Art Debates

Teaching Art through Inquiry, Choice, and Critical Dialogue

by

Jeremy Blair

Art Debates: Teaching Art through Inquiry, Choice, and Critical Dialogue

by Jeremy Blair

2026

Ethics International Press, UK

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Copyright © 2026 by Jeremy Blair

All rights for this book reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

ISBN (Hardback): 978-1-83711-535-8
ISBN (Ebook): 978-1-83711-536-5

Table of Contents

Introduction xi
Chapter 1: Teaching Art with Debate 1
Chapter 2: The Socratic Method 12
Chapter 3: Creating Supportive Environments for Debate 18
Chapter 4: Designing Effective Art Debates 24
Chapter 5: Art Debates 28
Chapter 6: Defining Art and Artists 35
Chapter 7: Non-Humans 55
Chapter 8: Monuments 74
Chapter 9: Targets 93
Chapter 10: Censorship 110
Chapter 11: Destruction 131
Chapter 12: Repatriation 155
Chapter 13: Collecting 181
Chapter 14: When Debates Fail 205
Chapter 15: Student-Designed Debates 216
Chapter 16: Facilitating Art Debates 226
Chapter 17: Assessing Growth in Debates 236
Chapter 18: The Impact of Debate 244
Chapter 19: The Case Against Debate 251
Chapter 20: Where Debate Leads Us 257
References 261

This book is dedicated to my students. They gave me the room to experiment, to stumble, to rethink, and to grow as a teacher. They taught me more than I could ever hope to teach them. Every day of teaching has shaped the ideas that found their way into these pages.

List of Figures

Figure 1. Visitors viewing Leonardo da Vinci's *Mona Lisa* at the Musee du Louvre, Paris.

Figure 2. Raphael, *The School of Athens* (1509-1511), Apostolic Palace, Vatican City.

Figure 3. Artwork by Jean-Michel Basquiat exhibited at the Foundation Louis Vuitton.

Figure 4. Bob Ross, *Purple Mountain Range,* displayed during the American Art auction.

Figure 5. Michelangelo Buonarroti, Sistine Chapel Ceiling.

Figure 6. Jeff Koons, *Balloon Dog*.

Figure 7. Sweni, an African elephant painting.

Figure 8. Spider web covered in morning dew.

Figure 9. Pair of Regent Bowerbirds.

Figure 10. Wim Delvoye's tattooed pig project.

Figure 11. Ai-Da, *Portrait of the Robot*.

Figure 12. Projection of George Floyd's image on the Robert E. Lee monument.

Figure 13. United States Marine Corps War Memorial.

Figure 14. Vietnam Veterans Memorial.

Figure 15. Bust of Nathan Bedford Forrest.

Figure 16. Destruction of ancient statues at the Nineveh Museum.

Figure 17. Installation view of the Degenerate Art Exhibition.

Figure 18. Pablo Picasso, *Guernica*.

Figure 19. Environmental activists throwing soup at Mona Lisa.

Figure 20. Michelangelo Buonarroti, *David*.
Figure 21. Dread Scott, *What Is the Proper Way to Display a U.S. Flag?*
Figure 22. Caravaggio, *Medusa*.
Figure 23. Banksy, *Rage, the Flower Thrower*.
Figure 24. Banksy, *Love Is in the Bin*.
Figure 25. James Turrell, *Twilight Epiphany Skyspace*.
Figure 26. James Turrell, *Unseen Blue*.
Figure 27. Ai Weiwei with one of his artworks.
Figure 28. The Parthenon on the Acropolis.
Figure 29. Parthenon Marbles.
Figure 30. Interior view of the Acropolis Museum.
Figure 31. Alphonse Mucha's *Slav Epic cycle*.
Figure 32. Installation view of Alphonse Mucha posters.
Figure 33. Visitors viewing a Jackson Pollock painting.
Figure 34. Worker unloading recyclable materials.
Figure 35. Archaeological excavations at Catalhoyuk.
Figure 36. Voyager Golden Record.
Figure 37. Andres Serrano, *Immersion (Piss Christ).*
Figure 38. Banana taped to a wall.
Figure 39. Frank Stella, *Sight Gag.*

Introduction

Discussion is not for the sake of victory, but for the sake of inquiry.

