

Pedagogical Possibilities: Arts-Based Practices of Collaborative Time for Teaching the Future

Author(s): Sarah Gerth V.D. Berg

Source: *Transformations: The Journal of Inclusive Scholarship and Pedagogy*, Vol. 28, No. 1, Transformations (2018), pp. 6-18

Published by: Penn State University Press

Stable URL: <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.5325/trajincsched.28.1.0006>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <https://about.jstor.org/terms>



Penn State University Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Transformations: The Journal of Inclusive Scholarship and Pedagogy*

JSTOR

Pedagogical Possibilities

Arts-Based Practices of Collaborative Time for Teaching the Future

SARAH GERTH V.D. BERG

KEYWORDS

teaching, art, future,
collaboration, time

ABSTRACT In a present that seems to hurtle toward an apocalyptic future, and the threat it poses for making rash decisions that may do more harm than good, the capacity to collectively experience—and suspend—time is an important component of teaching the future responsibly and creatively (as opposed to destructively and reactively). This essay reflects on one pedagogical approach to accomplish this—arts-based practices featured in WOUND, a study center for collaborative time that exists as both an online archive and physical space. As practices that also register in the field of community organizing, activism, and political life, the tools and trainings at WOUND present opportunities for interdisciplinary collaboration aimed at imagining and realizing alternative forms of communal life. I explore how the arts-based tools and trainings curated in WOUND’s archives might comprise an arts of futurity and provide innovative teaching tools for classroom use. Aimed at cultivating capacities for collaboration and attention in relation to the way things are and could be, the tools at WOUND have the potential to develop a wide-awakeness in the present and spark imaginings of what might become possible.

Education is commonly framed as a matter of preparing for the world to come and oriented toward subjects-to-be, as in Toffler’s classic text *Learning for Tomorrow: The Role of the Future in Education*. And yet, education is simultaneously rooted in the past; many are chagrined at its stubborn resistance to change (Tyack and Cuban). They are steeped in nostalgia for the mythic golden days of schooling (Kliebard) or mired in the legacy of unjust policies and pedagogical judgments about curricular needs for marginalized populations as future workers and citizens (Anderson; Erickson). In the midst of these tugging claims and desires of the past and future, it can be a greater challenge to resist the givenness of time and explore alternative possibilities: in other words, to enact an education that, as *Transformations* has striven to do, “takes responsibility for the world we have made, instead of pretending that things have to be the way they are now”

Transformations: The Journal of Inclusive Scholarship and Pedagogy, Vol. 28, No. 1, 2018
Copyright © 2018 The Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA
Published on behalf of New Jersey City University

(Spellmeyer 35). Part of the challenge is the *we* of this response: of collectively taking responsibility for the way things are and of imagining how they might become. In the midst of fearsome futures and nostalgia for or an amnesia of the past that blurs our responsibility in the present, the capacity to collectively experience time is an important component of teaching the future responsibly and creatively, as opposed to reactively and destructively. With this aim, I reflect in this essay on the pedagogical nature of tools at a study center dedicated to arts-based practices of collaborative time.

The Study Center, formerly titled WOUND and located at a gallery in New York City during the fall of 2016, featured tools and trainings in arts-based practices that also nurtured community engagement and social activism. The original title, WOUND, was meant to convey both the winding up of a clock or psyche and the pain—wounds—inflicted on people, relations, and the environment by capitalism’s relentless rush. The director, Caroline Woolard, and curator Stamatina Gregory framed WOUND as a study center for “mending time and attention” through group practice, individual reflection, and training, based on “the premise that certain practices and tools can offer an experience of collaborative time, a time which is specifically marked by our engagement with one another” (“WOUND”). These practices, although used by artists, are not artworks; rather, Woolard emphasizes, these are pedagogical tools. Given its position as a place for study (titled a Study Center), learning (implied in the “trainings” offered at the center), and pedagogy (invoked as one of the four reasons for the existence of the center), I came to WOUND interested in what a participant learns about collaborative time through engagement with the tools and trainings comprising the exhibition and, in connection with other articles in this issue of *Transformations*, how those practices constitute an arts of teaching futurity.

