



ARTISTIC CITIZENSHIP

Artistry, Social Responsibility,
and Ethical Praxis

EDITED BY

David J. Elliott • Marissa Silverman • Wayne D. Bowman

Artistic Citizenship

Artistic Citizenship

*Artistry, Social Responsibility,
and Ethical Praxis*

EDITED BY

DAVID J. ELLIOTT

MARISSA SILVERMAN

AND

WAYNE D. BOWMAN

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford. It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship, and education by publishing worldwide. Oxford is a registered trade mark of Oxford University Press in the UK and certain other countries.

Published in the United States of America by Oxford University Press
198 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10016, United States of America.

© Oxford University Press 2016

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press, or as expressly permitted by law, by license, or under terms agreed with the appropriate reproduction rights organization. Inquiries concerning reproduction outside the scope of the above should be sent to the Rights Department, Oxford University Press, at the address above.

You must not circulate this work in any other form
and you must impose this same condition on any acquirer.

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data
Names: Elliott, David J. (David James), 1948– editor. | Silverman, Marissa, editor. | Bowman, Wayne D., 1947– editor.
Title: Artistic citizenship : artisty, social responsibility, and ethical praxis / David J. Elliott, Marissa Silverman, & Wayne D. Bowman.
Description: New York : Oxford University Press, 2016. | Includes bibliographical references and index.
Identifiers: LCCN 2016006024 | ISBN 9780199393749 (hardcover : alk. paper) | ISBN 9780199393756 (pbk. : alk. paper) | ISBN 9780199393770 (oxford scholarly online)
Subjects: LCSH: Arts and morals. | Arts and society.
Classification: LCC NX180.E8 A78 2016 | DDC 701/.03—dc23 LC record available at <http://lcn.loc.gov/2016006024>

9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Paperback printed by WebCom, Inc., Canada
Hardback printed by Bridgeport National Bindery, Inc., United States of America

What do you think an artist is? An imbecile who only has eyes, if he is a painter, or ears if he is a musician, or a lyre in every chamber of his heart if he is a poet, or even, if he is a boxer, just his muscles? Far from it: at the same time he is also a political being, constantly aware of the heartbreaking, passionate, or delightful things that happen in the world, shaping himself completely in their image. How could it be possible to feel no interest in other people, and with a cool indifference to detach yourself from the very life which they bring to you so abundantly? No, painting is not done to decorate apartments. It is an instrument of war.

—PABLO PICASSO¹

You can't talk about the struggle for human freedom unless you talk about the different dimensions of what it is to be human. And when we're talking about art you're talking about meaning, you're talking about love, you're talking about resistance, you're talking about imagination, you're talking about empathy. All of these are part and parcel of what it is to talk about human freedom. And so art is about those who have the courage to use bits of reality to get us to see reality, in light of a new reality. So it's about vision by means of imagination, it's about empathy in terms of looking through this world and seeing the possibilities of a new world, a better world, a more decent, a more compassionate world. And so be one a painter, musician, sculptor, dancer, in fact, be one a human being who aspires to learn the art of living, because in the end I think that's what the arts are really about, how do we become, all of us become, artists of living? Which has to do with courage, which has to do with love, which has to do with justice, which has to do with leaving the world better than we found it.

—CORNEL WEST²

NOTES

1. Picasso in interview with Simone Téry, "Picasso n'est pas officier dans l'armée française," March 24, 1945, in *Les Lettres Françaises* [magazine published by the National Front], V, 48.
2. Taken from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=783fMZeG8Ac>, October 2, 2010, at Tonatierra Nahuacalli Embassy of Indigenous People in Phoenix, Arizona. Interviewed and filmed by Ernesto Yerena.

CONTENTS

Contributors [xi](#)

PART I Foundational Considerations

1. Artistic Citizenship: Introduction, Aims, and Overview [3](#)
by *David J. Elliott, Marissa Silverman, and Wayne D. Bowman*
2. Art and Citizenship: The History of a Divorce [22](#)
by *David Wiles*
3. New York Reimagined: Artists, Arts Organizations, and the Rebirth of a City [41](#)
by *Mary Schmidt Campbell*
4. Artistry, Ethics, and Citizenship [59](#)
by *Wayne D. Bowman*
5. Arts Education as/for Artistic Citizenship [81](#)
by *Marissa Silverman and David J. Elliott*
6. Art as a Bad Public Good [104](#)
by *Ana Vujanović*

PART II Dance/Movement-Based Arts

7. Movement Potentials and Civic Engagement: An Interview [125](#)
with *Liz Lerman*
8. Dance It, Film It, Share It: Exploring Participatory Dances and Civic Potential [146](#)
by *Sangita Shresthova*
9. Moving Comfortably Between Continuity and Disruption: Somatics and Urban Dance as Embodied Responses to Civic Responsibility [163](#)
by *Naomi M. Jackson*
10. Re/imagining Artivism [189](#)
by *Rodney Diverlus*

PART III Media and Technology

11. Queer and Trans People of Color Community Arts Collective: Ste-Émilie Skillshare [213](#)
by *Sandra Jeppesen, Anna Kruzynski, and Coco Riot*
12. Slow FAST Forward: Enacting Digital Art and Civic Opportunities [233](#)
by *Jennifer Parker*

13. Tactical Citizenship: Straddling the Line Between Community and Contestation 254
by *Eric Kluitenberg*
14. Ghostly Testimonies: Re-enactment and Ethical Responsibility in Contemporary Israeli Documentary Cinema 272
by *Raz Yosef and Yaara Ozery*

PART IV Music

15. Music, Social Change, and Alternative Forms of Citizenship 297
by *Thomas Turino*
16. Citizens or Subjects? El Sistema in Critical Perspective 313
by *Geoffrey Baker*
17. Arts-Based Service Learning with Indigenous Communities: Engendering Artistic Citizenship 339
by *Brydie-Leigh Bartleet and Gavin Carfoot*
18. Alchemies of Sanctioned Value: Music, Networks, Law 359
by *Martin Scherzinger*

PART V Poetry/Storytelling

19. The Points Are Not the Point, But Do They Still Matter? A Practitioner's Take on Spoken Word, Slam Poetry, and the Responsibility of Artists to Engage Their Audiences 381
by *Kyle "Guante" Tran Myhre*
20. Poet as Citizen in a Contested Nation: Rewriting the Poetry of Soviet-Occupied Afghanistan 392
by *Aria Fani*
21. Songs of Passage and Sacrifice: Gabriella Ghermandi's Stories in Performance 415
by *Laura Dolp and Eveljn Ferraro*

PART VI Theater

22. Applied Theater and Citizenship in the Puerto Rican Community: Artistic Citizenship in Practice 447
by *David T. Montgomery*
23. Performing Citizenship: Performance Art and Public Happiness 469
by *Sibylle Peters*
24. Valuing Performance: Purposes at Play in Participatory Theater Practice 480
by *Nicola Shaughnessy*

PART VII Visual Arts

25. A New Letter Named Square [513](#)
by *Coco Guzman*
26. Working All the Time: Artistic Citizenship in the 21st Century [521](#)
by *Diane Mullin*
27. Image as Ignorant Schoolmaster: A Lesson in Democratic Equality [549](#)
by *Tyson Lewis*
- Author Index [563](#)
- Subject Index [575](#)

CONTRIBUTORS

Geoffrey Baker is a Reader in the Music Department at Royal Holloway, University of London. He specializes in music in Latin America. His book *Imposing Harmony: Music and Society in Colonial Cuzco* (Duke University Press, 2008) won the American Musicological Society's Robert Stevenson Award in 2010. Together with Tess Knighton, he edited *Music and Urban Society in Colonial Latin America* (Cambridge University Press, 2010). He also works on Latin American popular music, particularly in Cuba, Argentina, and Colombia. His book *Buena Vista in the Club: Rap, Reggaetón, and Revolution in Havana* (Duke University Press, 2011) was published in the series *Refiguring American Music*. Since 2011, he has been a research associate on the ERC/Oxford University project "Music, Digitization, Mediation: Towards Interdisciplinary Music Studies," for which he carried out fieldwork on digital cumbia and folklore in Argentina and Colombia. Baker has focused increasingly on childhood musical learning and music education in Venezuela and Cuba. He received a British Academy Research Development Award and undertook fieldwork in Venezuela in 2010–2011 on the orchestral music program El Sistema, which resulted in the book *El Sistema: Orchestrating Venezuela's Youth* (Oxford University Press, 2014) and the website <http://tocarypensar.com>. He was coinvestigator on the 3-year AHRC Beyond Text project "Growing Into Music," for which he made a series of films about childhood music learning in Cuba and Venezuela, available online at <http://growingintomusic.co.uk>. For further information, please visit <http://geoffbakermusic.wordpress.com>

Associate Professor **Brydie-Leigh Bartleet** is Director of the Queensland Conservatorium Research Centre, Griffith University, Australia. She has worked on a range of national and international projects in community music, arts-based service learning with Australian First Peoples, intercultural community arts, and arts programs in prison. She convenes the conservatorium's award-winning Winanjjikari Service Learning Program and in 2014 was awarded the Australian University Teacher of the Year. She is the Cochair of the International Society for Music Education's Community Music Activities Commission, is co-founder of the Asia Pacific Community Music Network, and serves on the Board

of Australia's peak music advocacy body, Music Australia. She also serves on a range of international and national boards, including the *International Journal of Music Education—Practice* and the *International Journal of Community Music*, and is coeditor of the forthcoming *Oxford Handbook of Community Music* (with Lee Higgins).

