opposed by the scientific view, which strives to relate phenomena to their real connections and signifies revealing what ideology conceals and consequently breaking with the fallacies it establishes to bolster its relations of domination and exploitation in favour of a social class. The scientific approach to the reassessment of the human entails revision of the value system imposed by ideology and the search for truth and for explanation of reality.

As examples of ideology we could mention Pareto’s *theory of derivations* (Del Palacio 1978, 9–28), according to which behaviour depends on derivations or mental aggregates (feelings), and some schools of *information theory* for which certainty is related to the quantity of information; the latter is used to validate opinions, and people generally need little to persist in them and a lot to change them; the *theory of relationism*, which posits spheres of thought in which it is impossible to conceive of absolute truth as if it existed independently of the values and social position of the individual and without being related to the social context; the *behaviourist school* (behaviourism as a form of positivism), in which conduct, which for other theories is deliberate

¹ The most effective literary disseminator of ideology was Destutt de Tracy (1754–1836), because of the simplicity and popularity of his account; another was Dr Cabanis, in his *Rapport du physique et du moral* (Condillac, Helvetius, etc., are more strictly philosophers). Linking Catholicism and ideology: Manzoni, Cabanis, Bourget, Taine (Taine was the master for Maurras and others of a Catholic orientation) — the “psychological novel” (Stendhal was a follower of Tracy, etc.). Destutt de Tracy’s main work is *Eléments d’idéologie* (Paris, 1817–1818), more complete in the Italian version, *Elementi di ideologia del conte Destutt de Tracy*, translated by G. Compagnoni, Milan, Stamperia di Giambattista Sonzogno, 1819 (in the French text a whole section is missing, the one on Love, known and used by Stendhal through the Italian translation).

action, is replaced by behaviour—mechanical, biological, instinctive, and conditioned action, the individual and collective control of which makes total administration of society possible; *sociologism*, *historicism*, and *empiricism*, for which apprehending a phenomenon means understanding, respectively, the social context, historical evolution, and sensory perceptual data from which it arises and of which it is a product; these principles of intelligibility of phenomena are only partial and conditioned views; and *functionalist theories*, for which social equilibrium depends on institutions, given that society is regarded as an organism in which all its members must properly fulfill a function.

Every scientific approach, and therefore every research methodology, is affected to some degree by ideology, but some schools are more affected than others, namely those that tend to justify power or act as its agents and have a more clearly political purpose: theories in the service of power, as they are called.

In addition, as a result of ideological influences, sociocultural obstacles to knowledge and research work are created, among the most common of which we can identify *ethnocentrism*, which establishes the values and customs of the group in which one was born as infallible standards of judgment and assessment; *subjectivism*, which reduces research to observation of facts or seeks to judge them emotionally on the basis of favourable or hostile feelings; *argument from authority*, which accepts a statement as true because someone (an opinion leader) said it, and not for the reasons that may be put forward; *dogmatism*, which presents formulas expressed as indisputable truths (even if they are incomplete experiences); *impressionism*, which confuses transient experiences with established truths, as, for example, when a statement is made about a group of people based on what is only known to be true of one of them; *stereotyping*, which regards unproven images or unsubstantiated generalization as true; *specialism*, which devalues any knowledge that does not belong to the researcher's field of study and fails to recognize or attach importance to possible interdisciplinary connections; *instrumentalism*, a form of pragmatism that sees thought solely as an instrument to modify reality, not to acquire knowledge of the world; *conventionalism*, a form of pragmatism that does not distinguish between experimental truth, definition and theory: statements are conventions, which, though they may be accepted or rejected in theory, are more convenient in practice and enable phenomena to be arranged in simple constructions; *fictionalism*, a form of pragmatism that understands knowledge as a process resulting from an act of invention, as an effect of human creative abilities; *operationism*, which understands the value and meaning of a concept as lying in methodological operations: a concept is synonymous with a set of operations; *scientism*, which attempts to prove the divine value of science, and also aims to raise all knowledge to the category of science without understanding that it has other epistemological dimensions (Mannheim 1983, 49–55).

We cannot get away from the fact that knowledge entails a wide range of relationships between the subject that knows and the object that is known, in which the former in some way appropriates the latter. The conditions of the subject, the evolution of the object, sensible (pre-scientific) knowledge and objective knowledge, resulting from the epistemological break with the sensory, are part of the process of knowledge.

