A RHETORIC OF REVIVAL:

REIMAGINING MUSEUM SPACES

THROUGH DIGITAL MEDIA

by

AMANDA BETH STEVENS

AMY DAYTON, COMMITTEE CHAIR

DAVID AINSWORTH
STEVE BURCH
YOLANDA M. MANORA
PAMELA TAKAYOSHI

A DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in the Department of English
in the Graduate School of
The University of Alabama

TUSCALOOSA, ALABAMA

2016

ABSTRACT

Though this dissertation's ideas and theories are grounded in multiple disciplines, its primary focus is on voices. Voices that are heard, voices that are marginalized, and voices that are erased from narratives altogether. Though this focus has been examined in many facets and within many disciplines, examining marginalized voices through visual rhetorical spaces such as museums and art is an area that has not been widely examined in the field of rhetoric and composition. While other disciplines have examined these practices, rhetoric and composition is an important addition to these studies because composing and rhetoric are taking place in these spaces and, while doing so, are leaving out many marginalized voices. My specific topics for inquiry are: the rhetoric of the physical museum; representation of voices through online art spaces and their rhetorical differences to the physical museum; the current interactive and communal spaces to help recover voices through live online spaces; and the possibilities of these spaces for their future community-building and voice recovery. In my dissertation, I argue that, working in tandem, live museums and digital museum spaces have the ability to recover community voices that have been marginalized by the museum in the past by creating inclusive spaces for community voices and new public memories of the museum space.

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my mother for her support and for always encouraging me in everything I have done. It is also dedicated to the memory of Dr. Carolyn Handa who started this journey with me but who was never able to see the final product. I hope I made you proud.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

CONTENTS

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

In 2003, in time for the state of Ohio's bicentennial, the Cincinnati Art Museum revealed a new wing, The Cincinnati Wing, whose goal was to familiarize the community of Cincinnati about its past and its importance to art history. This move coincided with many changes and renovations happening as the city of Cincinnati tried to recreate its own image through gentrification and multiple building projects. The live museum was being renovated to rearrange collections and create changes to make the museum more accessible to everyone. One of these changes included allowing the Cincinnati Art Museum to participate in the Google Art Project, therefore creating ways for those who could not visit the live space of the museum to participate in viewing art.

Scholars like Karen Hutzel and Carolyn Handa have already examined community involvement in digital art spaces and live museums. Jonathan Alexander has shown how visitors to digital sites may also utilize their extended reach within communities to help recover marginalized voices and narratives while not excluding those that already exist. My work begins by examining the "narrative of revival" presented in the Cincinnati Wing of the Cincinnati Art Museum, using the work of Margaret R. LaWare and Victoria J. Gallagher's study of the Joe Louis Monument in downtown Detroit as a framework for my own. Here I will note how the Cincinnati Art Museum succeeds in creating a rhetoric of revival to match the city's own revival through the use of visual rhetoric in both the architecture of the building and the physical arrangement of collections and pieces in the museum galleries. I will also note that, while

creating this narrative, other narratives are neglected or left out completely and others are romanticized versions of reality. While this is often a symptom of museum art, there are many ways in which counternarratives to these previous narratives could be presented in the modern day, including the digital sphere, which will be examined through several case studies and examples.

This dissertation hopes to accomplish three major goals: First, to examine the ways in which museums can create memory spaces while simultaneously ignoring significant histories of specific groups of people; second, to examine the online art spaces that currently exist and the ways in which they create spaces for public memory, and note how those spaces, like the space of the live museum, neglect or leave out narratives; and third, to explore the ways in which live museum spaces and digital spaces like museum websites can assist in recovering these narratives by creating a larger and more active community. I ultimately argue that these communal spaces are the key to assisting museums in recovering marginalized voices through creating strong live and digital communities in which the voices of all who want to participate may take part.

Contribution to the Field

Many scholars (Greg Dickinson, Carole Blair, and Brian L. Ott, Bryan C. Taylor, Victoria J. Gallagher and Margaret R. LaWare) have examined the connection between live museums, digital museums, and the ways in which these separate entities are created. Few studies have investigated how these two media are connected—as well as how marginalized voices within the live museum space may reclaim their own narratives. I argue that live and digital museum spaces are inherently similar in their function as archival and community building spaces. This does not mean that they are the same spaces or that archival work is their

only function. The spaces differ in rhetorical purpose, with the live space often acting simultaneously as a historical space, an educational space, and an entertainment space and the digital space as both a space to store history and educational material and also as a supplemental space to the live space. As this dissertation will show, both of these spaces could be better utilized for community outreach and the recovery of marginalized voices. Their function as historical and educational spaces makes this voice recovery a requirement. While the live space of the museum currently has many outreach programs to help build community, the digital spaces are in their infancy and have not had the same opportunity to build online community bonds.

Though often deemed "lower-stakes" and more superficial than live interaction, online communities are not only meaningful in similar ways to "live" communities, but recent research by Jonathan Alexander and Michelle Sidler suggests that they may also foster change. Alexander's book *Digital Youth: Emerging Literacies on the World Wide Web* notes that online community spaces can help young people create new identities that help them join new communities. He found they can also create alternative news sources for their own local communities giving them initiative. Sidler's "Playing Scavenger and Gazer with Scientific Discourse: Opportunities and Ethics for Online Research" shows how these spaces "flatten discursive spaces, making them accessible to mainstream and nonmainstream scientists alike" (73). While Sidler is speaking specifically of online scientific spaces, she notes that they work in similar ways to all other communities, and that "Online scientific communities allow emerging fields to build academic, political, and social power in much the same way that other online discourse communities operate" (74). This flexibility is why these online communities are useful resources for marginalized community members.

Alexander discusses the idea of web activism in which we move away from seeing the Web as just a community building tool and toward one that supports communities and their activism (Alexander 299). He notes that there are three types of web activism: "awareness/advocacy; organization/mobilization; and action/reaction" (356). Alexander's book was written in 2006 and we have seen the Web used in these ways through community action that happened cooperatively in the live and the digital realm. In these ways, the digital spaces often take on the same duties as salons or parlors in earlier revolutionary movements, as starting points where agendas are set, grievances are aired, and demands are made. Examples of recent hashtag activism including #BlackLivesMatter, #JAHistoryNOT4Sale[1], and #YesAllWomen show the ways in which these online movements are making new forms of political activism both in live and digital spaces including citywide protests in live space, cancellation of an auction, and further calls for social justice protests and political reform.

Moving toward Alexander's vision of web activism in which the Web is used *by* communities rather than a space used to *build* communities is where this study ultimately leads. But before a specific discussion about the benefits of using the live and digital space of museums to give voice to marginalized communities can occur, more general discussions about the benefits of using digital space to make public marginalized voices must take place. The online social activism movements mentioned above are not the only ways in which online spaces are used to give voice to marginalized groups. In some cases, digital spaces are useful because they

---

[1] This hashtag came after art made by incarcerated Japanese-Americans in Internment Camps during World War II was set to be auctioned in April 2015. As NPR's Hansi Lo Wang notes, "Japanese-American families had donated many of the pieces to Allen Eaton, an historian who was working on a book published in 1952 about arts and crafts from the internment camps" (NPR.org) but the collection had since come "…into the hands of an anonymous friend of the Eaton family" (NPR.org) who decided to auction them. Social justice activists protested the auction, with online protests in the form of the #JAHistoryNOT4Sale hashtag and the auction was ultimately canceled due to these protests.

can bring together people from great distances that have some personal, historical, or cultural connection.

These online spaces are not immune to misuse, however, and must work with their live counterparts without being overshadowed by them. While online spaces can bring together people from great distances, it can also lead to confusion, especially if members have moved away from the city and are not as familiar with current city politics or the live museum. Alexander notes the perils of the digital sphere, noting that digital space can suffer from the same issues as live space like marginalization and bullying and brings with it new problems like "hacktivism" which has been used by groups like Anonymous in order to derail online communities, organizational movements, or generally disrupt Web interactions and information (Alexander 299-302). User identities are also problematic in a way not as common in live spaces. For example, it is arguably easier to lie about ones identity online than it is in live space. This does not mean that people in live space do not lie about their identities, but rather the anonymity the Internet offers allows people easier access to assume false identities within online community spaces.

This anonymity, however, is what makes online spaces a better place to discuss serious political issues. Marginalized voices, who have no place or limited live public spaces like traditional newspapers, public forums, and museums to discuss these issues have digital spaces like homepages, blogs, chatrooms, social media, and other outlets to air their frustrations and discuss ideas for political movements. For younger people who are determining their identities, Alexander notes that the Web is often a space that allows them to explore these identities more fully. The Web suffers from many of the same ailments as live spaces, but the difference is that there is inherently more space for these discussions. Message boards and social media do have

their own "gatekeepers" or moderators who can erase content. Blogs, chatrooms, and homepages can also be erased or hacked into, but even in the face of erasure, these spaces can be built and rebuilt in the digital sphere, something not possible in live spaces where the conversations are not even being had or, if they are, are receiving little attention beyond the marginalized audience.

An argument about the lack of marginalized presence in live spaces like the Cincinnati Art Museum is where this study began, and while some in museum studies, like Michael F. Brown, note that this form of criticism can be contextually clueless, stating that "Its rhetorical strategy is tiresomely predictable: comb the archives for objectionable, racist declarations by long-dead museum employees, mix in a bit of authorial hand wringing about a troubling exhibit label or two flavor with a dollop of Foucault and a dash of Gramsci, shake vigorously, serve" (148-149) but my argument here is not necessarily with what is present within the museum, but rather what is left out, erased, or replaced.

> This study builds on the work of Carolyn Handa, who notes that
>
> Museum and exhibition studies provide compositionists with sources that can help us better envision Web sites, multimodal documents, and ultimately all writing as designed spaces, terrain that conveys information in rhetorical ways we may never before have considered while also yielding important cultural and historical information. While composition scholars have not usually drawn from these spatially oriented disciplines, such fields can now provide us with new points of view for analyzing the rhetorical aspects of written compositions (164).

Not only do these spaces teach us how to compose digital spaces, but also how to use those spaces to create civic rhetoric and use those civic rhetoric spaces to foster change within historical (gatekeeping) spaces like museums.

Literature Review

This study finds itself at the intersection of three bodies of scholarship: museum studies, visual/digital rhetoric, and digital communities. In this literature review I will unpack and negotiate these interdisciplinary topics. Though this project involves multi-disciplinary study, at the heart of this project is Paulo Freire's call for a clear dialogue to dismantle oppressive systems. In his seminal *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*, Freire describes dialogue as "the encounter between men, mediated by the world, in order to name the world" (88) and notes that dialogue, unlike the current oppressive systems, is a space in which oppression can be discussed and dismantled, noting that, due to its definition, "dialogue cannot occur between those who want to name the world and those who do not wish this naming—between those who deny others the right to speak their word and those whose right to speak has been denied them" (88). He then adds that the only way for those who have been denied the right to speak is to "first reclaim this right and prevent the continuation of this dehumanizing aggression" (88). Throughout the years, the field of composition and rhetoric, as well as many other fields, has worked to reclaim voices or those who have been ignored by gatekeeping institutions. Many of these attempts have been mired in controversy, but these efforts continue to improve the ways this work is carried out.

Carolyn Handa shows the ways in which the study of visual and digital rhetoric and digital communities are shared interdisciplinary study topics. Modifying the work of Jean Trumbo, she notes the four different types of spaces encountered in digital realms: Physical

Space, Perceptual Space, Conceptual Space, and Behavioral Space and uses Trumbo's chart to show how these spaces are parceled out in disciplinary terms, noting that physical space, which Handa defines as "The size and shape of the space occupied by the multimedia project" (152) is found in the geography, architecture, engineering design, graphic art, media studies, and art history disciplines; the perceptual space, defined by Handa as "Our sense of the scale, distance, or proportion within the multimedia project" (152) belongs to the disciplines of design studies, hypertext studies, technical writing, cartography, visual culture, and typography; conceptual space is defined as "The way in which the user understands or remembers the design space" (152) and is in the cognition studies, design studies, semiotics, philosophy, and literary studies disciplines; and behavioral space, "The way in which the user actually moves through the space" (152), belongs to museums studies, anthropology, cultural studies, popular culture, sociology, and history disciplines. Handa cites Janice Lauer, who noted that "Composition studies has maintained from the beginning what a number of disciplines are just starting to admit—that many of their most important problems can be properly investigated only with multiple research methods" (qtd. in Handa 153) and this study is no different, taking into account museum studies in particular and examining the intersections and the ways in which the fields of museum studies and composition and rhetoric studies can collaborate to create a better way of thinking about community space.

Museum Studies

Before we can discuss the connections between composition and rhetoric and museum studies and how we can combine the work of these disciplines to recover and make public marginalized voices, we must first understand the goals of museum studies in relation to the

purposes of museums. I will begin by examining what museum studies scholars believe city

museums are and whether museum scholars see a clear distinction between art museums, city

museums, and museums. My discovery is that, while some scholars make distinctions between

these three spaces, the majority of scholars overlap them, more often differentiating between

science museums and all other forms of museums (art, history, and city). For example, Ian Jones

notes that "Many are in grand buildings of the nineteenth century, reflecting city pride; full of

paintings, sculpture, silverware; showing off the taste of an elite or perhaps the taste of a wealthy

local industrialist" (4) therefore, it does not seem a problem to describe art museums like the

Cincinnati Art Museum, which does this work, as a "museum." However, some museum studies

scholars like Christopher R. Marshall make the distinction between museums that are

storehouses and art and exhibition galleries that are contemplative spaces, noting that,

"…museums constitute inherently projective spaces, whereas art galleries remain committed to

the ideal of a more self-contained and reflective space" (170). Marshall also states that

> …museums spaces also project more emphatically than galleries in the ways in which
>
> their exhibitionary elements have been knitted together, as it were, in order to reach out
>
> beyond themselves to convey an integrated message of whatever broader
>
> communications agenda the exhibit is seeking to articulate… Their focus, instead, is not
>
> so much on the co-ordinated communications message as rather on the autonomy and
>
> individuality of the artwork displayed in its own right (171).

And while this may not be the mission of all art museums, museums like the Cincinnati Art

Museum that work simultaneously as a city museum and an art museum do the work of both,

creating narratives and housing art together to make out of individual works a solidified whole.

Therefore, since the scholarship is split and it seems that the present definitions describe the

Cincinnati Art Museum as both a city museum and an art museum, I will refer to art museums and city museums as simply "museums." And since the purpose of this study is recovering and making public marginalized voices, this is something all museums involved in historical preservation and whose missions are to educate and serve the community should be engaging in anyway.

After establishing the definition of "museum" in the context of this study, it is important to examine the purposes of museums from the museum studies disciplinary perspective. One value all the scholars I consulted agree on is that education is a major task of museums. Jack Lohman explains that city museums walk a fine line in their responsibilities to the public, noting that "The social function of *public* museums has been at their heart from the very beginning. Museums and galleries have always been places of contest, on the one hand aiming to be 'temples of art' for the cognoscenti, and on the other hand looking to educate and improve a mass public" (65). Lohman also explains how museums spaces can be "…powerful places of learning that are nonjudgmental and unassociated with 'problems' and social failing—one of the most basic qualities a museum can share is its aura of success—but museums can also fundamentally 'represent and express a vision of an inclusive society'" (69). If museums have an aim to educate, then certainly, the "aura of success" must be tempered by the failures within society and history. It is not that the overarching narratives of a city's history cannot be that of a successful one, but to ignore the marginalized groups that suffered during times when others were successful and prosperous fails in the mission of educating communities in a meaningful and honest way.

Marlen Mouliou states that city museums are, among other entities, "…agents for social inclusion, cultural understanding, and tolerance; professional institutions in the public realm with

the responsibility of being accountable to their users and nonusers, as well as to the governmental and nongovernmental bodies that guide and accredit their work" (160). This is a heavy load for museums, but a goal many museums are attempting to reach in the twenty-first century museum. It seems that, unlike the nineteenth and twentieth century museum, the twenty-first century museum is focused on being more inclusive to the city and the community it serves, with Jones noting that "The city museum is increasingly focusing on the city itself. The city has become the artifact. The past is now examined more critically and is frequently used to shed light on the present" (5). These museums are no longer strictly focused on the objects in the museum, but rather the stories behind those objects and the ways in which the objects are used and created by their surroundings. Jones states that the "ideal" museum is "…a museum about the city in all its aspects, not a museum that happens to be in the city" (6) and Mouliou agrees, noting that modern museums "…aim to tell interesting stories about the past, the present, and the future in a challenging and compelling way" (160).

With this new goal for museums in mind, Jones not only warns of the problems of these memorial/historical spaces, stating that "Distance can have the habit of lending enchantment to the eye and providing a view of past centuries that is unjustified by the facts as we know them. Nostalgia can be irresistible, especially if it applies to the recent past" (7-8) but also shows the ways in which museums—both live and digital—could be a starting point for more community involvement in city and urban development, stating that a museum "…can therefore be a unique resource for the better understanding of a city's present. Not only that, it can provide an informed platform for planning the city's future. In so doing, it can also be a forum for debate and discussion to enable city people to contribute actively to their city's development" (10).

Eric Sandweiss and Carol David describe the problems with these attempts and the work

that the modern city museum has when shifting to inclusivity, with Sandweiss noting that

"…early museum curators felt compelled to make of their cities a posed subject, suitable for

framing and protected from the presumably corrosive forces of time. This contrived historical

memory…has indeed preserved an image of the past" (44) and in doing so, has made their more

recent goals more difficult, noting that "Today, as museums about cities seek to make themselves

more instrumental to the welfare of their surrounding cities, they do so burdened by the paradox

of an institutional history spent attempting to connect with an urban past by thwarting the

dynamic flow of urban change" (44). And while it seems like the city of Cincinnati and its

memory spaces are now ready to capture this change, it does so by ignoring the struggles of the

past that led to a new found "rhetoric of revival." Carol David similarly notes of the problems

that "…despite conflicting purposes and operations that exist, especially in nonprofit

organizations, the power of a master narrative, which for art museums conveys an overarching

image of elitism, remains dominant despite many activities to democratize" (319). Since

traditional museums were created by wealthy interests, this image of wealth and prestige remains

with them.

Many in the public consider art museums elite spaces that are meant only for art scholars,

collectors, and the upper class. Museums have tried to combat this image by including schools

and the community in more events, but the image remains. However, David notes that this

image of elitism within the inner workings of the museum at the institutional level is not entirely

wrong. In her study, David examines "two sets of narratives told by art museums" (319) she

notes that one has to do with "the internal organizational structure…and the social world of the

people who govern them" (319) and "the stories museums tell their members and the general

public in promotional brochures and news releases" (319). She further explains that, despite efforts to democratize, "the master narrative of elitism is too powerfully entrenched in museums' organizational structure and too strongly reinforced through museums' communication with the public to allow the image of museums to change" (319-320). Not only are issues of erasure by the master narrative a problem, but, when marginalized voices have been included, they are often spoken for, rather than speaking for themselves.

One failure on the part of many disciplines, including museum studies, is being inclusive of voices but speaking on behalf of them. Speaking for others can pose a problem of changing the narrative, but, as pointed out by Tracy Lang Teslow's "Reifying Race: Science and Art in *Races of Mankind* at the Field Museum of Natural History," it can also conflate already existing stereotypes, noting that Hoffman, who was tasked with curating the *Races of Mankind* exhibit "approached her foreign subjects with a mixture of class and race prejudice, colonialist superiority and romanticism" (71). Freire similarly warns of these issues, noting that dialogue "must not be a situation where some name on behalf of others" (89) and that it is instead "a conquest of the world for the liberation of humankind" (89) that requires everyone to speak on their own behalf. Similar calls have been seen by many scholars in all disciplines, including composition and rhetoric.

Some museum studies scholars (Danielle Rice, Carol David) have called for more formal art education within public schools and community programs. Rice notes the importance of the way we are trained in "looking" and the connection to memory. She notes that few of us are appropriately trained in art education or about art museums, which makes it difficult to look beyond the narrative created and is, in part, the reason art curators situate galleries the way that they do—in order to help untrained visitors to navigate art in the galleries. Speaking specifically

13

of how humans are trained to view objects, Rice explains that "In everyday life, we use our vision selectively and instrumentally to maneuver through the overabundance of sensory stimulation surrounding us" (13). She notes as an example that we make inferences about traffic signs and lights and ignore distractions on the side of the road to avoid accidents. Because art museums are spaces often housed within ornate architectural surroundings, as with the Cincinnati Art museum, it is important to consider these ideas of learning and visual exclusion and inclusion. If the voices of others are not present, not only will visitors not know the truth about the past, but the visitors will also not consider the realities of the past for marginalized groups of people. Furthermore, Rice notes that "Research indicates that associative experiences play a key role in the [a]esthetic enjoyment of people with little background or previous exposure to art. In other words, such people tend to prefer some paintings over others primarily because they serve as reminders of pleasant events or places..." (14) and this shows how objects, especially objects that involve sensory and emotional memory, help people create memories.

Carol David notes that museums in the 1990s and today spend money on education, but that "the staff and funds provided to this branch are generally more modest and their programs less visible to the public than those devoted to the museums' collections" (331). David also posits that including education and making the museum a space for all members of the community is a major priority of museums but that, "…this part of most museums' missions still remains eclipsed by the master narrative of elitism that pervades the stories describing the organizational structure, activities, and personalities of art museums" (332). John Pedro Schwartz also calls for more education, stating that his "…argument assumes that the discovery and employment of the museum's means of persuasion develop competence at analyzing and using forms of communication that are common to other spaces and texts" (29). His call is not

for a new literacy, what he describes as "museum literacy", but rather a pedagogy that "uses the museum as a means for teaching the five literacies that are already or rapidly becoming central to our curriculum: verbal, visual, technological, social, and critical" (29). His call, as a museum studies scholar, is similar to Carolyn Handa's call that "…our analytic perceptions, abilities, and vocabularies must expand beyond two-dimensional surfaces to three-dimensional space" (151) and like Cynthia and Richard Selfe, he notes that we must become critics of technology and museums that use them as well as users of technology and museums (Selfe & Selfe 68) showing that all disciplines are concerned with increasing education within their fields through the use of technology. Both fields believe that better education in these disciplines could help to alleviate the issues of erasure and ignoring marginalized citizens.

Digital Communities

These calls and concerns for democracy, education, and dialogue have prompted a further look into community and the ways in which public memory is built within the digital sphere. For this project, I will look specifically at museal space. Before examining the ways in which public memory is built within these arenas, I must first examine the very idea of the areas these communities and their communal memory institutions inhabit: space and place. Dickinson, Blair, and Ott note that, "Space and place sometimes are used as approximately equivalent terms…a *place* that is bordered, specified, and locatable by being named is seen as different from open, undifferentiated, undesignated *space"* (23). These differences are also present in the work of Yi-Fu Tuan, who sees space and place as separate entities that must depend on one another to exist. He explains that "Place is a type of object" (17) while "Places and objects define space, giving it a geometric personality" (17). Fu Tuan continues this explanation by

15

noting that spaces cannot exist without a place or starting point, stating that, "Neither the newborn infant nor the man who gains sight after a lifetime of blindness can immediately recognize a geometric shape such as a triangle. The triangle is at first 'space,' a blurred image" (17). Greg Dickinson, Brian L. Ott, and Eric Aoki agree, describing the Whitney Gallery of Western Art as a "gallery space" and noting that the "redesigned Whitney…disrupts both the formal conventions and the narrative content that had previously governed the space" (21).

Others, like Bruce Ferguson, Margaret R. LaWare & Victoria J. Gallagher, and Carolyn Handa, make no particular distinction between the terms in their pieces, "Exhibition Rhetorics: Material Speech and Utter Sense", "Sparring with Public Memory: The Rhetorical Embodiment or Race, Power, and Conflict in the *Monument to Joe Louis,*" and, "Digital Space: Crossing Untraditional Frontiers." While it is unclear whether these scholars have preferential definitions for these terms, and whether they believe one depends on another is not known because they do not go into detail.

Dickinson, Blair, and Ott note how place is tied to memory in two ways, first, because "It is important to our understanding of public memory to address the precise, and often unique, ways in which memory is parsed, represented, shared, and embraced by means of different forms and created by various *techne'*" (24), and second, that "Particular kinds of places are more closely associated with public memory than others, for example, museums preservation sites, battlefields, memorials, and so forth" (24) meaning that these places become spaces of simultaneous communal and personal narrative. Dickinson, Ott, and Aoki note that there are two specific memory types under the umbrella of public memory in museal practices: collected and displayed memory. They define collected memory as "the memory that derives purely from what is included in the archive. Objects that have been accorded social and cultural importance

16

through inclusion in the archive provide the material resources for collected memory" (22) and displayed memory is defined as "the practices of exhibition and representation" (23). While public memory does not necessarily create community, it gives communities somewhere to grow and to create their own narratives.

In their essay about the connection between live communities and their digital counterparts, Sorin Matei and Sandra J. Ball-Rokeach state that while many see the great potential of using the internet to build communities, many others harken back to the concerns of Neil Postman and worry that "online social ties will substitute for offline social bonds; the more we are online, the more we will abandon our neighbors and families…" (552). Many of these fears of online replacing live interaction have been seen in other venues, for example, the fear that the release of tablets might stop people from reading physical books, or that digital streaming services would end movie theaters, or even that the use of online archives for art might end the need for art museums. While some of these devices have seen a decline in the "live" versions or attendees of these institutions, it has had a similar effect to movies "replacing" stage plays or the printing press "replacing" oral storytelling before it. A decline in live space attendance has occurred in these spaces, but the entire pastime has not been replaced by these new technologies. Gunther Kress notes that this fear of new technology or communication styles has not dissipated, and has more recently occurred when discussing images, noting that some believe "that writing is giving way, is being displaced by image in many instances of communication where previously it had held sway" (283). He notes that "This realization calls forth a variety of responses, mostly negative, ranging from outright despair, anger, and nostalgia to some still utopian voices on the other end of the spectrum" (283). These utopian voices that

see only the positives of digitization can be just as problematic as those who dismiss it altogether.

Matei and Ball-Rokeach note of these "utopian voices" that some believed that "online social spaces would ease the burden of ascribed identities and allegiances built into our social, ethnic, and physical communities" (554). These were what those in early digital technology studies called "digital positivists" who believed that the Internet was an ideal space that would break down real world problems like racism, sexism, homophobia, and classicism. Selfe and Selfe note how English teachers who were positivists used "computer-supported writing environments as places within which they and students can try to enact educational practices that are more democratic and less systematically oppressive" (67). Some examples of these spaces include, "on-line discussion groups," "on-line conferences," and "collaborative groups" (67) which are spaces meant to make students feel more empowered. They note, however, that positivity can lead to problems, stating that when we elevate these spaces as those "within which cues of gender, race, and socioeconomic status are minimized; students speak without interruption; and marginalized individuals can acquire more central voices" (67) we ignore the realities of online communities, that "are *also* sites within which the ideological and material legacies of racism, sexism, and colonialism are continuously written and re-written along with more positive cultural legacies" (67). As Selfe and Selfe show, racist, sexist, and classist divisions are still openly practiced online. Therefore, I posit that these digital communal spaces can foster conversations about these issues that lead to social change through combined digital and "real" world efforts.