Wayne D. Bowman's primary research interests involve philosophy of music and the philosophical exploration of issues in music education. His work is extensively informed by pragmatism, by critical theory, and by conceptions of music and music education as social practices. He is particularly concerned with music's sociopolitical power, music and social justice, and ethically informed understandings of musical practice. Dr. Bowman's publications include *Philosophical Perspectives on Music* (Oxford University Press, 1998), the *Oxford Handbook of Philosophy in Music Education* (Oxford University Press, 2012), numerous book chapters, and articles in prominent scholarly journals. His *Educating Musically in a Changing World* was published in Chinese by Suzhou University Press in 2014. A former editor of the journal *Action, Criticism, and Theory for Music Education*, he is also an accomplished trombonist and jazz educator. Dr. Bowman's academic career has included positions at Brandon University (Canada), Mars Hill University (North Carolina), New York University, and the University of Toronto.

Mary Schmidt Campbell is President of Spelman College and dean emerita at New York University, having served for over two decades as dean of New York University's Tisch School of the Arts. An art historian and leader in the development of cultural and educational policy, she began her career in New York as Executive Director of the Studio Museum in Harlem, a lynchpin in Harlem's redevelopment. Public appointments include her service as Commissioner of Cultural Affairs for the City of New York, Chair of the New York State Council on the Arts, and, appointed by President Obama, Vice-Chair of the President's Committee on the Arts and Humanities. A graduate of Swarthmore College, she received a PhD from Syracuse University. She has written and lectured widely about Black artists, cultural policy, and arts education. Currently, Dr. Campbell is completing a biography of the collage artist Romare Bearden for Oxford University Press.

Gavin Carfoot is a Lecturer in Music and Sound at the Queensland University of Technology, Australia, where he is currently postgraduate coordinator for music. As a musician, songwriter, and producer, Gavin has worked on a range of projects, from touring with swing bands, writing and producing desert reggae groups, and collaborating with pop artists from television shows such as Australian Idol and X Factor. He has worked in various community contexts with Indigenous Australian musicians, and recently collaborated with the Brisbane Multicultural Arts Centre on an intercultural recording project called Echoes. His collaborative work in arts-based service learning won a Griffith Award for Excellence in Teaching in 2012, and his research has been published in forums such as *Leonardo Music Journal*, *Continuum: Journal of Media and*

Cultural Studies, *International Education Journal*, and the forthcoming *Ashgate Research Companion to Popular Music Education*, to name a few.

Rodney Diverlus is a Haiti-born, Florida-raised, and Toronto-based dancer, choreographer, and community organizer. Currently, Diverlus is working with Decidedly Jazz Danceworks in Calgary, Alberta, Canada's preeminent jazz dance company. As an independent artist, Rodney has performed in and created works for a variety of companies and festivals, including the New Voices Festival, Annual Alberta Dance Festival, Cadence Ballet Company, Chimera Project's Fresh Blood Festival, Kashe Dance, ReActive Dance Theatre, Obsidian Theatre, and Arise at Buddies and Bad Times Theatre. His creative works are influenced by and weave in jazz, contemporary, and Afro-Caribbean dance aesthetics and influences, spoken word/oral traditions, and digital media. Diverlus is a proud activist, and his work extends beyond the studio and into the communities he lives in. Hailing from Ontario's student and antiracist movements, he has recently finished a tenure as President of the Ryerson Students' Union and Commissioner for the Ontario chapter of the Canadian Federation of Students, Canada's largest student organization. Additionally, he is a cofounder and on the steering body of Black Lives Matter Toronto, the Canadian chapter of the #blacklivesmatter movement, which works to address anti-Blackness and state-sanctioned violence against the Black community in Toronto. In his work, Diverlus emphasizes the importance of acknowledging the meaningful participation of people from the margins. His areas of interest are access to education, anti-Black racism, addressing state-sanctioned violence, anticolonialism, radical arts education, community empowerment, and others.

Laura Dolp examines the historical agency of music as a site of human transformation, including music and spirituality, the interrelation of music and sociopolitical spaces, storytelling, mapping and musical practices, and the poetics of the natural world. She is editor of a reception study of Arvo Pärt (Cambridge University Press, forthcoming) and co-contributor to *The Cambridge Companion to Arvo Pärt* (Cambridge University Press, 2012). Her articles have appeared in *19th-Century Music* and the *Journal of Musicological Research*. Currently she is investigating the historical relationship between cartography and the musical score in a work entitled *Maps and Music: Stories of the Cartographic Score*. She holds a PhD in Historical Musicology from Columbia University. For more information, go to <http://lauradolp.com>

David J. Elliott joined New York University in 2002 after 28 years as Professor and Chair of Music Education at the University of Toronto, Canada. He has also served as a Visiting Professor of Music Education at Northwestern University, the University of North Texas, Indiana University, the Puerto Rico Conservatory of Music, Guangzhou University, and the University of Limerick. Elliott is the author of *Music Matters: A New Philosophy of Music Education* (Oxford University Press, 1995), coauthor of *Music Matters: A Philosophy of Music Education* (Oxford University Press, 2015), and Editor of *Praxial Music*

Education: Reflections and Dialogues (Oxford University Press, 2005/2009). He has authored numerous book chapters and journal articles and is the Cofounder and Editor Emeritus of the *International Journal of Community Music*. Elliott has presented more than 300 conference keynote papers and invited lectures at university music schools around the world. He is also an award-winning composer and arranger and a professional jazz trombonist.

Born in Shiraz, Iran, **Aria Fani** holds a degree in comparative literature from San Diego State University. Currently, he is pursuing a PhD in Near Eastern Studies at the University of California, Berkeley. His essays and literary translations appear regularly in *Peyk*, the Persian Cultural Center's bilingual publication. His writings have been featured in *PBS Tehran Bureau*, *Iran Nameh*, *Consequence*, *Reorient*, *Ajam Media Collective*, and *Jadaliyya*. He resides in Berkeley.

Eveljn Ferraro investigates Italian national identity within transnational scenarios through the lenses of migration from and to Italy, the connections between literature and other media, liminal spaces, and postcolonial studies. Her work has appeared in the *Journal of the Northeast Modern Language Association Italian Studies* (NeMLA Italian Studies), *Carte Italiane*, and the volumes *The Cultures of Italian Migration: Diverse Trajectories and Discrete Perspectives* (Farleigh Dickinson University Press, 2011), and *Small Towns, Big Cities: The Urban Experience of Italian Americans* (Bordighera Press, 2010). Currently she is writing about the role of intermediality in the testimonial literary work of Italian-Jewish author Ebe Cagli Seidenberg. She is a Book Review Editor for *Altreitalie*, an *International Journal of Studies on Italian Migrations in the World*. She is Adjunct Lecturer of Italian Studies at Santa Clara University, California. She holds a PhD in Italian Studies from Brown University.

Born in Southern Spain, **Coco Guzman/Coco Riot** is a visual artist currently living in Toronto, Canada. Coco is the artist behind the internationally distributed project Genderpoo, an ongoing installation work questioning the notion of normalcy through washroom-sign-like drawings and community workshops. *Los Fantasma*s, a recent work, is a visual narration of contemporary Spanish silenced histories, and has been acclaimed both by the media and the public. *Los Fantasma*s is currently showing around Canada and Latin America. Coco is also the author of *Llueven Queers*, the first Spanish graphic novel on queer life. Coco is the founder of the community-oriented art studio Pio! in Toronto. Coco has drawings published in activist magazines such as *Shameless*, *Bitch*, and *Pikara* and in contemporary art magazines such as *HB*, *Art Actuel*, and *.dpi*.

Naomi Jackson is an Associate Professor in the School of Film, Dance and Theatre at the Herberger Institute of Design and the Arts at Arizona State University. Her articles appear in such publications as *Dance Research Journal*, *Dance Chronicle*, *Contact Quarterly*, and *Dance Research*. She has served as a member of the boards of the Society of Dance History Scholars and the Congress on Research in Dance, and has helped to organize various conferences, including the first International Dance and Human Rights Conference in Montreal in 2005. Her

books include *Converging Movements: Modern Dance and Jewish Culture at the 92nd Street Y*, *Right to Dance/Dancing for Rights*, and *Dignity in Motion; Dance, Human Rights and Social Justice* (edited with Toni Shapiro-Phim). Her current research is on dance and ethics.

Sandra Jeppesen is an activist-scholar who participates in social movements for radical change through direct action, grassroots organizations, and social justice research. Currently Associate Professor at Lakehead University Orillia in the Department of Interdisciplinary Studies, she is Program Coordinator of the Media Studies program. Participating in the Collectif de Recherche sur l'Autonomie Collective (CRAC, or Collective Autonomy Research Group) to contribute to a long-term study of antiauthoritarian groups and networks in Quebec, Jeppesen examines in her research alternative media uses in protest and social movements. She cofounded the Media Action Research Group (MARG, <http://mediaactionresearch.org>), a collective researching autonomous media activists who create queer, feminist, antiracist, anticapitalist, and anticolonial media. She is also active in a group studying antiausterity protest media in Europe.

Eric Kluitenberg is a theorist, writer, and educator working at the intersection of culture, politics, media, and technology. He was a Research Fellow at the Institute of Network Cultures, Amsterdam (2013), and formerly the head of the media program of De Balie, a center for culture and politics in Amsterdam (1999–2011). He taught theory of culture and media at the University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam University of Applied Sciences, and a variety of arts colleges, and was a scientific staff member at the Academy of Media Arts Cologne. Kluitenberg's publications include the *Network Notebook Legacies of Tactical Media* (2011), *Acoustic Space Vol. 11* (ed.) *Techno-Ecologies* (2012), *Delusive Spaces* (essays, 2008), *The Book of Imaginary Media* (2006) and the theme issues *Hybrid Space* (2008) and *Im/Mobility* (2011) of *OPEN Journal for Art and the Public Domain*. Most recently he is coediting an extensive anthology on Tactical Media, together with David Garcia, which will be published by MIT Press (2016). Kluitenberg teaches cultural and media theory at the Art Science Interfaculty in The Hague, and he is the editor in chief of the Tactical Media Files, an online documentation platform for Tactical Media.

