Tackling art/craft nomenclature, again, with particular reference to octogenarian potter Alice Qga Nongebeza, of Eastern Cape, South Africa
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Since language evolved there has been an ongoing need for accurate terminology. With the passing of time English words, like those of other languages, have mutated in usage and meaning as ideas took on different aspects and imperatives changed. Furthermore, in post–1994 first democratic elections in South Africa, it is appropriate to carefully examine terminology that may carry overtones of pejorative attitudes which could have contributed to ongoing marginalisation of some artists working in particular media or regions of southern Africa, and elsewhere. Thus, just as terminology such as Iron Age, when applied to southern African prehistoric and more recent eras and artefacts, requires ongoing re–evaluation with regard to appropriateness, so too does contemporary usage of phraseology that includes the posing and implementation of art / craft dichotomies. This paper seeks to contextualise usage of art / craft phraseology, and also looks at aspects of previous recommendations for change in southern African usage thereof. Thereafter, without denying rights of individuals and societies to make up their own minds on aesthetic issues, conclusions reached include that it seems to be indeed appropriate to discontinue use of the word ‘craft’ in both local and other visual arts contexts.
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In southern African archaeological contexts, for example, it has been found that the term Early Iron Age —referring to an approximate timeframe from about AD 350 to the beginning of the colonial period for some prehistoric peoples and ceramics— is both directly imported from Europe and has some inappropriate connotations. Usage of Early Iron Age terminology has also led to statements such as the “Iron Age in South Africa is now known to have extended over approximately the last two millennia” (Van Schalkwyk 1991: 4), which implies inaccurate lumping together of deeply prehistoric lifeways and creative acts with those of some peoples in relatively recent times, such conflation being derogatory in that it implies, for instance, “static cultural timelessness” (Nettleton & Klopper 1988: 39). Just as reflections upon terminology such as Early Iron Age have resulted in calls for change towards more locally and time specific
nomenclature, such as Pioneer Agriculturalists, First Millennium Agriculturalists [or Second Millennium pre–colonial Agriculturalists], so too do dichotomies that have developed around ideas about art and craft suggest that ongoing reassessment of such terminology is appropriate.

Despite the fact that some arguments around this matter of reassessment of terminology and methods of redress may seem rather dated it is appropriate to revisit and reassess them because there is also a growing sense of urgency being generated in some quarters where only relatively slow progress has been made towards enacting more broadly inclusive approaches to enjoyment and marketing of visual art in southern Africa. In a nutshell, paraphrasing Neva Makgetla (Sunday Times, August 16, 2009: 2), I feel that it is vital to recognise that many factors contribute to “the structure of the [South African visual arts] economy that [serves to] systematically reproduce exclusion for so many people”. I think that at least part of inbuilt exclusionism seems to be reflected in terminology used, and thus am of the opinion that this issue continues to have ongoing relevance.

In this regard it can be seen that categorisation and ranges of thought revealed in such binaries as art / craft, art / artefact, art / curio, art [sometimes high price] / the rest [usually lower price], as noted by Prudence Rice (1991: 436), seem to have contributed to partial marginalisation of clay as visual arts medium and ceramics as collectibles, as well as reflected “pejorative attitudes … [based at least partly on] a set of simplistic, stereotyped beliefs about domestic / household origins of ceramics practices and usage”.

While acknowledging that establishing frameworks upon which information can be hung in order to make sense of the world is normal and part of living, appropriateness in both southern African and worldwide circumstances of such dichotomous rating systems as art / craft is questionable from many points of view, not least of which is, as noted by Sidney Littlefield Kasfir (1992: 47, citing also Maquet 1979: 32 and Clifford 1988: 22), that from some African perspectives there are no objects that “are ‘art’ in the current Western sense”. This observation has also been largely confirmed by Silvia Forni (2001: 23) who found, in her study of pottery and traditions in the Ndop Plain in Cameroon, that any distinction made between art / craft “seems rather fluid, since the value of objects and actions is understood in the context of their production and use rather than in respect to a preconceived set of labelling categories”.