This split of positivism and negativity has not disappeared, as evidenced by Charles Ess in his "Computer-mediated colonization, the renaissance, and educational imperatives for an

intercultural global village" where he notes that while many believe that the Internet will "inevitably result in greater democracy, equality, individual freedom, and economic prosperity" (12) in the "electronic global village", others note that "computer-mediated communications (CMC) technologies embed Western cultural values and communicative preferences" (12) and that these "well-meaning efforts to 'wire the world' in the name of an ostensibly universal/cosmopolitan vision of electronic democracy, paradoxically enough, emerge as a form of 'computer-mediated colonization'" (12). These issues were similarly voiced very early in the technological revolution by scholars like Sven Birkerts and Neil Postman, with Postman's concern in his 1992 *Technopoly* a parallel to those in the present day. Postman fears that technology will invade people's lives for the worse and will create a "technopoly" in which "those who have control over the workings of a particular technology accumulate power and inevitably form a kind of conspiracy against those who have no access to the specialized knowledge made available by the technology" (9). While this was evident in the early days of the Internet, more people are wired today than previously and the number of those wired continues to grow. Ess immediately counters these concerns, noting that there are ways to work around one online narrative, stating that "diverse cultures can resist and reshape Western technologies" (12) in order, not to, as Freire notes, host a "hostile, polemical argument between those who are committed neither to the naming of the world, nor to the search for truth, but rather to the imposition of their own truth" (89). And my work builds upon this work, noting, as Ess briefly does, that the digital sphere is a space with the possibility for this colonization to be dismantled and the rebuilding of narratives in these spaces through the participation of groups of people and artwork that have been marginalized.

Even though the digital sphere is a place that can be rebuilt through online community, injustices in technology and digital communities still exist. As Jonathan Alexander notes, even communal voices are edited or "whitewashed" (Alexander 80), because certain texts and tools privilege specific groups of people. A recent example of digital technology privileging white populations over others is the lack of non-white emojis on iPhones and other Apple devices. Though non-white emojis have recently been added, this did not happen until groups and consumers complained about the lack of diversity in telephone emojis. As Jacklyn Lopez, Joshua Burnett, and Sally Chandler assert "Because virtual spaces are vast beyond measure and increasing in size by the minute…there is an increasing need for structures to organize information to help users find and understand what they need" (322) and these organizational online spaces often create communities. Within these online communities, marginalized groups can begin to have a space to discuss their narratives, which often run counter to the "master narrative." The live spaces and the Internet allow us to hear other voices that might otherwise be silenced and creates more democratic spaces of art. This is completed through the use of multimodal technologies—particularly online museum spaces—as well as the live space of the museum.

Despite all the concerns about digital communities, I posit that the live space and digital space must work in tandem for any effective change to take place. Matei and Ball-Rokeach note that real life presence is often also needed for online communities in the United States to work, noting "Our research indicates that the best predictor of making friends online is the presence of personal ties in real community" (553) similarly to how some might be encouraged to make personal connections and meet "in person" to facilitate these relationships. Mary Chayko finds the same result in a piece written in 2014, noting that "the online and the offline are fully

integrated in modern social life. Digital communication technology, we shall see, tends to inspire

and strengthen social connectedness overall – in online and offline contexts" (977). Twitter has

become more a modern place for social justice movements to begin, but often the actual

movement must take place in "live" space (#BlackLivesMatter, #JAHistoryNOT4Sale,

#YesAllWomen) of course, these hashtags also allow for other, hegemonic voices to speak and

respond (#AllLivesMatter, #NotAllMen), but this creates the dialogue Freire speaks of, and is a

space, due to its sheer fluidity of time, space, and place, where people from around the world or

the real "global community" can participate in these discussions. Even if speaking for others

occurs, this can be debated in this forum and while the administrators still act as gatekeepers, if

posts are judged to disappear unjustly, others will take note and mention the injustice. Social

connectedness enables more forms of activism that can help marginalized voices be heard by

those in authority.

Visual/Digital Rhetoric

Just as I call for the live and digital museal spaces to work in tandem, I also call for the

fields of rhetoric and composition and museum studies to work in tandem in order to consider

ways to create narrative spaces that are inclusive. Because rhetoric can include marginalized

voices through literacy and digital studies, and because museal studies can examine and discuss

visitors, the artifacts these spaces house show how these disciplines can come together and assist

in the making of public marginalized voices. The above call for cooperative work between fields

is not too far afield, as both disciplines already call for increased education in art and rhetoric as

well as digital technology. Combining these two educational forms allows for a more educated

community and communities that can grow and unite together in order to account for all voices.

These multiliteracies in education have been explored by The New London Group who note the importance of multiliteracies in education, particularly in the field of composition and rhetoric. While my examination is based around learning in the community and theirs is based around learning in the classroom, the ends of both, to educate, are the same and the same rhetorical principles are at play in both educational forms. They begin by explaining how design is a major topic for future study in multiliteracies, noting that "One of the key ideas informing the notion of multiliteracies is the increasing complexity of inter-relationship of different modes of meaning" (198) and they note that they "…have identified six major areas in which functional grammars—the metalanguages that describe and explain patterns of meaning—are required: Linguistic Design, Visual Design, Audio Design, Gestural design, Spatial Design, and Multimodal Design" (198). They stress the importance of multimodal media making that includes all of these forms, noting that "Desktop publishing puts a new premium on visual design and spreads responsibility for the visual much more broadly than was the case when writing and page layout were separate trades" (201). Speaking of ways to integrate these forms into pedagogical meaning, The New London Group notes that four factors make up pedagogy: situated practice, overt instruction, critical framing, and transformed practice (The New London Group 203) and these are steps that can be taken in digital communities to build them and guide community members in their usage.

Of particular importance to the creation and sustainability of the educating online community groups is the idea of situated practice. The New London Group defines situated practice as

> …the part of pedagogy that is constituted by immersion in meaningful practices within a
> community of learners who are capable of playing multiple and different roles based on

their backgrounds and experiences. The community must include experts, people who have mastered certain practices. Minimally, it must include expert novices, people who are experts at learning new domains in some depth. Such experts can guide learners, serving as mentors and designers of their learning processes. This aspect of the curriculum needs to recruit learners' previous and current experiences, as well as their extra-school communities and discourses, as an integral part of the learning experience (204-205).

They note that these forms of pedagogy all work together, stating that they want to bring the ideas back to "Situated Practices in the learning process involves the recognition that differences are critical in workplaces, civic spaces, and multilayered lifeworlds" (207). The New London Group explains how all of these tools relate to and rely on one another, showing that "Overt Instruction is not intended to tell—to empower students in relation to the 'grammar' of one proper, standard, or powerful language form. It is meant to help students develop a metalanguage that accounts for Design differences. Critical Framing involves linking these Design differences to different cultural purposes. Transformed Practice involves moving from one cultural context to anther; for example, redesigning meaning strategies so they can be transferred from one cultural situation to another" (207). All of these reforms laid out by the New London Group are ways to think about educational tools for communities.

Many scholars (Richard Buchanan, Carolyn Handa, Richard Lanham) have made clear connections between classical rhetorical tropes and the delivery and classification of digital technologies and digital communities. Jeff Bezemer and Gunther Kress discuss how the digital reproduction of artifacts changes perception and memory of these artifacts and Handa discusses classification as one way that webmasters help assist with individual and public memory—

something museum curators also do when grouping paintings into classified systems by country, time period, or art period.

Furthermore, Aristotle said of delivery in his *On Rhetoric* that, "It is a matter of how the voice should be used in expressing each emotion, sometimes loud and sometimes soft or intermediate…" and how the "pitch accents…should be entoned, whether as acute, grave, or circumflex, and what rhythms should be expressed in each case; for…consider three things, and these are volume, change of pitch,… and rhythm" (195). These rules for delivery are similar to rules of visual design and their "delivery" whether on screen or on canvas. Donis Dondis notes that, similarly to how oral delivery involves volume, pitch, and rhythm, visual delivery involves the dot, the line, shape, direction, tone, color, texture, scale, dimensions, and movement, noting that, "Using the basic visual components as a means for knowledge and understanding of either complete categories of visual media or individual works is an excellent method for exploration of their potential and realized success in expression" (39). From these basic visual forms, we can begin to build on more complex issues of visual delivery which I will examine more thoroughly in the dissertation.

While for many centuries delivery entailed the act of delivering a speech and was concerned with gestures, voice, and facial expressions, the shift from oral to written culture changed the focus of delivery in writing to issues of style and tone. In multimodal technologies like visual rhetoric, delivery is inherent to the reader's understanding of the message and may play an even more critical role than it does in alphabetic text. Richard Lanham stated in his 1991 *A Handlist of Rhetorical Terms* "As the use of animation continues to grow in electronic communication, and as the icon/alphabet ration in everyday communication continues to tilt from word to image, Delivery may find itself returned to its traditional eminence." (180).

Lanham's predictions have come true, with several scholars (Donis Dondis, David Cohen and Scott Anderson, and Gunther Kress) noting the ways in which visual design elements, even at the most basic level, create statements to interpret. Handa notes of delivery in digital spaces that

> Now, beyond just critiquing design or the inclusion of sound, we need to consider how well items like sound and design fit the rhetorical purpose and focus of a site. Now we need to consider how the sound and design fit with ethos and the audience being focused on. We need to understand the degree to which the site's primary creator has considered its cultural context within which the site will exist. The old aspects of delivery like facial expressions, tone of voice, gestures, sound volume, and fluctuations in posture or movement while speaking may have given way to the new aspects of delivery made possible by Web 2.0, or quite possibly still exist but have remained hidden, their digital forms disguising their unrecognizability (108).

She cautions that while composition and rhetoric is reevaluating the meaning of delivery and other rhetorical tools in our own discipline, we must continue to examine and collaborate with other disciplines on our meaning of delivery, stating that "While studying digital delivery, therefore, and the rhetorical performances that we see operating on Web sites, we need to bring together for study all the theories and practices now claimed by those different departments" (113).

Delivery brings us to the differences between live and digital space and why I will use them interchangeably throughout this dissertation. Though, as I will show, the two spaces are inherently different in design and structure, they are similar in their delivery and in their purpose. Digital museum spaces, like live museum spaces, aim to house important artifacts and to educate. Digital museum spaces are often supplemental to the live space or simply visually

reproduced live space, as is the case with the Google Art Project; their ultimate goals align with those of the live space. Though they differ in their delivery of artifacts and information, it does not mean that the live and digital deliveries are ultimately the same, just reconfigured. For example, Handa explains ways that the hallmarks of delivery are transferred from live to digital space, noting that "'intonation' on a Web site where no 'speaker' is present can still be achieved through methods other than a voice; in addition a speaker's dress or costume may have a digital equivalent to fabric if we think less literally. Many design elements such as background color, texture, length, periodicity, finishing touches, such as lace, buttons hats, scarves, gloves, and so on" (109). Similar issues to the digital/live space divide have been brought up in composition and rhetoric studies, first when moving from verbal delivery, then to alphabetic delivery, and now to visual and digital delivery. Susan Hilligoss and Sean Williams discuss the related topic of the split between verbal and visual texts, noting that "One of the most deeply rooted and potentially problematic 'writerly' views of visual communication is that the visual does something different than the verbal does. Words equal reason and visuals equal emotion…Words are precise and images are ambiguous" (236). While the noted differences in live and digital museum spaces are more about delivery and content rather than which is more effective, these previous arguments show that even if the delivery of information is different, the ultimate goal of all of these rhetorical acts—verbal texts, alphabetic texts, and visual texts—are all the same as is the ultimate goal of both live and digital museum spaces.

Creating visual language on webpages is difficult because this language utilizes both visual and textual elements while needing a useable interface. Much like visuals have no "set conventions" of pedagogical design in the first-year composition classroom, neither do webpages. However, just like the Aristotelian canon applies to visuals, it also applies to

webpages. Delivery has been discussed above, but the other canonical conventions apply. For example, invention is evident in the idea for a website because, while alphabetic forms of invention include brainstorming tactics, in the digital sphere, invention is akin to getting the idea for the website and planning the website before actually designing or arranging. Arrangement and style are included in the way in which the site is designed, including the literal arrangement of hypertext, tool bars, and images. Just like memory must be modified for written and visual texts, it must also be modified for webpages. Memory in the case of a website has a literal function because a website can be "saved" to the "favorites" bar on an Internet dashboard. Also, websites are automatically kept in a state of "public" memory and URLs for websites must be memorized by those trying to access them. Finally, delivery is the way in which the site is fully designed—the colors that are used, features, usability, and other decisions made in the design. Delivery can also include the domain ending in the URL, advertisements allowed on the webpage, and other sites that this particular site links.

Digital memory is also created through the digital reproduction of artifacts. Jeff Bezemer and Gunther Kress discuss the "gains and losses" that occur in the reproduction and transfer from live to digital items, noting that "…forms of arrangement (i.e., syntax) differ in modes that are temporally or spatially instantiated. Transduction inevitably brings profound changes in the move from one mode to the other" (241) and though these changes do occur, they still transfer. Using a protractor as an example, they note the gains and losses of changing an artifact to an image, showing that "…there are losses in *specificity*. Certain dimensional and tactile aspects, for instance, cannot be expressed in image…The material substance, its three-dimensional shape and, in many cases, the actual size of the protractor cannot feature in the image" (242). Further, they note that "Compared to the 3D object, the image affords a level of generality and

27

idealization apt for the didactic practice involved, a representation that is apt also for the curricular entity that is being constructed" (242).

As shown above, the delivery and design of a website's interface are particularly important due to their power to include and exclude. In an examination of computer interfaces, Selfe and Selfe explain that computer interfaces are like "maps" that privilege white, male, middle class privilege and hegemony (Selfe & Selfe 70). They note that this occurs in many small ways, but particularly in the setup and software applications of desktops, noting that they are constructed "…in terms of corporate culture and the values of professionalism" (69) and that "The objects represented within this world are those familiar primarily to the white-collar inhabitants of that corporate culture: manila folders, files, documents, telephones, fax machines, clocks and watches, and desk calendars" (69-70). Additionally, programs like Word that privilege some names over others by counting them as incorrect spellings show how some groups of people are privileged over others. Understanding who the interface privileges and who it ignores is an important part of analyzing and composing websites for students because they can recognize how to avoid privileging one audience over another when creating their own multimodal texts. Just like the context in which visuals appear is important, so are the spaces in which webpages appear and the genre of which they are a part.

Websites have particular genre conventions including comments sections, pictures, and advertisements on blogs, list sites, news sites; newsfeeds, and picture uploads on social media sites; and purchasing capabilities, product views, and search bars on shopping sites, that creators should also consider when constructing a rhetorically effective website. Understanding these conventions and visual language is imperative to understanding how to properly analyze and compose multimodal works, particularly those on the Web. This way, webmasters, as well as

consumers of digital media from marginalized communities can work toward making their own democratized memory spaces.

Theoretical Framework

Though live and digital spaces are inherently different both literally and rhetorically, they are able to work in tandem and can be representative of one another, often the digital space recreating or supplementing the live space. Knowing this, the start of this project began with a simple question: How do the digital and live spaces of the museum differently represent or rhetorically represent art spaces and artifacts? From here rhetorical issues impeded these basic questions—such as, was the space of the digital archive the same, or did it serve the same purpose as the live space of the museum? What was the purpose of each of these spaces? And how did these spaces function within the community? Through much examination, this dissertation is primarily about the connection between narratives that are told by the museums and the narratives of those whose voices supposedly represented by the museum—typically the local or surrounding community.

On a larger scale, this project reflects the spirit of Paulo Freire's work as I seek to create spaces of dialogue. As Freire notes "Dialogue is the encounter between men, mediated by the world in order to name the world. Hence, dialogue cannot occur between those who want to name the world and those who do not wish this naming—between those who deny others the right to speak their word and those whose right to speak has been denied them" (88). This project hopes to give voice to those "whose right to speak has been denied them."

This work is important as acts of cultural recovery in historical spaces and in uncovering current marginalized voices. This recovery includes reclaiming missing voices from the master

narrative within art museums (which act as archival spaces, entertainment spaces, and public spaces) and making public ignored modern marginalized voices. These issues are becoming more recognized through efforts by scholars of all disciplines. These scholars have noted the erasure of many groups of people from the collective historical narrative as well as the misrepresentation of those marginalized groups who are present. While this dissertation is a work informed by many disciplines, the main disciplinary grounding is within voice recovery like those found in literacy studies and community building through digital media (Jeffrey Grabill, Jonathan Alexander, Carolyn Handa).

This dissertation is built upon several studies that have been conducted by others that I apply to and use as a framework for my own examination of the Cincinnati Art Museum and various digital sites. I begin by using the work of Victoria J. Gallagher and Margaret R. LaWare. Their article about *The Fist* in Detroit examines The Monument to Joe Louis through a lens of racial and class consciousness and the ways in which the statue, which is meant to represent the city of Detroit and its citizens, distracts from larger issues within the community and silences the very voices of those living within the city. They note that the statue is important to study because it "evokes and intensifies emotions" (89) and "…is both the result and the focus of deeply felt reactions and responses, particularly because it evolved from and evokes a painful history of racism, discrimination, and racial division" (89).

Many of my theories of space and place lie with Fu Tuan, who argues that space and place are dependent on one another, but are wholly different entities with wholly different rhetorical functions. For the analysis of the Cincinnati Art Museum, I will use the work of Gallagher and LaWare mentioned above, and for the analysis of digital spaces, I will use the work of Anne Francis Wysocki and Carolyn Handa. After this, I will examine several case

studies of live and digital museum spaces that have tried to include community involvement. While live communities have always been spaces of political resistance, digital spaces and communities can also be spaces for solidarity, sharing, and recovery. Chayko notes that digital spaces are sometimes easier for people to communicate in, stating that "Individuals who are marginalized, discriminated against, or excluded from physical social settings…can find obstacles to social interaction minimized online" (981). Often, marginalized groups who create communities here are able to make safe spaces in which to actively discuss their marginalization and start to combat marginalization in all facets of life, including narratives within museums and other archival spaces.

Showing the negatives of online space, Sidler, discussing online science communities, notes that "Although online scientific discourse can create spaces of empowerment, this discourse and there spaces also allow an uncomfortable gaze to fall on the traditionally exclusive and restrictive world of scientific discourse" (75). Brown also notes that some people "…may no longer feel as marginalized from the cultural life of metropolitan centers, and they may find it easier to publicize their concerns to a global audience" (146) and while this is positive, he also states that "…their traditional knowledge all too easily diffuses beyond community boundaries, making it available to powerful outsiders who may use it for their own artistic or commercial or political purposes" (146). These issues are also seen in live space, but digital space provides more outlets for discussion which means that there are also more opportunities to gentrify, omit, and erase voices. But as stated earlier, online spaces are unique in their ability to be rebuilt again and again with little effort on the part of the commentator which is one way to combat these negative forces. Unlike a "set" live space, a digital space can be easily rebuilt or moved elsewhere.

Through these examinations of space, place, and voice recovery, I argue that digital communities and digital participation within museal communities can help recover missing historical voices within the museum and current marginalized voices within the community as well as present multiple narratives that may oppose those already existing within the master narrative. Using this theoretical framework will help to answer the questions I pose in the later chapter overviews and in my mission to show ways that digital communities can help create a more inclusive dialogue about a community's shared history.

Creating digital spaces for marginalized groups to have a voice is a strategy that has proven successful outside the art world in digital spaces. And online communities, though not without their own issues (Jonathan Alexander), are one way that these forms of recovery and making public can occur. There are several ways that this form of digital voice recovery and discovery can be enacted. While social media has had great success with social and political movements, many museums utilize social media spaces in order to keep in touch with patrons, but these attempts are not always successful because their media presence is not as interactive as it could be, often being more informative than interactive. Alison Hsiang-Yi Liu's examination of using blogs is a case study to examine what works and this methodology of trial and error followed by reflection is an effective tool for seeing what works and what does not.

This examination of trial and error is important because these spaces are already being used by marginalized individuals. Michele Sidler notes that

> These spaces are often used in computers and writing scholarship by minorities who 'exploit the rhetorical tools of Web sites and other online spaces to enact change, using discursive strategies such as the appropriation and exploitation of mainstream language; the support and encouragement of alternate voices and world-wide information-sharing,

32

including plans that lead to real-life community gatherings and promotion of individual

members' activities. These activities bring together like-minded citizens and may foster

social empowerment through sophisticated rhetorical use of the Internet's immediate

access and diverse publication outlets (74).

It is important to examine these grassroots efforts both in live and online spaces to see how they

involve communities and how they help make public marginalized voices and narratives. With

these efforts, it is important to remember that digital media has its flaws, downsides, and erasure

issues that must be addressed, but these digital strategies seem the closest to reaching Freire's

and the field's goal of a more inclusive dialogue between master and marginalized narratives. I

have presented a very short summary here, and will expand on these issues more thoroughly in

the dissertation.

Chapter Overview

Chapter Two examines the Cincinnati Art Museum's rhetoric of revival through its

Cincinnati Art Wing. Using the framework of Victoria J. Gallagher and Margaret R. LaWare, I

examine the rhetorical moves made by the art wing, noting the ways in which arrangement of

items within the museum creates narratives, some narratives that then create a cohesive whole

that ignores or romanticizes the lived experiences of those they are meant to represent. For

example, examining whose artwork is placed most prominently and whose is not placed

prominently (or at all) is an important key to showing how certain groups of people or types of

work are included or excluded from the master narrative.

The goal of this examination is to analyze the rhetorical moves made and to examine how

these rhetorical acts create memories within individuals and the public. This examination brings

with it signs of inclusivity and exclusivity based on the placement of pieces both in the museum and the digital spaces. This chapter will also note how the physical space of the museum creates a different rhetorical atmosphere than a digital space and therefore makes viewers read the narrative of the paintings differently. As I examine these differences, I also examine whose voices are left out of these spaces, whose voices or narratives are romanticized, and how the museum and its works impact the community.

The next chapter examines the rhetoric of digital spaces and the ways they differ from live spaces as well as the rhetoric of the design of these spaces. Using the work of Carolyn Handa and Anne Francis Wysocki as a framework, this chapter examines the ways in which the webmaster designs these spaces to create certain narratives for the visitor. It also examines the relationship between public memory and online space. This chapter is central to my argument because these digital spaces are key examples of the ways art narratives are currently digitized, and from here we will know how to improve the recovery of marginalized narratives.

Chapter Four begins with an examination of live and digital art spaces through two case studies. Karen Hutzel's piece examines a community art project in live space and the rhetoric of public and individual memory created, as well as the ways in which the work within the community fostered a communal space to recover voices. Alison Hsiang-Yi Liu's study examines three museum blogs, seeking whether or not blogs are an effective tool for reaching visitors and creating visitors who will return to the museums. My goal is to examine the way the museums utilize digital spaces to form communities or fail to do so. In examining these blogs, I can have a better understanding of which digital communities thrived and which rhetorical tools were in place to make them successful. I will also analyze two websites that were used as spaces of community interaction—the April 27, 2011 Tornado Facebook page and the 9/11 Memorial

page. These pages are examples of how community can be created in digital space and the ways these spaces can also create new narratives along with community members.

The final chapter will tie up any loose ends and answer any remaining questions concerning the project. It will serve as a space to reexamine earlier arguments and ultimately make a conclusion about ways that live and digital spaces can help recover marginalized voices, particularly in museum spaces. I will conclude by reevaluating the ways the field of rhetoric and composition, along with other disciplines, can partake in assisting with voice recovery of these museal spaces. I ultimately conclude by answering the question of how both live and digital spaces can work in tandem to assist in the recovery of marginalized voices within museums.

CHAPTER TWO

THE CINCINNATI ART MUSEUM

Introduction

Since 1883, the Cincinnati Art Museum has sat upon the hill of Eden Park, overlooking

the city of Cincinnati, ever vigilant as the city below has faced hardships and triumphs. Like all

museums this museum is, as Ferguson explains, in a constantly changing role due to, "the new

theories of representation which situate art and its functions in a larger semiotic environment

together with strong economic and social demands…" (177). And much like the city below it,

the Cincinnati Art Museum has changed and grown, developing with the city and its community

and sharing in its history. Once an institution funded fully by the wealthy and the elite, the

museum has morphed into a place more conducive to the needs and lives of the citizens of the

city, but this does not mean that the narrative it has created necessarily speaks to or for the

people. Like the city below the hill, the Cincinnati Art Museum, in recent years, has taken on a

narrative of a rhetoric of revival[i], its major accomplishment being when the Cincinnati Art

Wing—a wing dedicated exclusively to Cincinnati's expansive and influential art history—

opened in 2003 to coincide with the state's Bicentennial celebration as well as the anniversary of

the opening of the museum. Centennial celebrations are inherently celebratory and in this case,

it was a celebration of the birth of the state and all of its communities. Therefore, it is

unsurprising that a wing opening to coincide with a centennial celebration would focus on the

celebratory elements of the city's art history; however, as will be shown below, this celebration

comes at the cost of erasing the histories and realities of many of those communities.

This chapter will examine the ways the Cincinnati Art Museum, in congruence with the

city of Cincinnati's multi-million dollar expansion and building projects, creates a rhetoric of revival of the city of Cincinnati at the cost of the very citizens the narrative is supposed to represent. My analysis mirrors Victoria J. Gallagher's and Margaret R. LaWare's study, *Sparring with Public Memory* which examines the *Monument to Joe Louis.* Their project "seek[s] to demonstrate how the monument's symbolic, material, and contextual/geographical resources reference and make present the cultural experiences and memories of African Americans in America and in Detroit" (89). This chapter has a similar goal: to show that the Cincinnati Art Museum's symbolic, material, and contextual/geographical resources reference the past and the present of the Cincinnati Art Scene and the community in order to further the narrative of the rhetoric of revival of the city of Cincinnati.

This narrative of revival is a functional product of a larger scale transition of the city of Cincinnati, a city that was hit hard by the 2008 economic recession. To revitalize the once struggling city and create spaces that would draw in young professionals seeking new employment opportunities at large companies in and around Cincinnati, the city made plans to invest in more shared public spaces around the community and to "revitalize" once poor areas where many business owners had previously refused to open. Replacing abandoned buildings, mom and pop shops, and public housing with million dollar apartments and chain restaurants did have the desired effect—the downtown area is more financially prosperous than it has been in several years. But this prosperity came at the cost of removing local residents from their homes. It raises the question of whom these new public spaces serve and whom they harm. In this way, even these shared public spaces such as the apartments and restaurants, at the level of visible outdoor entities, work as a form of exhibition for the city and its efforts to create a rhetoric of revival to both the general public and those living outside of the city. As Bruce Ferguson

explains, "…Art exhibitions are at once a generalized and a particular form of communication directed at art professional spheres and other subcultures, meaning artists, critics, art historians, and students, as well as at respective patrons from government or commerce and other private spheres" (179) and these public spaces, created for the sole purpose of displacing the previous realistic narrative of poverty and crime are now ready-made exhibitions to change that narrative to one of prosperity and lawfulness. Similarly, the face and purpose of museums and their functions are changing.

As Ferguson noted in 1996, "Both the art object and the museum in which it is found then are the special subjects of a new critical industry whose criticality often ignores the genres, systems, histories and architectonics of exhibitions and their reception" (176) and that through this focus on strictly the art object and not the whole of the museum or the exhibition in which it is displayed the museum has created spaces where information or thorough examples can be given and received. However, he noted, that the museum's "public role is changing in response to the new theories of representation which situate art and its functions in a larger semiotic environment together with strong economic and social demands which are unique to today's Western culture" (177).

Ria Van Der Merwe, Karen Harris, and Bronwyn Strydom show the ways in which the museum as an entity has not only had to focus more on the larger contextual position of the museum as an object itself, and also as a part of the rhetorical narrative present, but also that the new generation has "placed museums under greater scrutiny as a result of growing democratization and greater access to better education" (160). They note that they "feel that museums do not adequately involve the community that they serve, and have in fact lost touch with the needs of modern society" (160) and this is something that will be discussed further in

the analysis section of this chapter. They note that the call for virtual museums and virtual spaces of museums are the next step in museology.

One of the museums refocusing their practices is the Cincinnati Art Museum, which features over 65,000 pieces of both traditional and contemporary art. This space, like all museums, holds artifacts that have been deemed important by way of cultural projection, or what LaWare and Gallagher define as "providing the rhetorical means, the materiality, through which social groups seek to further their own interests and assert some control over public space" (88). The question, as posed first by Ferguson, and repeated by others like Handa, is who speaks to and for whom? The museum's earliest contributions were, of course, those made by wealthy members of the city of Cincinnati who were given much control over the public space that they setup with the larger community in mind. The modern Cincinnati Art Museum receives funding from multiple sources, mostly private donations and endowments through grants and corporations, but also some state tax dollars through the Ohio Arts Council to "encourage economic growth, educational excellence and cultural enrichment for all Ohioans" (About Us). With these sometimes disparate goals in mind, and these competing entities to satisfy, the Cincinnati Art Museum has the difficult task of creating a space that satisfies its goals, its donors and board members, as well as the community it serves, and, in the case of the Cincinnati Art Wing, the community whose history it represents.