Wide-Awake to the Becoming of Time

This foray into curricular choices and consequences of teaching futurity resists reproducing a linear narrative of progress or disregarding the past. It is instead about being entangled in the becoming of time, drawing on feminist temporalities of Karen Barad, Elizabeth Grosz, and Rachel Loewen Walker. In this spirit, it also takes inspiration from the curricular visions of Gert Biesta, Maxine Greene, and Elizabeth Ellsworth for an education that embraces risk, wide-awakeness, and surprisings rather than predetermined outcomes and instrumental ends. These curricular theorists, in turn, borrow from aesthetics and affect theory; to this end, Jacques Rancière, Néstor García Canclini, and Brian Massumi shed light on how these arts-based tools—stimulating dissensus and imminence—make the future affectively real in the living present of the pedagogical event. It does so as a matter of being responsible to our own and our students’ pasts and possible futures.

Teaching the future assumes something about the nature of time. Here I challenge my own and students' assumptions that the future is neatly laid out ahead of us. Grosz instead encourages us to "generate and welcome a future that we may not recognize, a future that may deform, inflect, or redirect our current hopes and aspirations . . . a concept of the future which we do not control but which may shape and form us according to its forces" (2). Not only does the future act in and shape the present, but it also manifests in decisions made in the past based on what could or could have happened (Massumi). This future-past, in turn, forms our moment. Based on physics experiments on the behavior of electrons, Barad concludes that "it is not . . . that the future and past are not 'there' and never sit still, but that the present is not simply here-now. . . . Past, present, and future" are not linearly laid out "but threaded through one another" (244). Times are jumpy and unstable. Building on Barad's theory of intra-activity, Walker points to the mutual becoming of time and matter. The present is a *living* present, as Walker emphasizes: "an enactment of the processes of growth, change, movement, and touch, that characterize not only our human bodies, but bodies of water, insect bodies, and the systems of a city as it breathes its workers in and out from dawn until dusk and beyond" (47). The *living* present is the "making of time as the *becoming* of materiality" in these processes (47). Can we conceive of classroom exercises in which students realize their own agency as time makers, and the force of pasts and futures in their contexts?

As if anticipating Walker's theory of time, Ellsworth argues that "pedagogy stages encounters with the unthought—encounters with the future as in the making" (38). One way it does so is through pivot points (38): moments where inside and outside, self and society, past/present/future come into relation with one another. These encounters contribute to the emergence of the learning self in the pedagogical event, which Biesta also advocates in a curricular vision of open-ended becomings that resist fixed outcomes. For Biesta, without the "beautiful risk of education" that this event entails, schooling becomes a method of social reproduction (140). Against this predetermined future, Biesta argues that

the educational interest is, after all, an interest in the coming into the world of what is uniquely and radically new, which means that philosophy of education must always make place for that which cannot be foreseen as a possibility, that which transcends the realm of the possible. (52)

These encounters and risks can be triggered by socially engaged and arts-based pedagogical events. Greene argues that aesthetic experiences are particularly well suited to "release the imagination" and "disclose the ordinarily unseen, unheard, and unexpected" (27–28). Her vision for an education that fosters wide-awakeness—an active, curious, and critical encounter with the world—resonates deeply with a conscious participation in the becoming of the present and future, in dialogue with the past.

