

**Agnieszka Ługowska**  
*Wyższa Szkoła Gospodarki w Bydgoszczy*  
*agnieszka.lugowska@byd.pl*

## **THE ART AND CRAFT DIVIDE – ON THE EXIGENCY OF MARGINS**

**Abstract:** The subject of the art/craft distinction continues to occupy a marginalized position in the history of modern and contemporary art and remains almost invisible as an object of critical inquiry. The marginalization of craft will be pointed out here, yet the article does not aim at a unilateral defense of craft as art, since reversing the hierarchy of art and craft or dismissing it outright seems to be a mistake. Rather, it will focus on the changing dynamics of the hierarchy of art and craft and will present the marginalization of craft as an illuminating example of power and authority at work in the art world. The article aims to show how craft – typically marginalized or even invisible as a force shaping the art scene under modernism – was implicitly central to modernism’s constitution and has explicitly become one of the most prolific spheres of artistic activity today. The article primarily aims to present the moment of the emergence and perpetuation of the historical distinction between art and craft. Then, it goes on to shed some critical light on one particular medium that was traditionally associated with craft, namely fiber and the way this material was showcased in American art in the 1960s and 1970s. The article demonstrates how three different groups of artists negotiated the boundaries between art and craft. Finally, it goes on to present how contemporary artists embrace craft and how craft continues to act as a touchstone of what is designated as art, aesthetics, their centers and margins.

**Keywords:** art – craft – modernism – fiber.

Despite the efforts undertaken by artists, writers and curators working in the field of craft to draw attention to the prejudices of the hierarchy of media and the ensuing subordination of craft, the subject of the art/craft distinction in the history of modern and contemporary art has continued to occupy a marginalized position and has not become central as an object of critical inquiry. The present lack of focus on the evolution, history and effects of this

hierarchy is especially striking at the time when exploration of the distinction between high and popular visual culture, including design, advertising and other forms of mass-produced imagery is considered an important and prolific area of investigations. The paucity of thinking and writing on craft has led to a void in both debate and standards. Bruce Metcalf notes that it would be elucidative to have an advanced theory of the meaning of handmade objects in the late industrial era. This endeavor can be commenced with a brief overview of the theory that has infiltrated contemporary art, with some special heed paid to modernism.<sup>1</sup>

The emergence of the hierarchy of art and craft and the subsequent marginalization of the latter originated in the Renaissance when first claims were made for painting and sculpture as “liberal” rather than “mechanical” arts. Although the modern classification of the arts, which grouped together painting, sculpture, architecture, music, and poetry was contested, by mid-eighteenth century the separation of the fine arts from the mechanical arts was fully established. By the nineteenth century, the associations of the latter with the notions of usefulness, skill, the use of “lesser” media, as well as adherence to traditional form, were commonly accepted as marking the division between craft and art. The institutionalization of the art/craft divide on the basis of these characteristics remains evident and has found its embodiment in the relegation of crafted objects to the category of decorative arts and in their general exclusion from the history of art and aesthetics.<sup>2</sup>

Additionally, the attempts to present the art/craft distinction in the aesthetic and philosophical framework have contributed to and consolidated the belief in craft’s lower cultural status. The term “aesthetic”, first used in a distinctly philosophical context in the eighteenth century by Alexander Baumgartner, defined it as “the science of sensitive knowing”. Unfortunately for craft and other functional objects, Immanuel Kant, in the *Critique of Pure Reason* 1781, shifted the meaning of “aesthetic” toward the transcendental study of the objective preconditions of the judgment of taste concerning the beautiful.<sup>3</sup> The best-known statement by Kant on the distinction between art and craft related to their different relations to purpose and therefore aesthetic pleasure. According to the philosopher, fine arts, or the beautiful, are characterized by self-sufficiency or “purposiveness without a purpose”, whereas craft (Handwerk) is a rule-governed construction distinguished by a connection to an

---

<sup>1</sup> B. Metcalf, *Replacing the Myth of Modernism*, in: *Neocraft, Modernity and the Crafts*, ed. Sandra Alfoldy, Press of the Nova Scotia School of Art and Design, Halifax 2007, p. 7.