Whose history is presented is largely a product of public memory—both what is considered important history by the public and what the museum presents as important history. This chapter is not a place where I will grapple with the meaning of public as that has already been grappled with[ii], and it is important to remember that the community who visits museums is diverse and come to the museum with different motivations. Together, this community creates a

public memory of the museum via the artifacts presented as well as the narrative created by the arrangement and exhibition of these artifacts. Dickinson, Blair, and Ott define this way of creating public memory as a process that "embraces events, people, objects, and places that it deems worthy of preservation, based on some kind of emotional attachment" (7) and that "we must acknowledge public memory to be 'invented,' not in the large sense of a fabrication, but in the more limited sense that public memories are constructed of rhetorical resources" (13). This means that not all histories are displayed, but that the museum chooses which histories are important. Because these are the histories on display, those who are not in marginalized communities—and even some of those within the marginalized community—are unaware of these histories that are not included in the museum space. For the Cincinnati Art Museum, these rhetorical resources include what Dickinson, Blair, and Ott note as "the language, structural elements, arguments, tropes, narratives, justifications, and such in which the event is cast—as well as the availability of knowledge of the event to begin with—are intentional resource available in a culture" (13). One example of art that the Cincinnati Art Museum only recently acquired is folk art which, until very recently, was an ignored art form within the museum space and was not an acknowledged part of Cincinnati's public memory[iii].

The Cincinnati Wing of the Cincinnati Art Museum is one such public memory space. According to former museum Director Tim Rub, the creation of the wing developed over nearly five years and is "the product of the creative contributions of our staff and Board of Trustees, who have been assisted by many volunteers and friends of the museum" (Aronson vii-viii) and their collective vision comes in the form of the narrative that the Cincinnati Wing presents—a narrative that coincides with the city's own: a narrative of the rhetoric of revival. This wing is a celebration of Cincinnati's rich art history, but also simultaneously celebrates the city's history.

Many of the galleries do not feature the narrative of the city directly, but rather opt to show the narrative of artists themselves—as with Maria Louise McLaughlin, Maria Longworth Storer, and Frank Duveneck. Because these artists contributed much to Cincinnati art, but did not necessarily create art featuring or involving issues within the city, it is important to remember that the omission of these paintings or the onus placed on the galleries featuring these artists also make an important rhetorical statement—one that helps the rhetorical narrative of a rhetoric of revival. This exhibition is what Ferguson defines as "publicly sanctioned representations of identity, principally, but not exclusively, of the institutions which present them" (175). Further, Ferguson posits that they are "narratives which use art objects as elements in institutionalized stories that are promoted to an audience" (175) and in the case of the Cincinnati Art Museum's Cincinnati Wing, the overall narrative of revival is presented through several narratives including the three sections mentioned later in this chapter.

The Cincinnati Wing itself is vast—spanning several rooms and multiple hallways—it is, after all, presenting the museum through an art history lens. The three galleries of the Cincinnati Wing I will discuss in this analysis are those most concerned with the political history of the city. The first gallery is the Larry and Rhonda Sheakley Gallery, which features paintings showing Native American life. As the plaque in this section notes, "Nostalgia for a romanticized notion of the American frontier spurred a renewed interest in Western themes in art, and an urgency to capture the 'vanishing race' of the Native American prompted many artists to look to the West for inspiration" and shows how the other sections of the wing, align with the museum's goal to create a narrative of a rhetoric of revival. The second gallery analyzed is the Daniel and Susan Pfau Gallery, featuring Civil War and Post-Civil War Era artifacts. And the third gallery, the Harold C. Schott Foundation Gallery, features images of peasants and idealized images of rural

and country life. A common thread in each section is the museum's omittance of the reality of these time periods by omission of not only alternative or folk artworks, but also of educational information through the museum's own voice in the informational plaques and through the reinforcement of a narrative of revival by showing only the positive events of the art museum— and therefore the city. While understandable that a wing opened to celebrate the accomplishments of the Cincinnati art scene focuses on positivity, the problems present within these time periods could be easily and briefly showcased without overpowering that message. Instead, the community that is supposed to be served by the museum—whose histories are too often left out are again ignored and seen through a gaze that is not their own, including minority populations, women, and the poor in the city. I chose these three galleries because they offer the most contested narrative spaces. While many of the rooms are dedicated to specific artworks (pottery, ironwork, etc.) or specific artists, these spaces are dedicated to historical moments including slavery and the slave trade, the forced movement of Native Americans to the West, and the life experience of the rural poor during industrialization.

These exhibitions are spaces of representation—in the art museum, this representation comes in several forms. According to Ferguson, representation is "Persuasion through complex transmissions of voice and image…strategies whose aim is the wholesale conversion of its audiences to sets of prescribed values to alter social reactions" (178). Representation takes place in all forms of the exhibition, and Ferguson establishes that aesthetic values, like labels, lighting, and other design and informational elements within the Cincinnati Art Wing are used to "emphasize, de-emphasize braided narratives with purposes—fictions of persuasion, docudramas of influence" (181) and that "Art museums are designated to speak about identity and history through productive material subjects in performance" (184). Using these tools, the gallery—and

the larger museum—functions as a resource for public memory, cultural projection, and representation in three ways that I also borrow from Gallagher and LaWare's study: first, through values and experiences, second, through location and audience, and third, through historical, political, and social contexts.

As has already been stated, the Cincinnati Art Museum has created a narrative of the rhetoric of revival, but this narrative could not be created without using the values and experiences of both the audience and the museum. These values and experiences come through many forms and from many perspectives, including those of the curators, the visitors, the city and the museum's history, and the items and architecture of the museum, which all form to shape public memory. Location adds to this public memory—via both the physical location of the museum on a hill in Eden Park. The setup of the exhibitions within the museum is also a part of location because as Ferguson states, "The exhibition brackets out the work of art and sublimates it to its own narrative ends as a minor element in a major story" (183). Location is also seen through the audience that the museum serves—who lives within and around the location, who works in and around the location, and whose narratives are being told through the museum and the space and location of the museum. Finally, values, experiences, location, and audience all shape and are shaped by the historical, political, and social context of the museum and the city it serves.

Values and Experiences

Values are made visible in and through the experiences embodied within the Cincinnati Art Wing including the galleries, aesthetics, and participatory elements, but also by the visitors from the community who live within the current conditions of the city's current "revival." Both

work in tandem to create a form of public memory, but even public memory cannot account for individual memories and the narrative of the city and its history (including its art history) is offered many counternarratives by citizens who lived these experiences.

As Elizabeth Crooke notes, "Those who interpret museums are also diverse: men and women, majority and minority groups, able, disabled, academics, curators, visitors, non-visitors, adults, children" (1) and that "The people within these groups will also differ from each other, they will have widely divergent views, and each person will have a very personal sense of self and identity. It is this myriad that constitutes the museum's public" (1). Though there are very few places within the museum for these groups to present their counternarratives, there is one space in which visitors are asked to actively participate and that is in the Cincinnati Public School section. This gallery features artwork that was housed in the schools of the Cincinnati Public School District. As Julie Aronson notes, "The appreciation of art by the community was nowhere better demonstrated than in a remarkable program initiated by the Cincinnati Public Schools. A collection of paintings (mostly by Cincinnati artists) was amassed with contributions from schoolchildren" (200) and that "Because these paintings adorned their classrooms, generations of students took pride in ownership of the works…The Cincinnati schools offered children of all socioeconomic backgrounds their first exposure to art and thereby promoted the flowering of culture in the city" (200).

The plaque explaining the collection notes that the push for artwork in the public schools started in 1903 and has continued today. The "Book of Memories" is a place where current and former students of Cincinnati Public Schools are invited to write their memories of the artworks featured in their schools and is one of the few places in the museum where visitors can express their thoughts in writing for other visitors to read. The writing on the plaque above the book

reads: Did you attend one of Cincinnati's Public Schools? Do you remember the paintings in this gallery or other works from the Cincinnati Public Schools Art Collection? Please share your memories here" (Cincinnati Art Museum). On any given day, there are memories written in the book. And this space where people are instructed to stick to the narrative of the ways in which they were inspired by the paintings in school, a narrative that feeds a line of positivism and ignores the problems rife in the Cincinnati Public School systems including problems with funding, retention, and graduation rates, all issues tied to poverty, racism, and classism, indicative of the larger macrocosm of the city. This book, which is simply paper, can also have pages torn from it whenever necessary. If the museum sees fit to silence a memory or remove it, they have the final determination. And, of course, there is the possibility of visitors doodling or vandalizing the Book of Memories, an act that could also deter the narrative the museum hopes to convey.

Dickinson, Blair, and Ott describe memory places, like the Cincinnati Art Museum as "destinations" and note that "they typically require visitors to travel to them. Thus is created a unique context for understanding the past, one that is rooted in touristic practices" (26). Even if curators set up the museum using a specific narrative agenda, that agenda is changed when visitors enter the realm of the museum. Visitors bring with them their own sets of ideas, principles, and identifications. Citing David Thelen's survey of history making practices, Dickinson, Blair, and Ott note that "Americans put more trust in history museums and historic sites than in any other sources for exploring the past" (25) but this does not mean that visitors, especially those with a rhetorical foothold in the past, do not enter unable to recognize the narrative they are presented and the parts of the whole narrative that are erased. However, Dickinson, Blair, and Ott state that other visitors also impact the memories of museum goers.

45

Dickinson, Blair, and Ott note that "Memory places cultivate the being and participation together of strangers" (27) which can change the way one might think about their experience at the museum. They remind us, like Gallagher and LaWare and Ferguson, that these places have "character" and their very own histories. Included in the Cincinnati Art Museum's history are several changes to the setup and architecture of the building, but not necessarily to the items within the museum.

The museum draws visitors who come to the museum for several reasons including entertainment, education, and a sense of self and "Because the place, the memory signifier, is an object of attention and desire, and because it is not transportable, it necessitates a particular set of performances on the part of people who would seek to be its audience" (Dickinson, Blair, and Ott 26) who is, in this case, the public who visits the Cincinnati Art Museum. They note that this distinction gives it the status of place, which is different from space (Dickinson et al. 24) and also that "space can be a vacuum. Space can be a plot of land which, when designated the role of place, might become a local park" (25). Further, they note "it is an object of special attention because of its self-nomination as a site of significant memory of and for a collective" (25) and this seems to be the goal of the design of the grounds. From the outdoors here, it is clear that the museum, like the rest of the city, is deeply entrenched in the memories of the city's and the museum's history.

In fact, when one enters the museum, they encounter a lobby and have two directional options—a large hallway with tall ceilings and large, black curtains draping straight ahead, and a more modest set of doors with a small sign noting that it is the direction to the "Asian Art Galleries." Already, the visitor has encountered a hierarchical spatial organization and design as outlined by Fu Tuan in which the museum has acknowledged that the more important part of its

narrative is more clearly accessible (Fu Tuan 118). The "Icons of the Permanent Collection" is more directly linked to the Cincinnati Wing on this floor—featuring works by Cincinnati artists. This hierarchical arrangement extends to within the boundaries of the Cincinnati Wing. The wing itself is an entire unit, but is separated into several different galleries—some galleries connecting directly and others freestanding. For example, Frank Duveneck, one of the most famous local artists, is featured prominently within his own room, which features only his art, though several of Duveneck's paintings are present throughout other sections of the entire wing—this section is strictly preserved for personal works by Duveneck, creating, for him, a narrative of his personal life.

Privileging Duveneck and others like the Cincinnati Art Museum's affectionately named "Dueling Divas" M. Louise McLaughlin and Maria Longworth Nichols Storer, shows how the artists themselves are arranged within a hierarchical order. Though several of the same artists are featured throughout the many mini-galleries within the wing, including Joseph Henry Sharp and Joseph Farny in the Native American section, only Duveneck and the "Divas" have galleries dedicated to them. Perhaps it is because these particular artists were born in the Cincinnati area while many of the others immigrated or relocated to Cincinnati for a period in their lives, but not permanently. That presents the idea of the exceptionalism of the Cincinnati art scene, but concentrating on these specific artists also puts the other artists in the background. While these artists did not contribute as much to Cincinnati art since they were not always present, they participated in and influenced some of the art movements in the area. With recovery efforts, new artists and pieces of art are coming to light and are "recovered" after almost disappearing into obscurity, but there are undoubtedly many voices and artifacts that are lost to history. While the museum cannot recover items that were lost, the museum could take steps to acknowledge the

47

loss of these items by noting, in some way, that many artists or citizens of the community were not represented correctly in the past. Privileging the work of a few Cincinnatians who were able to achieve these accolades without acknowledging the many whose work was lost and also ignores the reality of the many that could not. For example, while Maria Longworth Nichols Storer being the first American (and woman) to decorate pottery under a glaze is certainly a political achievement; her personal triumph did not necessarily lead other women within the Cincinnati citizenry to become budding artists because for many women in the nineteenth century, this was not a possibility. Similarly, Duveneck's contributions as a middle class child of immigrants for the time period is impressive, but it did not necessarily mean that many other immigrants of the time period were able to achieve the same level of prosperity as him. While the museum holds these people up as examples of exceptionalism—understandably—they also actively ignore that for many in their positions, these were not realistic options and do not acknowledge the realities of the time period. By doing so, the museum ignores not only the community and population at large, but parallels the ways in which the modern art museum ignores the histories of these communities today.

One museum who created oppositional spaces within its own galleries is the Whitney Gallery. The Whitney Gallery had always been a "traditional" museum. One that featured artworks that are conjured up when one imagines the "glorious Old West." However, these "glorious" images not only ignore the realities of what happened in these spaces during these time periods, including the removal and continued subjugation of Natives, women, and non-white men, but also ignored the realities of different perspectives and the humanity of those who had been turned into legends. The renovated Whitney Gallery decided to create its own "revival" space, one that did not ignore the problematic past or differences in perspective.

Instead of simply showing these issues in a plaque, the redesigned Whitney Gallery actually

included artworks that countered the "glorious Old West" narratives. It did not exclude those

artworks that told the story of the "glorious Old West", but it presented other perspectives. As

Dickinson, Ott, and Aoki explain in their article, "(Re)Imagining the West: The Whitney Gallery

of Western Art's Sacred Hymn" one place that this was most effectively used was in a section

that represented the Battle of Little Bighorn. They note that two paintings, Alan Mardon's "The

Battle of Greasy Grass" and Edgar Paxson's "Custer's Last Stand" hang side by side. While

they note that Paxson's painting is a more traditional depiction, which "draws on a long lineage

of European aesthetics to represent Custer as a hero" (30) Mardon's painting, in contrast,

> …depicts the battle not from a singular perspective as one moment in time, but from a
>
> multiplicitous perspective that unfolds over several days; he draws not on European
>
> aesthetics, but instead on the aesthetics of buffalo hide paintings…Mardon's painting also
>
> focuses on the Indian warriors and, in particular, on the exploits of Crazy Horse. In short,
>
> this painting tells a revised, which is to say, discordant, version of this famous battle, one
>
> that focuses not on General Custer's defeat but on Native Americans' resistance to
>
> colonization (30)

This discordance is a possible alternative strategy that the Cincinnati Art Museum's Cincinnati

Wing could use.

While the Cincinnati Art Museum would not need to go to the extremes of acquiring and

adding new paintings, necessarily, they could improve the marginalization of voices and the

reality of history by including more conflicting information on their plaques. While the rhetoric

of art museums in general during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries were to show the

positives and glorify the myths and be upbeat and positive, then perhaps the job of the twenty-

first century museum is to renegotiate and recover history. All museums, science, art, and historical are implicit in this responsibility because they are all spaces that are keepers of history and much can be learned from paintings. While art of the time period may be telling in that realities were omitted, museum spaces—both online and digital—have the ability to recover these realities and open them up for discussion. Progress has been slow in all infrastructural spaces, but museal space seems that it is now ready to listen to voices that have been ignored for so long, and so many other voices of the past that have been ignored because no one was listening.

Additionally, folk art, created by artists who were not trained or necessarily skilled is featured in one small room in the museum, but it is on the second floor, and is not included in the Cincinnati Wing. The museum recently started acquiring folk art pieces, proving that they are starting to move toward a more inclusive narrative. However, in the case of the history of the city of Cincinnati and its art scene, there is no folk art present. This is likely because this kind of marginalized art interrupts the narrative of the rhetoric of revival that the museum is trying to present.

In her study of museums, Handa notes that examining museums like the Birmingham Civil Rights Museum and the Japanese American National Museum shows that these museums are tasked to "speak on behalf of, and in the voices of, those citizens who experienced the atrocities as well as the descendants of those citizens" (25) and, while the element of atrocities is removed from the Cincinnati Art Museum, it is equally important that the museum represents the population it serves. While some would argue that art museums are not necessarily spaces to address atrocities, there are many artworks that feature atrocities and there are a growing number of those in museum studies who acknowledge all museum spaces as places to include

50

contestations and narratives of communities. Additionally, the Cincinnati Art Museum, in its desire to present a rhetoric of revival that helps serve the city's own narrative finds itself functioning without the whole narrative of the history of art in Cincinnati and even the events of the city. Here I am alluding to no permanent artwork or galleries that feature riots in the city or the financial hardships of citizens, but instead mostly romanticizing their lives like pictures found in the Civil War and Post-Civil War section and the Country People section that features a romanticized view of the lives of the impoverished living in the rural country. Similarly, the section within the wing dedicated to Native Americans features not the artwork of Natives—but depictions of them through the lens of Caucasian artists who often present them through the "noble savage" trope.

The Civil War/Post-Civil War section, which is a part of the larger "Cincinnati Artists" section, features only a few paintings directly related to slavery and the slave trade and even fewer concerning the actual Civil War. Three paintings in particular, "Head of a Girl" by Elizabeth Nourse, "The Quadroon Girl" by Henry Mosler, and "The Underground Railroad 1893" by Charles T. Webber, are all featured in the same area—with Nourse's and Webber's paintings on the same wall and Mosler's on the wall beside them—separated by the other artifacts by a doorframe. I chose these three paintings because they are in galleries that concentrate on historical moments rather than particular art types or movements, which helps me explore more thoroughly why certain items are placed where they are within the museum. In this instance, all three of these paintings are near one another and are all from the same time period in the Civil War/Post-Civil War Era. These paintings are clearly put next to one another for the purposes of creating narratives, and it seems that the museum is working to show the people affected by slavery by presenting three different examples of those living during this period.

51

However, the arrangement of the paintings is still problematic due to the lack of further explanation on the plaques about the realities of the time period. Additionally, there is no clear address of slavery—even the space is titled the "Civil War/Post-Civil War Era" completely omitting the word slavery. This could be because the city of Cincinnati was such a pivotal space during the Civil War, being the first large "free" city after a border state, but there is very little use of the word slavery anywhere throughout this gallery.

Nourse's painting is an oil canvas portrait of a side profile of a young African American girl. The young girl looks to her right, wearing a buttoned overcoat of the time period; the background is a simple brown, putting all of the focus on the young girl's serious expression. The painting, like most of the paintings in this section of the museum, is framed in ornate gold and is placed several feet away from the other artwork on the wall, letting the portrait stand on its own. The information accompanying the painting notes that "Such sensitive and dignified portrayals of African Americans as those by Elizabeth Nourse were rare in the nineteenth century, when derogatory imagery permeated the popular media" and the plaque notes that Nourse was sympathetic to lower class people due to her religious upbringing."

Nourse and other middle and upper class Caucasian artists' depictions of larger groups of people are not necessarily the narrative of those people's voices, which gives visitors a distorted view of the shared history of these groups of people including women, minorities, and the lower class. When discussing photographs, John Armitage notes that, "still or video image production is never a 'mere deed' but highly dependent on agency: it matters who is taking a picture, with what motivation and for what purposes" (84) and this extends to paintings as well. This painting features an upper class Caucasian woman artist of the time breaking the mold and making portraits depicting the humanity of African Americans, a humanity that most works of art and

other forms of media at the time denied them. However, as will be seen with some of the other sections, Nourse, and by proxy the museum, shows how the white upper class gaze romanticizes marginalized groups like minorities and the lower class which does not help tell their story or further their own narrative of what life was truly like for them during this time.

In Mary Alice Heekin Burke's "The Rediscovery of Elizabeth Nourse" she notes that Nourse's work was largely forgotten after World War I after the "realist style" she painted in was no longer fashionable and because she was a woman, even an upper class Caucasian woman, her own voice and paintings were almost lost to history. The problem of Nourse's white and upper class gaze is shown in other paintings of working and rural people. While Heekin Burkes notes that Elizabeth "shared in the lives" of her subjects and notes that "Because she shared in their lives, she was able to portray rural and urban working women with a depth of understanding that eluded artists who knew them as only picturesque subjects" (library.cincymuseum.org) they never go into detail about how she "shared in" her subject's lives. And, though many are humanizing for the period and may have been working in rhetorical favor of change, the placement of paintings in the museum still ignores the realities of the period.

Also necessary to consider are the derogatory images that the museum mentions but does not show. While understandable that a museum—particularly one that welcomes children— would not want to show controversial paintings in a wing dedicated to the city's art, there is no further mention of issues of racism or disenfranchisement—something rampant in this period in the city of Cincinnati. Only one painting in this section hints at the true misery that those in bondage faced. On the wall to the far left of "Head of a Girl" is a striking painting of a girl, her long black hair loose and arms crossed—clearly bound in chains. "The Quadroon Girl" by Henry Mosler[iv] is based on the poem of the same name by Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, about

a young girl who is sold into slavery by her own father. A stanza of the poem is featured in the informative plaque, but no further information is given of the reality of women being sold into slavery at this time. The woman's dejected look, her head down, arms crossing her chest, with bare, vulnerable shoulders and a bleak gray background tell a powerful visual story. However, its placement between other, more positive narrative paintings seems out of place and is not a rhetorically effective nuance to the more upbeat paintings surrounding it. Therefore, it serves more as a quiet reminder than as a presentation or wrinkle in an otherwise positive narrative.

In stark contrast to this somber piece, the piece next to it returns to the previous narrative of positivity and revival. A painting by Charles T. Webber entitled "The Underground Railroad 1893" sits between "The Head of a Girl" and "The Quadroon Girl." The painting is in a heavy gold frame. This picture, like "The Quadroon Girl" is large, but is horizontal instead of vertical, and features many people within the frame. The scene is meant to be an "action" scene, featuring young children, men, and women being led on the Underground Railroad via abolitionists. The information here notes that Webber[v] "created this picture to celebrate the abolitionists' heroism in the moral struggle against slavery" (Cincinnati Art Museum) and includes his abolitionist friends, Levi and Catherine Coffin and Hannah Haydock, "leading a group of people to freedom." The museum's plaque does note what Webber did not—that the painting should also be a reminder of all the slaves and former slaves who bravely escaped and helped others escape. While the painting carries with it its own intrinsic narrative, including the casual erasure of the heroic slaves who helped one another escape a life of slavery, it being featured on a wall so prominently with other paintings of "positive" relations between African American and Caucasian citizenry—particularly within the city of Cincinnati—shows how the museum is crafting a rhetoric of revival based on positivity and hope while negating the normal

realities of the city.

This section about slavery and the Civil War also misses or completely ignores three race riots that occurred in the city during the nineteenth century—one in 1829, one in 1836, and one in 1841. It is not that these riots were ignored or that no one painted or created art about them—but that art is not displayed nor are the riots mentioned within the plaques of the museum—particularly in this section dealing with the complicated relationship between African American and Caucasian citizens living across the river from a border state before and during the time of slavery. This very real narrative does not fit in with the narrative of a rhetoric of revival that this wing hopes to create and with that omission brings an erasure of the public memory of the complicated racial issues that had always been present in the city of Cincinnati. And while art pieces depicting these issues may not be easily acquired by the museum or may be lost to art history, the exclusion of plaques explaining this history in sections that discuss the Civil War, show that the museum has refrained from including the darker parts of Cincinnati's history. Since the museum presents other paintings that do show the history of the city—but only the positive aspects, it shows that the museum is choosing to ignore certain narratives over others. While that is their right as an arts institution, it seems counterproductive to the mission of presenting the city with its history through the art and artifacts of these periods. In a similar vein, the city is erasing the memory of the 2001 Cincinnati race riots by "revitalizing" much of the city that was damaged during the riots—poverty stricken, high crime areas like Over-the-Rhine and downtown. Instead of investing money in businesses that were already present and trying to revitalize the neighborhoods that were there, the city instead removed everyone, and like the echoing silence of the museum about those three race riots, the city decided to "wash" over the problems of these neighborhoods and the larger issues of racial and class injustice with a

rhetoric of revival; but instead of featuring beautiful paintings of progress, the city features clean high rise apartments and middle class dining.

While some might downplay the importance of including the more negative aspects of the city's history as represented through art of the period in a wing made to celebrate the accomplishments of art within the city, it is disingenuous to present only a part of the city and its narrative, ignoring the struggle that the city's citizens once—and presently—face. If the wing's goal is to present the history of art through the city and if the museum's mission is to educate and represent the city's history, they are obligated to present these realities. Though several of the plaques discuss the issues of the period, artworks of the time featuring racial and class injustices are not present, and therefore are silenced and even omitted from the visual narrative of the museum.

In a neighboring room is a section dedicated to peasant and rural life. The plaque by this section notes that "In late-nineteenth century Europe and America, paintings of European country folk engaged in day to day activities grew tremendously popular. Industrialization had brought the lower classes to the cities in search of employment in the factories" something that was happening in the city of Cincinnati. The plaque also notes that "out of these circumstances grew a nostalgia for simpler times and a romanticized vision of rural village life." Again, this is an example of the upper class white gaze romanticizing a group of people they considered "other." Village or rural life in both the United States and Europe were difficult and labor-intensive similarly to the work happening in the industrialized cities, but these paintings choose to focus on a romanticized version of jubilant people with time to sit in fields and lazily watch cows graze rather than working in the field and milling and tending to the cows.

We see familiar artists of these paintings carried over from the Civil War room including

several paintings by Elizabeth Nourse and some by Henry Mosler. Many of Nourse's paintings in this room are portraits of peasants in European countries; however one painting is an example of the description above—featuring a romanticized conception of the daily life of those living in the country. "In the High Meadow" features two free roaming cows feeding on grass as a little boy sits next to them, holding a stick in his hand and seemingly idling away the time by enjoying his life in the country. Likewise, Mosler's painting, "Chimney Corner" depicts a man and woman smiling and talking by a large hearth with a fire. This romanticized vision of rural life—both in and out of the Cincinnati area—again shows the art museum's attempt to create a rhetoric of revival. In this instance, not only is the difficult life of those in the city ignored by featuring no contrasting paintings of life in the city, but it also ignores the daily hardships faced by those living in rural areas including poverty, hunger, weather, and disease in favor of a romanticized vision of what those who could afford to be nostalgic—upper class Caucasian people—thought rural life should be or should be represented as to audiences. This not only erases the very real struggle of those living a rural life—and with it their agency and voices—but also the contributions they made to the community and its development.

I should note that it is understood that most artists of the time were painting in this form of positivism and the upper class Caucasian gaze was the only gaze widely available, but the writing on the walls, the plaques, the setup of the museum which could feature counternarratives to these depictions but do not, with the exception of a few phrases describing why the depiction is problematic or adding a few words about why it is problematic, are counter steps the museum could take but do not. Even with "The Quadroon Girl," we see one example of a counternarrative of sorts, but it is lost in a room full of depictions of the Underground Railroad and portraits of clean, young minorities who are not being shown in a form of discrimination and

fear they faced on a daily basis living in the city of Cincinnati—only a short boat ride away from being swept back into southern slavery.