Anna Kruzynski, Associate Professor at the School of Community and Public Affairs at Concordia University, seeks to conjugate activism and intellectual work. Although she has been active in mainstream community organizations and social movements, her heart lies with the more radical fringes of the global justice movement. She was first involved with a radical feminist collective (Nemesis) and is now a member of a neighborhood-based antiauthoritarian affinity group, la Pointe libertaire. Her research activity, using participatory action research methodologies, aims to help activists document and reflect on their activism. She worked with the Popular Archives of Point St. Charles to document the history of neighborhood activism in a working-class Montreal neighborhood.

She also worked with the research group on collective autonomy (CRAC) to document self-managed, contentious feminist and radical queer groups that have emerged in Quebec since the Zapatista uprising against neoliberalism in 1994. In the years to come, Kruzynski hopes to develop a research project to explore social, economic, and political initiatives, located on Quebecois territory, that enact a postcapitalist politics.

Liz Lerman is a choreographer, performer, writer, educator and speaker, and recipient of numerous honors, including a 2002 MacArthur “Genius Grant” Fellowship and a 2011 United States Artists Ford Fellowship in Dance. A key aspect of her artistry is opening her process to various publics, from shipbuilders to physicists, construction workers to ballerinas, resulting in both research and outcomes that are participatory, relevant, urgent, and usable by others. She founded Liz Lerman Dance Exchange in 1976 and cultivated the company’s unique multigenerational ensemble into a leading force in contemporary dance until 2011. She was recently an artist in residence and visiting lecturer at Harvard University, and her current work *Healing Wars* is touring across the United States. Liz conducts residencies on the critical response process, creative research, the intersection of art and science, and the building of narrative within dance performance at such institutions as Yale School of Drama, Wesleyan University, University of Maryland—College Park, Guildhall School of Music and Drama, and the National Theatre Studio, among many others. Her collection of essays, *Hiking the Horizontal: Field Notes From a Choreographer*, was published in 2011 by Wesleyan University Press and released in paperback in 2014.

Tyson E. Lewis is an Associate Professor of Art Education at the University of North Texas. His research focuses on educational logics that interrupt, suspend, and render inoperative contemporary constructs of learning, lifelong learning, and the learning society. In particular, he is concerned with the disruptive possibilities that open up within education when we turn our attention to the aesthetics of teaching, the unique pedagogies of the arts, and the relation between art, politics, and subjectification. His articles have appeared in numerous journals including the *Journal of Aesthetic Education*, *Studies in Art Education*, the *Journal of Philosophy of Education*, and *Educational Theory*. He is also author of the book *The Aesthetics of Education: Theatre, Curiosity, and Politics in the Work of Jacques Rancière and Paulo Freire* (Continuum, 2012) and, along with Megan Laverty, is coeditor of *Art’s Teachings, Teaching’s Arts: Philosophical, Critical, and Educational Musings* (Springer, forthcoming).

David Montgomery is the director of the Program in Educational Theatre in the Steinhardt School of Culture, Education and Human Development at New York University (NYU). He is a specialist in drama education, theater for young audiences, directing, new play development, arts-based research, teacher training, and drama across the curriculum. As an actor and singer, Montgomery has performed in numerous professional venues before working as a K-12 teaching artist in New York City and full-time middle school drama teacher at I.S. 292

in Brooklyn, New York. Dr. Montgomery is also the artistic director of the New Plays for Young Audiences (NPYA) series at the Provincetown Playhouse, a project where three new plays written by leading playwrights for young audiences are developed every summer. In addition to directing numerous theater productions, Montgomery directed the Looking for Shakespeare (LFS) program, where high school students worked with him and graduate students from NYU to shape an original production of Shakespeare. Dr. Montgomery has written journal articles and collaborated on two chapters in *Teaching US History: Dialogues Among Social Studies Teachers and Historians*, published by Routledge (2009). In 2012, he published a book cowritten with Dr. Robert Landy, director of the Drama Therapy at NYU, entitled *Theatre for Change: Education, Social Action, Therapy* (Palgrave Macmillan).

Diane Mullin is Senior Curator at the Weisman Art Museum at the University of Minnesota. Her curatorial work focuses on modern and contemporary art. Mullin holds a PhD and an MA in Art History from Washington University in St. Louis. Her graduate research considered gender issues in 1970s body art and changing notions of subjectivity in midcentury American art and culture, as evidenced in particular by Robert Rauschenberg's earliest work (1948–1953). She has curated numerous exhibitions including *SAD: Illuminating a Northern View of Darkness* (2007), *Paul Shambroom: Picturing Power* (2008), *Common Sense: Art and the Quotidian* (2010), and *Local Time* (2015). Mullin was assistant professor of liberal and critical studies and director of the MCAD Gallery at the Minneapolis College of Art and Design from 1995 to 2004. She is a member of the graduate faculty at the University of Minnesota and is adjunct professor in the MCAD MFA program. She regularly publishes in art and scholarly journals and sits on art selection juries nationally.

Yaara Ozery is a film scholar and PhD student at the Steve Tisch School of Film and Television at Tel Aviv University, Israel. She teaches film theory and Israeli cinema at Tel Aviv University and Sapir College. Her master's thesis focuses on the ethics and aesthetics of reenactment in recent Israeli documentary cinema. She is currently investigating the politics and aesthetics of contemporary Israeli women's cinema.

Jennifer Parker is Associate Professor of Art at the University of California Santa Cruz. She is the Founding Director of UCSC OpenLab: Art and Science Research Center and currently serves as Art Department Chair and faculty member for the Digital Arts & New Media (DANM) program. Parker has been running the DANM Mechatronics collaborative research cohort since 2009, developing interactive projects that combine art, design, science, and technology. Her work has been presented nationally and internationally. She is the recipient of several grants, awards, and fellowships including Artworks NEA, Art Matters, the New Forms Regional Grant administered by the Inter-Arts Program of the NEA, the New Jersey State Council of the Arts, and the Kate Neal Kinely Memorial Fellowship Award.

Researcher and performance artist **Sibylle Peters** studied literature, cultural studies, and philosophy, and worked at the universities of Hamburg, Munich, Berlin (FU), Bale, Wales, and Gießen. She is currently codirector of the PhD program Performing Citizenship in Hamburg. As a freelance performance artist, she directed lecture performances and performance projects in cooperation with the geheimagentur performance collective. Peters is founder and director of the Forschungstheater/Theatre of Research situated at the Fundus Theater Hamburg, a theater where children, artists, and scientists collaborate as researchers.

Nicola Shaughnessy is Professor of Performance and Founder and Director of the Centre for Cognition, Kinesthetics, and Performance at the University of Kent. Her research and teaching interests are in the areas of contemporary performance, applied and socially engaged theater, autobiographical drama, and the intersections between cognitive neuroscience and theater. Her work on the potential of performance to engage with neuropsychologies involves interdisciplinary collaborations in health and education contexts. She was Principal Investigator for the AHRC-funded project “Imagining Autism: Drama, Performance and Intermediality as Interventions for Autism.” Her most recent publications include *Applying Performance: Live Art, Socially Engaged Theatre, and Affective Practice* (Palgrave, 2012) and the edited collection *Affective Performance and Cognitive Science: Body, Brain, and Being* (Methuen, 2013). She is series editor (with Professor John Lutterbie) for Methuen’s *Performance and Science* volumes for which she is contributing a new collection: *Performing Psychologies: Imagination, Creativity, and Dramas of the Mind*.

Martin Scherzinger is a composer and associate professor of Media Studies at New York University. He works on sound, music, media, and politics of the 20th and 21st centuries, with a particular focus on the music of Europe, Africa, and America, as well as global biographies of sound and other ephemera circulating in geographically remote regions. The research includes the examination of links between political economy and digital sound technologies, poetics of copyright law in diverse sociotechnical environments, relations between aesthetics and censorship, sensory limits of mass-mediated music, mathematical geometries of musical time, histories of sound in philosophy, and the politics of biotechnification.

A Czech/Nepali media maker, dancer, and scholar, **Sangita Shresthova** is the Director of the Henry Jenkins Media, Activism & Participatory Politics (MAPP) project based at the University of Southern California. Her work focuses on the intersection between popular culture, performance, new media, politics, and globalization. She is a coauthor of *By Any Media Necessary*, a forthcoming book on innovative youth-led civic action. Her earlier book on Bollywood dance and globalization (*Is It All About Hips?*) was published by SAGE Publications in 2011. She also founded Bollynatyam and continues to explore dance and media through this platform. Her work has been presented in academic and creative venues around the world including the Schaubuehne (Berlin), the Other Festival

(Chennai), and the American Dance Festival (Durham, North Carolina). Her recent research has focused on performance through digital media, storytelling, surveillance among American Muslim youth, and the achievements and challenges faced by Invisible Children pre- and post-Kony 2012.

Marissa Silverman is Associate Professor at the John J. Cali School of Music, Montclair State University, New Jersey. A Fulbright Scholar, Dr. Silverman has published invited chapters in recent Oxford University Research Handbooks, as well as journal articles in the *International Journal of Music Education*, the *British Journal of Music Education*, *Research Studies in Music Education*, *Music Education Research*, the *International Journal of Community Music*, *Visions of Research in Music Education*, and *The New York Times*. Her research agenda focuses on dimensions of music education philosophy, general music, artistic interpretation, music teacher education, community music, and interdisciplinary curriculum development. Silverman is coauthor (with David Elliott) of the second edition of *Music Matters: A Philosophy of Music Education* (Oxford University Press), and is coeditor of *Community Music Today* (Rowman & Littlefield). As a secondary school teacher, Silverman taught band, general music, and English literature at Long Island City High School (Queens, New York).