These comments go to the nub of a number of issues, and have been confirmed by octogenarian potter Alice Qga Nongebeza (figure 1), who practices zero electricity usage ceramics technology from her studio at Nkonxeni village, Thombo, near Port St Johns in the Eastern Cape, South Africa. She maintains that in local Mpondo thinking an art / craft dichotomy is not present, and that in talking about visual art at home the concept used is known as “ubugcisa” which does not distinguish between types of visual art, but rather emphasises the fact that a work is “thought of and made by a person or people, it is made by hands” (Interview, 2001). This way of describing is more holistic than reliance on art / craft dichotomies, and allows for “aesthetic evaluations and choice … criteria [to be] part of larger systems of preferences and processes (Forni 2001: 22, referring also to Hardin 1995).

It is thus appropriate to consider the matter further, with particular reference also to ways in which polarised art / craft thinkings may have impacted on reception of works created by such Eastern Cape ceramics artists as Alice Qga Nongebeza, Nesiwe Nongebeza (figure 2), Debora Nomathansanqa Nitloya (figure 3), Mathabo Sekhobo (figure 4), and Matakatso Letsoisa (figure 5), amongst others.
Figure 1
Alice Qga Nongebeza of Nkonxeni village, Thombo area, near Port St Johns, Eastern Cape, photo 2005. Vessel 346mm h x 191mm w x 247mm lip Ø; (photo 2008).

Figure 2
Nesiwe Nongebeza of Nkonxeni village, Thombo area, near Port St Johns, Eastern Cape, photo 2005. Vessel 430mm h x 308mm w x 190mm lip Ø; (photo 2008).

Figure 3
Debora Nomathamsanqa Ntloya of Qhaka village near Thombo, towards Port St Johns, Eastern Cape, photo 2008. Vessel 90mm h x 144mm w x 100mm lip Ø; (photo 2008).
Sabine Marschall (2001: 63–64) has crystallised centrality of this art / craft issue in South Africa with observations that draw attention to “significant socio–economic and political implications”, including that:

During the apartheid period, the field of visual art in South Africa mirrored the divisiveness and racial inequality of the country at large. It was marked by deep discrepancies between black and white artists … the white dominated art world was strictly Eurocentric in focus and followed prevailing modernist paradigms, including the separation of so-called ‘high art’ and ‘low art’, fine art and folk art or craft … thus the limitations forcibly imposed on black artists induced them to produce what was labelled folk art or craft, thereby reinforcing apartheid ideology through enhancing the contrast between the cultural practices of different racial and ethnic groups.

Furthermore, Sabine Marschall (2001: 64) has also suggested that Michel Foucault’s (1991) observations regarding terminology offer a way of noticing that the words art and craft refer to two very “different discourses with distinct rules”, and that usage thereof is arbitrary, and “not neutral” (Forni 2001: 26). Fred Myers (2005: 98–99, referring also to James Clifford 1988: 224) has remarked in this regard that some conventions suggest “a classification as ‘art’ involves an object being articulated as original, singular, and unique”, based “on connoisseurship, markets, and art museums”, thereby establishing “a regime of value, the hierarchical organization of values implicated in classification and institutionalization”. Selected objects, in the “dominant discussions of art in the West” were “conceived typically as transcending simple utility”, and thus “participated in systems of taste, or distinction, built around the market”, and could be “used to construct or deny identity and cultural difference” (Myers 2001: 55, 7, 4).

In that regard it is also significant to note that it has been argued by Sabine Marschall (2001: 64, 71, citing Davison 1990, as well as Law 2000: 13), for example, that “the very notion of fine art is a construct that cannot be separated from power and class relations in society”, and
that it is important to examine how “and by whom” such terminology has been “imposed and whose interest do they ultimately serve”. In what has been described (Marschall 2001: 66) as a “sea change” publication featuring southern African visual arts it appears that Anitra Nettleton and David Hammond–Tooke (1989: 8) were amongst the first local scholars with loud enough voices to be noted as having clearly stated that an “assumption that … the indigenous peoples of South Africa had crafts but no art … is highly dubious”. They arrived at this verdict by firstly pointing out that “distinction between art and craft arose with the birth of the art academies in Europe in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries … as a result of humanist notions of the individual as ‘genius’ … with artists such as Leonardo … [prior to which] medieval Europe did not distinguish ‘art’ from ‘craft’”. Anitra Nettleton and David Hammond–Tooke (1989: 8–9) further added, by way of useful background, that

in English the word ‘art’ was first used in 1668 in its common, modern sense, of denoting painting or sculpture, while the term ‘craftsmen’, referring to one who practised a ‘handicraft’, was first used in 1876. Once the great divide between art and craft had been made, however, it allowed further distinctions between ‘high art’ and ‘folk art’ to be introduced … [and] ‘craft’ has come to be associated with objects of use, and ‘art’ with non–utilitarian products”.