Plato

Entering the Debate

Debate is one of the oldest forms of intellectual engagement (Anderson, 2014), but in many art classrooms it remains underutilized. In most K-12 and university art classrooms, the hum of creativity is measured by the sounds of brushes on canvas, pencils on paper, and the focus of artmaking. While studio work remains the heart of art education, the conversations that surround art, the questions, disagreements, the light bulb moments, and spirited exchanges, are just as essential. Art reflects the cultures, histories, and ideologies of its time and provokes controversy and dialogue. But all too often, these conversations happen informally, if they happen at all. This book is my response to that gap.

What Do We Mean by Debate?

Debate, in its broadest sense, refers to a sustained exchange of opposing viewpoints through reasoned speech, a practice as ancient as civilization itself and one that continues to this day (Broda-Bahm, Kempf, & Driscoll, 2004). What is commonly called "debate" in today's contexts is more precisely described as "dialectic." Dialectic is an ancient method of reasoning that seeks truth through structured dialogue, bringing opposing ideas into conversation and working through their tensions to arrive at a complete understanding (Nikulin, 2010). In Plato's work, dialectic was the highest form of philosophical inquiry and was featured in *The Republic* and *The Symposium*. Aristotle

formalized dialectic as a mode of reasoning, treating it as a disciplined method for testing claims rather than asserting dogma (Aristotle, 1984). In ancient Greece, Aristotle described dialectical argument as a means to criticize and evaluate opinions, emphasizing assessment over victory (Aristotle, 1984). In ancient Athens, this practice was embedded in everyday civic life, as citizens gathered in the agora, to debate laws and political issues. Moving forward, I use the term debate intentionally because it is more familiar to contemporary readers and my students.

Debate in Media

In modern democratic societies, debate remains central and appears across an expanded media landscape. Debate is featured on school speech and debate teams, university campuses, televised presidential and primary debates, and with sports pundits on television, social media, and the radio. Across these settings, debate functions as a public practice through which values, priorities, and collective identity are expressed and negotiated.

Today's students inhabit a world saturated by debate. Debate is now prominent on social media platforms such as Instagram, TikTok, YouTube, and X. Political commentators and content creators have adapted debate into highly shareable short-form content optimized for video clips, reactions, and podcasts. Debate has also become a form of entertainment through YouTube channels like *Jubilee*, whose popular *Middle Ground* series brings people with opposing viewpoints together for structured conversations on topics ranging from politics and religion, to race and gender. In many online spaces, debate is monetized, reinforcing ideological division through feedback loops that prioritize conflict over resolution. Debate is still embedded in our culture.

Art Has Always Been Debated

The first documented debates on art in Western culture emerged in Ancient Greece during the fifth and fourth centuries BCE, when philosophers such as Socrates (470–399 BCE), Plato (427–347 BCE), and Aristotle (384–322 BCE) began writing systematically about education and the role of the arts in society (Burton, 2025). Plato's *Republic* offers the earliest recorded critique of the arts. He warned that interpretation and expression were unruly forces that could separate citizens from rational order and destabilize the state. He argued that the arts should be included in the education of young citizens only under strict censorship, postponing exposure until the child's character had been firmly developed (Efland, 1990).

Aristotle advanced a more accommodating view of the arts, one that significantly shaped art education. Writing approximately forty years after Plato, Aristotle argued that artistic practice was a natural and valuable mode of human understanding. In Book VIII of *Politics*, Aristotle advocated for the inclusion of drawing in education alongside reading and writing, gymnastics, and music (*Politics*, VIII.3). He famously asserted that "art completes what nature cannot bring to finish," suggesting that the artist gives form to nature's unrealized ends (*Physics* II.8; *Poetics*).

Outside the Western tradition, debates about art developed independently in Asia, particularly in China, through philosophical frameworks. As early as the fifth century BCE, Confucian thinkers debated the moral power of music, ritual, and visual symbolism, arguing that the arts cultivated harmony and ethical order (*Analects*, Book III). Later Chinese art theory, especially during the Six Dynasties period, produced sustained debates about artistic purpose and truth. Xie He's *Six Principles of Painting* articulated criteria such as spirit

resonance (*qi yun*), shifting discussion away from imitation alone toward expressive vitality and moral cultivation (Cha, 2026).