In addition, there are other factors, such as observation and experience, without which scientific knowledge would not exist; but they alone cannot determine the conditions of possibility of a particular cognitive system. The epistemological structure of every discipline is based on the tripartite system of theory, method, and technique.

Approach to the Objects of the Visual Arts

The path that leads to logical, organized knowledge is understood as method. It involves implementing theory by formulating analytical tasks, systematized relationships, possible structures for deconstructing or reconstructing conceptual relationships and generalization of

epistemological procedures. Method, as an abstract conceptual process, is meaningless unless it is expressed through a language and applied in a practical way to transform reality.

Particularly prominent among methodological factors is the correspondence between research, expressed in different methods, and the scientific theories that have revolutionized conceptions of the world. Eli de Gortari (Eli de Gortari 1983, 17–39) points to some examples: Aristotle's deductive logic, which finds its supreme application in Euclidean geometry; Bacon, who, for the first time in the domain of philosophy, systematically and explicitly emphasized inductive knowledge: generalizing from observed connections between particular facts; and Galileo, who developed the theory and practice of induction in physics.

De Gortari also highlights the relationship between Hegelian dialectics and the method used by Marx to establish the periodization of history on the basis of economic development. Indeed, Marx draws on Hegel for the structure of the thought process: dialectics as the fundamental structure of the universe, even though he does not entirely adhere to the principles from which it is developed.

Other methodological determinants rest on the idea that social development is linked to technological changes, to the primacy of economic and commercial forces, to the dominant political forces which determine social organization and the development of research, and finally to prevailing ideals, beliefs, and values.

The fact is that in the various areas of knowledge research methods are applied that shape strategies to suit the demands of particular cases. The logical formulation of research methods in each discipline calls for prior analysis of the nature of its associated activities in order to identify them clearly, since what makes research activity complex is combining the methods that are part of general methodology—and therefore of research methodology—with those that may be developed as discipline-specific strategies in an area of knowledge. An axiomatic system is validated by relating a specific theory to the idea one has of the objects or to the particular facts.

It is important to study the thought structures that emerge from the various schools of philosophy, on the basis that applying methods requires detailed examination of the theories that gave rise to them.

Information and Knowledge

Methods guide the conduct of research, and it is important to understand that any one of them is derived from a fragment of the universe of philosophical knowledge. Paying attention to this is a necessary condition for making the discipline of research not only the pragmatic route for critical thought to follow, but also the way to be able to steer knowledge in the right direction.

In any methodological investigation important ethical issues arise, not only for researchers but for every visual arts professional, who must constantly relate the practice of visuality in an interdisciplinary way, whether through the content of the theoretical approach to the discipline or through the innumerable routes on which the art object or action often has to be situated.

Research is therefore a permanent task for those who conceive, teach, and practice the visual arts. The range of interests does not diminish the specific value of this activity, which lies in its potential for developing a critical approach and in the multifaceted applications of knowledge.

Intellectual work tends to be regarded by artists as an activity peripheral to specific practicalities, and they frequently ignore its repercussions in the area of creativity and training, since unfortunately the working process that runs in parallel with theoretical knowledge profoundly affects the continuity and integrity of the discipline itself, whose dynamics have been shaped in recent decades by the dazzling attractions of technology.

Knowledge is where the fundamental roots of a discipline lie and it provides a basis on which study of the visual arts can be constructed and developed. It is the essence that makes it possible to distinguish between an art professional and a pragmatic artist (Tatarkiewicz 1993,

288–311). It is worth pointing out the epistemological gulf between information and knowledge and the tendency to confuse data with ideas.

For example:

A + B = C is *information*
(even if it is meaningless)
but if A = a prefix denoting denial or negation
B = theism
C = atheism
this is *knowledge*.

For those who have the means and the opportunity to conduct research, the weight of responsibility bearing on their task and the privilege involved in having access to scientific knowledge, confined nowadays to small communities, are obvious. Research makes sense for the visual arts, whether in terms of the academic approach to understanding phenomena, of art objects or actions or of the project-based approach aimed at exploring conditions and parameters, both formal and substantive, of the problems of material expression of visibility.

Insofar as the formulation of the visual arts is deliberate and directed to a purpose, it raises the problem of means and ends, and can therefore be said to have a theoretical dimension related to the concepts that underpin them, a technical dimension concerned with the means by which artworks or artistic actions are produced, and a poetic dimension that establishes a link between the person who creates the work and those who perceive and view it, among the latter themselves, and between them and the work.