It is interesting that the distinction between art and craft in the English language was thus only relatively recently made, and appears at least initially to have been based around ideas about types of use value, namely contemplation / utility.

My own experience from observing outcomes (figure 6) and ways in which contemporary potters such as Alice Qga Nongebeza work is that it is difficult to clearly differentiate between such types of use value because both aesthetic and utilitarian considerations are seamlessly interwoven as influences on how finished works look and function. Participation in and taking note of her ceramics praxis during the past several years has also revealed that each and every varying feature and series of technical choices made by her—from clay collection practices at a site revealed in a dream, through to aspects of construction techniques, and her method of firing by placing raw works into an already raging bonfire (figure 7)—combine to result in one–of–a–kind uniqueness, no matter what was created.

Alice Qga Nongebeza vessel, 235mmh x 322mmw x 143mm lip Ø; (photo 2008).

Figure 6

Alice Qga Nongebeza birds, 220mmh x 140mmw each, (photo 2008).

Alice Qga Nongebeza vessel, 241mmh x 240mmw x 146mm lip (photo 2008).
That a vessel, for example, may both function just as well as a utility item in a home or gallery and/or as an element for contemplation in those same environments gives added value and serves to confound conceptual models that depend on art / craft hierarchical ordering. Furthermore, in southern Africa and elsewhere, just as with the ceramics of Alice Qga Nongebeza and others, there is much visual art that has been created and appreciated that is not exclusively restricted to “objects and performances intended as ‘artistic’ and ‘aesthetic’ in Western terms” (Forni 2001: 22, referring also to Hardin 1995). Thus, in present southern African circumstances it seems more appropriate to use local ways of viewing as a guide and consequently consider works from a point of view that takes into account such formal properties as medium and content as well as “proportion, patina, form and surface [colours and] textures” ——appearance and design—in conjunction with such concepts as fitness for purpose. Account could also be taken of “symbolic or ritual significance” (Forni 2001: 24) when appropriate, and in so doing facilitate an even more enriched appreciation of such visual artworks.
But, it simply is not enough to rail against continued usage of art / craft dichotomous terminology in southern Africa and elsewhere without engaging with potential taxonomic alternatives that reflect a reality of both openness to changes in consciousness as well as, in due course perhaps, changes both in exhibition and acquisitions criteria. A local process of implementing more appropriate terminology and consciousness seems to have slowly begun and includes, as noted by Sabine Marschall (1999: 4), influential personages of the calibre of Steven Sack having observed in 1996 that the “categorisation of art into ‘folk art’ and ‘high art’ … is [regarded as] not only irrelevant to the South African context but, at the present moment, obstructive to a re–shaping of the South African art world and the re–making of South African art history”. Despite this rousing public statement, however, Sabine Marschall (1999: 4) has significantly observed that the 1996 exhibition called Common and uncommon ground: South African art to Atlanta, that was curated by Steven Sack, featured no “vernacular art objects that would locally be termed ‘folk art’ [for the] largely American audience”, thereby providing evidence that other imperatives prevailed over a perceived need for active adoption of changed attitudes and display principles.

The South African Government’s White Paper on Arts and Culture, published in 1996, has been described as one of many strategies designed to encourage “political and socioeconomic transformation of South Africa … [which sought to facilitate] art and culture [playing] a vital role in transformation, correcting the injustices and biases of the past and achieving cultural equity”. Such focus on need for changed attitudes was also expressed by Namane Magau, for example, who is referred to as saying “we believe that arts and culture can be a magic wand in closing cracks and making our humanity whole again” (Marschall 2001: 66, 72, citing also Gevisser 1994).

It would seem that around about this time there was also, according to Sabine Marschall (2001: 66–7), a phase when public art galleries, for instance, reordered their permanent collections … and began to exhibit objects formerly called ‘craft’ … (such as small wood carvings, ‘naïve’ paintings, pottery and textiles) side by side with oil paintings, sculptures and installations by academically trained white artists under the heading of South African art”. Thus a process of reidentification, renaming and reordering had been put into motion in an effort to redress past injustices, and forge new thinkings about art and associated status, such relocation of objects from one category to another usually being accompanied by “a very significant increase in the object’s perceived value, i.e. cultural, aesthetic, and most of all monetary value, as well as an increase in the status and prestige of its maker”. Despite such substantial changes a central problem remains that aspects of an art / craft consciousness have in some quarters not yet substantially changed, and consequently it is that potters such as Alice Qga Nongebeza, and others, continue to draw short straws.