Perhaps the most interesting gallery in the Cincinnati Wing is the Native American section featuring mostly work from two men—Joseph Henry Sharp and Henry Farny. Like the "Country Life" section above, this section depicts Native American peoples from the gaze of Caucasian artists and shows them going about their day-to-day lives, featuring the "noble savage." The plaque here notes that the paintings featured in this gallery are, similarly to those in the Country Life section, a response to the vanishing populations of Native Americans and their customs and ways of life after they were forced off of their land. These paintings are meant to be nostalgic depictions of a rapidly disappearing Native American way of life. However, as with the other wings, these depictions of life were presented through the gaze of Caucasian Americans instead of the group of people being represented within them.

Several of the paintings feature Natives making arrows, Natives on a hunt, Natives killing a buffalo—all romanticized visions of what Native Americans did on a day-to-day basis from the perspective of Caucasian painters. Except for one painting entitled "Harvest Dance" there are no paintings depicting Native customs and rituals beyond the already envisioned ideas of what Native Americans did—mostly based around hunting. An erasure of white interaction with Natives is also clear except for one painting entitled "The Unwelcome Guests" which features a painting of a group of Caucasian Americans around a fire and a Native American walking up to them. This painting, though with ominous undertones, is lost and seems out of place in a room filled with paintings dedicated primarily to the hunt and preparation for the hunt. Similarly to "The Quadroon Girl" in the Civil War section, this painting gives visitors a quick view—a nod to the problems that would transpire and the issues of the time without actually fully

acknowledging them, similarly to how the city of Cincinnati might pay lip service to the issues

of gentrification but then will quickly remind the city of the reduced crime rate and income

accrued by the changes to the city.

When discussing the creation of Native American Studies, Scott Lyons notes that in The

Civil Rights Movement of the 1960s and 1970s "Different voices needed to be heard, different

histories had to be taught, and the white, male, straight, bourgeois, imperialist center was to be

questioned and, ideally, decentered" (294). Citing Eric Cheyftz, Lyons notes that what is

happening in the museum is the term "ethnographic-formal" or studying "formal cultural

properties" (294) rather than the social, political, and historical relevancy of the society. Lyons

calls for a new way of navigating the political landscape of Native American Studies, noting that

scholars need to "develop new ways of engaging with the irreducible modernity and diversity

that inheres in every Native community and has for some time" (297) and that "This means

interrogating the theoretical discourses now in circulation, especially nationalism, which is

dominant, to examine the assumptions can mischaracterize the real makeup of Native

communities and ironically reactivate the old ethnographic-formal model" (297).

Lyons notes how this white male gaze negates and neglects the realities of experiences

and the full range of social, political, and historical significance of Native American lives and

societies. Like Lyons, Jacqueline Jones Royster discusses these issues in her seminal "When the

First Voice You Hear is Not Your Own" noting that "The problem is that in order to construct

new histories and theories such stories must be perceived not just as 'simple stories' to delight

and entertain, but as vital layers of a transformative process," (35) but she notes that "the

problem of articulating new paradigms through stories becomes intractable, if those who are

empowered to define impact and consequence decide that the stories are simply stories" (35).

One way to combat these issues is, as already stated, to present other points of view and histories. In her "Rhetorics of Survivance: How American Indians Use Writing" Malea Powell notes how this is all linked to composition and rhetoric by showing that Natives use writing and tell stories in order to recreate their own experiences, experiences that even they have been conditioned to believe other opinions about. Powell notes that, "Despite hundreds of years of pressure, first from European colonists then from Euroamericans, American Indians did not disappear. And though our visibility has been repeatedly erased in American discourses of nationhood, we have, just as insistently, refigured ourselves and reappeared" (427) but this reappearance is still missing in the Cincinnati Art Museum. Instead of focusing on Natives, the space focuses on the "white gaze" or "nationhood" erasure both Lyons and Powell speak of. Natives, as Powell points out, have used this erasure to their advantage within their own community "to create and re-create our presence on this continent" (428) but many traditional art museums have not received this message, and those who have are working with communities which still cause problems (see Daniel C. Swan and Michael Paul Jordan 2015). Even if the Cincinnati Art Museum cannot acquire artifacts from Native Americans or, for some reason they are keeping these items in storage or loaning them to other institutions, the section that discusses those painting Native Americans during this period needs to include information about these efforts or needs to present information and counternarratives to the use of "ethnographic-formal" representations of Native Americans.

On one of the walls of this section is a quote with no author attributed reading "And now…the frontier has gone, and with its going has closed the first period of American History" (Cincinnati Art Museum). This quote is placed here to denote the reason for the section—to show how art helped try to maintain the memories of the Natives—a group of people whose way

of life was disappearing, or rather, whose way of life was being taken from them, but it also shows how the art featured in this gallery was produced during a time of great upheaval and change in American history—a change that coincides with the changes currently going on in the city of Cincinnati.

This is especially important because it resonates throughout the wing. This wing is dedicated to the rhetoric of revival. It hopes to show the good of the city—the life before what is thought now to have been a once "dead" form but now resurrected. This wing, like the quote above laments what is now gone and notes that nostalgia and memory is all that is left—much like the city itself had before the current "revival" came underway. This gallery in particular, but also the entire wing, is a reminder to visitors of what has been lost, but also shows the visitor (through a series of erasures and inaccurate placement of artistic renderings) that there is hope and positivity abound in the idea of revival. This shows that the city can, once again, return to its former glory through the means of reinvisioning. But this vision leaves out the hardships, the loss, and the serious problems that this revival costs the citizens living within the community. It erases and eradicates their struggle and leaves out their narrative while claiming to tell their story and house their history.

Location and Meaning Making

While the Cincinnati art scene is still remarkably vibrant, with many art galleries and shows in the city, the Cincinnati art scene in the 1800's was literally revolutionary in some ways including in the work of pottery and furniture. Anita Ellis, former Director of the museum, states that,

In the end, Cincinnati can boast of Louise McLaughlin, the leader of the china painting

61

movement in America and writer of the first guidebook on the subject, the first American

to discover the underglaze decorating technique and write a manual about it, and the first

American to work in studio porcelain. Cincinnati can take equal pride in Maria

Longworth Nichols Storer's Rookwood Pottery Company, the finest art pottery in

America, and one of the leading art potteries in the world. No other city in the United

States can boast so much about its ceramic industry (Ellis 110).

Additionally, the city's contribution to furniture making, with the Mitchell and Rammelsberg

Furniture Company producing furniture for citizens all around the country and artists like

Duveneck participating in worldwide art movements, made the Queen City one of the imminent

places to study and participate in art at the time. This rich art history is present in the many art

students from the nearby University of Cincinnati seen visiting the museum, sketch pads and

paints in hand trying to recreate the paintings before them. But this visual, with its array of

students of all genders, races, ethnicities, and classes does not paint a picture of the reality of the

Cincinnati art scene—and all prominent art scenes of the time that were widely dominated by

upper class white males. While the Cincinnati Art scene contributed much to the world of art, it

was not necessarily a place that catered to the non-art community or did not include the members

of the non-art community—many who were not allowed to be members of this community

simply based on their gender, race, or class. This was not necessarily the goal of the art scene at

the time, but ignoring the larger population who was left out of the movement creates a similar

narrative to the one the city is currently creating by removing citizens from their homes—whose

stories and lives are being forgotten in the pursuit of economic progress.

The location of the museum, Eden Park, is a place of many public spaces and houses

Cincinnati Playhouse in the Park, a space for plays as diverse as modern playwrights to

Shakespeare, and the Krohn Conservatory, a space built in 1933 that houses "3,500 plant species from around the world" (Cincinnati Parks Website). Placing the museum in a park—such a shared public space further shows that the museum is meant to be a part of the community. Just like the Playhouse in the Park and the Krohn Conservatory are meant to be spaces for the community to enjoy and places that reflect the cultural and agricultural abilities of the city, so too is the art museum—which sits as a keeper of history. The museum was present before the other public spaces, but the placement of other shared public spaces of both entertainment and conservation show that this space is meant to be not only a place for the community to gather, but also for the community to reflect together.

Playhouse in the Park allows the community to come together and reflect on works of art and literature like plays and shows while simultaneously keeping these items relevant, alive, and informative through performance. The Krohn Conservatory allows the community to reflect on the beauty of nature both within the city and beyond while allowing the preservation of thousands of countless plants and insects. Similarly, the art museum is tasked with providing both entertainment and a place for the community to gather to celebrate its shared history. However, through the omittance of important historical moments including the negative, the space ignores not only the struggles the city has endured, but also the community who survived—and who are still facing those struggles. No counternarrative has been produced to the Cincinnati Art Museum's narrative, and perhaps that is because it does not have to. The million dollar apartments and restaurants sit adjacent to crumbling neighborhoods and abandoned buildings—all still in the plans to soon become similar gentrified monoliths, but not yet turned. Like a painting, the contrast is clear, but never more easily seen than from up on Eden Hill.

One reason location and aesthetics are particularly important to pay attention to is that "The degree to which the memories enacted inside the museum are shaped by its architecture and deployments of space depends very much upon the character of the specific museum" (Dickinson et al. 30), and the Cincinnati Art Museum is one that clearly represents itself as a traditional museum trying to pay homage to its past while looking forward to the future—similarly to the city of Cincinnati. This desire to represent the past and the present is evident in the first piece viewers see when driving up to the museum. Mark Di Suvero's "Atman" is a tall, vertical, red sculpture with three long, steel beams. These beams are separated but meet vertically with several small beams sticking out at the top. Connecting two of the beams is a horizontal beam across them, making the figure look like a large, red "A." A wooden plank of California Redwood is attached by chains, making what looks like a large swing that visitors are welcome to sit and swing on. Choosing to place this sculpture against the large, traditional Romanesque revival architecture of the building is a choice by the curators of the museum to represent the museum as a place that is firmly rooted in the past but also open to the present and contemporary art scene. Because this piece can be seen from several other places inside the museum, and because it is not competing with any other artwork for viewers, it is a rhetorical choice that highlights the notion that art cannot be contained. While this is a space for art, art is ultimately created outside of the museum and in the community. However, this message of art, both its viewing and its creation not being confined to the walls of the museum, is disingenuous to the story within its museum's own narrative. A narrative that celebrates the history of Cincinnati art, while ignoring the citizens who were not included within it.

Historical, Political, and Social Context

Art is inherently political, and so are museums. Sharon Macdonald echoes Ferguson's question of "who speaks for and to whom?" asking "who is empowered or disempowered by certain modes of display?" (4) and notes that "Within the cultural study of museums, one of the most productive theoretical developments has been the analysis of museums as 'texts' or as 'media': and this is an approach that can usefully be harnessed to questions of the politics of display" (4). Despite these efforts, Ferguson states that while the public role of the museum is changing due to a call for more democratized spaces and public memories, "institutional analysis still tends to be sociological and historiographic, concentrating on museums' public political role rather than on the dogmatic narratives within each and every exhibition" (178) including the Cincinnati Art Museum's Cincinnati Art Wing. The Cincinnati Art Museum has succeeded in creating a space that celebrates history and a rhetoric of revival, but in creating this space, they have also ignored the realities of the lives of community members during these time periods. It is also important to remember that artwork is inherently political and so are the art museums that house them. Even the most aesthetically pleasing art is a rhetorical and political creation. As J.D. Ragsdale, F. Barndau-Brown, T.M. Thibeodeaux, R.S. Bellow, and B.R. Chapman note, museums are "explicit or implicit means of persuasion" (1) and that, "By virtue of the choices made to exhibit certain pieces and not others and to display some more prominently than others, museums make statements about essential cultural beliefs or political points of view" (1) and this is clearly shown in the Cincinnati Art Museum. The building itself—its design and staging, its placement of galleries, its hierarchical order of construction—the ways in which visitors are able to move around the museum from wing to wing and gallery to gallery—are inherently political acts of the museum.

What is left out of the museum's narrative, including the struggle of African American and Native people as well as rural community members, is also a political act. This is especially obvious when many of the paintings and galleries deal with subject matter and issues that are directly relative to this narrative. The history of Cincinnati, as with all cities, is long and sorted—full of triumphs and tragedies, but the art museum is only showing the triumphs. If it is to be a genuine representation of the city's history, the history of the city, then the dark days experienced by many of the citizens must be included in that history, especially when one considers where the museum came from—its start as an institution created by elites for everyone—but the voice of the elite cannot be escaped as the voices of the lower class cannot yet be identified because they are still frequently erased.

While the Cincinnati Art Wing erases many narratives, it does provide a narrative of the rhetoric of revival as shown in the city, and does shine a bright spot—sometimes too bright—in a city that has not, of late, had much to celebrate. If the museum's mission is to create a space of education and learning for the community, it must begin to seek out other narratives beyond those shown in the form of rhetoric of revival. Unlike the city of Cincinnati, the Cincinnati Art Museum has many options for creating physical counternarratives to the narrative of the rhetoric of revival including the Internet, and perhaps the best space for a counternarrative is through the functional use of digital archives and the unlimited digital space that the Web offers—something that will be discussed in the next chapter.

CHAPTER THREE

DIGITAL SPACES

The participation efforts to digitize collections in museums has increased exponentially over the years as museums create interactive websites for visitors and participate in archival programs like the Google Art Project. Not everyone is interested in these online efforts, however. While the Cincinnati Art Museum agreed to participate in the Google Art Project, another major Ohio museum, the Cleveland Art Museum, has refused. According to David Franklin, the museum's former director who was offered the opportunity by Google, the refusal is due to the experience of artwork and the ways in which digital reproductions cannot match the live experience.

In an article written by Judith H. Dobrzynski, Franklin cites the sculpture *The Stargazer* as an example of why he refuses to allow his museum's collection to become digitized, stating that something is lost in translation because "When you encounter *The Stargazer*[vi] in the museum, she looks as though she could have been sculpted yesterday. Translucent marble, clean lines, almost an interpretation of the human form that Picasso would have envied." He adds that this piece of art is a part of the larger story of museums and states that "Museums matter because they create the space to behold, to circle, to covet, to engage with an object so small, and feel the continuity of something so large." Franklin is not alone in his skepticism of these projects, with many curators and museum directors raising concerns that these digital spaces will alleviate all reason for a live museum space. Franklin does not necessarily believe that visitors will stop attending, but that the visual experience will be altered in an inauthentic way. This brings up two important arguments about the rhetoric of viewing a piece of art in a live space versus a

digital space; first, that reproduction cannot appropriately replicate the item, and second, that reproductions via digital image cannot fully replicate the emotional, rhetorical, and memory experience one has when viewing the image in a live space.

Though Franklin does not believe digitization of artworks outside of museums is the ideal viewing experience, he believes that digitization is a useful learning tool within the art museum. According to the Cleveland Art Museum's Website, an installation called "Gallery One" is a "40 foot, interactive, microtile wall featuring over 4,100 works of art from the permanent collection…" This wall allows visitors to interact with the collections, allows children to draw with digital shapes, and allows visitors to connect with the museum[vii]. Gallery One's conception and installation was overseen by Franklin, who states in an interview with Caroline Guscott that "The space connects art and people, art and ideas, and people with people." Forms of digitization like Gallery One have created new ways to share and collect information within museums, while initiatives like the Google Art Project have created new ways to share and collect information and make it accessible to anyone with a working Internet connection. Through examinations of two of these spaces—one meant to strictly replicate the museum and the other to enhance the museum experience—this chapter will show how design elements are important to the rhetoric of these spaces and will note the ways usability could help aid the rhetorical goals, online engagement, and participation.

In this examination, we must consider the live space of the museum and its rhetorical purpose. Physical versus digital is an argument present in our own field in the ongoing discussion of the pros and cons of both digital and traditional publishing. Perhaps the physical location is one reason for this. Permanence is more assured, more guaranteed in a physical structure. For example, unlike the Internet, museums are built of brick and stone. It can be

touched, driven to, knocked down, and rebuilt brick-by-brick—the construction visible for all to see not behind the privacy of a refresher icon. These live, physical spaces create a sense of security and permanence for visitors that online spaces do not share and perhaps it is this lack of permanence that leads people to think differently about items in digital space.

Besides the physicality of museums, we must remember the purpose of museums—as educational and entertainment spaces, yes, but also as spaces of historical and communal memory. Though in the previous chapter I showed several examples of how erasure has been present in live spaces, these issues of erasure are also present in digital spaces. And while digitization efforts like the Google Art Project include a lot of capabilities not seen in traditional museums including alleviating "the problem of storage, preserving and protecting the real artifacts and allow[ing] virtual spaces to contain a limitless number of exhibits, to which users have access at any time and from any place" (Bonis et al. 184), digital public archives can also have many drawbacks beyond the live museum spaces. André Malraux notes that most of the early museums featured only ancient art and European paintings and excluded non-Western art, which was an early criticism of the Google Art Project's site. While this was not necessarily an erasure of the art—they did feature some pieces of Eastern Art[viii]—the lack of Eastern museums showed the privileging of Western art. Though this ethnocentrism was seen widely in many major archival projects like the Google Art Project in its early stages, forms from around the world including Eastern and Western art forms have been added to these databases.

While the Google Art Project has added artifacts and museums from around the world in the last four years, it is still available in only eighteen languages, leaving a large part of the world's population from having accessibility to the site. Other issues were the fear that it would skew art history by those who were included and those who were excluded and what constituted

69

art. Alastair Sooke of *The Telegraph* argued that the site itself suffered from favoring some pieces over others, stating that "someone else is deciding what images are worthy of study on your behalf—an impulse that surely runs counter to the 'democratic' motivation of the project in the first place. Essentially, Google's Art Project is a cherry-picking tool…" (Sooke). While Sooke's claim was certainly true, especially in the early unveiling of the Google Art Project, the same is true of the live space of the museum. What is featured, what is left in storage, and what is left out altogether are all decisions made by curators and museum directors. The difference is that, unlike a live museum space that must have physical room to grow, the Google Art Project can add to its digital collections at a much faster and unprecedented rate and, if the past four years since its launch is any indication, the Google Art Project will continue adding pieces to its site.   Due to copyright laws, many twenty-first century artworks are not included in the Google Art Project's Website, meaning that visitors will miss out on many contemporary works of art. While these issues are still present, they are not exclusive to the Google Art Project—after all, all museums risk skewing a visitor's perception of art based on what is in their exhibits. Because the Google Art Project collects art objects and museums from around the world, the more voices that are omitted or ignored are often drowned out by the many voices that are heard and seen. Since these spaces are meant to replicate the museum experience as closely as possible from a digital perspective, these spaces have acted similarly to the live spaces thus far; also participating in erasure and marginalization of voices.

Because museums have always been a mix of entertainment, practicality, and a learning institution, they have held places of prestige within public and cultural memory, places the Internet has not always occupied. Another issue with digital archives is raised by Enrico Bertacchini and Federico Morando including "low reproduction and transmission costs for

digital content [that] are likely to threaten museums' economic control over their intellectual property and to erode their authority as leading players in the authenticity, integrity, and contextualization of artworks and cultural objects" (60) meaning that once items are available on the Web, there is no way of stopping hackers and others from gaining access to the digitized artifacts. While museums build spaces of rhetorical narrative for paintings, the museum itself has always held a space of a rhetorical ethos of trust and prestige while computers are seen by many as tools that are used in daily life and, often, solely for entertainment. I argue that these new digital spaces have an opportunity to not only become more prestigious in the public memory, but these digital learning spaces, just like other digital spaces, can create new participatory communities engaging people from beyond the city in which the live space is situated and even recover voices.

In his "Rhetoric, Humanism, and Design" Richard Buchanan discusses design and notes that "the assumption is that design has a fixed or determinate subject matter of nature...However, the subject matter of design is not given. It is created through the activities of invention and planning…" (24). Delivery is the outcome of invention, and both are utilized when creating webpages. Web designers use specific rhetorical moves in order to make websites easier to examine. They begin through the use of invention by deciding which information is the most important for a visitor to view and also decide, through acts of invention and delivery, how this information will be disseminated to the viewer. Carolyn Handa addresses these rhetorical tactics in her work, and I will similarly examine the rhetoric of the layouts of both the Google Art Project Website and the Cincinnati Art Museum Website. I argue that while digitization changes and limits some elements of the rhetorical experience, it also reflects the way some individual art pieces, like sculptures and many paintings, were intended to be viewed—in

71

isolation, rather than as a part of a collection. This creates a different memory that centers more around the piece in the digital realm than about the piece and the space as it would in the physical space of the museum. Memory is a major component to the ways in which voice recovery works and this chapter will also examine how memory is composed differently online than in the live space of the museum. Because online space, like writing (and unlike orality), allows viewers to create records, it is another form of memory that is shaped and created through multiple narratives. These narratives are often created online through site design and usability. All of this is leading to my argument: that digital communities built in art spaces can add to efforts within the public community and enhance the live museum experience.

This chapter was formed out of a question Handa asked, "Does the rhetoric that emerges on the World Wide Web differ from the rhetoric we find in print, in the codex book, and from the visually focused rhetoric that studies images or three-dimensional objects such as sculptures or monuments?" (4). Ultimately, Handa finds that it is fundamentally the same in function, though different in form. For that reason she notes that "The study of digital rhetoric today needs to be conducted by humanists, that is, by rhetoricians and compositionists, just as much as by artists, computer technicians, multimedia designers, and Web technologists" (5). Though Handa's question was the basis for the beginning of this chapter, other questions about the specificity of online communities, public memory, and art museums entered the project and will be discussed at length in this chapter. Building on these questions, I will examine digital representations of art museums online.

In examining the rhetorical representation of voices online, I discovered that there are three main means of representing art in online spaces. The first is through online digital archiving sites like the Google Art Project whose practical and rhetorical mission is to document

and keep record of artwork in ways similar to an art museum; the second is through museum

websites whose practical and rhetorical mission is to give information to visitors about the

museum and the artifacts there; and the third is through online social media networks, whose

practical and rhetorical mission is to encourage the public to attend museum exhibits as well as

to interact with patrons. Unlike the third, the first two present common issues of limited

representation within the museum—even digital museums—and I will concentrate on these two

in this chapter. Working from Handa's assertion that "An expanded definition of rhetoric will

help us draw on our knowledge and practices as textual scholars. It will clarify and identify how

that knowledge and those practices have been refashioned" (6), this chapter will examine digital

rhetoric of two of these online spaces: the replicating space of the Google Art Project and the

informative and participatory space of the Cincinnati Art Museum Website. While the second

chapter focused primarily on the curators, this chapter will concentrate on the web creators who

are the "curators" of these online spaces as well as the visitors[ix]. Similarly to the museum

curators, these web designers are not always concerned with recovering voices, even though

online spaces are a great place to do this work. These sites work as memory spaces with their

design and usability determining how they are utilized and remembered by visitors. By

examining the rhetoric of these sites and their spaces, we can determine ways to use and enhance

these spaces for recovery work, public memory work, digital storage, and historical preservation.

This chapter is structurally based on Wysocki's earlier study in which she viewed and

analyzed two different CD-ROMs featuring the artwork and information about the life of Henri

Matisse as well as Carolyn Handa's work on three-dimensional versus digital spaces. While CD-

ROMS are no longer a widely used technology, many of the design aspects and setup of CD-

ROMS, like the two analyzed in Wysocki's study, are similar and were likely the prototypes for

modern digital archive spaces like the Google Art Project. Wysocki refers to her study as "phenomological" in nature, noting that she considers it so because throughout the article she is "trying to reflect on [her] experience of moving through these CDs at the same time that [she] move[s] through them" (140). This is similar to what I will do, except I will pay particular attention to how the webpages are rhetorically constructed, similarly to Handa, who does a brief examination of Google and Bing search engine pages in her *The Multimediated Rhetoric of the Internet*. Handa is more interested in the specific rhetorical elements utilized by the web designer, while Wysocki is more concerned with the visitor experience of the CD-ROMS and my study will consider both of these elements. Wysocki is examining two CD-ROMS and ultimately arguing that the design of each disc makes the viewer construct different narratives. These different narratives give the viewer different relationships to the art featured on the CD-ROMS, and therefore, the spaces of the CD-ROMS themselves. Wysocki notes the ways in which each CD-ROM creates a different narrative, stating,

> And, although the environment of CD-ROMs seems to offer an author more room for
> differing visual compositions than does the academic environment of writing on paper,
> the visual contexts of these two CD-ROMs are so similar that you might still on first pass
> think the two CDs were both encouraging you toward constructing similar relationships
> with art and artists (139).

This chapter will conduct a similar examination of two of the three types of digital spaces that art museums offer.

Wysocki notes that in the piece she will write "about the openings and about the screens designed to help me move through the art of the collections; I am also going to write about the screens that present me biographies of the artists" (140). She will "then write about the overall

visual structure of the two CDs, in order finally to write about how these CDs 'see' us, their 'readers'…" (140) and I will use a similar structure in my own analysis of these digital museum spaces. I will not "walk through" the two websites as she does with the two CD-ROMs, but I will note the design and visual structure of both sites and examine the usability of both sites in order to determine how they hope visitors will "read" or use the site. This second part is especially important to my examination, but also to hers because she notes that the two CD-ROMS hope to arouse different responses in viewers. These are differences we can see in digital archives like the Google Art Project which largely ask viewers to be passive consumers of the artifacts and the Cincinnati Art Museum's own website, which includes social media and other participatory and community building elements as well as more information about the history and context of the museum and the pieces themselves.

Wysocki explains that while the CD-ROMS might make viewers believe the same rhetorical message is being sent, however, there is a huge difference in the rhetorical purposes of both of these websites. Further, she notes that:

> Both "A Passion for Art" and "A Stroll through Twentieth Century Art" are about private
> art collections that are open to the public: both multimedia pieces use the floorplans of
> the spaces in which the collections are shown—in the first, a private mansion, in the
> second, some gardens, a 12th century chapel, and several more recently constructed
> buildings—as initial metaphors for structuring what is on the CDs. In both CDs, a reader
> can click on a digitized photograph of an artwork to see it in more detail and to learn
> about who made it. In both, a reader can learn about the people who built the collections,
> about why they started collecting, about their relationships with the artists whose work

they collected, and about how they came to construct the places that serve as the

metaphors for structuring the CDs (139-140).

It is important to note that these CD-ROMs are constructed similarly to the websites except that

the reader cannot necessarily learn about the people who built the collections, why they started

collecting, the relationships with artists whose work they collected, or how they came to

construct the places that serve as the metaphors for the CD-ROMs. These elements are more

likely to be found in the Cincinnati Art Museum's Website, rather than the Google Art Project's

Website, because they are trying to accomplish different rhetorical purposes and, as noted above,

want the visitor to "read" and use them differently.

As Handa and others have noted, webmasters must make many rhetorical considerations

when creating a website, including practical functionality, revisits, etc. According to Handa,

webmasters have a task "to understand and map the thinking processes reflected through the

choices involved in more complex Website construction" (7).   Handa begins by noting the

similarities between Bing and Google search pages stating "Looking *at* Google and Bing, then,

we notice that to streamline the search process in a special area, both sites have menus directing

visitors to images and videos, for example, or shopping maps" (69). The Google Art Project's

site, from its opening page, follows Google's ethos and has sliding images with a search bar and

a few links. The rhetorical move made by the site here is to show the ways this is similar to the

main Google search engine page that visitors are familiar with. The Cincinnati Art Museum

opens its webpage with a rotation of images and text that is clickable as visitors to the page want

to move through, similarly to how one might move through a live museum, stopping in specific

spots and taking as much time with each space as they desire.

Google and Bing are two search engines engaged in finding information for users. In her examination, Handa begins with the similarities between the two and the rhetorical setup of the websites. Both the Google Art Project and the Cincinnati Art Museum are spaces to search for art, with the fundamental difference being that the Cincinnati Art Museum Website is trying to promote itself and its events in addition to artwork. The designs of the webspaces are different as well. In keeping with its ethos of easy searches, the Google Art Project has several "Search" options when clicking off of the initial homepage, giving the visitor an experience where they are more in control as opposed to the Cincinnati Art Museum site, where visitors are encouraged to click on links. Unlike the Google Art Project, where the search box is in the middle of the page, on the Cincinnati Art Museum's site, often subcategories with links are provided to direct the visitor to specific places. This is because the rhetorical purposes of the spaces differ, one to replicate and one to engage.