In Western culture, ancient debates about imitation, truth, and artistic purpose resurfaced with renewed force during the Middle Ages and the Italian Renaissance. In the thirteenth century, St. Thomas Aquinas helped sustain traditions of debate through the *quaestio disputata*, or disputed question, a rigorous form of public inquiry used in medieval universities (Goodwin, 2002). This method required him to present opposing arguments in their strongest form before offering his own reasoned responses and resolutions, creating a structured model for examining competing ideas (Brown, 2024).

During the Italian Renaissance, these dialogical approaches to knowledge were directed toward the arts. Giorgio Vasari's *Lives of the Most Excellent Painters, Sculptors, and Architects* (1998/1550) framed art history as a progressive narrative shaped by individual genius, skill, and refinement, while Albrecht Dürer's *On Painting* (1956/1525) argued that artistic practice rested on proportion, mathematics, and intellectual discipline. Dürer's writings mark an important moment when artists themselves entered long-standing philosophical debates about art, asserting that painting was not merely a craft, but a form of knowledge aligned with science, reason, and truth. Together, Aquinas, Vasari, and Dürer demonstrate how questions first posed by Plato and Aristotle continued to shape how art was defined, taught, evaluated, and debated well into the modern era.

Teaching Through Debate

In my own teaching practice, I have found debate to be a transformative force in how students see and understand art. The spark for this work began in 2007, during my first year as a high school art teacher in Savannah, Georgia. In those early years in Savannah,

classroom debates were casual and unscripted, quick, animated exchanges that sparked when students questioned an artwork's value, authenticity, or meaning. For example, most of my students rejected Jackson Pollock's action paintings with the familiar refrain, "I could do that." Rather than shutting down these comments, I learned to lean into them, using students' skepticism as an entry point for deeper discussion. I also found myself energized by introducing students to new artists such as Kehinde Wiley and Kara Walker, whose work provoked strong reactions and complex conversations about power, race, history, and representation. Over time, I recognized that I enjoyed facilitating these conversations, and challenging students' assumptions, more than teaching studio projects. Hands-on artmaking was not always the primary goal as dialogue and inquiry took center stage in my classroom.

This shift continued to evolve as I left my teaching position in Savannah to attend graduate school in Texas. In graduate school, I learned how to write open-ended questions, and how to construct productive subquestions that promote higher order thinking. I also learned how to remain silent at critical moments, and how to respond constructively when students offered unexpected, resistant, or disruptive ideas.

These strategies helped transform the informal classroom discussions I was leading at the high school into a deliberate framework. As I continued teaching, these eventual art debates were revised and shaped by student feedback and classroom observations. The debates were tested and refined across multiple courses, institutions, and levels. Eventually, these now formalized art debates were a part of my curriculum, and my young graduates led art debates in their own classrooms, confirming that these practices are transferable beyond my own teaching.

What Do Art Debates Look Like?

Across all the debates presented in this book, some questions are designed to challenge inherited assumptions about art. Others ask students to confront ethical boundaries and institutional norms. Some debates extend into civic and public life, prompting students to consider how art functions in shared spaces. Students also grapple with enduring aesthetic questions and discuss why people protest with art. Taken together, these conversations position art not as a static object of study but as an active site where personal and cultural narratives, values, power, and responsibility are constantly negotiated.

Each debate is constructed to support meaningful student engagement by combining relevant prompts, visually compelling images, age-appropriate framing, and structures that encourage students to consider multiple perspectives. Some debates draw directly from current events, prompting students to connect art to war and politics. Others rely on historical case studies that ask students to examine questions of authorship, preservation, and institutional responsibility. As Parker and Hess (2001) argue, democratic classrooms flourish when students are supported in engaging controversial issues within respectful, well-facilitated environments, precisely the conditions these debates are designed to cultivate.

Why Debate Works

Readers may wonder why I use the word debate rather than discussion. Discussion encourages the exchange of ideas, but debate introduces productive tension. Debate asks students to defend positions, respond to competing viewpoints, examine assumptions, and justify claims publicly. The goal is not conflict for its own sake, nor is it winning. Rather, debate creates conditions where ideas must

be tested rather than shared. In this sense, debate functions as a particular kind of discussion, one designed to move students beyond opinion and toward reasoning.