The idea that arts might “disclose the ordinarily unseen” (Greene) and “transcend the realm of the possible” (Biesta) has been elaborated on by Rancière as the aesthetic regime of the arts: the “delimitation of spaces and times, of the visible and the invisible, of speech and noise, that simultaneously determines the place and the stakes of politics as a form of experience” (13). We can become more attuned to how practices intervene in the distribution of the sensible by making visible, heard, felt, and doable what was previously unseen, unheard, unfelt, and inconceivable of doing. Rancière describes these forms as “an aesthetic anticipation of the future” and “a community to come” (29–30), echoing the aims of WOUND. García Canclini draws on Rancière in developing his theory of imminence—“an impending revelation” (26), hovering on the verge of what has yet to happen—as the aesthetic effect of socially engaged art. Imminence is particularly relevant to the affective presence of time and the arts of futurity:

The aesthetics that are now possible are those that accept untimeliness. . . . We are living in imminence and what we call art are the ways of working on this threshold, not in order to enter a new territory but to discover a tension. (García Canclini 178)

Art that disrupts the distribution of the sensible or hovers in the cut between the im/possible (Barad) contributes to making untimely events and feelings affectively real in the present. In the context of increasingly apocalyptic forecasts for future, policies of prevention, precaution, and preemption validate the affective factuality of the future as threat (Massumi). Rancière and Canclini suggest that the arts might help us imagine futures not motivated by threat while also distinguishing between affective fact as reality that we react to versus the way things are now as a reality that we take responsibility for.

In an essay accompanying WOUND, Gregory et al. write that rather than time that is “neatly divisible, linear, and disciplinary,” collaborative time is “time produced through collaboration and collective action,” such as the sustained duration of transformative practices. The tools and trainings invite visitors and users to wonder:

how, through collaboration, can we unwind time in order to render it open, unspecified, and inviting? . . . Can these practices render time a qualitative not quantitative phenomenon, something that is marked and construed for groups through mutuality rather than received through authority? (Gregory et al.)

In relation to teaching the future, I add to these wonderings:

How do we learn to experience or increase our capacities for collaborative time?

What are the pedagogic pivot points and hinges of these practices?

Following Ellsworth, I also echo her sentiment that these examples are not intended to be “blueprints, prototypes, or utopian visions” nor “didactic models of the future. . . . Instead, they gesture beyond themselves. They are investigations more than they are models” (9). And so, I hope to tease out the way in which these exercises, as *practices* instead of *products* or *performances* are possibilities for teaching the future. As practices, they come closer to developing ways of thinking in the humanities that might speak to other stakeholders in our social, scientific problems, such as the Dinner 2040 project organized by the Humanities for the Environment, which invited various stakeholders to a design charrette for imagining the future of food production and supply for “the future we want to see in Maricopa County, Arizona, 2040” (Adamson 353).

WOUND: Practices in Collaborative Time

At its original exhibition in 2016 at the Cooper Union Free Art School in New York City, WOUND included physical objects or framed scripts that were displayed on tables or wall ledges, with a variety of reconfigurable, multipurpose seats and benches designed by Woolard to facilitate individual and group practice. The main gallery room, as well as a room partitioned off in the back, was used during trainings. Objects were labeled “in use” or “at rest,” signifying their status as practices and tools, as opposed to autonomous artistic products. The collection also exists as an online archive, with trainings and workshops held in galleries, cafés, libraries, and educational spaces in New York City and internationally. Parts of the physical collection have traveled to Providence, Rhode Island, and Dakar, Senegal. Some tools are housed at the Commons, a space dedicated to the practice of solidarity economies in Brooklyn, New York. Over the past year, WOUND’s name has changed to the Study Center for Group Work. While it no longer focuses on collaborative *time*, it does maintain a focus on “collaborative methods, [which] often embrace the unknown, encouraging people to listen deeply enough to be transformed.”