Kyle “Guante” Tran Myhre is a hip-hop artist, two-time National Poetry Slam champion, activist, educator, and writer based in Minneapolis, Minnesota. His works have appeared on Upworthy, MSNBC, Racialicious, Feministing, MPR, Everyday Feminism, and the Progressive, and he has performed everywhere from the United Nations to the Soundset hip-hop festival to hundreds of colleges, clubs, and theaters across the country. Unapologetically social justice minded, he has shared stages with artists like Talib Kweli, Saul Williams, Brother Ali, Dead Prez, Sage Francis, Andrea Gibson, and many more. Guante serves as a teaching artist on the rosters of COMPAS and TruArtSpeaks (where he is Communication Director), engages in writing and performance residencies with youth, as well as regularly facilitates workshops and classes on a range of social justice issues. He also writes regularly at <http://www.guante.info>, or follow him on Twitter at @elguante.

Thomas Turino was Professor of Musicology and Anthropology from 1987 to 2012 at the University of Illinois at Champaign-Urbana. He received his PhD from the University of Texas at Austin in 1987. He published *Moving Away From Silence: The Music of the Peruvian Altiplano and the Experience of Urban Migration* (University of Chicago Press, 1993) and *Nationalists, Cosmopolitans, and Popular Music in Zimbabwe* (Chicago, 2000) for which he received the Alan Merriam Prize from the Society for Ethnomusicology. He coedited the book *Identity and the Arts in Diaspora Communities* (Harmonie Park Press, 2004), funded by a multiyear grant from the Ford Foundation. In 2008, he published *Music as Social Life: The Politics of Participation* (University of Chicago) and *Music in the Andes: Experiencing Music, Expressing Culture* (Oxford University Press). He is the author of many articles in journals and has contributed chapters

to numerous books and scholarly encyclopedias. Since his retirement he has been performing kena and charango in an Andean trio; button accordion and fiddle in a Cajun band; old-time music on banjo, guitar, and fiddle; and Zimbabwean music on mbira. Recent recordings are *Matt and Tom Turino: Here and Far Away* (2008), *Euphor* (2012), *Charlie the Hat* (2013), *Hathaways & Tom Turino: Peruvian Music Project* (2013), and *Tom and Matt Turino: Real Time* (2014).

Ana Vujanović is a freelance cultural worker—researcher, writer, lecturer, dramaturge, and curator—in the fields of contemporary performing arts and culture who is based in Berlin and Belgrade. She holds a PhD in Theatre Studies from the Faculty of Dramatic Arts, Belgrade. She is a cofounder and a member of the editorial collective of *TkH* (*Walking Theory*), the Belgrade-based theoretical-artistic platform, and chief editor of *TkH Journal for Performing Arts Theory*. Her particular commitment has been to empower the independent scenes in Belgrade and former Yugoslavia (*Druga scena* and *Clubture regija*). She has lectured and given workshops at various universities and independent educational programs throughout Europe (Belgrade, Ljubljana, Amsterdam, Madrid, Giessen, Berlin, Bilbao, etc.) and has been an international visiting professor at the Performance Studies Department of the University Hamburg (2012–2015). She engages in artworks in the fields of performance, theater, dance, and video/film, as dramaturge, coauthor, and artistic collaborator. She publishes regularly in journals and collections (*TkH*, *Maska*, *Frakcija*, *Teatron*, *Performance Research*, *TDR*, etc.) and is the author of four books: *Destroying Performance Signifiers*, *An Introduction to Performance Studies* with A. Jovičević, *Doxicid*, and *Public Sphere by Performance* with B. Cvejić. In recent years her research interest has been focused on the intersections between performance and politics in neoliberal capitalist societies, and she is currently researching the performance of the self in the 21st century. See <http://www.anavujanovic.info/>

David Wiles is Professor of Drama at the University of Exeter. He studied at Cambridge and Bristol, and spent many years teaching in the Department of Drama at Royal Holloway University of London. His historical research has focused on Elizabethan theater (including Shakespeare's *Clown*, 1987) and on classical Greek theater, where he has taken a special interest in questions of mask and performance space. His *Greek Theatre Performance* (2000) became a widely used student text. His *Short History of Western Performance Space* (2007) related different spatial configurations of performance to different social functions, and this overview was complemented by his short monograph *Theatre & Time* (2014). As lead editor of the *Cambridge Companion to Theatre History* (2013), he showed why the long historical view matters in a world obsessed with the present. In *Theatre and Citizenship: The History of a Practice* (2011), he explored the tension between two key ideas: that theater is a vehicle for ideas and debate, and that theater is a tool for social bonding. He argued that citizenship should be understood not as an idea but as an activity, a mode of performing one's part in society; thus, the performance of theater is the performance of citizenship. He is currently

working on the history of acting, tracing the close convergence between the art of acting and the art of public speaking.

Raz Yosef is Associate Professor and Chair of the cinema studies BA program at the Film and Television Department, Tel Aviv University, Israel. He is the author of *Beyond Flesh: Queer Masculinities and Nationalism in Israeli Cinema* (Rutgers University Press, 2004) and *The Politics of Loss and Trauma in Contemporary Israeli Cinema* (Routledge, 2011) and the coeditor of *Just Images: Ethics and the Cinematic* (Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2011) and *Deeper Than Oblivion: Trauma and Memory in Israeli Cinema* (Bloomsbury Academic, 2013). His work on gender and sexuality, race and ethnicity, ethics and trauma in Israeli national visual culture has appeared in *GLQ*, *Third Text*, *Framework*, *Shofar*, *Journal of Modern Jewish Studies*, *Camera Obscura*, and *Cinema Journal*.

Artistic Citizenship

PART I

Foundational Considerations

Artistic Citizenship

Introduction, Aims, and Overview

DAVID J. ELLIOTT, MARISSA SILVERMAN,
AND WAYNE D. BOWMAN ■

This volume gathers scholars, artists (amateurs and professionals), arts educators (in schools and communities), and community activists across the arts (dance, music, poetry, social media, theater, and visual art) to consider, clarify, and critique the proposition that the arts can and should be “put to work” toward the positive transformation of people’s lives in local, regional, and international contexts. This proposition is rooted in a shared belief that the arts are fundamentally social phenomena and always have been. Artistic practices and artistic values existed long before the emergence of the 18th-century, European notion of “art for art’s sake.” According to that misguided idea (which for many has unfortunately become something more akin to doctrine), the true or legitimate values of art are “intrinsic”—residing exclusively in supposedly internal or aesthetic properties of entities considered to be “works of art.” On this view, values that relate to concerns outside the work are “extrinsic”: of merely subsidiary or subordinate value. Their significance is extra-artistic, perhaps even nonartistic.

Unfortunately, this view relegates many of art’s most powerful social, political, ethical, and moral values to residual or extra-artistic status. This notion is not just misleading; it is implausible and irresponsible, leading us to trivialize or marginalize some of art’s most powerful contributions to our shared humanity. Social/ethical responsibility lies at the heart of responsible artistic practice, a view to which the contributors to this volume speak eloquently and with considerable urgency.

One does not need to look far for evidence to counter the notion that art’s true value is necessarily intrinsic, resident solely in entities regarded as works. There is copious archeological evidence that our earliest human ancestors—perhaps as long as 100,000 years ago—engaged in what most reasonable people would recognize as creative artistic endeavors: dancing, drawing, music making, painting,

sculpting, and so forth. Bona fide artistic endeavors existed and thrived long before the notion that their truest values should be intrinsic in nature. In music's case, for instance, music-like artifacts—stone percussion instruments and percussion activities—were already part of the personal–musical–social–cultural practices of our ancestors when they moved out of their original African habitats approximately 120,000 years ago (Cross, 2011; Huron, 2003, 2006). We have clear evidence that ancient humans constructed drums, rattles, and (later) flutes 40,000 to 60,000 years ago, and it is not unreasonable to speculate, as some scholars have (Cross, 2011; Huron, 2003, 2006), that music-like vocalizing or “singing” was a common human practice even earlier. Artistic practices were vital, dynamic aspects of human culture long before the advent of art “works” and their supposedly intrinsic value.

Why would our ancestors engage in “impractical” diversions like these amidst the overwhelming challenges of mere survival? Did they make music to create works of art or to respond aesthetically to music's intrinsic values, as 18th-century European theorists argued? Not likely. The literature that deals with the origins and evolution of music supports the thesis that music was vital to early humans' survival because musical practices promote constructive, prosocial, in-group behavior; bonding; and group cohesion. Humans, like most other primates, are social beings who have an innate desire and survival need to live in groups where individuality and competition are balanced with cooperation and bonding. Much of music's historical import, then, stems from its practical value, a claim that is equally applicable to early forms of human visual art, dance, drama, and the like.

The social cohesion theory proposes that music originated and evolved because of its remarkable power to promote and maintain coordinated, intra-group, and intersubjective relationships—values that art-for-art's-sake advocates would have us regard as extrinsic, secondary, and fortuitous. But why is music so extraordinarily effective at promoting social bonding and group cohesion? The answer is not to be found in aesthetic responses to a work's formal properties but in the emotionality and sociality of music making and listening, and in the ways we respond to familiar sound. Humans respond emotionally to familiar musical sounds and actions they understand (Elliott & Silverman, 2012; Gabrielsson, 2001; Huron, 2006). As psychophysicologists Jaak Panksepp and Gunther Bernatzky (2002) put it, “If we did not possess the kinds of social-emotional brains that we do, human music would probably be little more than cognitively interesting sequences of sound and, at worst, irritating cacophonies” (p. 151). The same basic theory may well apply to the other arts, with art-specific emendations: Familiar sequences, patterns, and actions are crucial to the creation and preservation of shared identity—both individual and collective.