<sup>2</sup> E. Auther, *String, Felt, Thread, The Hierarchy of Art and Craft in American Art*, University of Minnesota Press, London 2010, p. 15.

<sup>3</sup> H. Risatti, *A Theory of Craft, Function, and Aesthetic Expression*, University of North Carolina Press, Chapel Hill 2007, p. 71.

interest or purpose. To Kant, fine art is the product of radical originality and thus defined as a free form of creation oriented towards an object devoid of utility. Conversely, craft is hampered by its utility and cannot be appreciated aesthetically. In a similar vein, Collingwood perceives art as the outcome of an imaginative process of creation and discovery and opposes it to craft, which takes recourse in technical procedures to obtain a preconceived result. More contemporarily, Danto sees art as a self-referential embodiment of ideas whereas craft as merely well made. It seems that the history of craft/art relations bears a great resemblance to the long standing history of marginalization between aesthetics and philosophy, where the former played a subservient role to realize the objectives of the latter. It should be borne in mind that none of these thinkers was particularly interested and focused on examining crafts for crafts' sake, but used them primarily as a convenient foil for refining various definitions of art.<sup>4</sup>

Throughout the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the basic assumptions about the inadequacies and marginal position of craft's *vis-à-vis* fine art were maintained and reinforced explicitly through classification, as well as implicitly through such critical categories as "decorative", among others.<sup>5</sup> According to Greenberg, decorative was associated with surface embellishment, skilled labor and precision in a mechanical rather than "felt out manner" of working. As the critic maintained this physical finish and skillfulness relating to the decorative were in stark contrast with such terms of art as conception, inspiration and they all clashed with the formalists' conviction that each art must pursue the essence of its medium. Additionally, another relevant issue in analyzing art/craft division ensues from Greenberg's assessment of Georgia O'Keeffe's painting. According to him, O'Keeffe was deficient due to the precision of her brush and her works were linked with the terms decorative and the crafts rather than art, which in a wider perspective pointed to a deeply gendered character of the decorative. Greenberg's criticism of O'Keeffe work as detailed draws on the historical association of "women" and the "particular"<sup>6</sup>. From a wider perspective, these distinctions can be drawn from hierarchical relations between form and matter central to Western philosophy and the history of art.<sup>7</sup> Matter or "nature" is given a significant form by the artist, and is associated with the mind and idea, implicitly referring to the masculine, while craft, associated with materials as ends in themselves and the tactile rather than the cognitive realm, implicitly refers to the feminine.

---

<sup>4</sup> L. Shiner, *The Fate of Craft*, in: *Neocraft, Modernity and the Crafts*, ed. Sandra Alföldy, Press of the Nova Scotia School of Art and Design, Halifax 2007, p. 39.

<sup>5</sup> E. Auther, *String, Felt, Thread...*, p. 13.

<sup>6</sup> C. Greenberg, *Review of an Exhibition of Georgia O'Keeffe*, "CG, vol. 2" 1946, p. 87.

<sup>7</sup> E. Auther, *String, Felt, Thread...*, p. 63.

This centrality of the particular clashed with the cornerstone of modernist ideology, namely the idea of an autonomous art object which is self-contained and exists without reference to anything else. Such an object was supposed to perform one function – to support an aesthetic experience that could be brought about solely by art. Kant declared that aesthetic experience could occur only when the observer had a disinterested attitude. That is, a person in a state of disinterestedness operates in a free state of cognition that does not vary from person to person. Most modernists accepted Kant's logic at face value. Yet this concept proved problematic for contemporary aesthetics and the proponents of a more encompassing and engaged notions of aesthetics; for example Arnold Berleant or Wolfgang Iser have been trying to overcome it. Kant also rejected sensory pleasure and emotional appeal from the realm of aesthetics. This is the logic that has led to the exclusion of craft from the realm of art, the logic premised on the conviction that every true judgment of beauty contains an implicit claim to universal validity.