As practices that also register in the field of community organizing, activism, and political life, the tools and trainings at WOUND intend to precipitate opportunities for interdisciplinary collaboration aimed at imagining and realizing alternative forms of communal life. The artists contributing these tools define “a practice (or a methods) [as] a way of doing things intentionally to develop an ability or awareness” and collaboration as “the action of shared work *and also of shared decision making*” (“Study Collaboration”). The exhibition consists of tools such as Yoko Ono’s *Question Piece*, a template for a conversation comprised entirely of questions; Paul Ryan’s *Threeing Stick*, a tool for facilitating group communication; and chapter 4 of Chloë Bass’s *The Book of Everyday Instruction*, instructions for telling story of a particular distance related to sociological theories of intimacy and unfamiliarity between two bodies in space. WOUND also features trainings, often hosted by artists or activists with works in the

exhibition. For example, Taraneh Fazeli, on behalf of the Canaries collective, facilitates “Calling in Sick,” a workshop in which participants participate in dialogic exercises, memoirs, and open letters to the community that addressed the social experience of care. Shaun Leonardo’s participatory workshop and performance “I Can’t Breathe” is a self-defense class composed of impromptu defensive actions in response to readings from Nina Simone’s lyrics, creating a communal, embodied reflection on protection and survival. Through these tools and trainings, the exhibition/Study Center aims to cultivate participants’ capacity for collaborative time.

Over the fall of 2016, I attended several trainings at WOUND offered by different artists and community organizers. In this media essay, I reflect on two of those: “Analogical Mapping and Indirect Procedures: A Brief Survey of Working Methods” with Judith Leemann and Kenneth Bailey of the Design Studio for Social Intervention and “Operator’s Manual for Context X” with Chris Wobken and Elliot P. Montgomery of Extrapolation Factory. As an educator, I was interested in what I might incorporate from these arts-based practices into my own practice of teaching, particularly in the context of working against foreclosure in futures thinking. Through close observation and reflection on my own participation in the trainings, as well as conversations with other participants, gallery assistants, and artists, I strove to attend to the pedagogic pivot points and hinges of these tools and practices that might help us experience time and imagine other futures, together.

Object Lessons

I sit between other participants along the wall in a dimmed room, kneeling next to a projector that beams onto the far wall. Artist Judith Leemann and activist Kenneth Bailey of the Design Studio for Social Intervention (ds4si), a creativity lab for the social justice sector, are about to lead participants in a workshop titled “A Brief Survey of Working Methods,” sharing practices from Leemann’s own creative process and teaching as well as Leemann and Bailey’s community organizing work. They will share methods of observation and analog mapping, which aim to give visibility to complex systems underlying social and individual problems. Mapping, describing, translating into visual form—these arts-based practices open up space for ways of knowing that are not grounded in the assumptions of a rationalist, positivist epistemology guiding commonly held assumptions and public policy.

For the first part of the workshop, “Object Lessons,” Leemann guides the group in exercises on descriptive observation. She has created several collections of small wooden hobby or chess pieces—titled *Stages*, *Tools for Telling Time*, *Untitled (Caedere)*, and *Wordless Didactics*—that are “in use” at WOUND. In short films, Leemann has recorded her own hands manipulating small wooden objects from these collections on a surface in front of her. We watch four clips from the *Wordless Didactics* series “Preposition and Prosthesis.” For each clip,

Leemann instructs us to describe, rather than interpret, what we see in pairs or trios with those sitting near us. For example, two participants and I attempt to describe the scene in one clip:

PARTICIPANT 1: I see a step stool.

PARTICIPANT 2: But is that interpretation?

PARTICIPANT 1: The stools move toward each other from opposite diagonal corners.

PARTICIPANT 2: The larger stool is turned upside down and right-side up again, then they continue just past the center and stop; the smaller stool is turned upside down and right-side up again, they continue to the opposite corner from which they started.

PARTICIPANT 3: The hands move with deliberation.

PARTICIPANT 1: Was that interpretation?

This task of observation and description, even for something as banal as hands moving wooden objects over a board, is difficult as we encounter the impossibility of description. Leemann probes this difficulty, asking us to share how the exercise *felt*. There is something about the collaborative component of the exercise, too, that is challenging and fruitful: not just in holding each other accountable to the fidelity of description, but also talking through the tension between description and interpretation together. If it is so hard to describe the movement of small wooden pieces across a wooden board, Leemann and Bailey prompt as they share examples from their work with ds4si, consider how much harder it is to describe complex social issues such as police violence or gentrification.