Before further discussing these websites, I must first discuss the fundamental differences between visitor experience with digital and physical spaces. The physicality of the live space changes our experience with art. Malraux notes that "A Romanesque crucifix was not regarded by its contemporaries as a work of sculpture; nor Cimabue's *Madonna* a picture" (9) but notes that, instead, "They [museums] have imposed on the spectator a wholly new attitude toward the work of art" (9). This includes our understanding of art as a rhetorical form and a museum visitor's experience when seeing art in a museum. Not only does the museum contextualize art—framing each individual piece within larger narratives, but it also changes the piece. For example, a sculpture, while made to be viewed, was not necessarily crafted to be viewed in a building housed with and in relation to other artworks. Unlike ancient texts that were meant to be kept in libraries, the museum is a nineteenth century invention and is not where artifacts were

originally meant to be viewed. Items like ancient pottery and other artifacts that were used in daily life were not considered art or important artifacts, but daily tools for comfortable survival. The creation of these storehouses has changed the way we view these artifacts, as important and progressive historical achievements rather than crude tools.

Live and digital spaces are different for many reasons, but there are also different cultural norms and cultural cues within each form. For example, the act of being in a space—not just the physical space of the museum, but the space around the museum as well—affects the rhetorical understanding and narrative an individual visitor creates. Online spaces have cues built within communities like using all caps for "shouting" and negotiations of etiquette on message boards. Because respondents on a message board cannot see the nonverbal cues of the person or even the physical cues of walking away, online visitors must depend on strictly written cues for when a conversation has ended.

The live space of the museum offers shared experiences for the viewers, creating a sense of community, and often, reflecting the community. While the museum features history about the community (though, as shown in the previous chapter, not all of the history), it also creates a sense of community because visitors are all in a shared space, all present for the same reason and exploring the same narratives, while simultaneously interpreting and revising those narratives themselves. Other visitors in live space can affect the way a piece is interpreted. For example, even overhearing a conversation that others are having about a piece might help shape a visitor's opinion, or a visitor making facial gestures at one piece but not another, or even how long another guest examines one piece might influence what other patrons do and the way they examine and interpret different pieces. These spaces and this sense of community help form a kind of inauthentic public memory because everyone examines the narrative constructed by the

curators and the museum gatekeepers and either accepts that information as memory or rejects it, in which case they have very few opportunities for creating counternarratives without concentrated effort like creating grassroots museums or taking their grievances to the museum. As will be shown, the same is ultimately true of the digital space, but unlike many museums that have created live community grassroots museums in response, as well as artifacts within these museums[x], digital spaces, in their infancy, have not yet created many of these counternarrative communal spaces.

Digital Archives: The Google Art Project

As Walter Benjamin wrote in his "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction" in the 1930s, "In principle a work of art has always been reproducible. Replicas were made by pupils in practice of their craft, by masters for diffusing their works, and, finally, by third parties in the pursuit of gain" (217) and as seen with Franklin above, the issue of reproduction is still argued today. However, this is largely due to the question of what is lost in the reproduction of these works. As Benjamin also notes, "Even the most perfect reproduction of a work of art is lacking in one element: its presence in time and space…" (218) and the experience of a reproduction, even the reproduction of an entire building, is different than the original source material.

This is why digital archival spaces like the Google Art Project are meant to be the online embodiment of museums**.** While the digital space cannot match the live space, and while it has different rhetorical cues as shown in its functionality and design, its main rhetorical goal is to recreate the museum space and the artifacts within it. The live museum's main rhetorical goal is to simultaneously be an entertainment and education space[xi]. This site, similarly to the live

museum space, has the ability to preserve artifacts that may lead to the recovery of voices through memory, but this is not its function. In fact, unlike the live museum, its function is not necessarily to "preserve history" first, but is instead meant to recreate the museum space including its ethos and rhetoric.

These sites purposely create a rhetoric of re-creation. Like live spaces, digital spaces create their rhetorical meanings through design and usability. And, due to the media platforms on which they are housed, digital spaces use design and usability differently than traditional live or physical spaces. For example, the Google Art Project offers a "Street View" tour through many of the museums they have archived. This allows viewers who cannot make it to the live space to examine the museum in the closest possible digital format available. Through use of 360 degree camera angles and zoom-in options, the Google Art Project seeks to create a rhetoric of representation through design and usability options. This section does not mean to argue that the project succeeds or that these digital spaces are rhetorically identical to the live spaces, only that the rhetorical goal of the designers of these digital spaces is to recreate the live space. This is accomplished in two ways: through design and through usability.

When discussing design, we must first consider how the elements of digital design differ from the elements of designing a live space. Much of the design elements on the Google Art Project's Street View section have to do with usability since those sections are literally screenshots of the various rooms within the museum, however, the general site of the Google Art Project is similar to most traditional websites with the design enhancing the viewing experience. The general site, or the site that houses only artifacts (unlike the Street View option that takes the viewer "inside" the museum), begins with paintings taking up the majority of the screen—a clear rhetorical design to let the visitor know that the paintings, the artifacts, and the museums are the

80

primary focus of the site. There are several links at the top and the bottom of the page from which the viewer can navigate, but the main focus is still the art with easy-to-use links less visible than the artifacts on the site.

The general site is what Carolyn Handa would describe as one built on parataxis, which she points out, goes along with Google's philosophy as a corporation, stating that the Google company is one "built on parataxis and the ability to move associatively" (46). Handa uses the rhetorical term parataxis to describe a space that is less constrictive and more associative. As she notes, "…simply put: hypotaxis=hierarchical, trying to account for and rank every possible situation. Parataxis=unranked, allowing for equal importance and not compelled to subordinate" (45). Unlike a space built on hypotaxis, or a very restrictive form of order and function, spaces composed in a parataxis form allow visitors to move more freely through their own connections and their own keywords and search terms. Spaces built on parataxis, like Google spaces, allow viewers to see many options for finding information including thousands of link hits, images, and related news and videos. This type of space changes the viewer's experience because, like in the live space of the museum, it allows them to create their own opinions, narratives, and memories experience, and interpret on their own and, in the case of online community space, with others. The usability of Google is one of the key features of its parataxis design.

Thinking about usability, designers must think like museum visitors. While the design is largely dictated by the actual museum design and the curators, the usability of the digital space must be configured for a digital format by the web designers. Similarly to how the live space of the museum allows visitors to walk around the space and wander from one piece to another, the digital space allows this, but the usability is, naturally, different. In the digital format, this is done through the ability to click different pictures and bypass other pictures and artists by typing

a specific artist name or painting into a search bar. Instead of plaques providing extra information as in the live museum space, web designers must decide if they want to include a pop-up item, a link, or written hypertext in order to disseminate this information online. How many artifacts to include on one computer screen must be considered as well as the option to change how many artifacts can be viewed at once and questions of the order for artifacts are design and usability functions web designers must consider. Of course, these are issues the physical museum must also take into consideration, but the capabilities of the two spaces provide different usability and design possibilities.

When visiting the online space of the Google Art Project, usability is the first aspect that a visitor notices. Since the motivation of many visitors is to see important works, the visitor to the Google Art Project's Cincinnati Art Museum section would take advantage of the easy to navigate system and would likely use the search bar to type in the name of the painting or a famous artist they were interested in viewing, bypassing all of the other items in a way that is not physically possible in the live space of a museum. Though visitors can rush to a space and ignore artifacts, they must physically step through the museum, noting the tile, the walls, or whatever in the physical space they are viewing. This bypass ability changes the connection, scope, and experience of viewing art.

Also, visitors in the live space of the museum will have easy access to information plaques beside the piece. On the Google Art Project site, a visitor must click on a small information tab to get information about the individual piece and visitors will likely skip this since it requires more work than glancing at a plaque. Additionally, it breaks up the general function of looking simultaneously back and forth and side-by-side at the information and the

painting, with a loading screen and pop-up taking up the space creating a different viewing and learning experience.

While in the live space of the museum, additional information could be discovered by asking volunteers more about the pieces, in the digital space of the Internet, a visitor can click on more information tabs or even go to a new tab and do a larger web search about a painting, author, or art movement. Like the example above, this will also break up the viewing structure for the visitor but will allow a plethora of information at the viewer's fingertips, though it would not all be reliable.

An article written by Sarah Kimmerle states that "Roughly 2,000,000 people visit the Google Art Project each month…" and these are more than likely art lovers, people interested in exploring museums, or students working on art projects. Those visiting the Google Art Project are likely the same people visiting the Cincinnati Art Museum. For the casual viewer who uses this space to visit museums they do not have financial means to visit, they will likely only look at the paintings and not look any further at the information. This information would be helpful for students doing research on a certain artifact. However, the reproduction of artifacts is so common online that someone could easily bypass this space and simply look at a Google Image Search to find the artifact. What then, is the purpose of this project and who is it built for? There are no released figures for how many hits this digital space receives, so the purpose of this space and other spaces that are digital archival spaces like Artstor is, for web designers, to rhetorically recreate the museum. For the museums, participating in these digital endeavors is to give more people access to their works and museum space.

Issues of erasure that exist in the live museum also occur here, where visitors to the digital sphere are still subjected to the narrative the curators have created. Perhaps in a space

like the Internet—where there are many communities dedicated to political issues, and a company like Google who, while still a corporation, while still born from the Ivy League, places its ethos in the realm of sharing information in a fair manner. Perhaps because Google's purpose with this project is to create a space that is complimentary to the museum (as the director of the Google Cultural Institute, Amit Sood notes, the purpose of the project has never been to "replace" the museum, but rather to supplement it), they have not found the need to take issue with some of the erasure by the live space or to fix those erasures.

The Google Art Project's Street View is perhaps the only part that sets it apart from other digital archives. Though written in 2001, the Barnes CD-ROMs Wysocki describes in her study is setup similarly to the Google Art Project's Street View section, with a visual floorplan at the bottom and screenshots of the actual gallery space. Even the free movement is similar, as Wysocki notes, she can move in three ways, "I can click the 'Left' or 'Right' buttons that are below the wall to move in either direction; or I can move the mouse to the sides of the screen until the cursor changes to an arrow, and then click to move in that direction" (143). Despite the site's effort of easy access and full information even online, the Google Art Project does suffer from the same hierarchical and erasure issues of the live museum, including the setup of the museum in its entirety in the Google Street View sections of the museums and which items are deemed worthy of showcasing. This issue is amplified in the digital museum where only a limited number of items are showcased. Additionally, there are some visual distortions that take place due to camera angles and lighting in the Google Street View Section. These visual distortions create different memories of the museums and the artifacts within them than the live museum.

While the pieces of the museum may be remembered from the Google Street View tour of the museum, many visitors will remember the interface—the white lines, the concave blurred edges of floors and sometimes morphing of paintings due to camera angles. This does not ruin a visitor's experience, but it means that the online site itself becomes its own memory space—its own experience, much like the architecture and live space of the physical museum. Like all memory spaces, this space has a collective, public, and personal memory for people and serves groups of people differently. Webmasters are concerned with the specific technical elements and aspects of the site, museum curators are concerned with how the art is displayed and the order and way in which it is displayed, and visitors are concerned with usability and information available on the site much like an architect, curator, and visitor at a live museum would be. These design and usability elements are parts of the space's delivery. And while this site does use parts of delivery in design, it does not, as Handa notes, present something "akin to a theatrical or musical performance meant to be seen, heard, or experientially 'consumed' by an audience" (111) and the fact that this digital space does not take advantage of all of its capabilities proves that it is trying to strictly recreate the museum space.

Further, Handa notes that "While we can locate, identify, and 'see' a speaker, in most performances, rhetorical or otherwise, we can only—in any rhetorical delivery on a Web site—experience the performance itself, because it shows us no physical speaker, only traces of that deliverer/creator conveyed through sounds, words, and images…" (123). For the Google Art Project, the intention is simple: to allow visitors to easily access a digital museum. In an attempt to recreate the experience as closely as possible, the Google Art Project has also attempted to create zoom in options on many paintings (and plan to do it on many more in the future) in order to let visitors see the painting in a more detailed way as they would in the museum. The lighting

85

is visually different on a screen than in person—including the ways in which light changes both in person when one moves from place to place and in digital spaces when one adjusts the brightness of their screen or the tilt of their laptop or tablet screens.

Even these minute changes impact memory. Handa discusses her own memories of performance and notes that "we all have such memories of different events performed in a range of categories. But pinpointing what made them memorable is more difficult, that is, identifying specific qualities making them so" (113-114). And the same is true of viewing artwork, either in digital or live space. She also notes that "…once identified, however, we should also be able to translate these qualities, if need be, to their digital equivalences…" (114) and that "We must do so if we want 1) to consider a Web site as being capable of giving a digital performance, and then 2) to analyze exactly how its elements work, or don't work, in order to make a Web site's digital performance rhetorically effective" (114) and in the Google Art Project, there is not much happening rhetorically beyond a rhetoric of reproduction. The site keeps the original museum's Cincinnati Wing intact through its Street View feature, therefore keeping the ethos of the museum and its rhetoric of revival. The other sections that feature just the paintings in digital space are focused more on the individual pieces than on the art museum and exhibits as a whole, but their practical and rhetorical missions are also those of reproduction. While this chapter originally sought out the rhetorical differences between the live and digital space, it seems that the rhetoric of design and usability of the two spaces is what differs the most and this is due to them being different media and spaces. The one place these rhetorics are most noticeable to the viewer are in the realm of memory.

Changing the space, the design, and the usability also changes the memories created in the digital space. The only way for the rhetoric to really change in a digital medium is through

86

the design and usability of the site as well as how these design strategies lead to different individual and public memories than those in live space. The rhetorical moves made on the site might greatly differ to the idea of public memory and individual memory connections visitors to the digital site have with the pieces than those who visit the live space of the museum. Like the live museum, the digital museum on the Google Art Project does not currently foster a space of authentic public memory—but rather the memory the curators and museum staff wish to imply. Public memory, agreed upon and authentic memory, is not possible in spaces that are kept primarily by "gatekeepers."

The Google Art Project is designed to accommodate individual memory more so than an agreed upon "public memory" because people will likely be viewing in private spaces like homes. Since there is no space for direct interactivity with a "community," the viewer will likely create individual memories that a person will associate with the site, and, likely the museum itself. As Vera L. Zolberg notes when discussing the differences between public and individual memory, the discussion of these locations often focus on shared memory because they are shared narratives (however, shared histories must first be reasoned within individual memories), noting that "Social scientists are less concerned with the individual level, attending, rather, to the construction of shared histories or myths, and often with social, political, or economic consequences" (70). So while the shared memories are present in the city and possibly within the paintings, the digital realm is a new space to consider the idea of "memory" and certainly "public memory." As stated earlier, it parallels writing in a way that orality does not with its ability to serve as a reminder or memory space while simultaneously allowing for revisions and rereading of meaning.

In the online environment of the Google Art Project the viewer, like the items, is isolated from other viewers or the "community" that makes up these viewers. While the act of visiting the specific Cincinnati Art Museum on the site makes a viewer more connected to the Cincinnati Art Museum specifically, it does not enhance their interactivity with the community or help them become a member of the specific community or even a related online community. In exchange for this community, however, viewers are able to see items in isolation and are therefore able to connect with art in a way that they cannot in the live space of the museum. While some argue about the reproduction quality of the art, I argue that even that is secondary to what is gained when art can be viewed, not in a collection surrounded by walls of similar pieces that are deemed fit to be there by a curator, but in space that allows visitors to create their own narratives about the pieces. I do not mean in the misguided sense of misunderstanding a piece (this can also be done in the space of a live museum), but it allows viewers to see a piece uninhibited by larger narratives or means—perhaps in exactly the way Franklin hopes that viewers can see a piece—in its most natural artistic form. However, digital space is lacking the advantages of live space like the scope and details of artifacts, as well as interaction with other patrons.

Museum Websites: The Cincinnati Art Museum Website

The practical purpose of the Cincinnati Art Museum Website is to educate and store historical artifacts and the rhetorical purposes are similar. Unlike the Google Art Project and similar archival spaces, this site also gives information about the museum itself rather than just the artifacts within the museum. Like the archival spaces, this space can only show a limited number of paintings and some are unable to be shown due to copyright, so those paintings would obviously not be included for reasons of law and practicality. It is more difficult to discern then,

88

why some items that are not under copyright are displayed and others left out. Just like with the Google Art Project, the curators are often the ones giving direction for how to design the online spaces, but the ultimate decision is up to the web designer. While visitors can ultimately create their own path in many museums, including the Cincinnati Art Museum, how everything flows on the website as well as the usability of the space is determined by the designer; much like the flow of the live space of the museum is left up to the architects of the museum. However, curators have a separate power in the live museum that they do not hold in the digital space. In a live space, curators have a workable area that is already dictated for them. In a digital space, the possibilities of where to place items, how to place them, and how easy they are to maneuver is a different experience than in a place with bordered walls.

Like the Google Art Project, this site is constructed in a way that is easy for visitors to use, however, its rhetorical purpose—to be informative rather than a space to be explored—includes more direct tabs and labels. While the Google Art Project is structured more around ways to find information the visitor comes with (by including multiple tags and ways to "search" for specific artists, items, and artistic movements), this website is more rhetorically situated to assist a visitor who is often not sure what they are looking for. This has to do with the rhetorical purposes of an archive versus a museum website. An archive is meant to be a space to save items that may sometime be taken off the "shelf and looked at later." They are usually items the community knows about or at least instances they have an idea about that can be explored at a later date and time.

Unlike the Google Art Project, this site has potential for community building and voice recovery. This site brings the community together in the invitation to experience art. The Cincinnati Art Museum Website does have one feature—a new blog—that attempts to establish

some form of community interaction.   It is important to examine these issues because a lot of important work can be done online and is often equal to what can be done in a live space. Digital space has the ability to bring people together and organize in a way that is not possible in live space. Due to its temporal status as a place that is constantly in space and that can be accessed at any time, digital space allows visitors to communicate at any time with one another—even in delayed spurts. Adding this ability to organize in live space builds better civil action and participation.

The Cincinnati Art Museum Website, though still not fully engaging the community, is an information space that allows more directly for a "public memory" space due to its more direct ties to the museum and the community. However, the scope of an online space far exceeds the reach of a physical live space and therefore, the very definition of community alters greatly when discussing an online space like the Cincinnati Art Museum. Gaynor Kavanagh also discusses memory, noting that "Testimony can be a force aimed at social unity, through the ordering of lore and legitimization of the holding of power. It can also be employed to prompt pleasure and pride, terror and dire warnings" (41). Here Kavanagh is discussing oral storytelling, but it is also relevant to the history and purpose of art. While much art was created for aesthetic purposes, other pieces, like Pablo Picasso's *Guernica* were made for reflection and pieces made to force the reader to examine their beliefs.

As Zolberg notes, many see artwork as assuming a specific space in our cultural hemisphere, one that stands alone and outside of our history and our local communities due to its elite history and its purpose as a leisure activity. Likewise, Hibai Lopez-Gonzalez et al. discuss the ways in which a sport like football in Spain is a part of "national belonging, fan identity, or community engagement" (86) but they note that fans are often thought of and the community are

thought of from the perspective of their violent tendencies (riots, beatings, etc.) and I would argue that this stereotyping also happens to art within art museums. However, this is flawed thinking as many paintings, even classic paintings like Picasso's *Guernica*, are there to record and interpret history. Paintings were, after all, the first Polaroid and, like filters today, the painter could take liberties with the original to change the rhetorical elements within. And communities that create and house these activities are interested in preserving history, capturing culture, and, ultimately expressing the reality of the age in which the art is made.

Lopez-Gonzalez et al. define community as "the coalition of people who shares an identity, or to put it more simply, a group obsessed about the question 'who are we'" (87), but they note that "From an operational perspective an online community is described as 'a group of people with a common purpose whose interaction is mediated and supported by computer systems, and governed by formal and informal policies'" (87). Lopez-Gonzalez et al. describe these policies and norms, stating that "The web imports behaviors and customs to online discussion that are specific to the Internet—such as lurking. It is widely accepted that the vast majority of the members in online communities are *lurkers* that is, people who read and rarely participate but whose existence is anyhow 'desirable' for the health of the community" (87). They also note that "Trolls" and "flame warriors" enter these online communities simply to disrupt any meaningful discussion, something that, while sometimes happens with protestors in live community spaces, does not happen as easily or as often due to the anonymity that an online space provides. Though these disruptive members are not around in the Cincinnati Art Museum Website due to their current lack of a solid online community, these are issues that may become a problem in the future if the community element is built up on the sites.

Building on Handa's earlier explanation of hypotaxis and parataxis, this site is more based on hypotaxis because it is a rhetorically and functionally more straightforward site and is meant to be a space to get information about the museum itself. Because users come without their own information, the orderliness and mitigation of items is more necessary for its purpose. The museum website is a vastly different rhetorical space even more separated from the live space of the museum than the archival spaces of the Google Art Project because, while visitors to the museum are looking for information, they usually want to be there as well, which may not be the case with someone visiting the Cincinnati Art Museum Website.

While the archival space of the Google Art Project is more connective with the idea of individual memory due to the isolation of viewers, the Cincinnati Art Museum Website space is a place of public memory, not necessarily because it is constructed by the public, but it is the information the public is given and may influence public thought about the museum. Unlike the Google Art Project Website, which is concerned primarily with digitally reproducing artifacts, the Cincinnati Art Museum Website is concerned with the idea of the museum itself, perhaps in a way that not even the live space presents. Though the live space features many plaques with information about the building, the history is not as easily found, or as quickly read, as the "About Us" and "History" tabs that are easily, and hypotaxically, placed on the website.

Like the Google Art Project's Website follows Google's company ethos, so too does the Cincinnati Art Museum's Website. The museum's goal is to not only inform and entertain the public, but also to engage with them. Like the Google Art Project, this site does not offer all of the museum's items, however, in this instance, and from a business perspective, this could be seen more as a motivator to have visitors come and view the remaining artifacts. This site does not offer a specific glimpse of the Cincinnati Art Wing, with the "Browse the Collection"

hyperlink immediately taking the viewer to "Collection Highlights" which features several vases and woodwork at the opening. This section has a dropdown menu that allows the visitor to browse through several different sections including "American Decorative Arts," "European Decorative Arts," and "Arts of Africa" among many others.

Unlike the live space of the museum, this digital space is less susceptible to cries of erasure due to the limited scope of their collection online here and due to their rhetorical function as a space that is meant to inform about the museum than necessarily about the artifacts there. Additionally, this space includes links to information about the museum and community events under the "News" and "Calendar" sections, both of which are featured on the right side in sideways brightly colored tabs to highlight them for the viewer. The webmaster likely did this in order to encourage visitors to take part in the community efforts of the museum, therefore actually encouraging more community participation and discouraging methods of erasure. However, some contestation could occur when one considers what the online site (as well as the live museum) considers "Collection Highlights." Not only does one have to consider how these items are chosen as the highlights of the museum, but must also consider, as in the Google Art Project's site, how these items are organized and why some items are featured ahead of others.

The site attempts to make the space more accessible to the community through usability and design but also through their use of social media sites including Twitter, Facebook, and Instagram. These spaces allow for the museum to not only post about special events, including community events, but these digital spaces are also spaces of digital discourse where visitors may interact with those who represent the museum by posting comments and asking questions. This allows visitors to build communities in these spaces. The official nature and cohesiveness of these communities may be questionable, and this is an issue that will be grappled with in the

next chapter. While social media sites are populated by members of all generations and age groups—with many of those who grew up with the first social media sites now reaching middle age—teens and young adults who attend exhibits from an earlier age may continue attending throughout their lives. Also, according to demographics from museum studies by those like John H. Falk, most museum attendees are parents with children, meaning that the young adults who may have children soon will be more aware of the programs and events offered by the museum. As Luigina Ciolfi, and Liam J. Bannon note:

> We believe that as the field of Interaction Design develops, there is an enlargement of the research object, with an expanding focus, not longer solely studying utility and usability of artefacts and environments, but extending to include more aspects of the user experience of these objects and environments. This interest in the user experience does not reduce to an attempt to 'design' the user experience in some explicit fashion, but it does take on board a sensitivity to the lived experience of people, and acknowledges the ways in which existing places have meanings for people which are an intrinsic aspects of their knowledge of these objects and spaces (160).

Including visitors to these social media spaces in community events and even keeping them updated on community events will allow visitors to learn more about the space of the live museum as well as the artifacts within it. This knowledge could also have the potential to assist viewers in noticing missing voices from the narrative or examining the rhetorical efforts the museum makes that may or may not include specific voices while excluding others.

The collections are arranged in a way that visitors have no way of knowing which piece they are looking at in an orderly way, so visitors are examining and experiencing the art in a similar form of "discovery" that they would experience in the live space of the museum. Forms

of both public and private memory are encouraged in this space, though the main rhetorical stance is geared toward public memory because it is a space that openly announces public events and triumphs from within the community. This space, unlike the space of the Google Art Project, is also geared toward a more specific community reaching out largely to patrons within the city of Cincinnati.

Conclusion

The true ramifications of collecting and displaying historical artifacts in a digitized form on the Internet have yet to be seen. Though some may worry about issues of a loss of security, a loss of authenticity, and a loss of prestige, others will note the democratization and learning opportunities encouraged by these new technologies in step with the live space. Julian Stallabrass makes perhaps the best claim for digitization of these important historical artifacts, stating that

> The net has the potential to be the ultimate archive, the repository of all human
> knowledge, opinion, and culture, yet it combines that ideal with an aggressively amnesiac
> urge. It could be the perfect memory system with everything ever uploaded stored,
> digital and thus unchanging, a Library of Alexandria for the contemporary age but
> without the fragility (or flammability) of books (44).

While the digitization efforts of museums are encouraging democratization of learning, they still carry with them the inherent hierarchical and erasure issues of the live museum. However, through their capabilities and digital sites, along with their live counterparts, they have an opportunity to assist museums in rectifying these issues.

CHAPTER FOUR

ENGAGING COMMUNITY

Days and weeks after a devastating outbreak of storms rocked the Southeastern United States in April of 2011, after everyone's injuries had been accounted for, and all the rubble had been removed, the next issue on everyone's minds was the artifacts found—artifacts and personal belongings blown for miles across towns and state lines. These documents—letters, photos, other small items, and even pets—had somehow made it through the rampant winds, but now needed a way to come back to their owners. Since there were no direct ways to contact strangers in this increasingly unlisted world, these people with documents in their yards decided the best way to notify people that their items had survived was to post the items (or information about these items) on social media websites. Due to its platform, Facebook's group feature was used in many instances and these groups were joined by those who had been victims of the storm or people who knew others in the storm—a large group of people trying to blindly put together the pieces and artifacts that traced a person's life. This was a community effort that spanned well beyond the normal confines of "community" that describes those within proximity—the type of community that spans regions, states, and nations. Instead, the movement was largely spurred by the ability of social and digital media to connect people over large distances, or even those who lived close but were strangers in everyday life.

I use this example to show how artifacts can be disseminated and rediscovered through digital platforms and by community members. Similarly, community and public artwork and artifacts can be shared and disseminated in order to recreate records of truth and counternarratives not found in formal museums like the Cincinnati Art Museum or digital

archival spaces like the Google Art Project. That is not to say that the live space of the museum

and the live and digital space of the archives are not useful in these endeavors. This chapter will

examine the ways in which community art projects and digital art efforts allow community

members—whose narratives, voices, and artifacts are often left out of museal spaces or used

inauthentically to create a forced and false narrative about the community or group—to reclaim

their voices and histories. While these efforts are ultimately carried out within these physical

communities, there are many instances where voices, connections, and information are

disseminated through digital space. Working from Freire's principle of the rhetoric of dialogue,

I use the work of Karen Hutzel and Alison Hsiang-Yi Liu to argue that these initiatives can

create a more democratic space for forgotten histories and narratives as well as encouraging

community involvement and youth engagement. Utilizing both live and digital spaces, the

subjects and communities—not just curators and visitors—have the opportunity to discuss their

stories, their artwork, and their livelihoods.