In modernist ideology, only one kind of visual phenomena supports the aesthetic experience – the formal elements of art. Only the formal elements of art call for universality. For this reason abstraction – color and form disconnected from content – became the most significant mode of art-making by the mid-twentieth century. Art devoid of content, utilizing only formal elements, was said to be “autonomous” with no intrusion of use and the external world. Therefore, the crafts had to face the fact that any object embedded in tradition or made for physical use could be classified as art only to the degree in which tradition and use could overshadow the formal attributes of the work. Additionally, it was maintained that these formal qualities, by stimulating an aesthetic experience, could cause the viewer to “transcend” immediate material existence. Modernism redefined art, whereas craft, which has always been geared at the social and psychological uses of objects as well as the meanings people project upon the things they handle, love, and cherish, was automatically relegated to some marginal position.<sup>8</sup>

## FIBER ART AND THE STRUGGLE FOR LEGITIMACY

In the mid-1960s, the American artists working in traditional craft media and the curators interested in legitimating craft as art had begun to challenge craft's marginal status in the art world. This article will shed critical light on one medium in particular that was traditionally associated with craft, namely

---

<sup>8</sup> B. Metcalf, *The Fate of Craft...*, p. 13.

– fiber (a broad category including, but not limited to, string-based materials from thread, rope, felted substances and woven textiles) – and the way this distinction was complicated in American art in the 1960s and 1970s. Over that period people interested in craft and aspiring to enter the art world idolized the theory of autonomy, accepting its claim to authority uncritically and failing to examine its supporting logic. The two fundamentals of modernity – the autonomous art object and the language of formalism – were perceived as basic elements of fine arts and craft adopted them for the sake of its credibility. In attempting to assert equal status by following slavishly modernist artistic prescriptions, craft showed its implicit sense of inferiority about its traditional roles. The numerous social implications of craft, in which the value of many pieces of contemporary art reside, were quickly eliminated. Elements of design, material and technology were attended to visually without concern for their inherent, wide-ranging social meanings.

Studies like *Beyond Craft*, such exhibitions as *Woven Forms*, *Eccentric Abstractions* and *String and Rope*, such work in fiber as Saret's and Adam's sculptures are representative of the projects and works of the 1960s and 1970s that signaled the arrival of fiber as a new medium of "high art". Collectively, these projects and objects reveal that the adoption and elevation of fiber in the American art world came from multiple sources, each with a very different definition of art at that time. In each case, craft – typically dismissed as a force shaping the art world in this period – was central to the meaning generated by such projects. *Beyond Craft and Woven Forms* attempted to elevate fiber from the realm of craft to that of art and were undertaken by individuals and institutions to legitimize the work in materials traditional to craft. The above-mentioned projects all challenged fiber's long-standing association with utility or craft. Questioning the subordination of fiber as a craft medium of primarily utilitarian value, Adam's and Saret's works exemplify the significant role fiber played in probing the aesthetic boundaries in the art world in the 1960s and 1970s and the diversity of positions these explorations arose from.

The efforts to abolish fiber works' associations with craft and enter the brave new world of modernism without the burden of crippling tradition, culminated in a paradoxical situation where these works were viewed as neither art nor craft and were relegated to some ontological limbo. Although such objects had the potential to undermine the real and symbolic boundaries between art and craft, at that time the reluctance to accept hybrid categories that had the potential to bridge the divide, could not be subdued and therefore their power to redraw the boundaries that excluded them from the world of high art was circumscribed.