I quickly envision the applicability of this exercise to teaching my own classes: how do we get students to distinguish description from interpretation, to realize the impossibility of an objective description and to create an understanding of a scene collaboratively? We could use Leemann's *Wordless Didactics* films, create our own silent choreographies with small classroom knickknacks, or apply this process of collaborative description to a classroom observation or neighborhood walk. We could change modalities, exploring the tension between description and interpretation as we attend to choreographies of sound, smell, and touch. These are not merely interesting, infinite variations on a basic effort to describe a scene. Rather, when focused on probing the movements and borders of things, these Object Lessons are methods for attending to a living present. The pedagogical pivot point lies in sensing time in the duration of matter's stability or movement, for, as Walker writes, "matter itself is the force of time's passing and, consequently, 'we live as time makers' . . .—tables, chairs, animals, and plants live as time makers. Existence is predicated on the making of time, and each time maker is part of a living present or an intra-active duration" (55). As we attend to the objects, we attend to the duration of their presence that

constitutes our present. Furthermore, by cultivating our capacity for attending to what is there, might we also develop tools for dealing with “the nonexistence of what has not yet happened,” threats of the future, which appears “more real than what is now observable over and done with” (Massumi 52)?

Analog Mapping

Leemann next introduces analog mapping, a practice she often engages in university arts courses and studio critiques. This practice also comes out of a concern for the way language might limit us to expressing that for which we already have words. Analog mapping involves transferring a problem or idea onto a diagram of a completely different system: a gumball machine, a bicycle, a cross-section of the earth’s crust. Leemann scatters nearly a hundred such diagrams of different objects and systems across the floor. As the group combs through these diagrams, some participants pick up a diagram immediately and others sift through them slowly as if weighing each diagram against the particular problem in mind. When participants signed into the training, we were asked to write down a “small,” “medium,” and “big” personal or work-related problem on a large sheet of butcher paper. Leemann prompts the group to recall those problems and map them onto these systems. I try to map my wonderings about the pedagogical possibilities of these arts-based practices onto a 30° arc with clusters of dots concentrated at the center of the angle. This forces me to break down the wondering into various parts: the collaboration, the experience of time, pivot points, examples of these practices or organizations working at this intersection. After a period of individual mapping, we shared our reflections. Some participants reached new insight into their problem, others felt the analogy was forced, and a few wondered if we were predisposed to select the diagrams that suited our problem best and what the consequences of that selection might be for our capacity to imagine alternative scenarios. Leemann and Bailey shared stories from their experiences with these practices—from challenging the linear logic of public policy to overcoming writer’s block in crafting an artist’s statement.

The practice’s focus on individually mapping a personal problem did not immediately seem fruitful for cultivating collaborative time. Nor did it seem fruitful when I used the same exercise in an introductory doctoral course on curriculum theory, asking students to map a challenge related to their teaching or work and then to imagine, from new relationships that might have emerged, a possible response to that challenge or alternative unfolding of the event. Then, as in the workshop, the mapping method only provided vague notions of understanding the problem and possibilities differently. To better cultivate an experience of collaborative time, I plan to adapt this exercise to help students understand curriculum as a social creation (Walker and Soltis) as they create a curriculum for their final group project. Periodically through the process of designing their curriculum, groups will map their curriculum—its

entanglement of materials (books, technology, manipulatives, crafting supplies, etc.), formal curricular components (objectives, assessments, activities), bodies, rules, norms, environmental features, and null elements—onto a diagram of a different object or system. They could negotiate this mapping informally; but protocols for group work could produce different experiences of collaborative time and generate different directions for the curriculum. For example, in a silent process, Member A makes the first placement of a part of the curriculum onto the diagram. Member B places another part of the curriculum onto the diagram, in relation to the previous mapping. And so on—each group member, in turn, makes choices contingent on previous decisions. Completing this exercise periodically throughout the curriculum design process, provides groups with a chance to reflect on how their collaborative product has changed, how anticipated designs take surprising turns, and how ghosts of past diagrams surface in later mappings.