I cannot predict where a debate will go, and that sense of not knowing creates space for genuine inquiry rather than predetermined outcomes. Because students bring different backgrounds, values, and experiences into the classroom, no two debates unfold the same way, even when the same prompt is revisited across semesters. Some conversations continue beyond the classroom, while others inspire further research or creative work.

In contrast, many art classrooms emphasize creative production while treating discussion as secondary. While studio critiques, artist statements, and discussion are familiar practices in art classrooms, they are rarely structured to sustain disagreement, hold competing interpretations in productive tension, or connect art to ethical reasoning. As a result, students learn *how* to make art without learning how to publicly reason about why art matters. Eisner (2002; 2016) reminds us, the arts cultivate perceptual, conceptual, and imaginative ways of thinking, not merely technical skill. Debate-based pedagogy brings these dimensions to the foreground. It positions students as both makers and meaning-makers, capable of articulating why art matters to them individually, and within broader contexts.

Why This Book Exists

This book grew out of years of conversations with colleagues, former students, and teacher candidates who asked for copies of my debate questions, discussion prompts, and instructional materials. What began as a collection of activities gradually evolved into a larger body of work centered on using debate as a way to teach art. My hope is not that readers adapt, revise, and build upon them to meet the needs of

their own students and schools. The goal is to make inquiry, discussion, and debate a more visible and intentional part of art education.

Over the years, this approach has become increasingly formalized and is now embedded as a core component of my course ARED 2020: Art Education Theory at Tennessee Tech University. While at TN Tech, I have developed more than one hundred formal art debates. These debates reflect an evolving pedagogy shaped by sustained classroom practice, observation, reflection, and revision rather than a fixed method. What follows is the result of that ongoing process and an invitation for others to continue it.

How This Book Is Organized

This book builds on that premise by offering a practical and flexible framework for integrating debate into art classrooms. The opening section establishes the foundations of teaching through structured dialogue, introducing debate as a pedagogical approach, situating classroom discussion within the Socratic tradition, exploring how to create environments where students feel comfortable engaging in debate, and providing practical guidance for designing effective art debates.

The heart of the book is a collection of classroom-tested debates that explore many of the most important questions in art and visual culture. Readers will first encounter foundational art debates about how art and artists are defined and valued. From there, the conversations expand to include non-human makers, as well as debates surrounding monuments, censorship, destruction, repatriation, collecting, and much more. Throughout these chapters, debates are supported by student quotes, images, historical context,

guiding questions, and facilitation strategies drawn from classroom practice.

The final section of the book shifts from the debates themselves to the realities of teaching with them. It examines unsuccessful or failed debates, student-designed debates, and practical approaches to facilitation and assessment. The book concludes by considering the broader impact of debate on student and teacher learning. Together, these chapters position debate as a central practice for thinking deeply about art, culture, and the world.

Ultimately, *Art Debates* is both a teaching resource and an invitation to engage. It asks educators to embrace the messy, unpredictable, and deeply human work of dialogue while challenging students to see art as living, contested spaces where meaning is created, questioned, and reshaped through conversation. It invites teachers, students, and readers alike to approach art with curiosity, courage, and a commitment to listening as much as expressing. My goal is to make debate as essential to the art classroom as the sketchbook or the paintbrush.

Chapter 1
Teaching Art with Debate

I cannot teach anybody anything. I can only make them think.

Socrates

Why Debate Belongs in Art Education

Debate is misunderstood as a competitive exchange focused on winning and losing. In educational settings, people associate debate with political arguments, courtroom proceedings, or speech competitions complete with judges, scorecards, and clearly defined victors. Such images can make debate seem confrontational, intimidating, and disconnected from everyday teaching. Debate is far more than verbal competition. At its best, debate is a structured form of inquiry. It is a way of thinking with others through questioning, reasoning, reflection, and dialogue. Students learn by experimenting with ideas, testing assumptions, weighing evidence, listening to alternative perspectives, and revising their thinking in response to new understandings.

In art education, debate is especially important because art itself is inherently contested. Artworks invite interpretation, disagreement, emotional reaction, ethical reflection, and personal meaning making. What one viewer experiences as profound and transformative, another viewer may dismiss as insignificant. What one community celebrates as culturally important, another may find offensive, controversial, or harmful. Questions about value, meaning, representation, authenticity, censorship, and ownership rarely have universally accepted answers. As philosopher Nigel Warburton

(2003) reminds us, questions about art are "live questions that people disagree about passionately" (p. 9). Teaching art responsibly therefore does not require that educators resolve disagreements. Instead, it requires creating opportunities for students to engage those disagreements thoughtfully.