An unavoidable consequence of conceiving “musics” (all music, everywhere), visual arts, dancing, and other arts as social human practices—as distinct from entities whose intrinsic qualities afford aesthetic gratification—is concern for *what kind* of cohesion, togetherness, or identity these action patterns nurture and sustain. What kinds of collective identity do artistic practices powerfully

instantiate, and how? In what ways do our artistic endeavors implicate responsibilities to each other and to our collective human identities? What might it mean to be a conscientious artistic citizen? When we fail to take seriously artists' and art educators' social-civic responsibilities to others (on grounds, for instance, that such considerations involve values that are artistically peripheral, tangential, or extrinsic), what important issues are overlooked?

The contributors in this volume offer diverse, sometimes divergent, but invariably fascinating perspectives on these issues. Such richness and diversity are exactly what we hoped would emerge from this project.

PREMISES, AIMS, AND ASSUMPTIONS

Three basic assumptions or premises guided our selection of contributors to this project—three fundamental convictions about the nature of art and artistry we felt confident our participants' contributions would help illuminate. The first of these is that *the arts are made by and for people*. All forms of art and art making—regardless of media or the particular “messages” or meanings they embody or convey—are grounded in social endeavors and encounters. These social considerations are not incidental, subsidiary, or artistically extrinsic; on the contrary, they are fundamental to the meaning, value, and broadly human significance of artistic endeavors. Art making, sharing, taking, and experiencing are richly personal, corporeal, cognitive, emotional, perceptual, social—and quite a bit more. The arts consist fundamentally of actions, events, and interpersonal engagements. Central to their meaning and import are the way these dimensions relate to the individual circumstances, dispositions, and needs of persons living with and for other persons. While every individual is unique, everyone is also a member of a vast, multidimensional, ecological human network.

Our intrapersonal and interpersonal experiences of the arts—our individual and shared feeling and thinking; our teaching and learning; everything we conceptualize, do, or desire—stem from our status as beings who possess, undergo, enact, and “perform” our individual and collective personhood(s) (Elliott & Silverman, 2015). Artistic actions and interactions are fundamental to the creation of our individual and collective human identities.

The arts are made by and for people, living in real worlds involving conflicts large and small. As such, the arts are also and invariably embodiments of people's political and ideological beliefs, understandings, and values, both personal and collective. Accordingly, artistic endeavors involve a special kind of citizenship—civic responsibility to conceive of and engage in them with a view to the particular social “goods” they embody or nurture. The arts are rich human actions replete with human significance and, by extension, ethical responsibilities.

Our second premise can be traced to the work of John Dewey and to the many scholars and arts practitioners who, like Dewey, stress the *need to integrate art making and art taking* (whether by amateurs, professionals, or teachers) *with personal and community life*. The arts, urged Dewey, should not be placed on an

“aesthetic pedestal,” consigned to consumption or contemplative gratification by connoisseurs in concert halls, art galleries, theaters, or museums. It is a profound mistake to regard the arts as collections of mere entities whose significance is unconnected to everyday experience or ordinary life.

On the first page of his *Art as Experience* (1934), Dewey states his opposition to canonizing artists’ creations as untouchable objects that exist to be worshipped—mysterious “things” with otherworldly or god-like status, “masterworks” of high art. Against this Romantic, late 18th- and early 19th-century view, Dewey believed that art emerges from and is continuous with everyday human experience. When art and art making are separated from or elevated above everyday life—as self-sufficient entities, valued solely for their beauty—they are stripped of their power to make meaningful social differences. “When an art product once attains classic status,” Dewey asserts, “it somehow becomes isolated from the human condition under which it was brought into being and from the human consequences it engenders in actual life-experience” (p. 1).

What social or practice-based perspectives like Dewey’s illuminate (and what aesthetic accounts of art often sweep under the rug) is that art does not consist exclusively or even primarily of “works,” nor does it necessarily take the form of “fine art.” The values of art and “the arts” are numerous, diverse, dynamic, and invariably grounded in social experience. They are not intrinsic or self-contained, but functions of their service to various human needs and interests. In other words, art’s importance stems from the effectiveness with which it is “put to work” in the realization of a variety of overlapping and interwoven human values or “goods.” The notion of resident or intrinsic value is not just misguided, then, but seriously misleading (Bowman, 2013). The value of art, like all value, is a function of what it is good *for*, the uses to which it is put.

Our third premise is that if the arts are inherently social practices, they should be viewed, studied, and practiced as forms of *ethically guided citizenship*. Because they contribute powerfully to the personal, cultural, political, therapeutic, ideological, spiritual, and economic dimensions (among many others) of people’s lives—because they are potent transformative social forces, as demonstrated vividly in movements ranging from the civil rights movement in the United States to the antiapartheid movement in South Africa, and from movements as diverse as the Arab Spring and LGBT rights—the arts and arts education have strong ties to the concept of praxis.¹

From our perspective, praxis is a multidimensional concept that includes active reflection and critically reflective action guided by an informed ethical disposition to act rightly, with continuous concern for protecting and advancing the well-being of others. It is action dedicated to personal and collective flourishing, grounded in commitments to transform and enrich people’s everyday lives. Praxial art making thus consists of thoughtful and careful (i.e., “care-full”) artistic practice, of artistic action that is embedded in and responsive to ever-changing social, cultural, and political circumstances. Likewise, arts education is instructional practice that is understood as and guided by commitments to

improve students' lives and the well-being of society at large through action that is ethically responsible and responsive.

In other words, praxis—as distinct from mere activity or habitual behavior—involves a deep concern for what Elliott and Silverman (2015) have called full human “personhood” and the pursuit of what Aristotle and other philosophers consider the highest human values: a “good life,” a life lived well, a life devoted to virtuous action (one that avoids vices of excess or deficiency). Aristotle summarized these values in the term *eudaimonia*: human thriving. From our praxial perspective, the arts teach us “things about our common humanity that are worth knowing, and [render] us less vulnerable to forces that subvert or compromise human well-being” (Bowman, 2002, p. 63). Experiencing and making art “changes who we are and what we expect from life” (Bowman, 2002, p. 63).

Furthermore, as Regelski (1998) explains, praxis is fundamentally concerned with diagnosing what ought to be the case for particular people or human situations. Praxis is of such a nature, however, that even these “oughts” are provisional and contingent: interim proposals that must be constantly reconsidered in light of experience and the changing particulars of the individuals, groups, and situations or contexts involved (p. 29).

Accordingly, artists engaged in praxis are deeply committed to making art that reflects their own critical perspectives on their places and spaces. Their practices are guided by the important ethical question: What kind of artist is it good to be given my current set of circumstances?

ARTISTIC CITIZENSHIP

“Artistic citizenship” is a concept with which we hope to encapsulate our belief that artistry involves civic–social–humanistic–emancipatory responsibilities, obligations to engage in art making that advances social “goods.” The terms *artist*, *artistry*, and *artistic* as we use them are not intended to be exclusive or elitist. By “artists,” we mean to include people of all ages and levels of technical accomplishment (from amateur to professional practitioners) who make and partake of art(s) of all kinds, in contexts ranging from informal to formal, *with the primary intent of making positive differences in people's lives*. Whereas artistic proficiency entails myriad skills and understandings, artistic citizenship implicates additional commitments to act in ways that move people—both emotionally and in the sense of mobilizing them as agents of positive change. Artistic citizens are committed to engaging in artistic actions in ways that can bring people together, enhance communal well-being, and contribute substantially to human thriving.

At first glance, “artistic citizenship” may seem like an oxymoron (Elliott, 2012; Schmidt Campbell & Martin, 2006). However, the opposition between artistry and citizenship is apparent only if connected to the unfortunate semantic baggage of the 18th-century notions about artistry mentioned earlier—aesthetic, “fine art” or “work-centered” concepts of artistry, in which “true” art and “true

artists” supposedly disavow practical, civic, or political purposes. On these accounts, artists are inner-directed free spirits whose vision and work must not be contaminated by considerations “extrinsic” to the formal or expressive qualities deemed resident in the artwork itself.

The terms *citizen* and *citizenship* have been conceptualized in different and conflicting ways for thousands of years in the West. In this project, we have not sought to stipulate a single definition to which each of our contributors are expected to adhere. Instead, we have invited authors to contribute chapters that explore how they envision citizenship relates to artistry. We have resisted the temptation to advance a definitive account of citizenship because we believe its openness and suggestiveness are important assets. In other words, we intend the term *citizenship* metaphorically and hope its openness is evocative. Despite the diversity of meanings that attend the concept of citizenship, we hope its use in this volume invokes the idea of living and acting in ways that are prosocial and responsible. As Liu and Hanauer (2011) have aptly observed, citizenship in its broadest sense involves “showing up for each other” (p. 51).

This leaves unresolved the question of how artistry and citizenship may best be brought together. But again, we doubt there is a single satisfactory or definitive answer to this question, and once again, we prefer to let the diversity of perspectives included in this volume demonstrate the dynamic range of answers that are possible. Instead of advancing an ironclad definition here, we will offer four inspiring examples of artistic citizenship in action.