The above is borne out by the fact that nominally, the term “fiber art” enjoyed the widest applications throughout the art world, yet Auther observes that it was used with anxiety, for it continually rendered suspect the artistic identity of the makers by marking them with the aspect of their work (here the medium) defined as outside of the norms of art. Auther notes that the term “fiber artist” at first sight looks similar to “pop artist”, but when used to exclude the artists from the mainstream, a more apt parallel would be with the term “woman artists”, which, in a similar vein, particularizes the maker outside the legitimate definition of art. This term more clearly demarcates the mechanisms of boundary maintenance and entrenchment of margins between art and non-art, affecting the wider reception of fiber.<sup>9</sup>

It is worth noting that fiber gained new recognition in the USA in the 1960s and 1970s, outside the world of high art in a variety of social and artistic contexts that championed the revival of traditional crafts of hand-weaving, quilting or embroidery. They included the hippie self-fashioning, interest in folk art, personalization of clothing, revival of the traditions of minority communities and the feminist recuperation of craft traditions as well as the craze for macramé.<sup>10</sup> This backdrop demonstrates both the richness of the major craft revival in the USA and at the same time the mounting difficulty of fiber artists to distinguish their work from this nebulous, all-encompassing conglomeration of individuals dabbling in the crafts. The frequent connection made between fiber art and macramé, the association prompted by the craft revival, provides a good example of why fiber artists strove to distinguish their work from popular craft. Auther suggests that both the craft revival and more specifically the macramé craze were problematic for fiber artists, because they reinforced the assumptions about fiber as a woman’s medium of low artistic status. Macramé had become a cultural phenomenon that impinged on the fiber movement’s struggle for its status as art. Fiber artists dedicated to transforming the genre into an autonomous aesthetic activity faced a significant obstacle in the heterogeneity of the field of textiles composed of amateurs and professionals. The urge to distinguish fiber art from the cultural definition of textiles as a craft – construed as a commercial profession, ethnic tradition, pastime, women’s work that resulted in a useful object – was essential to the transformation. As Auther points out, curators, artists, critics and fiber artists committed to elevating the status of textiles as an art form focused on under-scoring art-oriented, concept based practice rather than craft-oriented technique.<sup>11</sup> This move marked a turn towards non-utilitarianism or the anesthetization of

---

<sup>9</sup> E. Auther, *String, Felt, Thread...*, p. 9.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 25.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 34-42.

historic fiber techniques as well as a conviction that the critical discourse of formalism should approach fiber neutrally, paying heed to its form and yet overlooking its multiple uses in culture outside the world of high art.

Additionally, there existed a pressing need for the authorization of the artistic status of fiber artists. This authority was vested in the curators who discerned artistic quality in objects, pronounced judgments on what is fine art and what is mere craft, what is high, and what is low. Over that period the museum strategies of acquisition and display elided the issues of context, technique and utility in favor of disinterested contemplation of an object divorced from its social realm. Finally, fiber was presented and theorized as concept-driven and at long last included into the realm of art. Yet this happened at the expense of the questions of skill, technique and material, and the overall aesthetic content of fiber was impoverished.

### PROCESS ART, POSTMINIMALISM AND MATERIALITY

The *String and Rope* exhibitions represented a very different sphere of practice in the art world in the 1960s. The artists presented were positioned within the avant-garde circles and loosely categorized as process or postminimalist artists. Those participating in *String and Rope* included Robert Morris, Eva Hesse or Barry Flanagan whose works, although executed in string or felt, did not have to go to great lengths to have the status of artworks bestowed on them. Quite the contrary, their work in fiber was regarded as furthering the reach of sculpture and as a practical realization of the theoretical considerations on sculpture expounded by Rosalind Krauss. Additionally, the most striking difference between them and fiber artists was the fact that they had no prior background in weaving and debuted in galleries endorsing the avant-garde and their shows were regularly reviewed by major art periodicals. These artists enjoyed personal and professional relationship with each other as well as with New York based artists and curators.<sup>12</sup> The critical, institutional and associational factors contributed to the dominance of this sphere of practice in the art world over other using fiber.