Beyond fostering collaboration—shared work and decision making in their curricular creations—this exercise addresses a tendency to design with one of two mindsets rooted in assumptions about future possibilities: “but that could never work in a real classroom” and “that could never work in a real classroom, but...” In their *Manifesto* (2011), Biesta and Carl Anders Säfström provocatively argue for an understanding of education that occupies this tension between, as they call it, “what is” (the reality of the present) and “what is not” (the hopes for the future):

To keep education away from pure utopia is not a question of pessimism but rather a matter of not saddling education with unattainable hopes that defer freedom rather than making it possible in the here and now. To stay in the tension between “what is” and “what is not” is therefore also a matter of being responsible for the present. To tie education to the “what is” is to hand over responsibility for education to forces outside of education, whereas to tie education to the “what is not” is to hand over education to the thin air of an unattainable future. From an educational perspective, both extremes appear as irresponsible. We therefore need to stay in the tension. (541)

As students map their curriculum onto various diagrams, they attend to the relationships between “what is” and “what is not”—“what need to be different to” and “what could happen if.” In doing so, they collaboratively negotiate this tension between the present and future.

Practices for Prototyping Future Scenarios

If practices in observation and analog mapping help us extend and contract the present, exercises in speculative futures might help students to imagine

alternative outcomes instead of reactively planning to a given future. As declared in the “Humanities for the Environment: A Manifesto for Research and Action” by Poul Holm and colleagues affiliated with the Environmental Humanities Observatories, “by exploring the spectrum of the human imagination—from the mundane, everyday imagination to daydreams and fantasy—counterfactual thinking helps us how to think about the future in hypothetical ways, and can provide a key to addressing human issues of consciousness, perception, and agency” (983). Such interventions are modeled by Extrapolation Factory, a studio for speculative design and futures studies founded by Chris Woebken and Elliot P. Montgomery, who lead a training centered around their *Operator’s Manual for Context X*, a collection of methods for “collaboratively prototyping, experiencing and impacting future scenarios” (Woolard and Gregory). Projects have included creating 99-cent stores of the future by hacking material bought at contemporary 99-cent stores; designing vending machines of the future; and sending junk mail from the future to recipients in the present. Such projects aim to imagine the material conditions and needs of multiple futures.

In the training at WOUND, participants apply methods from *Operator’s Manual for Context X* to their own future-oriented questions. We introduce ourselves and our areas of work: there are self-identified designers, technologists, students, artists, an anthropologist, and a historian. Woebken follows each introduction with a series of questions about the context of the problem or design and the beginning of possible future scenarios for the use of the object or consequences of the problem. He passes around a stack of worksheets with a design-thinking template from *Operator’s Manual for Context X*, and invites us to use it for rapidly prototyping multiple futures. This particular template prompts us to write down the context, partnering organization, and question around our future scenario. There is a large square to sketch or write out what the “project might look like” and a diagram of four planes reminding us to consider its economic, social, political, and material/ecological dimensions as the scenario plays out across different intervals of time. The directions are ambiguous, though—are we to decide on a single participant’s question or problem to collectively prototype; and how, exactly, do we begin to imagine the unimaginable? We never quite move past this stuck spot—the collaboration falters, possibly because we do not share a common question, community, or context around a particular issue. Woebken suggests we try other methods, such as the Futures Wheel Diagram (which looks like a kaleidoscopic bike wheel) in which we imagine secondary and tertiary consequences spiraling out from an event. Through this exercise, we discuss the possible consequences of a design for a garment that tracks body movement to collect data of the embodied experience of police surveillance; of removing monuments honoring Confederate leaders and soldiers; and of

granting legal rights to nonhuman agents such as rivers. Thinking in multiple futures develops the capacity for attending to the many possibilities imminent to a single moment in time, and to how current conditions might be changed to make different futures possible.