This can be claimed with certainty because, for example, even though our Eastern Cape Department of Sport, Recreation, Arts and Culture has done many good things aimed at encouraging artists and visual arts in the province, an enormous anomaly lies embedded at the core of Provincial Government policies in this regard. This anomaly has negatively impacted on reception and values associated with artworks created by the likes of Alice Qga Nongebeza and others. The problem has at least partially arisen out of the art / craft dichotomy wherein the Eastern Cape Department of Sport, Recreation, Arts and Culture, which is very active in promoting visual arts, has fallen prey to dichotomous thinking in its showcase sponsorship of specific visual arts at particular exhibition venues at the annual National Arts Festival in Grahamstown. As part of this Arts Festival lavish gallery space has, for example, usually been allocated to so-called established ceramics and other Eastern Cape ‘artists’ at the Monument high up on a hill and then more recently in town at the prestigious Albany Museum History
Building (figure 8). In contrast, only container or tent space in cramped circumstances elsewhere in town\(^10\) and on a Village Green has been made available to usually rurally based ceramics and other ‘crafters’, despite that persons such as Alice Qga Nongebeza and Mathabo Sekhobo (figure 9) have been engaged in ceramics, beadwork, grassware, fashion design and other visual arts praxes all their lives, some of whom create top–of–the–range works in their respective genres.

Such marginalisation is peculiar in the extreme because the Eastern Cape Provincial Department of Sport, Recreation, Arts and Culture could use its influence, financial inputs, and access to principal display venues as a lever, and launch a determined programme to foreground so–called craft alongside so–called art. All works could be collectively displayed as visual art in the same venue, thus creating an atmosphere of sharing in having works specially lit and carefully displayed, therein adding to foundations for changes in perceptions regarding these works. Yet, that Provincial Department has remained, in this instance at least, slave to what Lize van Robbroeck (2004: 47) has termed “the vastly arrogant and Eurocentric ‘international’ high art arena” that seems to have vested interests in, amongst other strategies, sustaining art / craft dualities.

Jillian Carman (2006: 164–166 with reference to comments made by Thembinkosi\(^{11}\) Goniwe at Sessions eKapa ) has suggested that steps to counter compliance with such vested interests could include focus on finding a more appropriate “language outside of institutionalised power structures and Western paradigms … [so that] transformation … is also about conceptual restructuring”. Yet, part of why transitional difficulties continue to plague local discourse has been identified by Anitra Nettleton (2006: 10,17, referring also to Thomas 1999) as arising out of a situation wherein “art history is basically a western discipline … [and] when art historians take on the study of non–western material culture as art, they may be according it similar dignity to that given to segments of western material culture, but they are also fitting others’ objects into a mould in which they are awkwardly crushed”.

This anomaly is similar to another that has been expressed in various discussions and so on which asserts that it is all very well to reject so–called western dichotomous categorisation techniques, but then inconsistent to look for acceptance of certain bonfired ceramics and other works sometimes designated as craft within a basically western context of exhibitions, galleries, and buyers. At face value such an argument may seem to carry weight, yet upon
examination reveals itself to be firmly rooted within either/or dichotomous modes of thought which contributed to polarisation of art/craft concepts of visual art to begin with, and therefore seems to be counterproductive under present circumstances of seeking greater inclusivity.

Thus I remain convinced that it is suitably constructive to continue efforts at finding middle ground terminology appropriate to our southern African circumstances. And, despite anomalies and awkwardness referred to, it has nonetheless become abundantly clear that “destabilization of the category art” (Myers 2001: 8) is taking place. As a way forward Fred Myers (2001: 56, and 2005: 111) has suggested that cognisance be taken of trends towards noticing that new kinds of visual artworks “are circulating through new spaces and institutional linkages” and “building new audiences as well as meanings”. He has also recommended that consolidation of objects “in the category … ‘art’ should better proceed through the clarification of local art histories, emphasising the work of producers, rather than the simple judgement of collectors and dealers”.