The Puzzle That Changed Everything

In 2003, while in college, I enrolled in a course called *Aesthetics and Criticism*. At the time, I assumed aesthetics meant beauty and criticism meant negative feedback. I had never participated in what I would now consider an intelligent conversation about art. My art history courses were lectures accompanied by slides and my studio classes focused on making art, with formal critiques centered on the work. Looking back, I spent very little time discussing what art actually was, why it mattered, or how people arrived at different conclusions about it.

That changed through a small red textbook I was assigned to read in my aesthetics course called *Puzzles About Art: An Aesthetics Casebook* by Margaret Battin, John Fisher, Ronald Moore, and Anita Silvers (1989). The book was unlike any textbook I had encountered. Rather than presenting established facts, it presented short scenarios, hypothetical thought puzzles, and ethical dilemmas. Each case invited readers to form opinions, justify their reasoning, and engage in dialogue.

One of the earliest cases I remember discussing was titled “Call It Driftwood.” The authors ask readers to imagine a well-known artist finding a piece of driftwood on a beach and presenting it to a curator as an artwork entitled *Driftwood*. Should the curator display the piece? At first glance, the question seemed absurd, but the more our class discussed it, the more complicated it became. Did artistic intention

transform the random object into art? Did authorship matter? Did context matter? Would our answer change if the driftwood had been selected by an unknown artist instead of a famous one? What if a dog picked up the piece of wood instead of a person? If I believed the driftwood should be exhibited, that position was acceptable, provided I could support my position. If I believed the curator should reject it, that position was equally valid if I could justify my reasoning. The value was not in arriving at consensus but in participating in the inquiry.

Another memorable case from the book explored three monochromatic paintings by Yves Klein. The paintings were identical in size, color, and appearance, but each carried a different price. Surprisingly, collectors favored the most expensive painting. The authors asked if price itself might influence perceptions of artistic value. Questions such as these transformed my understanding of art education. Talking about art and defining art suddenly felt just as important as making it. The habits of mind developed in that course like questioning, reasoning, listening, disagreeing, justifying, and reconsidering assumptions, would eventually become central to my teaching philosophy and ultimately inspire this book.

The Fire in the Louvre

The first art debate I ever taught at my university was based on a case featured in *Puzzles About Art: An Aesthetics Casebook* (1989) and is one I continue to use. The situation is "The Louvre is on fire. You can save either the *Mona Lisa* or the injured guard who had been standing next to it, but not both. What should you do?" (p. 149). I have adapted this scenario in different ways, but the essential dilemma remains the same. Below is a brief excerpt from this art debate involving my university students in 2025.



Figure 1. Visitors viewing Leonardo da Vinci's *Mona Lisa* at the Musée du Louvre, Paris, France. Photograph by Brittany Chastagnier, June 7, 2022. Published on Unsplash

> "Imagine we're all standing in the Louvre. There's a dedicated gallery with the *Mona Lisa* hanging behind bulletproof glass. You're practically swimming through the crowd trying to get to the front. You are standing in front of arguably the most famous painting in the world. Then, It's obvious there's some sort of emergency. There's smoke. There's fire. You only have time to save one thing. Do you save the *Mona Lisa*, or do you save the guard who works at the Louvre? What will you do?" I asked everyone.
>
> "Save the guard!" most students wailed.
>
> The class started looking for ways around the dilemma, "I would save the guard and the *Mona Lisa* by dragging the injured guard while the guard holds onto the painting,"

> I tried to complicate the matter, "What if the guard is an eighty-nine-year-old man and has lived a long life, do you still save the guard?"
>
> Another replied, "That's a horrible thing! Always save the man!"

As students continued introducing new variables and alternate explanations to the debate, the obvious answer became complicated. Some students argued that all human lives retain value regardless of circumstance, while others considered how responsibility, intention, and context might affect their decision. What started as a straightforward moral question gradually evolved into a genuine ethical controversy. Without realizing it, they are engaging in higher-order thinking. They are evaluating ethical frameworks, testing principles, examining evidence, and exploring how changing contextual details can transform a problem.