The art world within which they practiced contributed to a great degree to craft marginalization. Strikingly, Auther points out that the exhibition reviews did not focus on the fact of reevaluating the marginality of fiber, but presented the event as the outcome of fifty years of experimentation with new media in the art world. By insisting on the concept or idea over the inclusion of new

---

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 48.

media, critics looked for such artistic antecedents as Duchamp, Arp or Pollock. The emphasis was put on the literal properties of the material culminating in the production of finished, purely optical form with the omission of personal and physical engagement. Thus, the reception of the felt works was advantageous not only thanks to Morris's efforts to contextualize them as idea-based but also thanks to his professional and personal connections in the art world. The critics lauded the works in felt for both ability to concentrate the attention on materials, their visceral and tactile properties essential to process aesthetics as well as rhetorical ability to rescue the works from the realm of the feminine or the decorative.

Author states that fiber was a key element presaging the collapse of the modernist understanding of medium. Both fiber, process or postminimalist artists strived to dismantle the norms of their respective fields. Ultimately, the two spheres embraced objectives that worked at cross-purposes, making their practices difficult to reconcile. Process or minimalist artists did not strive to legitimize fiber as an autonomous medium of high art, as it was the case for fiber artists. On the contrary, within process art circles fiber's non artistic properties constituted its power to act as a catalyst in the dissolution of sculptural norms and conceptions of quality in art. In that case craft functioned as a conceptual limit essential to the evolution of art, as Glenn Adamson's claimed it constituted "a border that can never be reached, but is nonetheless intrinsic to any sense of position."<sup>13</sup> Process artists used fiber as a non-precious material with connections to the abject – a conception of the craft that fiber artists did not want to subscribe to. Acknowledging the different orientations of these two spheres of practice towards the category of art (positive in the case of fiber artists, negative in the case of process artists) does not only demonstrate the way the distinctions between them were asserted but also leads to the third possible stance on fiber role in vacillating the established arts and crafts categories.

## FEMINIST POLITICIZATION OF THE ART AND CRAFT DIVISION

In the early 1970s, within the context of women art movement, the hierarchy of art and craft and its links to women's exclusion from the art world, came under review. Feminist artists undertook a larger project to expand the category of art to include the experiences of women, everyday materials, as well as women's traditional art forms. The once negative associations of fiber with

---

<sup>13</sup> G. Adamson, *Thinking through Craft*, Bloomsbury Academic, London 2007, p. 2.



femininity and the domestic were recast positively this time as distinctive and culturally valuable features. The artists included Faith Ringgold, Harmony Hammond, Miriam Schapiro and Judy Chicago. They initiated a critique of the marginalization of craft by elevating disdained practices and materials to the level of high art.

This new body of knowledge about women's exclusion from high culture was extended to the analysis of craft/art relations and women's place in this discourse. The marginalization of craft to art gave rise to other marginalizations, namely these between the genius artist vs. an anonymous maker, the uniqueness of an individually made object vs. the collective production, intellectual vs. nonintellectual, non-utilitarian vs. decoration. For the first time in history, the marginalization of craft became the site of political struggle.<sup>14</sup>

As the article demonstrates, the works of the feminist artists of the 1970s set off a compelling critique of the hierarchy of art and craft with an ameliorative impact on today's artistic practice. Undoubtedly, women's art movement differed aesthetically and politically not only from fiber art but also from process and postminimalist art. First and foremost, the women's movement revealed the hierarchy of media as an arbitrary construct that confined the definition of art. Feminist artists refused to accept the division of art and craft since its inception.<sup>15</sup> They criticized the vast set of negative cultural associations relating to craft media and elevated fiber through the legitimization of women's everyday experience as a source of art. This strategy allowed them to tap into fiber's aesthetic properties as well as its social and cultural meanings. Steering away from a formalist, self-referential approach to materials led to an unprecedented expansion of artistic forms and practices. Yet, the movement did not dissolve the hierarchy, on some occasions it even strengthened the very divisions the works seemed to renounce. Each of the artists mentioned above working in the so-called high art world, benefited from the same boundaries separating them from the realm of craft that their work referred to.<sup>16</sup> Despite this, they undoubtedly managed to bring to harsher light the ethical dimension of the system of classification that resulted in the marginalization of the work of women labeled as craft and legitimized everyday experience as a subject of art, allowing feminists artists to tap into wider cultural and social meanings. This could have happened since the agenda and audience of the women's movement significantly exceeded the provincial borders of the art world to which fiber and postminimalist artists were confined. In contrast to women's movement, the above strategies adopted by fiber

---

<sup>14</sup> E. Auther, *String, Felt, Thread...*, p. 99.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 164.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 160.

artists and process and postminimalists aiming at reevaluating the marginalization of craft proved less effective and more restricted to the internal history and politics of the art world.