In 1994, Leslie Neal and her dance company, Leslie Neal Dance, began teaching dance and the other arts to incarcerated women in Florida’s Broward Correctional Institute, a maximum-security prison. Neal and her company engaged the female prisoners in weekly 2-hour dance and movement workshops. Today, Neal and other dancers and artists provide quality arts engagement programs for over 600 prison inmates and juvenile offenders through their organization, ArtSpring Inc. Believing strongly in the power of the arts to save lives, ArtSpring now delivers programming

in residential facilities for girls in foster care, adult residential substance abuse treatment facilities, homeless shelters, public school programs and local community centers. Our programs for incarcerated women remain our core vision, focusing on building community by assisting them to overcome obstacles that led to their incarceration in order to become productive citizens upon release.²

In 1992, performance artists Guillermo Gómez-Peña and writer and visual artist Coco Fusco dressed in aboriginal clothing combined with Western adornments like Rayban sunglasses and Converse sneakers and locked themselves in a cage. For 2 years, they traveled North America and Europe re-enacting the performance art piece they called “The Couple in the Cage.” Within the cage they performed tasks authentic to the lives of aboriginal Mexicans, interspersed with voodoo doll making, TV watching, using laptop computers, and storytelling in

a self-invented language. Their performance as caged “natives” dramatized the damaging effects of racist beliefs, colonization, and imperialism. As Gómez-Peña put it:

We performed the piece at Irvine, which is known for it's [sic] incredible xenophobia towards Mexicans. We also performed the piece in Madrid in Columbus Plaza, the heart of the Quincentennial debate, and later in London at Covent Garden. People of color were exhibited at Covent Garden and many other places in Europe, from the 17th century to the early 20th century.

In all of the cities we have performed, there have been a range of responses from absolute tenderness and solidarity—people giving us presents, offerings, quietly being with us, sending notes of sympathy—all the way to extremely violent responses. In London, a group of neo-Nazi skinheads tried to shake the cage. In Madrid, mischievous teenagers tried to burn me with cigarettes while some handed me a beer bottle of urine. There were businessmen in Spain regressing to their childhood, treating us as if we were monkeys—making gorilla sounds or racist “Indian” hoots.

I think we have touched on a colonial wound in this piece.³

These performances by Gómez-Peña and Fusco dramatically highlighted beliefs that non-Western cultures are uncivilized, primitive, and inferior to Western ones, showing American, Canadian, and European audiences that such beliefs are no less criminal than placing two innocent people behind bars.

In 2004, John Malpede critiqued the “war on poverty” through his project *RFK in EKY: The Robert F. Kennedy Project*. In 1968, Kennedy made a 200-mile trek across eastern Kentucky. Taking Robert Kennedy's epic 2-day trek across eastern Kentucky in 1968 as inspiration, Malpede developed a 4-day, 200-mile performance event that involved performance artists, visual art installations, in-depth political discussions of historic and current events and social policy issues, and hundreds of local cast members—as well as close collaborations with fellow artistic citizens Henriëtte Brouwers, David Michalek, Harrell Fletcher, and Sjoerd Wagenaar. Malpede explains:

Like the original tour, *RFK in EKY* focuses attention on the indigenous expertise and alternative visions of Appalachia . . . The 48 hour performance recreated all aspects of Kennedy's tour, including two official hearings of the Senate Subcommittee on Employment, Manpower and Poverty (held at Vortex and Fleming-Neon), roadside visits with individual families, walking tours of small communities and strip mine sites, stops at one-room schoolhouses, and speeches at courthouses and colleges. A series of contextualizing activities took place preceding the recreation, and surrounded the two-day performance itself . . . These events range from the analytical to the deeply personal and use art as the occasion for creating public meeting space in rural communities.⁴

The starting point, according to Malpede, “was to create performance work that connected lived experience to the social forces that helped to significantly shape and determine that experience . . . As I’ve worked on the project, I’ve become aware of other artists also interested in historical recreations and documentary theater, and for similar reasons.”⁵

Because Malpede incorporated events that helped the communities understand the many adverse effects of poverty, the artists in effect created “an alternative history . . . [retrieving] history from the realm of nostalgia and cultural heritage and [injecting] it with critical thinking.” In Malpede’s words,

Unlike just about every “historical recreation” I’m aware of, this project is not about recreating a battle, or any other kind of violence. It’s about ideas. The force of ideas and about the history of ideas. It’s about the problems confronting the region then and now. Its [sic] about social policies of the sixties and now. And ultimately it’s about the level of political dialogue then and now. And for that reason it’s simultaneously heart breaking and elevating.⁶

Finally, let us consider briefly several examples of artistic citizenship in music. British composer Sir Michael Tippett was an avowed pacifist and registered conscientious objector who refused to serve in World War II and was imprisoned for 3 months. Tippett explains:

People come to pacifism for many reasons. My own conviction is based on the incompatibility of the acts of modern war with the concept I hold of what man is at all . . . Modern wars debase our moral coinage to a greater degree than could be counterbalanced by political gains; so that the necessity to find other means of political struggle is absolute. That was certainly my conviction during the Second World War. My refusal to take part was thus for me inescapable, and my punishment with a relatively light term of imprisonment logical.⁷

The oratorio *A Child of Our Time* was Tippett’s response to Hitler’s assault on the Jews. It tells the true story of the shooting of a German diplomat (a minor Nazi official, Ernst vom Rath) in Paris by a 17-year-old Polish-Jewish, German-born boy, Hershel Grynszpan. Prior to this shooting, Grynszpan fled to France to escape Nazi pogroms. His mother and father, whom, sadly, he had to leave behind, were suffering under the Nazi regime. Enraged by Hitler’s brutality and anti-Semitism, Grynszpan shot vom Rath in Paris. Nazi retributions were horrendous. Grynszpan’s parents were both executed immediately, and Grynszpan himself suddenly disappeared (he was last known to be alive in 1942; he was declared dead in 1960). This shooting was the pretext for Kristallnacht. According to Tippett, “The work began to come together with the sounds of the shot itself—prophetic of the immanent gunfire of the war—and the shattering of glass in the *Kristallnacht*.” Tippett began composing his oratorio on September 3, 1939, the day the war began.

Tippett expressed artistically his conviction that composers have ethical responsibilities to confront the problems of their eras. Benjamin Britten (1913–1973) composed *Who Are These Children?* for similar reasons. Several contemporary composers—for example, John Adams, Philip Glass, John Corigliano, and Frank Ticheli—have created compositions related to other sociopolitical issues, including the terrorist acts of 9/11 and LGBT rights.

The assumptions that frame the concept of artistic citizenship and the examples just explored have a number of direct and important implications for the processes of education in the arts. If artistic practices entail ethical responsibilities, instruction that presumes to introduce learners to the full range of goods an artistic practice exists to serve must help students identify and confront local, national, and world problems through their artistic efforts. Mastery of technical skills, though necessary, is simply not enough. The range of social problems on which artistic practice can be brought to bear is immense: violence, religious and ideological conflicts, poverty, starvation, disease, environmental disasters, and gender and racial discrimination, to name but a few. How might arts instruction help young people identify and understand fundamental human problems and engage in artistic practices in ways that meaningfully address them?

This crucial question points us in directions not widely acknowledged to be relevant to education in the arts. The focus of many, or perhaps most, school and community arts education programs is on enabling students to make, “appreciate,” and understand the arts for their own personal satisfaction. University teacher preparation in the arts focuses primarily on imparting the skills and instructional methods needed to prepare their students to present performances, productions, and displays for their own edification and that of their audiences. Too often, instruction in the arts is fixated on drilling and refining techniques—processes that are more akin to training than to education (Bowman, 2012). The resultant products and presentations are, though often quite spectacular, isolated, “bracketed,” and out of touch with the pressing problems and issues faced by students in their everyday lives. From a broadly human perspective, the agendas and objectives of many arts educators are narrow, insular, remote, and disconnected from the affairs that matter most in people’s everyday lives.

What we are suggesting here—and what most of the authors in this book imply to one degree or another—is that conventional approaches to arts teaching and learning are not sufficiently educative. They neglect the crucial ethical dimension that distinguishes human practices from mere technical proficiency. They fail to take students to levels of awareness and production that put their artistic abilities to work in service of a wide range of social goods. School and community arts teachers and facilitators should be doing more to help their students understand how the arts make meaningful differences in people’s lives, how responsible artistic practice can actually make the world a better place. Education in the arts should take the form of apprenticeships through which students learn to approach art in ways that are socially responsible, responsive, and constructive.

The chapters that follow document inspiring efforts to understand and engage in art making as socially responsible practice—in ways richly suggestive of instructional practices with compelling transformative possibilities, practices designed to make the world more just and equitable and improve people's lives.

FUNDAMENTAL QUESTIONS

In framing this project, we invited contributors across art disciplines to share their research, their practical projects and strategies, their experiences, and their insights as artistic citizens. As indicated, however, we deliberately left open the meaning of “artistic citizenship” to allow a range of interpretations and perspectives to emerge. The result is, we think, an imaginative and inspiring collection of chapters, richly suggestive in their range and scope. They address and explore quite a number of interlocking and provocative questions, including these:

- What does “citizenship” mean, and how might these meanings relate to our understandings of the privileges and obligations that attend artistic practices?
- How might “artistic citizenship” differ from (or resemble) citizenship in general?
- “Is there a polity called *art* to which persons belong, owe allegiance, and [from which they] derive benefits? If there is such a polity, what practices does being an *artistic citizen* require?” (Schechner, 2006, p. 34).
- In what ways and to what extent do art makers and art takers have responsibilities (or obligations) to deploy the potentials of the arts to advance social justice, human rights, and the like?
- What personal, social, cultural, educational, political, therapeutic, economic, and health-giving goods can artistic engagements (amateur or professional) facilitate?
- What ethical issues and responsibilities attend the concept of art making as a force for advancing positive social and political change?
- How might artistic citizens engage the general public in artistic projects designed to serve diverse public, social, cultural, and political interests?
- How can ethically oriented artistry contribute to the mitigation of racism, sexism, ageism, classism, ethnocentrism, and other forms of social injustice?
- What abilities and dispositions of body, mind, and heart do amateur and professional artists require if they are to engage in, develop, and expand the possibilities and potentials of artistic citizenship?
- What historical precedents can inform and refine our understandings of the “why, what, how, who, where, and when” of artistic citizenship?