Then the conversation broadened beyond life-and-death decisions into questions about why the *Mona Lisa* matters in the first place.

> "If the *Mona Lisa* burned up, thousands of prints would still exist," one student stated.
>
> Someone quickly replied, "Everyone has seen it. Save the guard."

As the debate continued, I learned who valued moral reasoning and who adjusted positions according to circumstances. I learned which students approached problems pragmatically, who thought emotionally, who defended principles, and who enjoyed exploring exceptions. I learned which students were comfortable speaking and which needed encouragement. The debate revealed how they justified those choices, offering insight into their reasoning, priorities, and willingness to defend difficult decisions.

For nearly a decade, students have continued to debate this dilemma in my classroom. The details of their answers vary, but the result remains remarkably consistent: a question opens the door to deep thinking. *The Fire in the Louvre* has inspired dozens of subsequent debates and ultimately inspired this book. It demonstrated that students do not need complicated prompts to think deeply. They need meaningful questions, thoughtful facilitation, and the freedom to explore ideas whose answers are not immediately obvious.

Thinking Through Art

Johnson and Johnson's (2009) work on structured academic controversy suggests that intellectual conflict can function as a productive resource for learning. Students deepen understanding by examining opposing viewpoints, testing arguments, and synthesizing competing ideas. Similarly, Dewey (1938) argued that meaningful learning emerges from uncertainty, inquiry, and reflection rather than passive reception.

Research has repeatedly linked debate-based instruction to improved critical thinking, argument literacy, and problem-solving skills (Bellon, 2000; Kennedy, 2007). For art education, these capacities are especially important because many of the discipline's central questions resist definitive answers. Debating whether Duchamp's *Fountain* should be considered art, if monuments should be removed, or whether AI-generated imagery should be exhibited requires students to navigate aesthetics, history, ethics, and culture simultaneously. Debate is thinking through art.

If debate offers so many educational benefits, why is it still relatively uncommon in art education? Part of the answer is tradition. Many art teachers are trained in environments that emphasize studio production, demonstrations, critiques, and lectures rather than

structured discussion. Also, debate is difficult to teach and it can feel unpredictable. Some teachers worry about controversy, classroom management, or discussing sensitive issues without definitive answers (Demissie, 2020). Others feel unprepared because few teacher preparation programs explicitly train future educators to facilitate debate. On the other hand, many of the skills art teachers possess like asking questions, guiding critiques, encouraging meaning making, and helping students examine multiple viewpoints, provide a strong foundation for debate-centered instruction.

Debate Has Always Been Part of Art

One reason why debate feels so natural in art education is that art educators have been facilitating debate-like conversations for generations. Studio critiques, peer reviews, and artist statements all require students to make claims, provide evidence, interpret visuals, and respond to competing perspectives. Few scholars have influenced my thinking about discussion and interpretation more than Terry Barrett. In *Criticizing Art: Understanding the Contemporary* (2012), Barrett examined the many ways people talk about art, from casual conversations to formal critiques, museum discussions, and classroom dialogue (Barrett, 2012). One of his most useful observations is that spontaneous reactions allow people to test interpretations, receive feedback, and express opinions without fear of ridicule. Before asking students to take positions, I give students time to react, question one another, and explore their uncertainty. Meaningful discussion begins when students are free to say, "I don't get it," and work through that uncertainty together (Barrett, 2012).

Readers may wonder how debate differs from a traditional art critique. While both involve discussion, interpretation, and evidence, they start at different places. Critiques typically focus on understanding, evaluating, or improving a specific artwork. Debate

usually begins with a broader question, dilemma, or controversy that may involve multiple artworks, artists, or perspectives. During a critique, a students might ask, "What does this work communicate?" During a debate, they might ask, "Should this work exist?" or "Why does it matter?" In practice, the two approaches overlap. Many critiques naturally evolve into debates, and many debates draw upon the close observation and evidence-based reasoning associated with critique.