Nowadays it seems that fiber has made a stable presence in contemporary art world. Even a cursory glance at contemporary artists working in fiber and needlecraft techniques reveals a whole array of diverse artists applying fiber. Elaine Reichek's embroidery, Anna Wilson's creation and dissection of black lace, Charles Le Dray's exploration of the self and masculinity through the manipulation of clothing, Hu Xiaoyuan's embroideries of body fragments sewn with her own hair in traditional Chinese technique or Darrel Morris's embroidered explorations of class relations in the USA, could serve as a case in point. The works of these artists and many others show how craft not only continues to be used to address issues of gender, race and personal experience, originating in the feminist appropriation of the material, but have widened its scope to incorporate issues of hybridity, sexual identity, activism, tradition, cultural collision, globalization and many other themes.<sup>17</sup> In view of so many artists reverting to craft in their artistic practice, it seems plausible to reflect upon the message these works contain concerning the hierarchy of art and craft today. Auther does not imply that the marginalization of craft was dismantled by the artists using fiber in the 1960s and 1970s. Yet it seems apt to suggest that the works from that period set the stage for the present conditions under which many contemporary artist are able to overcome the historically negative repercussions of this divide. Apart from their contribution, the rise of installation art, relying on extra aesthetic associations in the production of meaning, also gave some impetus to the forthcoming transitions. The move from pictorial representation to installation, as Danto contends, has significantly expanded the ability of quotidian materials and objects to become part of the art world. The installation approach to art on numerous occasions does not require special skills. Keeping this in mind, it may be jocularly ventured that artists who still make objects and work in a single medium should be wary so as not to be mistaken for craftspeople. This rising status of crafts is also accompanied by the internalization of the contemporary art world and a change in curatorial practice that has propelled the dissolution of aesthetic hierarchies and the boundaries of the art world. Many artist from Korea, Nigeria, China bring to the fore the traditions of their home countries, historically excluded from the Western canon of high art and this process is accelerated by the work of curators willing to expand the art world beyond the borders of North American and Western Europe. Finally, the presence of fiber in contem-

---

<sup>17</sup> See *Extra/Ordinary, Craft and Contemporary Art*, edited by Maria Elena Buszek, Duke University Press, Durham and London 2011.

porary art, to some degree, has been fueled by the renaissance of popular fiber craft in American culture. The revival of knotting, crochet, embroidery are connected with various social forces associated with third wave feminism's ironic embrace of women's traditional craft as well as with Do-It-Yourself lifestyle and other sites of alternative culture. These are intertwined with the propagation of the environmental movement and activism surrounding globalization, where handmade objects stand for anti-consumerist, ecological, sustainable, even ethical practice and where craft transforms into craftivism.<sup>18</sup> The connections to counter cultural or popular craft have opened up new vistas for a growing number of artists willing to embrace this context. The alignment rather than disjuncture of art and craft practices has transformed the validity and reception of fiber and materials used in contemporary art. The line demarcating the center from the margins, the divide between art and craft proved permeable, partaking of aspects of both and ultimately demonstrating and performing that permeability.