- What are the most effective strategies and tactics that artist-activists (or “artists”⁸) use to confront problems like racial violence, poverty, disease, and discrimination?
- What are the specific or distinctive potentials of particular artistic endeavors for fulfilling the commitments and responsibilities of artistic citizenship?
- How can school and community arts education programs develop young people’s habits of heart and mind in and through socially responsible art making?

Additional questions and issues will emerge from the chapters that follow, questions too numerous to list here. But the questions, discussions, and actions to which these chapters lead will be the ultimate measure of this project’s significance. We leave it to our readers, then, to carry these conversations forward—to follow the leads offered by contributors to this volume. Although we cannot know precisely the form those ideas may eventually assume, it is our hope that they will involve continuous critical dialogue across artistic disciplines about the ethical potentials of artistry, the nature of artistic responsibility, and the remarkable capacities of the arts to improve our neighborhoods, our societies, and our world.

OVERVIEW OF THE BOOK

We conclude this introductory chapter with a brief survey of the contributions composing this volume.

In the first section of the book, “Foundational Considerations,” **David Wiles** begins his discussion of theater and citizenship by explaining several early definitions and concepts (by Plato, Aristotle, Polybius, etc.) of the natures, values, and relationships between art and citizenship. From the conceptual themes of classical antiquity, he moves to an examination of Brecht’s school operetta, *He Who Says Yes*, which was adapted from a Japanese Noh play. This play was grounded in choral song, themes of social consensus, and Buddhist spirituality, and then reworked by multiple authors to become an Aristotelian tragedy about moral choices. The lesson Brecht took away from performances of his play was that audiences learn through doing, not watching. The time has come, says Wiles, to take seriously the classical belief that the fundamental purpose of art is to create fellowship and citizenship as experiences of togetherness and community.

Mary Schmidt Campbell discusses the roles of cultural institutions in the rebirth and reconstruction of New York City, when the city was on the verge of bankruptcy. Harlem, Chelsea, downtown Brooklyn, the South Bronx, Flushing Meadows, Queens, Astoria, and 42nd Street became transformed neighborhoods anchored by either not-for-profit or for-profit cultural organizations. She argues that the desire and need to save New York City during the 1970s city was,

at its core, a deliberate act of citizenship at its very best, uniting high and low, rich and poor.

Wayne Bowman explores relationships between citizenship and the rights, responsibilities, privileges, requirements, and obligations generally implicated by artistry. Taking virtue ethics as his point of departure, he investigates the “internal goods” of artistic practice, seeking to show their implications for artists’ responsibilities both to self and to others. Among the questions he considers are “What are the virtues of artistry?” and “How might artistic engagement necessarily implicate responsibility to broader community needs?”

Marissa Silverman and **David Elliott** begin with the assumption that the purpose of arts education is to help students find lifelong and life-wide fulfillment and flourishing—to live a good life, a life of meaningfulness and significance, for themselves and their communities. If arts education can be aimed at empowering students to find meaning in/for their lives, and the lives of those with whom they live, then the very nature of education in/for the arts involves acts of artistic citizenship.

Ana Vujanović, a freelance performing arts/cultural worker, examines how the arts have the potential to shape the agentic powers of citizens, and the relations between “art and the public good” in today’s European neoliberal societies. She proposes that art can be understood as a “bad public good” to the degree that there is a potentially “bad,” rebellious public and another one that is silent, is obedient, and fits the idea(l) of the neoliberal public order. Without fostering their “bad”—disturbing, unpleasant, confusing, uncertain, and noisy—actions and powers, artist-citizens forfeit the possibility of making a significant impact on the public good in the neoliberal, capitalist states.

In the section on “Dance/Movement-Based Arts,” **Liz Lerman**, founder of the Liz Lerman Dance Exchange, discusses in an interview with Marissa Silverman and David Elliott the many ways in which dance is and can be utilized for civic engagement. To cite one example, she discusses her project, *Hallelujah/USA*, which actively engages audience members on stage to present and represent different forms of spirituality. The goal is to create an artistic–therapeutic “balm for deeply political wounds,” rather than a solely intellectual or aesthetically contemplative experience. Through dancing, “representatives from nine different faiths effectively universalized spirituality itself” to reinforce shared sentiments.

In a discussion of Bollywood flash mobs (among other examples), **Sangita Shresthova** focuses on the intersection of live performance, expression, popular culture, new media, and “civic potential.” She explores how live community-based performances created for online circulation become sites of embodied and mediated “artistic citizenship” without making any explicit civic or political claims. She argues that such performances become civically significant precisely because they evade (and even reject) such labeling, which allows them to exist in a civically liminal space.

Naomi Jackson considers how a dance artist’s civic capacities can be characterized in relation to discourses within particular contexts. By examining the specific discourses of somatics/postmodern dance and urban dance practices,

Jackson examines how arts educators can model and provide dance students with constructive roles for establishing and celebrating diverse communities through powerfully embodied and spiritually enriching movement forms. While somatics/postmodern dance discourses provide valuable insights into choice making grounded in gentleness, relaxation, and nonjudgment, specific urban dance practices offer dynamic views of civic life that embrace, challenge, and contest societal norms.

Rodney Diverlus, an independent, Canada-based dancer, choreographer, and community organizer, introduces, deconstructs, and dissects the concept of “artivism” and explains its manifestations, purposes, and social values. While recognizing the need for abstract, personal, form-driven, and curiosity-driven art making, Diverlus argues for the universal application of artivism, for a symbiotic relationship between art and activism. Diverlus investigates key sites to illustrate the integration of theory and practice, elaborate the concept of art makers as agents of social change, explain the juxtapositions of personal and political art, and argue for the importance of dance as a tool of communal engagement. Additionally, he proposes that arts educators radicalize arts-based education as a way of introducing artivism to students and emerging artists. For Diverlus, artivism is both a vision and a call to action. It is a continuation of the age-old question: Why create?

In the section on “Media and Technology,” **Sandra Jeppesen**, **Anna Kruzynski**, and **Coco Riot** discuss the Ste-Émilie Skillshare, a Montreal-based community “do-it-yourself” (DIY) art space that is run by and for people who identify as trans, two-spirit, queer, indigenous, and/or people of color and their allies. This case study fills a gap in research between intersectionality, critical race, and queer theory on the one hand, and DIY alternative media theory on the other. It challenges the boundaries of artistic citizenship and demands a rethinking of the use of the term *citizenship*. Finally, the theories and practices introduced by Ste-Émilie suggest ways in which other DIY spaces might move forward.

Jennifer Parker explains that the powers of social media (among many other things) enable nonspecialists to contribute to research across art, design, and technology. Additionally, Parker acknowledges that social media gives citizens the right to participate as equal members of a networked community, both online and offline. In her discussion, Parker draws from collaborative projects in Urban Hacking and Placemaking dedicated to improving the livability of communities by combining ideas of art and technology. For example, at Trinity College in Dublin, Ireland, “Hack the City” invited Dublin’s citizens to “take control and adopt a hacker mindset to bend, tweak, and mash up Dublin’s existing urban systems” and, in doing so, to rethink the city “from the ground up.” Individually led projects include Lucy Orta workshops in Johannesburg aimed at teaching unemployed people new fashion skills and how to work for collective solidarity, and Suzon Fuks’s “Water-Wheel” project, a social media platform focused on water politics and the richness of the topic for artistic expression.

Media artist **Eric Kluitenberg** discusses how participatory cultures attempt to lift citizens out of individual isolation and engage them in processes of communal

exchange and creative forms of sociality that enable new modes of “the political” to emerge. Simultaneously, new strategic forces of commodification and coercion (state, corporate, ideological) come into play. Kluitenberg argues that to navigate this perilous landscape, a “tactical citizenship” must be articulated. He is concerned with retaining the emancipatory potential that practices of participatory culture offer us without falling prey to new systems of coercion, especially in the online domain. Kluitenberg examines three art initiatives that offer important insights into how this complex negotiation might be achieved.

Raz Yosef and **Yaara Ozery** reflect on the civic–ethical roles played by contemporary Israeli documentary film artists in representing testimonies related to the Israeli–Palestinian conflict. More specifically, they discuss the special use of documentary re-enactment in depicting those testimonies, focusing mainly on Shlomi Elkabetz’s 2011 film *Testimony*. In this film, the re-enacted testimonies do not represent an attempt of the filmmaker to return to an “authentic” historical truth; rather, they emphasize and expose the very act of the testimonies’ re-enactments as performances. As such, the authors examine the artistic responsibilities of documentary filmmakers as seekers of “truth” through “re-enactment.”

In the section dedicated to “Music,” **Thomas Turino** argues that social change and new forms of citizenship fundamentally involve new habits of thought and practice within individuals, and habits that contrast with and challenge the status quo. For Turino, *participatory* music making and dance are activities that can be potent resources for social change and provide alternative models for citizenship. According to Turino, this is the case because participatory music and dance operate according to values and practices diametrically opposed to capitalist values; they are voluntary, open to anyone who is interested, and, by nature, they engender a kind of egalitarian consensus building. Participatory music and dance lead to a continuity of involvement necessary for habit change, and habits become the basis of special social *cohorts*—voluntary social groups drawn together by enthusiasm for the activity and by shared preexisting tendencies toward the broader values that underlie the activity. Becoming a part of social cohorts, according to Turino, aligns with aspects of artistic citizenship, because when one engages with/through music with/for others, empathy and fellowship fuel that person and the community to which he or she belongs.