The live space of the museum and the live and digital space of archives provide museum

visitors with a snapshot of a city and a nation's history, but these are not the only histories—and

in some cases, these are not the only nations. Many recent studies have examined how museums

are reaching out to try to work in tandem with the various groups they seek to represent (see

Swan & Jordan 2015), but many groups are also creating their own museums and spaces through

grassroots efforts. While recovery work for voices is happening at live museum spaces and at

the digital spaces that represent those live spaces, the digital realm brings with it many new

features and ways of including voices that might have previously been left out of the narrative.

Like the previous chapter, this one focuses on the digital and all of its possibilities when creating

more community spaces for art.

In an interdisciplinary project like this, it is important that I consider the role of museum scholars and curators outside of my field in their own interactions with the community. Jack Lohman, notes that "Museums do an enormous amount of good work for the community" (69) and Marlen Mouliou agrees in her "From Urban Blocks to City Blogs" stating that, "Over the last ten to fifteen years, a great deal of effort has been put into enhancing the connection between urban communities, and today, innovative (and successful) museum practice is becoming much more common" (157). But what are these new "innovative" museum practices Mouliou speaks of?

They can be found in a museum's mission, according to Mouliou, who notes that "Increasingly, the task of a museum is to deal not only with the past of the city, but its present and future as well, in order to contribute actively to the city's development and help reinforce a sense of place and identity" (157). She notes that there are five functions city museums follow

- Museums can give a sense of order to urban chaos

- They can act as hallmarks of urban identity and traditions

- They are vehicles for urban regeneration or at least they can help halt urban deterioration

- They can be symbols of urban historic heritage

- They can be meeting grounds for socially different groups (157)

This list shows the possibilities of city museums but not necessarily how they function. These possibilities—including digital possibilities, are what I want to examine in this chapter. It is also important to note that these functions are written from the perspective of museum studies and not necessarily the artists within the art world. The museum is a separate rhetorical space from individual artworks and is entrusted with creating its own ethos. This ethos can be one of

exclusion and ignoring urban historical realities or can be a space that simultaneously celebrates its art history while also being inclusive of marginalized voices in the past and present.

If, as many of the museum scholars here have noted, the mission of museums and their interactions with communities is to help determine the future of the city, then of course the museum would have to involve the citizens of the community, especially those who have not held traditional power within museums like lower class and minority populations. In her 1999 article "Elitism in the Stories of US Art Museums: The Power of a Master Narrative" Carol David notes that brochures, pamphlets, and exhibitions were (and still are) attempting to get community members to visit and become involved with the museum but states that the problem with these outreach tools is that they rely on "insider" information and knowledge of the museum and only "speak" to those who already frequent museums rather than targeting those who do not attend (David 327). This is a place where online spaces, especially, could help with democratization and allow more possibilities for community involvement and voice recovery. For example, Mouliou notes that blogs are a positive step for museums because they

> Provide commentary or news, not only as partisan gossipers, but also as fast sensors of changes and as disseminators of key information in the public domain. They take the form of user-generated content and open-source journalism, allowing readers to leave comments and other material in an intrusive format. They take a non authoritative tone and are more democratic, open to debate, independent, and wide ranging. They give readers new perspective son various topics and offer different viewpoints from those of official news sources; thus they can potentially shape public views and attitudes (158).

And this is an important point to remember when considering ways that electronic resources like blogs can help museums further their outreach and communication with the community.

David also describes the realities of life within museal spaces including infighting and other issues that hinder a museum's ability to fully represent and reach out to the local community. She discusses the clash that often happens between directors and elite boards, citing one unnamed museum where the director was interested in targeting the local population and their interests, but the board disagreed. This disagreement led to the director stepping down (David 324). She explains that some of these tensions manifest from a lack of understanding and collaboration, noting that "Like the boards of some other nonprofit organizations, such as universities, the members do not democratically represent the groups they serve nor are they always selected from experts in the organizations' subject areas" (323). This anecdote is likely happening around the country which is why it is important for the members of the community to also take an active role in their museums.

But David notes that this is a difficult reality because many in the general public do not have familiarity with the museum or what its function is beyond a recreational space to view art and artifacts. David states that "Museums invite the public inside through special exhibitions; however, the exterior architecture of the older museums and the strict rituals of museum behavior may not be inviting to those unfamiliar with museum attendance" (328). This elitism is one trait the Cincinnati Art Museum excels in combatting because much of the museum does not have ropes or glass cases shielding the art. However, not having these precautions is also a sign of inclusivity of specific museum members who understand the rules of the museum to "look but not touch" the art. But even if community members do not have access to the board, community members can take action and air their grievances to the board.

Creating new tools to improve community and museal relations, it seems, is an important part of the future of museum studies. David leaves us with a stark reminder that "despite the

conflicting purposes and operations that exist…the power of a master narrative, which for art museums conveys an overarching image of elitism, remains dominant despite many activities to democratize" (319). Looking at some of the tools mentioned by museum scholars like Mouliou and David, this chapter hopes to show ways that digital spaces have assisted communities in the recent past and how these spaces are currently being used in museums, citing the positive and negative findings of these current spaces.

In addition to museum studies, it is important to see how this project aligns with the field of composition studies. Looking at the work of one museum studies scholar, John Pedro Schwartz, we can see that their ultimate goal is not that different from those in composition and rhetoric. Schwartz notes in his "Object Lessons: Teaching Multiliteracies through the Museum" that he is calling for increased education and literacy for community members. His call is not for a new literacy, or what he dubs "museum literacy", but rather a pedagogy that "uses the museum as a means for teaching the five literacies that are already or rapidly becoming central to our curriculum: verbal, visual, technological, social, and critical" (29). His call, as a museum studies scholar, is similar to Carolyn Handa's call for more education and attention to digital rhetoric, showing the intersection of ideas and disciplines. Handa describes digital rhetoric as

> [S]imply (or maybe not so simply) traditional rhetoric applied visually as well as textually. It is not another form of rhetoric. We do not switch from digital to traditional rhetoric. All of the components we are accustomed to discussing in traditional rhetoric, especially having to do with style and arrangement for the purposes of conducting logical, discursive, persuasive arguments, are elements that can occur visually. Digital rhetoric—the rhetoric that covers multimediated documents—builds on, uses the same cues as, already existing forms of traditional rhetoric (18).

She explains that the omnipresence of the Web in our modern lives requires that we become better versed and educated in digital rhetoric, specifically when examining websites like those in museums. It seems that there is an intersection in both disciplines (as well as many other disciplines) in a call for more education in the arts and rhetoric. Ultimately both disciplines feel that not enough public education is spent on these important learning tools.

This chapter is built around a fundamental principle: that museums should represent the communities they serve by assisting in the recovery of community voices that have been marginalized. It is important to begin by considering what representation is and what the traditional museum's goals and responsibilities are when purchasing and curating artwork. For example, the Cincinnati Art Museum's Cincinnati Wing is meant to be a celebration of the beginning of the Cincinnati art scene. This examination seeks to answer the question of what happens, both rhetorically and visually, when groups get together to participate in these artistic forms of voice recovery.

One step beyond just community participation in the consumption of these art pieces is the participation of voice recovery through these community practices. The purpose of museums has been fluid throughout history, so a museum's "purpose" is not only debatable, but likely to change over the course of time. As museums have discovered, visitors have multiple interests when visiting museums but are all a part of a similar art visiting community. The museum's survival depends on the ability to change to the needs and uses of visitors.

While those who visit museums to see items they have never seen before will be satisfied with a first visit, there is no guarantee that they will come back to the museum if they do not feel a connection to the work there and if the space is not changing and growing. It is the same reason the Google Art Project is constantly adding new museums and incorporating new viewing

technologies, search options, and digital exhibits. One aspect both of these archival spaces are missing, however, is the ability to reach the community and the visitors directly. This chapter is built around two case studies including one live art initiative and one digital form of art initiative. Not only do these studies give us different examples of direct community involvement and voice recovery, but, in many instances, they also fulfill Freire's mission of an inclusive dialogue. These case studies are Karen Hutzel's examination of a community art project and Alison Hsiang-Yi Liu's examination of three museum blogs and will be discussed at length below. I chose these two studies because they are not only case studies conducted by those outside of composition and rhetoric, meaning that they are examining the spaces in ways that are different from composition and rhetoric, but they are ultimately working to discover the same information: how these spaces create community. The Hutzel piece, in particular is relative to my project because it takes place in the city of Cincinnati and shows that there are many community movements toward reclamation projects within the city. Hsiang-Yi Liu's piece is important because, unlike many other studies on blogs, hers examines several blogs and notes the ways the blogs succeed and fail at engaging visitors—something not many other studies do.

Cincinnati Playground Art Project

Hutzel discusses her involvement in a community art project in which she worked with students set to reclaim a playground that had been lost to gangs. Hutzel notes that her study "intends to create change, empower participants, and deconstruct single voices of authority through critical practice" (303) and she cites Freire and hooks who "argued for a collective critical practice, in which there is more than one single voice of authority" (303). Hutzel notes that "She [hooks] promotes the deconstruction of a privileged voice through collective critical

103

practice, which re-emphasizes the role of social networks and group learning in a community context" (303) and this is especially important when we consider communities that are deconstructed and not living within the bounds of a specific area or near one another—including the digital realm. Though Hutzel is not in the field of education, she connects art and pedagogy as well as the ways in which rhetorical acts of art can help students gain confidence and understand their community and the ways art has the power to help them reclaim their own spaces or voices within a city that has ignored them. Her study is connected more directly to the field of composition and rhetoric because she is interested in how the rhetoric of these spaces and the artwork created within them can empower students and communities.

Hutzel cites three ways of entering communities with outsider status that are important for museums trying to become more involved in the recovery of marginalized voices within the community to consider. As already established, museums are within the community, and therefore should be looked upon as active members. But, traditional museums often have "outsider" status because they do not represent the current community and, due to biases in history, do not have collections equally representing community members.

In order to help museums enter the community conversation, Hutzel presents three ways of entering communities with outsider status, first, by claiming and understanding outsider status; second, by implementing an asset-based community art curriculum; and third, by using an action research methodology—what Hutzel describes as a methodology "structured to actively engage participants, including [herself] in the community [of the West End] through art" (304) and to bring "attention to ethical issues of researcher trust and responsibility by considering the participants as equal contributors" (304). For the museum, this might include adding discussion features to digital collections or allowing active message boards on websites.

104

Hutzel shows how she enacted these entrance tactics in her examination and participation in a community art project with young children from a low-income, violent neighborhood in the city of Cincinnati. The project involved reclaiming a playground that had been overtaken by gangs. The students decided to accomplish this by creating two murals within the playground, noting that this act would show the community that they had rhetorically taken control over the space and reclaimed an area whose purpose was for children's play but had recently been used to sell drugs and settle gang turf wars. As she notes in the study

> It is argued that oppressive situations have developed strong collective identities and social capital among residents, which can lead to the development of community art as a catalyst for social change and inform community-based art education. An asset-based community art curriculum was implemented and two murals were developed (299).

In order to accomplish this mission, she uses her three entrance tactics.

She begins the article by claiming her own outsider status to the reader, noting that she is a white middle class woman who is from the Cincinnati area, but not from the low-income community she is working in. She notes that she only lived in the community a few years prior to and during this project. Hutzel implemented her own method of owning outsider status by first going into the community and speaking to them about the community, the people who lived there, and how the art project might help the community. She asked what they hoped the project would accomplish rather than telling them the purpose of the project, and as she notes, "I had to learn to listen and continue to build relationships in the community prior to becoming a contributing member of the community and to being able to conduct a research study with them" (300). She attended community council meetings and states that her race and demeanor in these spaces solidified her as an outsider, but once she began speaking with members of the

community, acknowledging her outsider status and listening to the community, her efforts were recognized as more genuine and the community started acknowledging her project.

The next step she followed in her own model was implementing an asset-based community art curriculum which she did through her work with students in creating the mural. She notes that many of these students, like the other residents in the area, were used to being moved from their homes due to urban "development" and were also taught in schools to privilege communal learning and relationships more than individual identities, something Hutzel sites as an important component to low-income marginalized communities (Hutzel 302). The ability for these students to work on this project in a group is important to their communal well-being and their community identity. This project not only helps these students with their identity and community, but it also changed the way students initially saw their community, changing their initial opinions. As Hutzel shows, the students saw their community as a safe space but thought their neighborhood was dirty and dangerous. Therefore, the students saw their communities as assets but needed encouragement and change to see the live space of their neighborhood that way. This project helped to accomplish that goal, changing the rhetorical stigma of the physical space of the neighborhood in the eyes of the students. The final step was to use an action research methodology which she did by allowing students to be the main contributors to the space and even allowing those who claimed to have no painting or drawing skill to describe their ideas and have a skilled artist draw their vision. The students were responsible for designing the items that went into the mural and were consistently asked about every aspect of the project.

Though this project is not necessarily serving a large population in comparison to the Google Art Project, this mural is a piece of art that will live within the public and individual

106

memory of community members. This piece of art, unlike those housed in an art museum, and unlike those in a digital space, is dependent on both cues from other viewers as well as individual cues since some will see the mural with others and some will see it alone. Additionally, a public mural differs from a museum space because it is not within a collection, but is rather, like a monument, its own rhetorical action. The appearance and items within the mural will also live within the public and private memory of viewers. Many of the items within the mural relate to the students' dreams for the future, including a rocket ship, a basketball hoop, a football going through a goal and becoming a rocket, and a little girl winning a track meet and holding the American flag on her body.

These rhetorical symbols of hope in a neighborhood that before did not offer these students such hope, is one way in which students recovering their own voices through hopes and goals creates a counternarrative to the other crime-ridden spaces of the neighborhood. Unlike a museum, this project did not have to claim "outsider" status because it was completed by members of the community. These community members took control of their own voice within the community through these art pieces. The students flipped the script on what the neighborhood had been and made the space their own, reclaiming their own voices in the process. Though with all of the "revitalizing" of the city, the mural is likely no longer present, for a time, these students learned that they could reclaim their own space. But the easy erasure and difficulty rebuilding live space is one issue that digital spaces do not have.

As already mentioned, the main purpose of this chapter is to show the ways in which live and digital spaces could be better utilized to create more community spaces. For this, Hutzel presents four forms that will assist with bringing together communities through social media, through digital archive spaces, through blogs, and through grassroots and community art spaces.

107

The first two, social media sites and digital archive spaces, are already being utilized by art museums and organizations in the digital realm and I have just discussed grassroots and community art spaces. Blogging is perhaps one of the best first steps to creating more inclusive digital spaces that may someday lead to more community engagement in the future.

Three Museum Blogs

Hsiang Yi-Liu's examination of these spaces is ultimately concerned with marketing and patronage. She notes that the purpose of her study is to examine whether or not blogs have the potential to engage the public and help build communities that will ultimately lead to patronage. The study was conducted in the early and mid-2000s, using blogs that had been around from as early as 2004 to the time Yi-Liu published her article in 2008. She notes that these websites were selected because they were well known and well-funded blog projects, meaning that the project would be stable and would not suddenly disappear as often happens in the digital realm. She selected three blogs for three spaces, which she refers to as "Case A," "Case B," and "Case C" and which I will refer to as its museum name in order to quell confusion.

In her study, Hsiang-Yi Liu sets out to discover whether or not blogging could attract more museum visitors. Her study relates to mine because it begins with an examination of the connection between online communities, museums, and therefore, the democratization of museums through online spaces. As Hsiang-Yi Liu states, she chose blogs because they are in some ways contradictory to museums, stating that "Museums conventionally play the role of an authority that interprets knowledge whereas blogs resist ideological monopolies and pursue information reciprocity" (258-259). This means that a merger of the two spaces—one authoritative and the other more democratic—could create a new collaboration effort that

108

simultaneously contributes to more community and visitor involvement while not jeopardizing the historical integrity of the traditional space of the museum.

One question that remains is whether it is important to create these communities. Hsiang-Yi Liu even asks "Is it necessary to set up an additional online community such as a blog" (260) since museums already have online websites to disseminate information? She immediately notes that it is important because "An official website and a blog differ in that the latter is a form of community-based website that embraces the core values of liberalism and open sharing" (260) and this is a very important endeavor if the goal is to create more inclusive traditional museum spaces. And while some would undoubtedly argue that we do not need these inclusive traditional museum spaces, previous scholarship and the appearance of more grassroots museum efforts show that there is not only a willingness for these spaces, but also a need.

Her full study examines three museum websites—what she describes as "two official community websites and a museum blog" (260). She begins with "Case A," the Royal Botanic Gardens London site (from here called "Royal Botanic Gardens") and notes that "As a national resource for botanic studies it was rich in academic materials but unconnected to regional and local communities" (260). For this type of non-aligned museum, meant to serve a larger population, digital media would be a way to connect individuals over great distances and to connect people with varying opinions, ideas, and cultures, creating a community space that allows cultural exchange and argument and mutual learning. Creating a digital media form like a blog for this type of environment would be one way of connecting multiple communities at once.

Similarly to the Cincinnati Art Museum, the museum also included those within physical proximity to the museum—a space to think more critically about the museum and other members of the community by "hosting a series of workshops in their respective cities with the aim of

consolidating relations with local communities" (260) and that "Museum staff were given the

task of collecting stories from local people and establishing community networks to extend

regional services" (261). Yi Liu notes that through this, the website was able to "infuse local

sentiment, feelings and experiences into its knowledge repository" (261), however, she notes that

despite these efforts, the website "remained stagnant after the website launch" (261). She

explores several possibilities for this, including that the stories featured on the site were not

featured as dialogue—each edited by the collective gatekeepers of the museum and its

webmasters and she states that "…users accessing the website for research… may benefit greatly

from the resources, the content is…not satisfactory for those community members who provided

the original stories since it functions as a static exhibition not a platform for lively interaction"

(261-62). This example is just one that exemplifies why it is important to follow Hutzel's

guidelines for entering communities through "outsider" status. If the museum had acknowledged

their place as an outsider, they may have been better able to facilitate conversations from

multiple members of the community, seeking out not only their stories, but also responses to one

another's stories. This form of online engagement also leaves out Hutzel's other guidelines

about implementing an asset-based community art curriculum and an action research

methodology because there is no clear effort made to connect directly with the community in the

first place.

The next website Hsiang-Yi Liu examines, or "Case B" (from here named the "Victoria

and Albert") is from the Victoria and Albert Museum and is titled *Every Object Tells a Story*

which, Hsiang-Yi Liu notes, "tells stories about museum objects on display" (263). She notes

that this site asks museum visitors to compose personal stories online based on artifacts in the

museum similarly to the Book of Memories in the Cincinnati Art Museum (Hsiang-Yi Liu 263)

and that "Case B has stimulated visitor memories and accumulated a plentiful resource of grassroots stories" (263), however, she states that

> The content that visitors compile mostly communicates private memories and concerns, not collective ones. Since some stories are not linked to objects they do not invite curiosity or encourage feedback…the majority of participants post personal reports and do not join in collective narratives (263)

If the goal is to create a community memory then this website, while engaging, has failed to create a fully communal experience. It does follow Hutzel's guidelines of entering through outsider status by acknowledging that it houses the artifacts and allows visitors to share their thoughts and memories. It has also implemented an asset-based community art curriculum of sorts by allowing museum goers to recognize how these items relate to them and their lives, but it has failed to create action because the information—though contributed by community members—is still one-sided. They are strictly the memories of individuals with no further discussion from others or contestation, agreement, or reminiscing (all action values that help build communities).

What Hsiang-Yi Liu names "Case C" (from here called "Minnesota") was a website that belonged to the Science Museum in Minnesota. She explains that this blog "consists of daily updates of scientific information, museum exhibitions, local concerns and global events" (263) and that "Registered visitors can post new topics and visual images on the platform as well as museum staff. This blog does not resemble a knowledge repository. Instead it acts as an open discussion forum for museum staff and visitors to share ideas" (263). Unlike the previous websites, this one features a way for visitors to communicate directly, not only with one another, but also with staff. She notes that the ability to access topics even after they have been present

for years allows visitors to continue contributing and for the site and the museum to continue collecting ideas from the community. She also states that the staff notes that the site does not require much upkeep, only a few hours a week to review and reply to messages (Hsiang-Yi Liu 263-64). This case succeeds in building community because it includes all three of Hutzel's guidelines for community interaction and manages to do it all while online.

The museum acknowledges its own status by presenting science-related topics from its own perspective and knowledge base, but then asks others within the community to contribute and present their own thoughts on these items. While the staff still controls the content, they do not control the ability of members to present counterarguments and new information that might contest what they have presented or to reinforce what they have presented as true (within reason—there is still the ability to delete comments, but this is the same for live museums where community members could silence other members). Through allowing the community to present its own versions of knowledge or to contribute to knowledge, it follows the asset-based approach to community building by letting the community know that they have important insights into important scientific developments and issues that impact our world. It also follows Hutzel's third guideline by creating an action-based space. The community is an online community of members from different places around the country, but not only does the space "allow action" by encouraging members to present counternarratives, include more information, or interact with one another, but the topics and the conversation created by these topics allow for the community to configure ways to combat problems presented here (i.e. climate change). The action discussion allowed on this site may lead to other forms of action—both online and within live space. The online space is typically best suited to creating action through its ability to navigate

and recruit people to take steps in live spaces, so this qualifies for the type of action that is undertaken by online spaces.

Hsiang-Yi Liu examined this site in 2008 and the site is still around but has changed some of its setup and the ways it facilitates community involvement, but they still follow Hutzel's guidelines and manage to build community because the core values—acknowledging outsider status, including an asset-based community art curriculum, and using an action research methodology—are still present. On one of the most recent posts on April 2015, there is only one comment, but this will likely increase as members can continue (and do) to comment on topics for years. And because the site requires members to register, it is often the same members responding, which in turn allows visitors to "get to know" one another and each other's thoughts online. Because the blog is asking questions that often involve communities beyond their own in Minnesota, commenters can be from around the country though some of the blog topics are meant to compliment the live space of the museum. The fact that visitors can discuss topics with one another and with staff also allows visitors to argue with the presented information and the presented narrative.

The strength of this blog or Minnesota, according to Hsiang-Yi Liu, is that it is "mainly authored by museum staff who provide articles about museum exhibitions and topics pertaining to people's everyday concerns" (266) and she notes how they acknowledge and build upon their persona as an authoritative figure by trying to distance themselves from that presentation, stating that "This museum clearly does not run the platform independently. Instead, it plays the role of moderator in a forum and induces member discussion on shared concerns in a forum that enhances online community collaboration" (266). In this way, this site works similarly to artists who helped students in Hutzel's study realize their vision for the murals by painting it for them.

The students shared their vision, but many of them were not comfortable painting because they felt they did not have those skills. The museum acts similarly and presents these topics in a scholarly manner and then opens them up in ways for the public to discuss and bring their own ideas while moderating the conversation. According to Hsiang-Yi Liu, the staff who runs the Minnesota blog also takes from comments posted by members, noting that one blog began with "Recently an anonymous visitor posted the question 'Why haven't I seen any fireflies over the last few summers? That got me thinking, and I realized that I haven't seen many fireflies, either…" (qtd. in Hsiang-Yi Liu 266). She states that this, along with constant updating and participation via community interaction, cultivates more community participation and that "In the long run, this engenders a common sense of history and identity among members, and ensures the community develops steadily so" (267) and this is the power of digital media and an example of the best it has to offer museums and their visitors and various communities.

Yi Liu ultimately notes that Royal Botanic Gardens, similarly to the Google Art Project and even the Book of Memories in the Cincinnati Art Museum "emphasizes transforming physical participation into virtual display. It put a physical community online but does not engage with the essence of online community" (265) and that "This sort of website cannot act as a channel for people to express themselves and become involved in a museum" (265). Similarly, the second site creates interaction but it is often one-dimensional with little interaction among community members beyond simply reading one another's stories. As Hsiang-Yi Liu notes

> Simply put, Case A [Royal Botanic Gardens] is more oriented to the physical while Case
> B [Victoria and Albert] is more oriented to the virtual. As for the gap between the
> website and reality, their communities do not appear to have crossed the boundary yet.

Case C [Minnesota], on the other hand, uses a blog as the starting point for community

activities and features issues of concern to all citizens that encourage participation (265)

Furthermore, she notes that "Case C [Minnesota] uses a virtual platform as an interactive

medium and the website's proactive role means it is an adequate pipeline for visitors to express

themselves" (265)—a channel that also enables visitors to question narratives as they are

presented by the museum.

Yi Liu's findings are just a beginning example of how museums can begin digitally

connecting with and working with the community. Yi Liu states that there will be resistance to

these forms of interactions. She notes the concern some museums have of the Internet making

people avoid coming to the live space of the museum, but states that this should not be a concern

because if using these technologies in tandem, it could encourage more visitors explaining that,

"First, existing museum websites could operate with blogs in a complimentary manner to jointly

reinforce the main function of communication…In addition, the museum experiences that online

users accumulate from participating in a general blog community may motivate them to visit it

[the museum] themselves" (269). Additionally, while these spaces allow for comments and

spaces to present counternarratives, there is still an ultimate "master narrative" present in these

digital interactions. These "master narratives," however, can be dispelled by a community of

people receiving the counternarrative information. When presented from other narratives, even

from user comments, visitors can investigate these claims and can discover other realities or

narratives not present in these spaces.

In order to better connect to their own community, The Cincinnati Art Museum started its

own blog site in October 2011, several months after the Google Art Project's site appeared, but it

receives considerably less comments and community interaction than the Minnesota site in Yi Liu's study. The first post begins with

> Isn't this beautiful? The website, I mean. Welcome to the new digital version of the Cincinnati Art Museum. We wanted this site to represent who we are, and how we bring people and art together. We wanted something that was elegant and open, easy to read and full of information, something that would frame the great works of art, exhibitions, and public programs we do in a forceful way, but that would also be easy and accessible"
> (Cincinnati Art Museum Website)

This introduction already tells the reader that its purpose is to connect people and art; however, upon looking at the blog, one quickly finds that the majority of entries are about the museum and its programs in the live space of the museum. Unlike the Minnesota science blog, many of the topics in the art museum, while interesting, are geared toward the everyday workings of the museum which leaves little space for community involvement. While it is a great way to include people already interested in the history of the museum, it does very little to discuss issues within the community, and, unlike the Minnesota blog, it does not engage with the people who do include participatory comments. This blog site is similar to Royal Botanic Gardens and Victoria and Albert, because, like Victoria and Albert, it does allow people the freedom to comment and, like Royal Botanic Gardens, has gone fairly stagnant. The blog is still updated, with its last entry being June 2015 with zero comments.

While Hsiang-Yi Liu's study examined blogs and wanted those to be used to create communities in addition to the websites, I argue that this would just be the first step. Hsiang-Yi Liu's study proves, along with recent collective online movements, that there is a move toward and a need for more online spaces. With its Google+ technologies, the Google Art Project,

116

currently an archival space to view the paintings within museums, could easily add a community component, allowing visitors to share information about the artwork, their experiences at the museum, and ratings of the museums through efforts like blogs, message boards, and chats. The Internet has the ability to display and create new ways of cataloging and experiencing archives and archival work. Whereas in a live space a visitor can look at newspaper clippings, the Internet allows a visitor to the same archival area to click on other various links and stories from archived newspapers. Furthermore, digital space does not have the same upkeep demands as a physical space and does not require as much time to rebuild or add on new information or exhibits as does physical space. The results of these blogs shows that blogs are "hit-and-miss" when it comes to creating an online community that functions in a way to recover and include marginalized voices. This brings us back to the introduction. What was rhetorically different about sharing items that are missing versus sharing stories about voices that have been misplaced or ignored?