Yet the total effacement of the position of craft as marginal has not occurred. The continued presence, good or bad, of boundaries, centers, margins and hierarchies within the art world is a fact. However, the pivotal difference between the operation of artists back in the 1960s and 1970s and today is that the association of the artists with these more marginal spheres does not necessarily delegate them to a craft ghetto. On the contrary, because of the ubiquity of technology, the role of crafts in a material environment teeming with consumer debris and increasingly divorced from direct experience, has been on the increase. Works that emphasize "the real", favoring viewer participation and other physical experiences found in either the process of fabrication or encounter also reflect our disorientation. These works represent our physical ways of working through the uncertainty that we live with, in the self-conscious act of touching, marking, assembling, repeating, stitching or mediating, the gap between the physical and sensory, between theoretical and cognitive is bridged. It seems that crafts have been at the heart of this re-orientation and may have forever changed what we expect from art.<sup>19</sup> Certainly, it is more viable to perceive the divide between crafts and arts as a certain continuum that has not been constructed along a single line, but is woven from multiple strands of thoughts, assumptions and practices. Over this continuum, as Shiner suggests, art, craft and design today designate an increasingly overlapping set rather than distinct areas of practice.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> E. Auther, *String, Felt, Thread...*, p. 183.

<sup>19</sup> P. Owen, *Fabrication and Encounter*, in: M.E. Buszek, *Extra/Ordinary, Craft and Contemporary Art*, Duke University Press, Durham and London 2011, p. 95.

<sup>20</sup> L. Shiner, *The Fate of Craft...*, p. 41.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

Auther Elissa (2010) *String, Felt, Thread, The Hierarchy of Art and Craft in American Art*, London: University of Minnesota Press.

Chicago Judy (1975) *Through the Flower: My Struggle as a Woman Artists*, New York: Anchor Books.

Metcalf Bruce (2007) *Replacing the Myth of Modernism*, in: *Neocraft, Modernity and the Crafts*, ed. Sandra Alföldy, Halifax: Press of the Nova Scotia School of Art and Design, pp. 4-30.

Morris Robert (1966) *Notes on Sculpture*, "Artforum" no. 6, pp. 42-44.

Owen Paula (2011) *Fabrication and Encounter*, in: M.E. Buszek, *Extra/Ordinary, Craft and Contemporary Art*, Durham and London: Duke University Press, pp. 81-95.

Risatti Howard (2007) *A Theory of Craft, Function and Aesthetic Expression*, Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.

Shiner Larry (2007) *The Fate of Craft*, in: *Neocraft, Modernity and the Crafts*, ed. Sandra Alföldy, Halifax: Press of the Nova Scotia School of Art and Design, pp. 33-45.

**SZTUKA I RZEMIOSŁO – O NIEUCHRONNOŚCI MARGINALIZACJI (streszczenie)**

Rozważania dotyczące relacji pomiędzy sztuką a rzemiosłem nie są często podejmowane przez historyków sztuki, estetyków czy filozofów. Z tego względu nadrzędnym celem artykułu jest ukazanie historycznej marginalizacji rzemiosła. Nie ucieka się on jednak do jednostronnej obrony rzemiosła jako prawowicie należącego do dziedziny sztuk pięknych, a raczej ukazuje zmienną dynamikę konstruowanych hierarchii oraz przedstawia marginalizację rzemiosła jako przykład działania władzy i autorytetu w świecie sztuki. Artykuł, ukazując szersze tło relacji pomiędzy sztuką a rzemiosłem, opisuje związki istniejące pomiędzy sztuką a rzemiosłem w latach sześćdziesiątych i siedemdziesiątych XX wieku w Stanach Zjednoczonych. Praca analizuje trzy odmienne grupy artystów tworzących w tym czasie prace z filcu i w efekcie trzy odmienne sposoby rozumienia relacji sztuka–rzemiosło będące rezultatem marginalizacji rzemiosła. Ostatnia część artykułu ukazuje liczne punkty przecięcia istniejące pomiędzy rzemiosłem a współczesnymi praktykami artystycznymi. Ich analiza umożliwi rewizję naszych poglądów dotyczących tego, co uważamy za sztukę, estetykę, ich centrum oraz marginesy.

**Słowa kluczowe:** sztuka – rzemiosło – modernizm – filc.