Making Space for Every Voice

When facilitated thoughtfully, debate can function as a powerful form of inclusive pedagogy. Art teachers regularly address issues of culture, representation, and identity and debate creates opportunities for students to engage these topics while honoring diverse perspectives. Freedman (2000) argues that art education should actively engage cultural and ethical controversies because such engagement prepares students for participation in democratic life. Similarly, Hess and McAvoy (2015) suggest that controversial discussions can redistribute authority within the classroom by legitimizing multiple perspectives rather than privileging a single narrative.

However, inclusive debate does not happen automatically. Educators must recognize that not all students experience discussion in the same way. Students may hesitate to share opinions when they fear judgment, stereotyping, or social consequences. Effective facilitation therefore requires careful attention to participation structures, emotional safety, and student agency. Consequently, inclusive debate requires intentional design. Students should never be required to disclose personal experiences, and participation structures should provide multiple avenues for engagement when discussions involve sensitive topics.

These concerns resonate with the work presented in *Cultivating Critical Conversations in Art Education: Honoring Student Voice, Identity, and Agency* (Stewart et al., 2024). In Chapter Three, Staikidis (2024) describes a scaffolded questioning strategy for facilitating difficult conversations. Beginning with broad questions, discussions gradually progress toward more focused personal associations, visualizations, and applications. I use a similar progression. For example, a debate might start with a question like *Should Michelangelo's David be censored in K–12 classrooms?* Students will then be asked how they first encountered the sculpture, if they studied it in school, and how they might introduce it to future students. The conversation then expands to questions of censorship, educational policy, and the public's role in shaping school curricula.

From Expert to Facilitator

Teaching with debate fundamentally transforms the role of the educator. Rather than serving as the sole authority, the teacher becomes a facilitator of inquiry. This shift aligns with Freire's (1970) conception of dialogue as collaborative meaning making. Constructivist traditions also emphasized the social construction of knowledge (Bruner, 1996; Vygotsky, 1978). Teachers leading debates establish the norms, monitor participation, protect emotional safety, frame productive questions, and intervene when discussions become unproductive.

Facilitation also requires restraint. Learning to remain silent has been one of the most difficult challenges of my own teaching practice. Early in my career, I jumped into discussions too quickly and did not provide enough wait time between questions. I clarified ideas, supplied examples, and corrected misconceptions almost immediately. I did not allow ideas to brew or breathe or even give space for a little awkward silence. Over time, I learned that productive

silence is not a failure of instruction. It is evidence that students are thinking.

Barrett (2012) repeatedly emphasized that facilitators should remain in the background whenever possible. Students, not teachers, should dominate conversations. If a facilitator asks a question, they should not answer it. If participation lags, they should pose additional questions rather than supplying conclusions. In my classroom, I have long followed Barrett's example. I establish clear expectations for both my students and me, and I resist the urge to correct minor factual inaccuracies during debates because such interruptions can discourage participation.

Similarly, I avoid heavily grading individual debates. Across a semester students may participate in forty or fifty individual debates. Rather than assigning scores to each one, I typically assess participation holistically. I cover my assessment strategy later in the book, but I believe excessive grading can discourage risk taking and transform dialogue into a performance. Students who fear losing points become less willing to contribute original ideas in my experience.

Above all, I try to model curiosity. Barrett (2012) argues that curiosity matters more than judgment in conversations about art. I agree. Students enter debates curious but sometimes hesitate to evaluate or judge a work of art or scenario. Through repeated experiences, they gradually learn that forming and defending judgments is not something to fear. It is part of engaging seriously with art.

A Space Where Questions Matter

More than twenty years have passed since I first encountered the questions and dilemmas in *Puzzles About Art*. During that time, I have

led debates in secondary classrooms, university lecture halls, education conferences, museums, and galleries. The topics have changed and evolved but one thing has remained consistent: students are eager to think when given meaningful opportunities to do so.

This book is my attempt to create for others what *Puzzles About Art* created for me: a space where questions matter, dialogue is valued, and ideas can be explored without predetermined answers. The chapters that follow build upon this belief. Together they demonstrate how debate can become one of the most powerful tools available to educators, helping students think more deeply, speak more confidently, and participate more fully in the ongoing human conversation that we call art.

Chapter 2
The Socratic Method

The more I know, the less I understand.