If we combine these two studies and use them as a model for creating more community-based and grassroots style organization by the "official" and state-funded museums, it would be one way of rewriting the narrative that many people, as opposed to a few (often from within the community), grassroots museums offer. Adding a digital component by allowing those who have moved away from the community or from communities that share similar backgrounds, we can begin the task of encouraging and reclaiming voices, not only in grassroots efforts, but in the more "corporatized" realm of the traditional museum. Rather than these grassroots efforts being maligned and washed over, as they have been thus far, the involvement of the community, rather than a single few "outsiders," will allow the narrative to stay more accountable because many

117

voices will be contributing. This can be achieved by traditional museums through Hutzel's three principles of outsider status.

Some might argue that the museum's role is not to engage or represent the community, but rather the art being made in the community during these time periods and that these are succinctly separate. Not only has the museum shown an interest in these forms of art by attempting to make a space for folk art within the museum, but their inclusion of the community in community art programs, and also for their claim that the purpose of the Cincinnati Art Wing is to connect the community with history, shows that the museum is attempting to reach out to the community and represent their history. After all, without visitors—the majority those from within the community—there would be no reason for a public museum. Also, Yi Liu notes that "Museums should always understand themselves as members of their local community. Their websites should feature everyday matters, together with exhibitions and related studies and they should ensure issues are shared and solutions produced jointly before consensus is reached…" (266) and that "The success of a community hinges on the power people generate themselves so museums, as both leaders and partners, should always adopt an open-minded attitude towards inviting visitor participation, and avoid representing themselves as experts" (266). While museums should certainly present themselves as experts of the art they are currently housing (those created by artists often for payment), what Yi Liu says here is important when discussing art or artifacts produced within communities.

Digital Movements in Action: April 27, 2011 Tornado Facebook Page & 9/11 Memorial

As stated earlier in the chapter, following the April 27, 2011 tornado outbreak that spanned three days, many sites, mainly through social media, were created to reconnect survivors

with lost items and artifacts, a trend that would be picked up for future natural disasters. I discuss it here because it is a real example of the ways digital archiving and digital communities can reshape narratives and help reclaim voices. Though this page is not one intended for art and is not built to be a permanent storehouse of memories like museums, it is a space where the community comes together to connect and build narratives via artifacts that were nearly lost in the storm. There are obviously many differences between an art museum whose goal is to create a clear narrative through the pieces and an online social media site posting artifacts in no particular order as they are found, but it does not mean that the site is without a narrative and it does not mean that this site did not create and build an online community of those already living within communities, separated only by interpersonal communication.

Though the original creator of the site shut it down months after the tornado recovery efforts, a restored version of the group "Pictures and Documents found after the April 27, 2011 Tornadoes-RESTORED" is a page to reconnect people whose items were scattered in the storm. The setup is simple just like any other Facebook page. The rhetorical purpose is for users to obtain information quickly and this page ensures that through its easy usability. While all Facebook pages are meant to create information, this offers very little besides photographs posted for members to claim. The photos were restored by the administrator, many with water and other damage from the storm. The creator of the page, and the woman restoring the photos, received many comments from the community concerning the restoration of the photos, prompting the administrator to respond in a post on June 8, 2011

> I got a msg [sic] asking why the pictures were not more enhanced with artistic flares; the
> answer is we are attempting to restore the photographs as close to the original for the
> families as possible. The Public may not see the power of a simple 3 by 5, but a mother

may treasure its contents" and this received seven comments, which is a conversation between the administrator and a group member.

This question being represented is an interesting one and shows that the community was coming together to support the site but also to question its methodology and its motives.

Even this space created counternarratives into the narratives of what victims are. Community members who were present in the cities that were destroyed but were spared their lives and personal possessions are still members of a victimized community but are not deemed victims themselves. Those within the victimized community retrieving, posting, and in many cases restoring the artifacts of those who were directly affected by the storm is proof of communities coming together—even fractured or damaged communities. Through restoration of the artifacts, there is a new narrative of rebuilding and renewal—one that often comes along with natural disasters—but this was on a more personal level. Before widespread digital use of social media and other websites, photos lost in such disasters were deemed lost forever. There are surely stories of people regaining these items through personal connections and word of mouth pre-Internet, but these are few and far between. Whereas posting photos and personal affects online have created a way to ensure that those who have lost everything, or thought they did, may find that some memories remain. The restoration of the photos changes the status of victim. While still deemed "victims" of the storm, these artifacts not only humanized these people, but also allowed them to reconstruct their own histories and create a new slate with the found artifacts.

The items themselves give a voice to missing voices or those that have been silenced, in this case, due to a natural disaster. While museums have the ability to reclaim and rediscover lost histories and lost identities through artifacts that were used in the daily lives of groups of

120

people, these artifacts—largely old photographs that had been ripped, torn, and tattered from the storm but were now restored—gave a voice and a history back to those who thought they had lost these artifacts of family history. For those collecting old photographs, they were preserving histories created before they were born—family and community histories.

These photographs and other artifacts can, like artworks in museums, be catalysts for discussion about emotions, connections, community, and can be a conduit for memory. When these pictures are posted on social media sites and seen by others who are trying to find items from community members that they may know, these items become pieces of public memory. While the people and the meaning of the pictures remain in the private memory of the owners, the picture as an entity or an item becomes a part of the public memory—a sign that the tornado had survivors—and this helps fuel the narrative of survival that the public and community needs to fully recuperate from such a disaster. Similarly, this is why museums want to create a past and a narrative, one that puts a positive spin on tragedy or at least brings hope and what was learned from tragedy. The positive narrative does not change the fact that many perished in the event and that many of the pictures went unclaimed either because the owners could not be verified, the owners did not want the items back, or, in some particularly tragic instances, the owners of the items had passed away in the storm. In these instances, the artifacts serve as a public memory of those lost in the tragedy.

This space also creates a distinction between the words "victim" and "survivor." While it could easily be argued that those who survived the storm were victims, having been disturbed physically, emotionally, or financially by the storm, they are also certainly survivors. Additionally, this site follows all of Hutzel's outsider status rules. Though the creators of the website were members of the communities affected by the storms, these individuals were not

121

directly affected, and therefore have a form of "outsider" status from the perspective of "survivor." The person running the site makes clear the purpose of the group and posts over almost every restored item that

> These items are not for sale. They are intended for the families only. Watermarks both visually and hidden have been registered with copies. The families can contact us for the actual restored product. There are no charges to the family. Thank you.

The administrator of this website stated her outsider status with statements like the one above. These are not her pictures. These are not her memories. These are not her artifacts. She is simply someone who assisted those who had lost items to reclaim them.

While this site did not implement an asset-based community art curriculum in the same way that Hutzel did, it did acknowledge and celebrate the importance of artifacts and also the restoration of these objects. Since the community chose to restore these photos and circulate them on their site and on their personal Facebook pages, it shows that the community not only understood these artifacts were important to the owners, but that the owners, and their items, were an asset to not only the community, but these items and this act was important to the narrative of rebuilding and the "survivor" narrative. While Hutzel's goal was to convince the students that their neighborhood was an asset and that they were an asset to their communities, the Facebook site sought to remind community members that their neighbors were assets to the community and that their artifacts—and more importantly their histories—were important to the community and the community's narrative of survival and rebuilding.

Obviously, the Facebook page did not implement an "action research methodology" but it accomplished the same overall goals of Hutzel's tactic, including bringing "attention to ethical issues of researcher trust and responsibility by considering the participants as equal contributors"

(304) and this was very important for the project because it not only involved the entire community in the finding, recovery, posting, and disseminating of these objects, but through its comment sections and interactive community efforts, it allowed everyone from within the community to organize, discuss, and share information. A post from May 7 featuring a family and a small child as well as fifteen other photos, has someone write: "Wow you are doing such a great job. I hope the owners find these!" The administrator of the site replied "…I do too. I suspect it will be weeks before most of them have their head cleared enough to even look for the lost items. Regardless they are here waiting for them when that time comes." And on May 8 someone added, "These belong to my mother" to which the administrator replies "There is a Happy Mother's Day…Which ones belong to you, this repeats itself over every picture. I have the original Restored [sic] one I can send you to have printed off."

The site made sure to give information to the families who wanted pictures and kept in contact with them through the site, posting a reminder on May 17 that "You may receive non watermarked copies of your family photograph by contacting…"

One woman asks on May 16, 2011

Hey I don't know how to put pics on here my boss found one in his yard and I've tried?[sic]

And the site responded that the person will

'almost' have the sight [sic] to post the original picture. To ensure the Families [sic] find it please go to 'Pictures and Documents found after the April 27, 2011 Tornadoes sight [sic]. We restore from different pages of the found photographs only

There are issues surrounding privacy, something the site took into consideration as evidenced by a post made on May 10, 2011 noting "We have restored a photograph of an elderly woman in a

casket. Due to the sensitivity of the privacy we will not be posting it. Please contact us if you think this is your photograph. Thank you."

Another issue was the photos being restored were copied from the site and offered at cost to the families. That is when the site started watermarking all of the photos as is posted on May 6, 2011

WARNING: Due to the changes in the Administration of the sight [sic] these Photographs are taken from, We have watermarked these photographs with traceable registered Identification to prevent the redistribution and potential sale to unsuspecting families. We never charge for restoration of the storm survivors or their families. We will not let others do so with our work. If any learn of an illegal distribution, please contact us and we will contact the authorities. These photographs are NOT for sale for any reason.

The site also posted links to information pertaining to tornado safety and the aftereffects of the tornado, posting a link on May 25, 2011 the "WunderMap Interactive Radar & Weather Stations" that took visitors to a weather radar. Another article linked on May 25, 2011 is from "BBC News" and is about bacteria found on hailstones, something that was pertinent to the weather that had just passed by and would continue passing by in the months to come in Alabama and around the country. Tornado warnings in the following days were also used including a May 25, 2011 post that simply reads

Kansas

Tornado Warning

Though this does not fit perfectly with Hutzel's calls for community, this component shows the ways in which the Internet can create communities that do important work. If we merge the

124

capabilities of social media networks to spread and disseminate information with Hutzel's ways of creating community work with live and digital space, we would be a step closer to implementing voice recovery and exposure work within communities.

9/11 Memorial Museum

The final website I briefly explore is the 9/11 Memorial Museum. This museum is important to examine because unlike the strictly online spaces I have discussed so far, this also has a permanent live space that functions as a museum and a memorial. At its creation, a majority of the space was produced online because there was literally no physical space to house the items—including pieces of the Twin Tower buildings. This memorial site walks the line of digital and live space in a way that many others do not and is a good example for the collaboration of online and live spaces within museums. Since it was built solely in response to a tragedy, it was built out of means rather than leisure and, unlike smaller city museums, this museum is arguably one for the entire country meaning that the narrative it creates and the public memory it creates is one that is universal to the ideals of a nation, rather than solely those of a community. It is also an online space that allows for community and even national involvement to keep the site running. This space is both a museum and a memorial, creating something unique. The homepage of the "Museum" section of the site notes the space's purpose, stating

> The 9/11 Memorial Museum is an educational and historical institution honoring the victims in the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001 and the February 26, 1993 World Trade Center bombing and examining 9/11 and its continued global significance (9/11 Memorial Webpage)

125

The site also notes that the museum space is split into two exhibitions: the historical exhibition and the memorial exhibition, stating that "The historical exhibition tells the story of what happened on 9/11 and explores the background leading up to the events and their aftermath. The memorial exhibition commemorates the lives of the victims" (9/11 Memorial Webpage). While this space is different from the Cincinnati Art Museum due to its function as a memorial space, it is still a museal space and is still a space that includes history and reflects that history, something not as clearly achieved in the Cincinnati Art Museum.

This online space reflects on history through a section that is dedicated to the families of those lost on September 11, 2001. The section, at the bottom of the page named "For 9/11 Families" leads the visitor to another webpage. It introduces the visitor to the space, noting that "This is a dedicated section of our website for the loved ones of those killed in the September 11, 2001 and February 26, 1993 attacks. This section includes information on the Memorial names arrangement and how to contribute to the Memorial Exhibition in the 9/11 Memorial Museum" (9/11 Memorial Webpage) and then offers the visitor a link to more information for planning their visit. By showing visitors to the webpage the ways the memorial is organized, and by allowing visitors to contribute financially to the upkeep of the museum, this space creates a transparency not always available in other museums. While the Cincinnati Art Museum has collection spaces and a donation space on its page, the narrative of the Cincinnati Art Museum is not one that fosters a feeling of community "inclusion" in the same way that the 9/11 Memorial does. This is not, of course, the fault of the Cincinnati Art Museum because the 9/11 Memorial is a memorial and representative of a tragedy, making people more motivated to donate.

In his article "Cities And Museums About Them" Ian Jones notes that most museums are not just interested in "city treasures, but with the lives of people and their interaction with each

other and with their urban environment" (7). The 9/11 Museum and its website have made the site a more welcoming and interactive space for those interested in contributing to the space. This is a fitting addition to the "open" narrative and the wide reaching consequences of the events of that day. Both this space and the space of the Tuscaloosa Tornado Lost and Found Page show how museums and digital spaces can be utilized to create spaces that go beyond the original mission of the city museum, and instead do as so many (Ian Jones, Eric Sandweiss, Marlen Mouliou) have called for, and have museums become spaces of representations of the community, its history, and the voices within it.

It is important to look at public memory and museums more directly to examine the ways a national space can create a public memory at a national level. If the 9/11 Museum succeeds in this, it can be used as an example to create public memory for smaller communities. This space creates public memory in several ways because it has an online and a live space and this changes how memories are made. In her study of the Oklahoma City National Memorial and Museum, "Identification as Civic Literacy in Digital Museum Projects" H. Brooke Hessler notes that many museums and memorials use strategies of identification in order to engage the visitor by making them identify with another person or victim, but this is not necessary in the context of the September 11 attacks. Most Americans can identify with the victims of this tragedy because, had they been civilians in the building, they may have also perished. This identification also creates a unified public memory.

The public memory of the 9/11 attacks are tied to the narrative the museum creates, one of reflection and hope. While many remember the horror of that day, that is not the only national narrative that endures more than a decade later. What is celebrated within the public memory are the stories of those who helped others during this time of tragedy. Looking at the online space,

127

there is very little mention of the terrorists. The FAQs section never names the terrorists individually, referring to them simply as "the terrorists" which is clearly a rhetorical decision to exclude them from the space that has the names of victims, making the space about the victims and not those who caused their deaths.

Unlike the tornado Facebook page, this museum page is not only more polished, but was also not available as readily as social media platforms today. Facebook was not created until 2004 and was not widely available to all users until years after the attacks on September 11, 2001. The early space of the objects were still not posted until much later and photos of people who were missing, which would likely be posted on social media forums like a Facebook group, Twitter, or Instagram today, were hung on fences near the rescue and cleanup site. This website is an example of how time, perspective, and reflection changes the way tragedies are considered, handled, and remembered. The online space, like the live memorial space, has been developed and changed over time along with the purpose of these spaces, first as spaces of recovery and then as spaces of memorialization and reflection.

City museums, including art museums, have a similar task. Though the stakes are not as high, and are typically celebratory in nature rather than mired in tragedy, cities have histories. Cities have tragedies. These histories and tragedies are often intertwined with narratives that are often ignored in art museums and these are the narratives of those in the community who are denied a voice due to their place of "otherness" and marginalization within their communities and the larger United States society. However, the goal of museums should be to not only collect and exhibit the full range of history within the city they represent, but also to reflect on that history, rather than bury it under million dollar condos.

Conclusion

There are no current examples of strictly digital movements within art museums that help to recover voices, and that is why I am calling for movements toward this type of action. Simply calling for art education, which is a useful endeavor, is not enough. Knowing this, it is important to examine the ways live and digital archival spaces of museums are connecting with and representing various communities. We must also look at the ways grassroots efforts within communities are working toward creating spaces for more voices and narratives left out of the "public" museum's narrative, or, equally problematic, whose stories have been altered to fit a specific narrative or a set of narratives. As shown in previous chapters, many voices and faces are missing from the museum. While art museums are unlike history museums in that their goal is not to necessarily recreate history, they are storage spaces for history, and art is fundamentally a part of that history. There are many voices of those from within the city that are missing from the narrative of Cincinnati's art scene, namely minority populations, the lower class, and folk artists. The Cincinnati Art Museum has recently added a folk art Wing, so it is taking steps to negotiate these spaces, however, the folk art added is not by local artists, and much of that art is likely lost to history. While some of the art may have been lost any number of ways, the recovery of such items by citizens is not futile and could still be called upon if rallied to discover pieces that people may have within their homes or in public spaces.

While this chapter and the previous chapters have spent much time and discussion on how to improve the current connection and involvement between art and communities and the ways in which these communities are already connected, little time has been dedicated to the ways in which each of these entities—in their current function—can help to create the best art experiences for communities. While I have criticized the Cincinnati Art Museum's and digital archive's handling of marginalized voices, it is precisely these spaces and these narratives that

remind us that they are missing and that they exist. If there were no museum, if there were no house dedicated to the past, then we would have no records at all. All of these spaces working in tandem not only force one another to reexamine themselves, but they also help create a space that is deeply dedicated to the needs and wants of the art-going community. Van Der Merwe et al. note that, "The significance of this collaboration between archives, museums and the community it serves shows that a balance can be achieved between serious scholarly research, skills development and entertainment" (168) and that these "move[s] beyond the museum visitor being merely a passive bystander to an active participant in creating an exhibition" (168). Through digital media, these communities can expand and get stronger and help give a voice to those who were previously silenced by the "cloak" of curating.

The live space of the museum allows visitors to focus on the art's history and the history of the art scene. While, as already shown, this can have negative consequences, with the live space examining itself from other perspectives and perhaps including more counternarratives to these hierarchical stories of art and the way it and life was during this time period, it is important to remember that this museum space can also act as a conduit for change. It has the power to not only make these changes, but it can also be the driving force—the main reminder that there are many more stories to tell than those that we can see, and that there are many more voices trapped, if not within the walls of the live spaces, than within the spaces between that house the digital sphere, asking to be released lest people forget that they are here.

CHAPTER FIVE

CONCLUSION

This study is grounded in the spirit of Freire and hooks and in the research of scholars from multiple disciplines including Carolyn Handa, Carol David, and Greg Dickinson, Carole Blair, and Brian Ott. As shown throughout this dissertation, education and public service are hallmarks of our history spaces like museums. When communities come together to celebrate and reflect on the past, these are the communal spaces at which they gather. In the case of the Cincinnati Art Museum and the surrounding community of the city, not all voices are included in the celebration and reflection of the city's past—a city that these marginalized voices helped build. This dissertation set out to answer the following questions: How are communities formed in online spaces and in public spaces and how do these communities differ? How does our understanding of these differences influence the rhetorical messages these various communities carry? And how can live and digital art spaces help create communities that recover marginalized voices and create a more inclusive public memory? I will ruminate on what I have discovered in this chapter.

How are communities formed in online spaces and in public spaces and how do these communities differ?

Through the work of many scholars from multiple disciplines, I have discovered that communities formed in live public and digital spaces are often different in form and function with live public communities having the supposition of being an "agreed upon" narrative and therefore often being homogenous in nature. It is not that fractures do not exist in these

131

community spaces, but that the fracture often comes from marginalized groups whose voices are ignored by the "master" narrative of public institutions. As the city of Cincinnati has shown with its own "revival," these marginalized voices often lack the civic power to directly admonish these slights and injustices.

The online community, however, is often formed out of live communities and sometimes from these members marginalized by the "master" narrative. These often less-permanent online spaces are not without their own important merits when it comes to fostering new ideas and public memories, but the online community space is often a place of discussion and invention rather than a space of direct action. The action taken in online spaces, even the act of telling stories that derail the "master" narratives in both live and digital public memory spaces, is a step toward making public marginalized voices and also recovering histories and voices that were not able to tell their own stories.

How does our understanding of these differences influence the rhetorical messages these various communities carry?

These spaces and the communities created by them often carry different rhetorical messages and stakes. For example, live space communities typically mobilize and meet in live space, while digital communities are often made up of groups of people who are scattered around the country and even the globe. This space and separation can, at times, lead to miscommunication and confusion within the community, but miscommunication can also happen in public communities that meet in live space. Live spaces have often historically been given more credence than digital spaces, especially where the Internet is concerned. This is rapidly changing, however, as online mobilization including "hashtag activism" has, in some cases, held

political weight as with the Japanese internment art auction example above. Because everything

in the digital realm takes place at different times (due to the fluidity of time in online spaces),

and because members of the community can be from many different places, the organization of

online spaces and communities may seem less efficient and disorganized but often the

organization is just different due to the nature of digital space.

While the public memory formed in both spaces can be similar, because the live space

tends to be more permanent than the online space, those memories formed in online spaces can

be fleeting due to the lack of continual visits to a space. For example, while the live space of a

museum may stand for hundreds of years and be visited frequently, a webpage may be available

for only a few years before it is shut down and the public no longer visits or discusses it. There

is also a difference in the participation of others and how this changes experiences in live and

digital space. In the live space, gestures, eye and facial movements, and tone of voice can all be

heard by other visitors to the space. These sensory forms of communication cannot be gleaned

when visiting digital spaces which often only offer alphabetic texts via message boards,

comments, or blogs from others. These differences can change perceptions of different artifacts

due to influence by others in live space through sensory elements in live space and through

written communication (not always clear in tone) in digital spaces.

How can live and digital art spaces help create communities that recover marginalized

voices and create a more inclusive public memory?

While live spaces have the ability to create public memories and secure social

movements in ways that digital spaces cannot, digital spaces afford more anonymity and

changeability—a factor that can be both positive and negative in its affect. These spaces could

133

work in tandem to assist museums and other historical communal spaces in efforts to recover and

make public marginalized voices. Building digital communities for those marginalized voices

and other community members gives them a 24/7 space to discuss their own narratives, histories,

and make requests from museum officials. Live and digital spaces can work together by building

both live and online communities to acquaint different members of the public with similar

concerns about marginalized voices and general concerns about the community and its history

spaces. Though this acquaintance of people from different backgrounds may initially cause

disagreement and tension, this is an important step in community building.

How Can Disciplines Work Together to Recover Voices?

This study has been situated primarily in two disciplines: the discipline in which I am

trained, composition and rhetoric, and a discipline that I have examined but have no formal

training in, museum studies. Through examining this discipline, as well as others, it has become

clear that, as with most projects in the field of composition and rhetoric, there is a need for

collaboration with museum studies for this study in particular, but also with various other

disciplines including those involved in digital design and community building. Because rhetoric

is so all encompassing, the field of composition and rhetoric must always make efforts to reach

out to and, when possible, collaborate with other disciplines. This examination has already

shown the ways in which composition studies and museum studies connect on the belief of a

need for more information, but there are other places that composition and rhetoric and museum

studies connect. Like composition and rhetoric studies, museum studies is interested in space,

place, and time and also call for more public education in both disciplines.

So how do these two disciplines, as well as other disciplines collaborate on these issues? There have been several suggestions here, but a connection can begin within the very education reform and outreach both fields wish to bestow upon communities. Collaboration begins with disciplines reaching out to one another and doing collaborative research. Very little of this exists in the current fields of composition and rhetoric and museum studies, with those in the composition and rhetoric field often, as I have done here, borrowing research from museum studies and qualifying it for my examination of rhetoric within the space of the museum. Similarly, museum studies often examines rhetorical acts and creates narratives within their field that have rhetorical implications, but, like composition and rhetoric, have very little interaction with the field of composition and rhetoric. This collaboration is more important now that live museums have moved into the digital realm and therefore must consider rhetorical acts of digital design and digital composition. In order to fully understand these spaces and to help educate others on these spaces, multiple disciplines must come together and begin collaborating on these projects.

The Need for Recovery Work

Though there have been many examples of the exclusivity of museum spaces since their invention in the nineteenth century, these issues of exclusivity have been recognized and many museums are working on becoming more inclusive spaces. However, the work is still in progress and the appearance of more grassroots museums shows that there are many interested in voices, works, and artifacts outside of the "master" narrative. Furthermore, recent interest in several fields in the act of voice recovery or amplification as well as more voices being visible through personal blogs and other webspace has allowed for a "revolution" of marginalized

135

voices of sorts. I do not mean this in a way that ignores the issues that still exist online as noted, but rather that these new spaces for conversation have also become new spaces of reclamation and discussion of topics that may not be of interest to the "master" or mainstream narrative. Grabill notes the importance of digital literacy to community action, noting that, "The implications of the interactions between information technologies, writing, and public institutions mean that to study community literacies is to study things called *community computing, community networking,* or *community informatics*" (9) and the ability for communities to form online and to have a better understanding of digital rhetoric is important to recovery work. This recovery work could include creating more space for comments and discussion in digital archive spaces, more community outreach including education programs for low-income residents in live museum spaces, and more civic engagement including representation at local events by the museum space.

While technology is one way to build communities, the online technology is not the reason that communities are built. Citing the work of Brian D. Loader, Barry Hague, and Dave Eagle, Grabill states that using technology to "fix" already existing social problems is not helpful, but rather that "According to this way of thinking, information is why people use computers and networks; information is the solution to a host of economic and social problems. However, information by itself isn't particularly useful; people need to be taught how to use information…" (11). One place that composition and rhetoric studies, museum studies, and digital tech studies align is the belief that citizens are in need of more information in many forms and agree that an educated populous will be better able to come together as a community and determine their own more inclusive historical narratives. This call for education can be

discussed within individual disciplines, but until we come together to collaborate, it is unlikely that these calls will be seriously heeded.

Pros and Cons of Digital Space

Despite the call for increased use of digital communities in this study, it is undeniable that there are many issues in both community building and the use of the Internet as community builder. As noted above, the Web is a place with the same prejudices as are present in the live space. Furthermore, much of the gamble in using webspace to create communities is whether the communities will continue to thrive without live social interaction and whether these online communities will, similarly to some live communities, break into hierarchies and infighting. Though these are real issues that may occur in these spaces, these are issues that can occur in all spaces and this is why I suggest that live and digital spaces work in tandem in order to make the most effective use of both community spaces.

The use of the Web itself can be an issue with its existing hierarchical structures and disenfranchisement of some groups as shown previously in the dissertation. Amy Kimmie Hea notes that "…digital writing scholars must consider the ways in which Web technologies reformulate notions of context, roles of and relationships between researchers and participants, and even our understanding of data" (270) and warns that, "Research projects that either fail to consider the influence of technical and cultural practices or attempt, as Takayoshi warned, to create seamless narratives about our research run the risk of reinscribing the very inequities we seek to disrupt" (270). She notes, however, that this is difficult due to "the Web's mutable nature, continued growth; and confluence of visual, aural, and hypertextual forms" (270) and also warns that "Web researchers must understand how cultural narratives influence their

projects" (271). Here I am not denying the current and historical issues of the Web, just as I am confronting issues within the live museum. There is much that the Web has to improve upon, especially when building communities and creating more equality and assisting more thoroughly in voice recovery. The Web is not going away and it is important to consider how the Web, like the museum, can be reformed and used to the benefit of marginalized communities and bring together disparate communities who may not always agree, but will allow conversations and negotiations that may not necessarily take place in live spaces.

Though the issues above are indicative of the problems present when trying to build communities on the Web, there are also advantages to using the Web as a community building space. The anonymity provided by these spaces, while it can be negative, can also be advantageous because it allows those who may participate in the "master" narrative a space to gain perspective or to aid in the voicing of marginalized voices without being discovered by those who also participate in the "master' narrative and may try to remove them from their duties. Furthermore, this space also allows many from marginalized groups or backgrounds the comfort and safety of speaking their minds and realities that they may be too frightened to speak in live public spaces. This space also allows for those from otherwise diverse backgrounds to connect and build communities around common interests or concerns and also eliminates the barriers of physical space and time.

Implications for Further Study

This study is a starting point for further research projects with online community building and community-driven voice recovery projects. One place to improve these projects is through further investigation of digital communities and how digital communities and online spaces are

138

utilized in museal space. I chose to examine museal spaces because they are largely unexamined in the field of composition and rhetoric. When looking into museum studies, many parallels between the two disciplines become apparent, especially when considering how to make more inclusive spaces. Composition and rhetoric is still grappling with digital composition and museal studies have only recently started including digital elements into museums, showing that there is still much to investigate and explore within these spaces.