While the methods from *Operator's Manual for Context X* only look forward, Walker reminds us that “a future uncontained by the past is not a future *without a past* but rather a thick time of the present that stretches to all past experiences in its very *engendering of a novel future* [emphasis in original]” (48). These exercises in designing futures make me excited about new tools for teaching history in ways that “develop a different sense of the ‘time’ of history . . . [that] think such events ‘out of time’” (Walker 55). The Futures Wheel Diagram provides a tool for specifically considering the secondary and tertiary consequences of alternative histories and their impact on the future. Consider, while reading Herbert Kliebard’s *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893–1958*: what if a different group of people was at the National Committee of Ten in 1892—what knowledge would they deem was of most worth, and how would those differences ripple through educational events? How might different groups of students come to different futures scenarios for their speculative histories? Or, how does the way in which a reader’s response to curricular histories — to the omission and oppression of people of genders, races, sexualities, abilities, and identities other to the white men at the helm of Kliebard’s history — activate spirals of secondary and tertiary consequences for the reader’s immediate and far futures? Imagining these rippling consequences in concrete details can help students recognize that “the living present is heavy with lineages that mimic, critique, and undo our assumed histories, and, rather than wiping away the past or seeking absolution for our actions, we can embrace this thick temporality, recognizing its ability to deepen our accountabilities to those pasts and their possible futures” (Walker 56).

Conclusions

Joni Adamson poses the question of whether “the humanities, which typically are characterized as weakly tooled to address social and environmental crises, [can] catalyze the imagination of new ideas, narratives, frameworks, alternatives, demands, and projects that will enable people to envision different, livable futures?” (348). In taking the distribution of the sensible—the conditions of collaboration, the possibilities of time, and systems of perception (Rancière)—as their content and medium, the tools collected at WOUND are not instances of political art, but an aesthetic vocabulary and practice of politics that has pedagogical potential for teaching futurity.

Used as individual exercises, these practices might be useful, but not meaningfully contribute to experiences of collaborative time aimed at

realizing different futures. Even when used to cultivate experiences of collaborative time, the practices might reproduce a linear logic of time, as with straightforward applications of the Future Wheels Diagram, and reinforce an overblown sense of human control over time, as the human becomes chess-master in analog mapping. Yet, while these arts-based practices themselves “may not prove to be indices to predicting the future of thought, they do provide lines of flight, directions of movement that are virtual in the present, laden with potentialities, and that thus have some impetus or force in engendering a future that is different from what we have now” (Grosz 157).

Their pedagogical potential lies in helping students grasp the intrusions and slippages of the past, present, and future in the making of time. Various iterations on Object Lessons attune a learning community to the becoming of time in the materiality of processes of change, growth, and duration. Analog Mapping, when conducted with protocols for collaborative work, helps put concepts and things from various times into different relations with one another, creating pivot points for jarring juxtapositions and new possibilities. To address time in the design thinking exercises for speculative futures, when integrating intra-actions with the past and present, is, as Barad puts it, “to take responsibility for that which we inherit (from the past and the future) . . . to risk oneself (which is never one or self), to open oneself up to indeterminacy in moving towards what is to become” (264). Collectively tinkering with the contingencies of our times in the Futures Wheel Diagram has the potential to reroute the circular, self-causing logics of the relationship between future threats and present actions (Massumi).

Greene describes a vision for the classroom as a “collaborative search” between teachers and students for ways of coming to “see our givens as contingencies . . . to posit alternative ways of living and valuing and to make a choice” (23). These arts-based practices of collaborative time offer methods of collectively attending to the present as an entanglement of material processes and affective currents of past and future. WOUND has helped to show me new ways to challenge students’ assumptions of time as linear, disrupt the inputs and outputs that render the future predictable by highlighting how these outputs defy prediction, and make collaboration a central instead of incidental to the pursuit of new knowledge. Their pedagogical potential lies in creating the pivot points between times, “through which we come to have the surprising, incomplete knowings, ideas, and sensations that undo us and set us in motion toward an open future” (Ellsworth 17–18).