These tasks, taken together, require intra- and interdisciplinary knowledge to recognize the ontological, epistemological, logical, and axiological aspects that enable us to understand both the surplus of meaning of the visual arts and the socialization of cultural values that they involve. Theoretical structures and conceptions are needed, as a way of establishing that the same object or action can give rise to different interpretations that are equally valid, as long as they are cognitively supported.

The visual arts, like other disciplines, are an area of learning, a body of knowledge unified by certain principles, but not a set of closed truths; on the contrary, these truths are in a constant dynamic relationship with other cognitive areas, influencing some and being influenced by others.

Conceptualization of the visual arts is valuable because it has a direct impact on the way of thinking, the behavior, and the actions and decisions of human beings, by virtue of being seen as generators of values and cultural assets.

The Epistemological Dimension of the Visual Arts

Understanding of the visual arts, from their earliest origin, has been conditioned by concepts emanating from theories that have arisen in philosophical contexts, so it is only to be expected that the phenomenon of visibility has been codified, in its numerous modalities, in terms of the categories of aesthetics.

Nowadays it is possible to determine and describe the phenomenon of the visual arts specifically on the basis of a profound knowledge of its own constants and variables.

We have to start from the imperative that the visual arts should be understood to include two planes of reality. One, pertaining to external reality, comprises the agents of visibility themselves and the other is that which forms part of the material configuration of the work. This approach enables us to recognize all the participants and non-participants and facilitates the presentation and understanding of the sequence of events that occur before and after the artistic phenomenon.

This presentation aims to provide a critical and analytical alternative with a more conscious conduct of the process.

The expressive function of the visual arts finds material form in objects or actions, the products of the task of representation. Visual representation as a form of recreational behaviour represents reality, mediating it in order to attain knowledge of it from a certain viewpoint, and like any representation, by virtue of being possible, it is representation for someone. The reference to this possibility is the distinctive feature of the recreational nature of art, the hedonistic aspect of representation manifested in the pleasure of knowledge. Thus the transformation acquires its full meaning in configuration, in the very fact of establishing a language and opening it up to interpretation.

Every object or action in the visual arts is a variation on representation. In every art object it is always possible to recognize mediation that is free and arbitrary, subject to what is known as the critical standard of correct representation; in other words, the relevant graphic repertoire to achieve an appropriate solution.

In this respect the artist is regarded as an interpreter and not a mere imitator of a model, and it is at this point that the relationship between the artistic phenomenon and its creator can be understood. This does not mean that the possibilities of mimesis are nullified. They have a place insofar as they contain the cognitive meaning of the essence, thereby revealing the nature of representation. Imitation is imitation if it repeats, that is, if it copies. Imitation is mimesis when it re-presents, that is, when it cognizes and re-cognizes. Representation as a recreational process involves the receivers of the designed object; it is the moment when the graphic communication is understood, when the total meaning can be revealed (Tatarkiewicz 1995, 301–314).

The artistic, as representation, does not pertain to the thing represented; it pertains to the way in which it is (re)presented; it has a referential structure that provides access to the representation of “something”; as a visual image it represents, by reproducing, an appearance mediated by a concept.

One must beware of reducing the concept of understanding to mere sympathy or empathy, because understanding is not necessarily an act of affinity; receivers maintain a distance from the visual arts, and this prevents them from participating pragmatically. This refers to the very act of seeing, where the aesthetic interplay includes viewers and involves time and distance in which they may be excluded.

It needs to be said that one of the artist’s intentions is to achieve the affinity of the receiver with the core of the visual text, or at least with the context of the visual. In the dialogue between receiver and art object an agreement must necessarily be reached. This may be of two kinds: prior agreement, in that there must be a common tradition, a shared participation in language, and factual agreement, where affinity becomes evident.

Thus two poles of interpretation are established: that of the message itself conveyed by the artist, and the specific realization performed by the visual perceiver. The visual arts cannot be exclusively identified with either of the two types of exegesis, since they are more than the visual text itself and only acquire meaning when they are realized, and this cannot occur independently of the receiver’s contribution, which, in turn, is conditioned by the provisions of the visual text.

Conclusions

Conceptualization of the visual arts is defined, in its essence, by surplus of meaning. It is this that enables an art object to transcend and to be interpreted again and again and represented in perpetual chains of conceptual meaning.