Often attributed to Socrates

Learning Through Questions

The history of teaching through questions stretches back to Socrates, who believed that truth is not best delivered as fixed knowledge but discovered through dialogue (Vlastos, 1994). Rather than presenting knowledge as a body of facts to be memorized, Socrates challenged learners with probing, open-ended questions designed to spark reflection, expose contradictions, and encourage individuals to construct meaning for themselves (Farnsworth, 2021; Kreeft, 2010). His method was not centered on transmitting information but on cultivating habits of inquiry, reflection, and self-examination. The underlying premise was deceptively simple: people learn more deeply when they are challenged to think through ideas rather than merely receive them.

In today's art classrooms, the Socratic Method remains profoundly relevant. Art should not be reducible to dates, categories, or skills. Meanings are negotiated rather than given, and interpretations are unique and evolve through discussion and reflection. As a result, the Socratic Method provides a framework for moving students beyond surface-level responses toward deeper engagement with artworks, ideas, and cultures (Eisner, 2002).



Figure 2. Raphael, *The School of Athens* (1509-1511), Apostolic Palace, Vatican City. Photograph by Abaca Press, February 16, 2017. AP Images. Reprinted with permission

Teaching Through Questions

Paul and Elder (2006) argue that Socratic questioning strengthens reasoning by encouraging learners to examine evidence, consider alternative viewpoints, and recognize the limits of their own understanding. For them, questioning is a way of cultivating humility, curiosity, and more disciplined thinking. Brookfield and Preskill (2005) similarly contend that discussion-centered pedagogy makes classrooms more democratic because knowledge is constructed through dialogue rather than transmitted unilaterally. In art education, where multiple interpretations are always possible, discussion provides a powerful means for students to build understanding collectively while learning to respect differing perspectives.

Hess (2009) argues that respectful disagreement can serve as a powerful engine of democratic learning and helps students engage in multiple perspectives without becoming polarized. Rather than treating disagreement as disruptive, these approaches position debate and discussion as opportunities for intellectual growth, empathy, and perspective-taking. Consistent with these ideas, The Art of Education University (2015) has advocated for Socratic seminars in art classrooms through carefully crafted open-ended questions that prioritize interpretation over recall.

Making Meaning Together

One of the most influential contemporary applications of this approach is Visual Thinking Strategies (VTS), developed through the work of Abigail Housen (2002) and Philip Yenawine (2013). VTS employs open-ended prompts such as 'What's going on in this picture?' and 'What do you see that makes you say that?' These questions encourage evidence-based reasoning while fostering attentive listening and tolerance for uncertainty. Students learn to support interpretations with visual evidence while considering alternative viewpoints.

Freedman (2000) argues that meaningful engagement with visual culture requires students to participate in collective meaning-making and critical discussion. Tavin (2003) likewise advocates for a critical pedagogy of visual culture that encourages students to confront challenging images and controversial issues rather than avoiding them. Through dialogue, students learn to examine questions of representation, power, and social justice that frequently emerge in contemporary visual culture.

Several other scholars have extended Socratic principles to studio practice and arts-based inquiry. Sullivan (2010) and Rolling (2013)

describe artmaking itself as a form of inquiry in which artists continually question materials, processes, and meanings. From this perspective, creative practice mirrors the iterative process of Socratic dialogue. Artists experiment, reflect, revise, and reconsider assumptions in a recursive cycle of questioning and discovery. The importance of multiple voices within educational dialogue has also been explored through contemporary dialogic theories. Hadjipanteli and Vrikki (2023) describe this work as "teacher dialogic artistry," highlighting the pedagogical dispositions needed to facilitate conversation-rich learning environments.

Creating Spaces for Dialogue

Research suggests that dialogic pedagogy can support inclusion and student engagement. Snyder and Cooper (2015) demonstrate how dialogue and storytelling can re-engage marginalized students by validating their experiences and perspectives. Chung (2022) argues that listening itself is a critical pedagogical practice, particularly in artmaking environments where students' ideas and identities emerge through conversation.

Museum educators Burnham and Kai-Kee (2011) demonstrate how carefully crafted questions can scaffold interpretation and support collaborative meaning-making. Their work highlights the role of educators not as authorities who provide answers but as facilitators who guide inquiry. I think about this when bringing students into galleries. The strongest gallery experiences are when I give students the agency to initiate their own questions. Once that happens, the conversation belongs to them, and my primary responsibility becomes keeping the dialogue moving rather than directing it toward a conclusion.