In light of the foregoing, and in acknowledgement of the present absence of alternative widely accepted terminology, as well as in recognition that such difficulties reveal that changes in thinkings are only still close to a starting point in what is likely to be a long process during which alternative and more appropriate terminology unfolds, it nonetheless thus seems preferable to me to use visual art and artist nomenclature in a similar way as, for example, Elizabeth Perrill (2008: 8–9, 21, 52). She freely, and in an uncomplicated way, uses phrases such as “ceramic artists”, “precision of the artists”, “artistic creativity”, and “ceramic arts” in her 2008 publication which features mainly ceramics created by means of zero electricity usage technology by mainly rural based potters in KwaZulu-Natal.

This publication featured works by artists such as Peni Gumbi Mathengwa (figure 10) and Buzephi Khanyile Magwaza (figure 11), amongst many others, in an extended catalogue that was produced in conjunction with exhibitions of featured ceramics held at both the Faulconer Gallery, Grinnell College, Iowa, and at Indiana University Art Museum, Bloomington, USA. She therein exposed particular ceramics and potters to a wider public, thereby contributing towards chipping away at art/craft dichotomous thought in much the same way as recommended by Homi Bhabha (WJT Mitchell interview with Bhabha 1995: webpage 4) who commented that cumulative “small differences and slight alterations and displacements are… significant elements in a process of subversion or transformation” of ideas and enactments thereof.

It is time to take, amongst others, Elizabeth Perrill’s (2008) example and drop usage of “craft” from southern African visual arts contexts, thereby encouraging a greater degree of flexibility for changes in mindset, underpinned nonetheless by recognition that in any event individuals, societies, and purchasers of artworks will apply own enjoyment, investment, use value, and aesthetic criteria.
Notes

1. This argument has been extensively developed in Steele 2001, for example, with reference to Hall 1984, 1986; Huffman 2000; MacLean 1998; Maggs 1992, 1993, 2000; Nettleton & Klopper 1988; Van Schalkwyk 1991; Whitelaw 1997; and Whitelaw & Moon 1996, amongst others.

2. Hence my inclusion of the word “again” in the title of this article, more of which later.

3. Neva Makgetla is presently “lead economist for research and information at the Development Bank of Southern Africa” (Sunday Times, August 16, 2009: 2).

4. This is a very generalized observation that nonetheless, from my point of view, largely holds true despite many exceptions in southern Africa that include wide recognition being accorded to works created in studio environments such as at Ardmore (Mentis 1998; Scott 1998) and at Rorke’s Drift (Le Roux 1987, 1998), as well as to families and individuals such as, for example, Wilma Cruise (Arnold 1996; Schmahmann 2002, 2004, 2007); Nala family of potters (Garrett 1998, Perrill 2008); Magwaza family of potters (Armstrong 1998, Cruise 2006, Perrill 2008); Bonnie Ntshalintshali (Arnold 1996, Lee 2008, Le Roux 1998, Schmahmann 2004, Scott 1998); Clive Sithole (Perrill 2008, Van Wyk 2007); and Clementina van der Walt (Cruise 2007).


6. See Steele 2007 for background on these potters and examples of their works.

7. My footnote: Marschall lists here such discrepancies as including, for example, “accessibility of education and artistic training, the availability of materials and other resources, as well as opportunities for exhibiting and selling work”.

8. At the time of jointly editing the volume entitled African art in southern Africa: from Tradition to Township Anitra Nettleton was Senior Lecturer, History of Art Department, University of Witwatersrand, and David Hammond–Tooke was Head: Department of Social Anthropology, University of Witwatersrand.

9. At the time of making this statement Namane Magau was head of human resources development for the South African Government’s Reconstruction and Development Program.

10. In all fairness it is very important to note that the Eastern Cape Department of Sport, Recreation, Arts and Culture has done, and continues to do, a lot to improve matters for previously marginalised artists, who certainly had no allocated spaces at all for display and selling of their works prior to South Africa’s first democratic elections in 1994.

11. Sessions eKapa was an international conference, held in December 2005, to discuss the start of a major series of exhibitions in Cape Town of contemporary African art. This conference was hosted by Cape Africa Platform, Cape Town. Goniwe participated in the session entitled “Messy states of the art: transgressing the boundaries of art practice and activism”.

12. See, for example, Preziosi 1989.
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