One way to improve these projects is through cooperative research and education across disciplines. In their study of online spaces and identity performance, Grabill and Pigg note that "Those who do not hold traditional forms of expertise participate by performing identity in ways that extend beyond establishing individual credibility" (101) and they note that "These performances create argumentative space by shaping how the conversation unfolds and enables the exchange of information and knowledge" (101) and these are spaces that need to be studied more extensively and need to be utilized in more positive ways. Though, as already discussed, online spaces, like live spaces, will never be free of issues like racism, sexism, homophobia, or classism, the Web is another space where serious conversations about these issues can occur.

Another space these conversations could (and should) be happening is within museums. While many museums have started working more with marginalized groups like Native Americans, there are many marginalized members within the communities—often working class and minority populations—whose voices are still being ignored. If museums do wish to take a more active role in communities, as the museum scholars presented here note the twenty-first century museum is trying to do, and if, as Elaine Heumann Gurian notes, "Members of our museum community write often about inclusion and of the 'new town square', which they wish museums to become" (203), then this study is a starting point to examine the ways museum

studies, along with other disciplines like rhetoric and composition can begin to work together on these voice recovery or recognition efforts.

Contribution to the Field

My own study is similar to what Handa describes as "Border Work" or work that goes beyond one's own discipline and beyond one's own scope of expertise. This study is a starting point and would be made stronger if, rather than simply using scholarship from the field of museum studies, I was able to collaborate with those in the discipline to discover how they see their role in the recognition or recovery of marginalized voices in museums. Aside from this admitted flaw, this study is very useful to the field of composition and rhetoric because, no matter the space, work in the digital sphere has been important for composition scholars. Just like the movement from orality to alphabetic text, the digital sphere is the newest composition space that uses the Aristotelian canon in order to compose and design rhetorical spaces. Just like those previous composition spaces, this space is one that can be utilized in order to create communities and speak to the public.

What remains of the necessary work is to continue voice recovery efforts and create spaces for marginalized voices to come together, build community, and have their voices heard. In order for this to happen, all spaces, including digital and live spaces, must work together to create as many avenues for this work as possible. I want to end here with the cautionary wisdom of Carolyn Handa, who states of marginalization and borderwork

It can be limiting—that is, a line to contain what is within and to mark all that is outside as marginal or 'other', and not worth our consideration. But a border can also be considered differently. Instead of limi*ting*, it can be seen as limi*nal*, a space that is a threshold more than a

guarded crossing with armed troops ordered to keep out anyone who looks remotely like an 'other' (166).

And this is something that all disciplines—composition and rhetoric, museum studies, digital tech, and web and graphic design must work on changing within our own disciplines and within the institutions that rely on the work we do. This work is still in its early stages, and there is still much left to do.

NOTES

Chapter Two

[i.] Here I use the rhetoric of revival in the sense of creating a narrative of rebirth and rebuilding. In this vision of revival, however, unlike other definitions, the concentration is only on the positive elements of a city's rebirth at the cost of ignoring problems that existed in the past and still exist. This shows the ways the "rebirth" or "revival" of the city is partially responsible for the continued disenfranchisement of local communities. Concerning Cincinnati in particular, this includes the African American urban community and the surrounding rural communities. Through erasure of voices from these communities in historical spaces like museums, and from the continued literal erasure of the homes of urban African American's due to eminent domain and gentrification, the rhetoric of revival, for all of its positive reinvisioning of the future of the city, has left out the ugly and negative consequences that have led to this revival.

ii. In his "Rhetorical Situation" published by *Philosophy & Rhetoric*, Lloyd F. Bitzer examines the idea of a rhetorical situation or what he defines as wanting to "know the nature of those contexts in which speakers or writers create rhetorical discourse: How should they be described? What are their characteristics? Why and how do they result in the creation of rhetoric?" (1). He notes that while much attention is paid to the speaker, very little is paid to the situation that prompts a speech/speaker to speak. He also notes that "a work of rhetoric is pragmatic; it comes into existence for the sake of something beyond itself; it functions ultimately to produce action or change in the world; it performs some task…" (4). He states that the *audience* as one of the three constituents of any rhetorical situation, noting that it "must be capable of serving as

mediator of the change which the discourse functions to produce" (8). Audience goes with the third 'constituent,' constraints, which he notes, are "made up of persons, events, objects, and reactions which are parts of the situation because they have the power to constrain decision and action needed to modify the exigence" (8). He notes that examples of constraints are "beliefs, attitudes, documents, facts, traditions, images, interests, motives, and the like" (8) and he notes that when "the orator enters the situation, his discourse not only harnesses constraints given by situation but provides additional important constraints—for example, his personal character, his logical proofs, and his style" (8).

iii. When thinking of public memory and the Cincinnati art scene, situations like the Mapplethorpe incident come to mind and are undoubtedly a part of the museum's decision making process. The Mapplethorpe incident was something that happened in the Contemporary Arts Center which is another art museum in Cincinnati that, unlike its traditional cousin, The Cincinnati Art Museum, featured contemporary and often provocative work. In a *New York Times* article by Isabel Wilkerson, the case and its outcome is discussed. One exhibit showed at the Cincinnati Arts Center in the 1990s, *Robert Mapplethorpe: The Perfect Moment* was deemed "obscene" though it had already "traveled from Berkeley, Calif., to Boston without incident" (NY Times). The exhibit showed a total of one hundred seventy-five photographs and seven were deemed obscene by Cincinnati visitors, and, ultimately law enforcement. The newspaper states that "Five of the seven photographs depicted men in sadomasochistic poses and were the basis of charges that the museum and Mr. Barrie had pandered obscenity. Two of the photographs showed children with their genitals exposed and were the basis of charges the defendants had illegally displayed the images of nude children" (NY Times). The artist, Robert

Mapplethorpe, was ultimately acquitted, but this case shows the struggle that curators and those who run museums face on a daily basis.

In an article in *The Cincinnati Enquirer* written by Jackie Demaline in May 21, 2000, (s)he notes that the controversy was still being discussed a decade later, noting that both sides claim a victory and that "Arts supporters have been able to deflect efforts to eliminate the National Endowment for the Arts, the federal agency that had granted money to museums featuring the art" (Cincinnati Enquirer) and that "arts groups say they were forced to unify and become politically active, taking the arts into American communities and schools" (Cincinnati Enquirer), however, Demaline also notes that "Watchdog group Citizens for Community Values, which organized the protest against Mapplethorpe's exhibit, claims victory, too" (Cincinnati Enquirer) noting that their sole purpose was to get the Contemporary Arts Center to react. Demaline notes that many now agree that much of the reaction and rhetoric to the photos in the Mapplethorpe collection had to do with the fact that, on a national level, "The pendulum was swinging toward a more politically and socially conservative America" (Cincinnati Enquirer) and much of the push and pull that was the "culture wars" of the 1990s. This incident was significant in the larger art world, but was especially important on the Cincinnati art scene and is likely a reason that the Cincinnati Art Museum in particular, often shies away from taking up controversial or provocative issues.

iv. Mosler had a very close relationship to the Civil War, as noted on the Smithsonian Archives "during the month of October 1862…he served as an illustrator for *Harper's Weekly*" (Smithsonian Archives) and "was present at the engagement at Green River, and 'present and

under fire' at the battles of Shiloh and Perryville" (Smithsonian Archives) which shows why

Mosler might have been sympathetic to the abolitionists and anti-slavery efforts.

v. The Smithsonian American Art Museum and the Renwick Gallery's website notes that Charles

T. Webber "moved into his own studio where he continued to paint portraits, but also started

creating mythological and historical work" (americanart.si.edu) and this mythology can be seen

in his painting of his friends as folk or mythic heroes in the Underground Railroad. The painting

was painted for the "World's Columbian Exposition" (also the Chicago World's Fair) which

shows the rhetorical purpose of Webber's submitting this piece to the World's Fair, whose

purpose was to exhibit the best art, but to also exhibit (rhetorical) progress.

Chapter Three

vi. See the piece here: http://www.clevelandart.org/art/1993.165

vii. For More information about Gallery One, visit www.clevelandart.org/about/press/press-

kit/new-interactive-gallery-opens-cleveland-museum-art-january-21

viii. Eastern and Western art are inclusive of multiple meanings, but the usage used by Sooke

and early critics is likely discussing Ancient Near Eastern Art, which The Metropolitan Museum

of Art's website describes as "…works ranging in date from the eighth millennium B.C. through

the centuries just beyond the time of the Arab conquests of the seventh century A.D. Objects

come from a vast region centered in Mesopotamia, between the Tigris and Euphrates rivers, and

extending north to the Caucasus and the Eurasian steppes and south to the Arabian peninsula. To

the west the region includes Anatolia, Syria, and the Levant, bordered by the Mediterranean; to the east, it extends through Iran and western Central Asia, with connections as far as the Indus River Valley." These critics are also likely pointing to the lack of museums from Asian countries in the early forms of the Google Art Project.

ix. For more information on types of museum visitors and museum visitor motivation, see *The Museum Experience* by John H. Falk and Lynn D. Dierking and *Identity and the Museum Visitor Experience* by John H. Falk.

x. For more information on museums creating counternarratives to traditional art pieces, see "(Re)Imagining the West: The Whitney Gallery of Western Art's Sacred Hymn" by Greg Dickinson, Brian L. Ott, and Eric Aoki.

xi. In *Learning in the Museum*, George E. Hein notes that museums serve as both educational and entertainment spaces, stating that "The need to consider what meaning visitors make of their museum experience comes from two different sources: one is the increasing importance of the educational role of museums; the other is the increasing pressure on museums to justify their existence" (3) and he notes that this pressure, as well as more leisure time activities than there were during the earliest museums, creates spaces that try to be both educational and entertaining.

REFERENCES

9/11 Memorial. "About the Families." *9/11 Memorial*. National September 11 Memorial & Museum, n.d. Web. June 2015.

9/11 Memorial. "Museum" *9/11 Memorial*. National September 11 Memorial & Museum, n.d. Web. June 2015.

Alexander, Jonathan. *Digital Youth: Emerging Literacies on the World Wide Web*. New Jersey: Hampton Press, 2006. Print

Aristotle. *On Rhetoric*. Trans. George A. Kennedy. New York: Oxford University Press, 2007. Print.

Armitage, John. "Vision, Inertia, and the Mobile Telephone: On the Origins of Control Space and the Spread of Sociopolitical Cybernetics." *New Visualities, New Technologies: The New Ecstasy of Communication*. Eds. J. Macgregor Wise & Hille Koskela. Burlington, VA: Ashgate, 2013. 67-82. Print.

Aronson, Julie, Ed. *The Cincinnati Wing: The Story of Art in the Queen City*. Athens: Ohio University Press, 2003. Print. Cincinnati Art Museum, 2011. Web. 26 May. 2014.

Benjamin, Walter. "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction." *Illuminations: Essays and Reflections* . Ed. Hannah Arendt. New York: Shocken Books , 1969. 217-226. Print.

Bertacchini, Enrico & Federico Morando. "The Future of Museums in the Digital Age: New Models for Access to and Use of Digital Collections." *International Journal of Arts Management* 15.2 (2013): 60-72.

Bezemer, Jeff & Kress, Gunther. "Writing in Multimodal Texts: A Social Semiotic Account of Designs for Learning." *Multimodal Composition: A Critical Sourcebook*. Ed. Claire Lutkewitte. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2014. 233-257. Print.

Birkerts, Sven. *The Gutenberg Elegies: The Fate of Reading in an Electronic Age*. Boston: Faber and Faber, 1994. Print.

Bitzer, Lloyd F. "The Rhetorical Situation." *Philosophy & Rhetoric* 1 (1968): 1-14. Print.

Bonis, Bill, Spyros Vosinakis, Ioannis Andreou, & Themis Panayiotopoulos. "Adaptive Virtual Exhibitions." *Journal of Library & Information Technology* 33.3 (2013): 183-198.

Brown, Michael F. "Exhibiting Indigenous Heritage in the Age of Cultural Property." *Whose Culture? The Promise of Museums and the Debate over Antiquities*. Ed. James Cuno. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2009. 145-164. Print.

Buchanan, Richard. "Rhetoric, Humanism, and Design." *Discovering Design: Explorations in Design Studies*. Eds. Richard Buchanan & Victor Margolin. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1995. 23-66. Print.

Chayko, Mary. "Techno-Social Life: The Internet, Digital Technology, and Social Connectedness." *Sociology Compass* (2014): 976-991.

Cheyftz, Eric. "The (Post)Colonial Construction of Indian Country: U.S. American Indian Literatures and Federal Indian Law." *The Columbia Guide to American Indian Literatures of the United States Since 1945*. Ed. Eric Cheyftz. New York: Columbia University Press, 2006. 1-124. Print.

Cincinnati Parks. "Cincinnati Parks." Cincinnati Parks Homepage, 2014. Web. 22 June 2015.

Ciolfi, Luigina & Liam J. Bannon. "Designing Hybrid Places: Merging Interaction Design, Ubiquitous Technologies and Geographies of the Museum Space." *CoDesign* 3.3 (2007): 159-180.

Cleveland Museum of Art. "Gallery One." Cleveland Museum of Art Homepage, n.d. Web. 22 June 2015.

Cohen, David and Anderson, Scott. *A Visual Language: Elements of Design*. London: Herbert Press, 2006. Print.

Crooke, Elizabeth. *Museums and Community: Ideas, Issues, and Challenges*. New York: Routledge, 2007. Print.

David, Carol "Elitism in the Stories of US Art Museums: The Power of a Master Narrative" *Journal of Business and Technical Communication* 13.3 (1999): 318-335. Print.

Demaline, Jackie. "Mapplethorpe Battle Changed Art World." The Cincinnati Enquirer, 21 May 2000. Web. 22 June 2015.

Di Suvero, Mark. *Atman*. 1978. Painted Steel with California redwood swinging bed. The Cincinnati Art Museum. Cincinnati.

Dickinson, Greg; Blair, Carole; & Ott, Brian L. Eds. *Places of Public Memory: The Rhetoric of Museums and Memorials*. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2010. Print.

Dickinson, Greg, Ott, Brian L., and Aoki, Eric. "(Re)Imaginging the West: The Whitney Gallery of Western Art's Sacred Hymn." *Cultural Studies Critical Methodologies* 13.1 (2013): 21-34.

Dobrzynski, Judith D. "Going Contrarian On the Google Art Project." *Real Clear Arts*. ArtsJournalBlogs, 31 May 2011. Web. 22 June 2015.

Dondis, Donis. *A Primer of Visual Literacy*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1973. Print.

Ellis, Anita J. "Cincinnati Ceramics: The Cradle of American Art Pottery." *The Cincinnati Wing: The Story of Art in the Queen City*. Ed. Julie Aronson. Athens: Ohio University Press, 2003. 105-135. Print.

Ess, Charles. "Computer-Mediated Colonization, the Renaissance, and Educational Imperatives for an Intercultural Global Village." *Ethics and Information Technology* 4 (2002): 11-22.

Facebook. "Pictures and Documents found after the April 27, 2011 Tornadoes-RESTORED." Pictures and Documents found after the April 27, 2011 Tornadoes-RESTORED main page, n.d. Web. 22 June 2015.

Falk, John H. *Identity and the Museum Visitor Experience*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press Inc., 2009. Print.

Falk, John H. & Dierking, Lynn D. *The Museum Experience*. Walnut Creek, CA: Left Coast Press Inc., 2011. Print.

Farny, Henry F. *The Unwelcome Guests*. 1887. Oil on canvas. The Cincinnati Art Museum. Cincinnati.

Ferguson, Bruce W. "Exhibition Rhetorics: Material Speech and Utter Sense." *Thinking About Exhibitions*. Eds. Reesa Greenberg, Bruce W. Ferguson, & Sandy Naime. New York: Psychology Press, 1996. Print.

Freire, Paulo. *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Continuum, 2007. Print.

Gallagher, Victoria J. & LaWare, Margaret R. "Sparring with Public Memory: The Rhetorical Embodiment of Race, Power, and Conflict in *Monument to Joe Louis*." *Places of Public Memory: The Rhetoric of Museums and Memorials*. Eds. Carole Blair, Greg Dickinson, and Brian L. Ott. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2010. 87-112. Print.

Google. "Google Cultural Institute." *Google Cultural Institute*. Google Art Project Homepage, 2011. Web. 22 June 2015.

Grabill, Jeffrey T. *Writing Community Change: Designing Technologies for Citizen Action*. New Jersey: Hampton Press, 2007. Print

Grabill, Jeffrey T. & Pigg, Stacey "Messy Rhetoric: Identity Performance as Rhetorical Agency in Online Public Forums" *Rhetoric Society Quarterly* 42.2 (2012): 99-119. Print.

Guscott, Caroline. *New Interactive Gallery Opens at the Cleveland Museum of Art on January 21*. The Cleveland Museum of Art, 14 Jan. 2013. Web. 22 June 2015.

Handa, Carolyn. "Digital Space: Crossing Untraditional Frontiers." *Negotiating a MetaPedagogy: Learning from Other Disciplines*. Eds. Emily Golson & Toni Glover. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2009. 21-38. Print.

-----*The Multimediated Rhetoric of the Internet: Digital Fusion*. New York: Routledge, 2014. Print.

Hea, Amy C. Kimmie. "Riding the Wave." *Digital Writing Research: Technologies, Methodologies, and Ethical Issues*. Eds. Heidi A. McKee and Danielle Nicole DeVoss. New Jersey: Hampton Press, 2007. 269-286. Print.

Heekin Burke, Mary Alice. "The Rediscovery of Elizabeth Nourse" *Cincinnati History Library* Cincinnati Art Museum Library, n.d. Web. June 2015.

Hein, George E. *Learning in the Museum*. New York: Routledge, 1998. Print.

Hessler, H. Brooke "Identification as Civic Literacy in Digital Museum Projects: A Case Study of the Oklahoma City National Memorial and Museum" *Community Literacy Journal* 6.1 (2011): 23-37. Print.

Heumann Gurian, Elaine. "Threshold Fear." *Reshaping Museum Space: Architecture, Design, Exhibitions*. Ed. Suzanne MacLeod. New York: Routledge, 2005. 203-214. Print.

Hilligoss, Susan & Williams, Sean. "Composition Meets Visual Communication." *Digital Writing Research: Technologies, Methodologies, and Ethical Issues*. Eds. Heidi A. McKee and Danielle Nicole DeVoss. New Jersey: Hampton Press, 2007. 229-247. Print.

Hutzel, Karen. "Reconstructing a Community, Reclaiming a Playground: A Participatory Action Research Study." *Studies in Art Education* 48.3 (2007): 299-315.

Jones, Ian. "Cities and Museums about Them." *City Museums and City Development* Eds. Ian Jones, Robert R. Macdonald, and Darryl McIntyre. Lanham: AltaMira Press, 2008. 1-15. Print.

Kavanagh, Gaynor. *Dream Spaces: Memory and the Museum*. New York: Leicester University Press, 2000. Print.

Kimmerle, Sarah. "Behind the Screens of the Google Art Project." Fine Arts Museums of San Francisco, 19 February 2014. Web. 22 June 2015.

Kress, Gunther. "Gains and Losses: New Forms of Texts, Knowledge, and Learning." *Multimodal Composition: A Critical Sourcebook*. Ed. Claire Lutkewitte. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2014. 283-301. Print.

-----*Literacy in the New Media Age*. New York: Routledge, 2003. Print.

Lanham, Richard A. *A Handlist of Rhetorical Terms*. 2nd ed. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991. Print.

Lauer, Janice. "Composition Studies: Dappled Discipline." *Rhetoric Review* 3. (1984): 20-28. Print.

Liu, Alison Hsiang-Yi. "Using Online Communities to Attract Museum Visitors." *International Journal of Education* 4.3. (2008): 259-274.

Loader, Brian D., Hague, Barry, & Eagle, Dave. *Community Infomatics: Enabling communities with information communications technologies*. Hershey, PA: Idea Group Publishing, 2000. Print.

Lohman, Jack. "The Prospect of a City Museum." *City Museums and City Development* Eds. Ian Jones, Robert R. Macdonald, and Darryl McIntyre. Lanham: AltaMira Press, 2008. 60-74. Print.

Lopez, Jacklyn, Burnett, Joshua, & Chandler, Sally. "A Report From the Digital Contact Zone: Collaborative Research and the Hybridizing of Cultural Mindsets." *Digital Writing Research: Technologies, Methodologies, and Ethical Issues*. Eds. Heidi A. McKee and Danielle Nicole DeVoss. New Jersey: Hampton Press, 2007. 319-336. Print.

Lopez-Gonzalez Hibai, Frederic Guerrero-Sole, & Olatz Larrea. "Community Building in the Digital Age: Dynamics of Online Sports Discussion." *Communication & Society* 27.3 (2014): 83-105.

Lyons, Scott Richard "Actually Existing: Indian Nations: Modernity, Diversity, and the Native American Studies" *The American Indian Quarterly* 35.3 (2011): 294-312. Print.

Macdonald, Sharon. Ed. *The Politics of Display: Museums, Science, Culture*. New York: Routledge, 1998. Print.

Malraux, André. *Museum Without Walls*. Trans. Stuart Gilbert and Francis Price. New York: Doubleday & Company, Inc., 1967. Print.

Marshall, Christopher R. "When Worlds Collide: The Contemporary Museum as Art Gallery." *Reshaping Museum Space: Architecture, Design, Exhibitions*. Ed. Suzanne MacLeod. New York: Routledge, 2005. 170-184. Print.

Matei, Sorin & Sandra J. Ball-Rokeach "Real and Virtual Social Ties: Connections in the Everyday Lives of Seven Ethnic Neighborhoods." *American Behavioral Scientist* 45.3 (2001): 552-556.

Mosler, Henry. *Chimney Corner*. 1893. Oil on canvas. The Cincinnati Art Museum. Cincinnati.

Mosler, Henry. *The Quadroon Girl*. 1878. Oil on canvas. The Cincinnati Art Museum. Cincinnati.

Mouliou, Marlen. "From Urban Blocks to City Blogs: Defining Attributes for the City Museum of Today." *City Museums and City Development* Eds. Ian Jones, Robert R. Macdonald, and Darryl McIntyre. Lanham: AltaMira Press, 2008. 155-180. Print.

New London Group. "From a Pedagogy of Multiliteracies: Designing Social Futures." *Multimodal Composition: A Critical Sourcebook*. Ed. Claire Lutkewitte. Boston: Bedford/St. Martin's, 2014. 193-210. Print.

Nourse, Elizabeth. *Head of a Girl*. 1882. Oil on canvas. The Cincinnati Art Museum, Cincinnati.

Nourse, Elizabeth. *In the High Meadow*. 1904. Oil on panel. The Cincinnati Art Museum. Cincinnati.

Picasso, Pablo. *Guernica*. 1937. Oil on canvas. Museo Reina Sofia. Madrid.

Postman, Neil. *Technopoly: The Surrender of Culture to Technology*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1992. Print.

Powell, Malea "Rhetorics of Survivance: How American Indians Use Writing" *College Composition & Communication* 53. 3 (2002): 396-434. Print.

Ragsdale, J. D., Bello, R. S., Brandau-Brown, F., Thibodeaux, T. M., & Chapman, B. R. "European Museums as Visual Persuasion: A Typological Approach." *Intercultural Communication Studies* 16 (2007): 145-157.

Rice, Danielle "Vision and Culture: The Role of Museums in Visual Literacy" *The Journal of Museum Education* 13.3 (1988): 13-17. Print.

Royster, Jacqueline Jones, "When the First Voice You Hear is Not Your Own" *College Composition & Communication* 47. 1 (1996): 29-40. Print.

Sandweiss, Eric. "The Novelties of the Town." *City Museums and City Development* Eds. Ian Jones, Robert R. Macdonald, and Darryl McIntyre. Lanham: AltaMira Press, 2008. 40-59. Print.

Schwartz, John Pedro "Object Lessons: Teaching Multiliteracies through the Museum" *College English* 71.1 (2008): 27-47. Print.

Selfe, Cynthia L. and Richard J. Selfe Jr. "The Politics of the Interface: Power and Its Exercise in Electronic Contact Zones." *CCC* 45.4 (1994): 480-504.

Sharp, Joseph Henry. *Harvest Dance*. 1893. Oil on canvas. The Cincinnati Art Museum. Cincinnati.

Sidler, Michelle. "Playing Scavenger and Gazer with Scientific Discourse: Opportunities and Ethics for online Research." *Digital Writing Research: Technologies, Methodologies, and Ethical Issues*. Eds. Heidi A. McKee and Danielle Nicole DeVoss. New Jersey: Hampton Press, 2007. 71-86. Print.

Sooke, Alastair. "The Problem With Google's Art Project." *The Telegraph.* The Telegraph, Feb. 2011. Web. 22 June 2015.

Stallabrass, Julian. *Internet Art: The Online Clash of Culture and Commerce*. London: Tate Publishing, 2003. Print.

Stargazer. 3000 B.C. Marble. The Cleveland Museum of Art. Cleveland

Smithsonian American Art Museum. "Charles T. Webber." *Smithsonian American Art Museum and the Renwick Gallery*. Smithsonian American Art Museum Collections, n.d. Web. 22, June 2015.

Smithsonian Archives of American Art. "Henry Mosler's Civil War Diary." *Smithsonian Archives of American Art*. Smithsonian Archives of American Art Collection, n.d. Web. 22, June 2015.

Swan, Daniel C. & Michael Paul Jordan. "Contingent Collaborations: Patterns of Reciprocity in Museum-Community Partnerships." *Journal of Folklore Research* 52.1 (2015): 39-84. Print.

Taylor, Bryan C. "Radioactive History: Rhetoric, Memory, and Place in the Post-Cold War Nuclear Museum." *Places of Public Memory: The Rhetoric of Museums and Memorials*. Eds. Greg Dickinson, Carole Blair, & Brian L. Ott. Tuscaloosa: University of Alabama Press, 2010. 57-86. Print.

Teslow, Tracy Lang. "Reifying Race: Science and Art in *Races of Mankind* at the Field Museum of Natural History." *The Politics of Display: Museums, Science, Culture*. Ed. Sharon Macdonald. New York: Routledge, 1998. 53-76. Print.

The Metropolitan Museum of Art. "Ancient Near Eastern Art." *The Metropolitan Museum of Art*. The Metropolitan Museum of Art Ancient Near Eastern Art page, 2015., Web. 22 June 2015.

Trumbo, Jean. "The Spatial Environment in Multimedia Design: Physical, Conceptual, Perceptual, and Behavioral Aspects of Design Space." *Design Issues* 13.3 (1997): 19-28.

Tuan, Yi-Fu. *Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 1977. Print.

Van Der Merwe, Karen Harris, & Bronwyn Strydom. "The University of Pretoria Archives Virtual Classroom: Connecting the Community's Past With the Virtual Future." *Mousaion* 30.2 (2012): 158-170.

Wang, Hansi Lo. "Art From Japanese-American Internment Camps Saved from Auction Block." National Public Radio, 18 April 2015. Web. 22. June 2015.

Webber, Charles T. *The Underground Railroad*. 1893. Oil on canvas. The Cincinnati Art Museum. Cincinnati.

Wilkerson, Isabel. "Cincinnati Jury Acquits Museum in Mapplethorpe Obscenity Case." The New York Times, 6 October 1990. Web. 22 June 2015.

Wysocki, Anne Francis. "Impossibly Distinct: On Form/Content and Word/Image in Two Pieces of Computer-Based Interactive Multimedia." *Computers & Composition* 18.3. (2001): 209-234.

Zolberg, Vera L. "Museums as Contested Sites of Remembrance: The Enola Gay Affair." *Theorizing Museums: Representing Identity and Diversity in a Changing World*. Eds. Sharon Macdonald and Gordon Fyfe. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell, 1996. 69-82. Print.