The visual arts are manifested through a metaphorical activity whose material realization involves a highly developed and deliberate approach. The art object or action contains the message and reaches receivers who interpret it.

The visual arts are based on developing a visual text in which understanding occurs through interpretation. When one perceives, that perception is culturized; it offers scope for interpretation, which is important in contexts other than those of the receiver and the time of interpretation. Indeed, in expressive terms, they present a *locutionary or syntactic level* (how the visual text says what it says), an *illocutionary or semantic level* (what the visual text says) and a *perlocutionary or pragmatic level* (what or whom it says it for): useful categories for situating the possible links with the interlocutor. Translating the expression of the designed is the dialogic possibility, the connection of the outside to the inside and vice versa.

The basis of the dialogic relationship is the question-answer pattern, in which the most important element is the question. Questioning opens up and makes possible the manifestation that may be the object (Austin 1971, 87–93).

Understanding graphic communication must therefore be seen as part of a meaning-event in which meaning is formed and deduced. In this process temporality plays a crucial role. So understanding refers to a process that is always open, never finished or structured.

The process of understanding is an intellectual act alluding to the epistemological alternatives that invoke conceptual circumstances which enable us to distinguish the appropriate from the inappropriate, with regard to the ethical tasks of the individual.

Openness to the possible ways of understanding art objects and actions must start from a knowledge of their intra- and interdisciplinary relations, which together make up the conceptual structure corresponding to the theoretical dimension of the discipline, without divorcing conceptualization from philosophy or from cultural history, so as to attain a conscious and coherent critical conception.

The contemporary arts cannot continue to practise the most highly developed modes of expression while displaying such glaring backwardness on the theoretical level, accompanied, moreover, by an incapacity for theoretical autonomy.

The visual arts, like any language, must evolve in the terms of their conception of the world and of culture so that their conceptualization proceeds in parallel along the paths followed by current schools of thought.

REFERENCES

- Austin, John. 1971. *Cómo hacer cosas con palabras*. Madrid: Paidós.
- Baudrillard, Jean et al. 1988. *La posmodernidad*. Mexico City: Kairós
- Calabrese, Omar. 1995. *El lenguaje del arte*. Barcelona: Paidós.
- Cassirer Ernst. 1979. *El problema del conocimiento*. Volume I. Mexico City: FCE.
- Colli, Giorgio. 1995. *Filosofía de la expresión*. Madrid: Siruela.
- Del Palacio, Alejandro. 1978. *La revolución como ideología*. Mexico City, Cárdenas Editor.
- Gauthier, Guy. 1992. *Veinte lecciones sobre la imagen y el sentido*. Madrid, Cátedra.
- Mannheim, Karl. 1983. *Ideología y utopía*. Madrid: Aguilar.
- Marx, Karl. 1980. *La ideología alemana*. Mexico City: Ediciones de Cultura Popular.
- Rupert de Ventós, Xavier. 1999. *Teoría de la sensibilidad*. Barcelona: Península.
- . 1973. *Utopías de la sensibilidad y métodos del sentido*. Barcelona: Anagrama.
- Scheler, Max. 1980. *Sociología del saber*. Buenos Aires: Ediciones Siglo XX.
- Tatarkiewicz, Wladyslaw. 1995. *Historia de seis ideas: arte, belleza, forma, creatividad, mimesis, experiencia estética*. Madrid: Tecnos.
- . (1993). “Creación: historia del concepto” in *Criterios*, 30-8/12: 288–311 (Desiderio Navarro, translator of “*Twórczosc: Dzieje pojecia*”, in: W. T., *Dzieje szesciu pojec*,

Warsaw, PWN, 1982). Accessed March, 4 2013. <http://www.criterios.es/pdf/tatarkiewiczcreacion.pdf>

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

Prof. Luz del Carmen Vilchis Esquivel: Professor, Visual Arts Postgraduate Program/Faculty of Arts and Design, National Autonomous University of Mexico, Mexico City, Mexico

The International Journal of Critical Cultural Studies

is one of five thematically focused journals in the collection of journals that support the New Directions in the Humanities knowledge community—its journals, book series, conference, and online community.

Cultural Studies critically examines the social, political and ideological conditions of cultural production. This journal is interdisciplinary in its scope, offering a wide canvas for the examination of the interactions of media, identities, politics, and epistemologies that underpin social action and cultural expression.

The International Journal of Critical Cultural Studies is a peer-reviewed scholarly journal.

ISSN 2327-0055