SARAH GERTH V.D. BERG is a doctoral student in the Department of Curriculum and Teaching at Teachers College, Columbia University. Her research interests involve the affective and aesthetic dimensions of curriculum.

Works Cited

- Adamson, Joni. "Networking Networks and Constellating New Practices in the Environmental Humanities." *PMLA* 131.2 (2016): 347–55. Print.
- Anderson, James D. *The Education of Blacks in the South, 1860–1935*. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1988. Print.
- Barad, Karen. "Quantum Entanglements and Hauntological Relations of Inheritance: Dis/continuities, SpaceTime Enfoldings, and Justice-to-Come." *Derrida Today* 3.2 (2010): 240–68. Print.
- Biesta, Gert J. J. *The Beautiful Risk of Education*. London: Routledge, 2016. Print.
- Biesta, Gert J. J., and Carl A. Säfström. "A Manifesto for Education." *Policy Futures in Education* 9.5 (2011): 540–47. Print.
- Ellsworth, Elizabeth. *Places of Learning: Media, Architecture, Pedagogy*. London: Routledge, 2005. Print.
- Erickson, Ansley T. *Making the Unequal Metropolis: School Desegregation and Its Limits*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 2016. Print.
- García Canclini, Néstor. *Art Beyond Itself: Anthropology for a Society Without a Story Line*. Durham: Duke UP, 2014. Print.
- Greene, Maxine. *Releasing the Imagination: Essays on Education, the Arts, and Social Change*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1995. Print.
- Gregory, Stamatina, Leigh C. La Berge, and Caroline Woolard. "Collaborative Time." *WOUND*, 2017. Web. 30 May 2017. <<http://woundstudycenter.com/#text>>.
- Grosz, Elizabeth. *Time Travels: Feminism, Nature, Power*. Durham, NC: Duke UP, 2005. Print.
- Holm, Poul, et al. "Humanities for the Environment: A Manifesto for Research and Action." *Humanities* 4.4 (2015): 977–92. Print.
- Kliebard, Herbert M. *The Struggle for the American Curriculum, 1893–1958*. New York: Routledge Farmer, 2004. Print.
- Massumi, Brian. "The Future Birth of the Affective Fact: The Political Ontology of Threat." *The Affect Theory Reader*. Eds. Melissa Gregg and Gregory J. Seigworth. Durham: Duke UP, 2010. 52–70. Print.
- Rancière, Jacques. *The Politics of Aesthetics: The Distribution of the Sensible*. New York: Continuum, 2006. Print.
- Spellmeyer, Kurt. "A Genealogy of Transformation." *Transformations: The Journal of Inclusive Pedagogy and Scholarship* 26.1 (2016): 33–35. Print.
- Study Center for Group Work. *Study Collaboration*. 2018. Web. 25 Apr. 2018. <<http://studycollaboration.com/>>.
- Toffler, Alvin. *Learning for Tomorrow: The Role of the Future in Education*. New York: Random House, 1974. Print.
- Tyack, David, and Larry Cuban. *Tinkering Toward Utopia: A Century of Public School Reform*. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1997. Print.
- Walker, Decker F., and Jonas F. Soltis. *Curriculum and Aims*. New York: Teachers College Press, 2004. Print.
- Walker, Rachel Loewen. "The Living Present as a Materialist Feminist Temporality." *Women: A Cultural Review* 25.1 (2015): 46–61. Print.
- Woolard, Caroline, and Stamatina Gregory. *WOUND Study Center*. 2016. Web. 30 May 2017. <<http://woundstudycenter.com>>.