Geoffrey Baker probes and reflects critically on the Venezuelan youth orchestra program El Sistema. He argues that while scholarship on citizenship education focuses on modeling democracy, critical debate about civic values, and political participation, all of these values are lacking in the Venezuelan El Sistema program, a program whose aim is, supposedly, social in orientation. Instead, Baker states that the program’s principal value is discipline, which—following Foucault—tends to generate docile technicians, as opposed to empowered and engaged citizens. This leads to the conclusion that El Sistema produces loyal subjects, trained to obey authority, rather than good citizens, educated to participate in democratic processes. However, according to Baker, there are many ways in

which large ensemble education might be reconfigured to place collaboration and critical reflection at its heart.

Brydie-Leigh Bartleet and **Gavin Carfoot** examine how arts-based service learning with First Peoples can engender intercultural understanding, reconciliation, social justice, and, more broadly, artistic citizenship. Bartleet and Carfoot provide a definition and framework for arts-based service learning with First Peoples that builds on internationally based literature, as well as 5 years of arts-based service learning work with Australian Aboriginal artists and university students. These insights are underpinned by concepts of artistic citizenship; in particular, an examination of how the arts can work for the betterment of other people's lives, as well as broader commitments to social justice and an ethics of caring.

Composer and media studies scholar **Martin Scherzinger** discusses the debated and theorized concern of intellectual property (IP) within music. Scherzinger asks: Should creative and innovative works be the object of ownership? Does the law have the ability to develop and encourage innovation in the arts and sciences? Should the author-concept govern the legal ownership of artifacts of culture? Should cyberspace alter the shape of copyright law? To answer these questions and more, Scherzinger investigates the dialectics of digital music pertaining to legal modes of economic valuation. For Scherzinger, "ownership"—whether literal or virtual—and the rights associated with ownership yield important implications for understanding artistic citizenship.

In the section dedicated to "Poetry and Storytelling," the slam poet, hip-hop artist, and activist **Kyle "Guante" Tran Myhre** explains the participatory natures of spoken word, slam poetry, and performance poetry. This chapter, written by a practitioner largely for a nonpractitioner audience, explores some of the fundamental elements of slam poetry, addresses common misconceptions, and illuminates what is important about this resurgence of the oral tradition. Additionally, Myhre considers the civic potentials within slam poetry and relates these potentials to the nature of artistic citizenship. The participatory means and ends of slam poetry parallel Turino's investigation in interesting ways

Aria Fani examines Persian literary cultures. For Fani, and for Persian people, the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan (1979–1989) ignited a heightened awareness of concepts of citizenship, homeland, and exile. In the absence of a centralized political body in Kabul, which might have been able to articulate the need to maintain the unity of the nation, poets expressed variegated narratives of what constituted Afghan "identity" and loyalty to the nation. Contextualizing the work of three Afghan poets in their literary milieu, Fani examines "resistance poetry" in Afghanistan today. For Fani, "resistance poetry" remains a vast and fluid space wherein composite idioms—humanistic and nationalistic, Persianate, and Islamic—lend themselves to expressions of protest, exile, and loyalty to homeland. Such expressions are acts of artistic citizenship, states Fani, because they are intended to resist, challenge, transform, and provide hope and a voice for the oppressed citizens of Afghanistan who were subjected to the boots of Soviet occupation.

Laura Dolp and **Eveljn Ferraro** investigate the creative work of Gabriella Ghermandi—a writer, musician, and performer of the spoken word with roots in the Horn of Africa and in Italy. Illustrating the relationships between storytelling, history, and resistance, Dolp and Ferraro focus on Ghermandi’s musical collaborations with Ethiopian and Italian musicians in the Atse Tewodros Project. In the process, they consider the ways in which Ghermandi’s storytelling is a form of activism that utilizes the emotional components of performance to relate a historical narrative worthy of an audience’s empathy. This informs our understanding of artistic citizenship by providing another concrete example of how the arts can be “put to work” for the improvement of people’s personal, social, political, and community lives.

In the section devoted to “Theater,” **David Montgomery** asks, “What does it mean to be a Puerto Rican citizen?” For Montgomery, this specific question is directly related to two other questions: “What is artistic citizenship?” and “Is it separable from citizenship in general?” After providing a brief history of Puerto Rico, Montgomery describes theater sites of artistic citizenship that address current issues such as politics and identity in the Puerto Rican community. Specifically, Montgomery explores how alternative theater practices in Applied Theater (including street theater, masks, puppets, physical theater, playwriting, and Theater of the Oppressed techniques) fuel concepts of citizenship aligned with self-expression, interaction, critical reflection, and communication in the community.

Sibylle Peters probes the issue of how performance art can help change and develop concepts and practices of citizenship. She refers to current programs of performance art–based research in Hamburg, Germany, such as the Theater of Research and the PhD program *Performing Citizenship*. Peters introduces the concept of “performative citizenship” and makes the case that this concept is a basic, theoretical framework for unpacking the paradox that lies within “acts of citizenship.” Peters explains why acts of citizenship often occur in the realm of performance art practices.

Nicola Shaughnessy begins her investigation with this question: “Are there qualitative or quantitative data that support claims for the ‘social goods’ of art making?” Shaughnessy cites a range of case studies that showcase the value of participatory arts as means of engaging with difference, otherness, and intersubjectivity. Drawing upon theories of embodied cognition, and with references to a rigorous framework for evaluating engagement in participatory arts activities, Shaughnessy argues that participatory theater arts demonstrate the value of emotional engagements with learning, the value of the arts in engendering emotional engagement, and the value of using professionally minded and sympathetic artists in efforts to promote emotional engagement and greater well-being through the arts. All of this work, for Shaughnessy, is at the heart of artistic citizenship.

The final section of the book is dedicated to the “Visual Arts.” **Coco Guzman** interrogates the nature of artistic citizenship through practice. A Spanish artist and social activist who is deeply concerned about the repressive actions of the current Spanish government—a regime Guzman regards as fundamentally

fascistic—Guzman explores artistic practices with the potential to subvert policies that undermine free speech, access to affordable housing, and fair wages.

Museum curator **Diane Mullin** critically examines selected American artists (from the 20th to the 21st centuries, native and immigrant) to consider the possibilities and limits of the ideas of the “common” and the “equal” not just as democratic principles, but also as democratic strategies for artistic *work*. Key to her discussion is the notion of the centrality of *work* in its verb form as an organizing and defining principle for a democratic art. Practice in this scheme becomes a game changer. Mullin reviews the theory of “dematerialization of the object” in the 1960s and considers its nascent (at least) claims to a democratic vision. She then proposes a redefinition of the object as the product of *work* while also broadening the idea of the object as both material and immaterial.

Tyson Lewis explores democratic pedagogy in the arts. Using Jacques Rancière’s work on universal teaching, democratic dissensus, and the politics of the arts, Lewis argues that engaging with the arts leads to a different concept of what it means to be a citizen. Instead of being tied to predetermined skills, dispositions, virtues, or content knowledge, a democratic subject is first and foremost a curious subject who is exposed to details of experience that would otherwise be marginalized, ignored, or rendered invisible by common sense. According to Lewis, Rancière’s “aesthetic regime” points us toward a redistribution of the sensible partitioning of social, political, and economic relations, which creates an affective space and time of democratic discontinuity. For Lewis, this affective discontinuity ruptures the ordering principles underlying hierarchical and exclusionary practices.

AN INVITATION

As indicated earlier, the questions, discussions, and actions to which these chapters lead will be the ultimate measure of this project’s significance. We believe it is important, then, for our readers to become actively involved in the ongoing conversations and debates concerning art, artistry, the arts, and art education begun in this volume. It is our hope that this volume may help generate continued critical dialogue across artistic disciplines about the ethical potentials of artistry, the nature of artistic responsibility, and the remarkable capacities of art to improve our neighborhoods, our societies, and our world. These are important discussions that everyone who engages in artistic practices should become actively involved.

This book is linked to its own website designed to deepen readers’ understandings of and interests in the issues raised in this volume. The website is intended to provide readers with (a) video clips of artistic citizenship in action around the world; (b) recorded interviews with scholars and practitioners working in a variety of global sites; (c) a blog designed to answer questions, motivate action, and create a global network of scholars and practitioners; and (d) supplementary resources about existing and emerging initiatives.

We will update the website regularly with new ideas and examples that we locate and identify ourselves and from feedback we obtain from blogging and readers' contributions. In these ways, we believe this website will become a "virtual meeting place" that provides an international forum for artists, scholars, educators, and readers to exchange ideas. Please visit us at <http://www.artistic-citizenship.com> and join in the conversation.

NOTES

1. For further discussion of praxis, see Chapter 5 in this volume.
2. See Art Spring. Retrieved from <http://artspring.org/about/community/>
3. See BOMB: Artists in Conversation. An Interview with Coco Fusco and Guillermo Gómez-Peña by Anna Johnson. Retrieved from <http://bombmagazine.org/article/1599/>
4. See The Robert F. Kennedy Performance Project. Retrieved from <http://www.rfkineky.org/project/about.htm>
5. See The Robert F. Kennedy Performance Project. Retrieved from <http://rfkineky.org/project/malpede.htm>
6. See The Robert F. Kennedy Performance Project. Retrieved from <http://rfkineky.org/project/malpede.htm>
7. Michael Tippett quoted in Gloag (1999, p. 3).
8. The concept of "activism" and therefore "artist" can be found in Rodney Diverlus's chapter (in this volume) and also Sandoval and Latorre (2007).

REFERENCES

- Bowman, W. (2002). Educating musically. In R. Colwell & C. Richardson (Eds.), *The new handbook of research on music teaching and learning* (pp. 63–84). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Bowman, W. (2012). Music's place in education. In G. McPherson & G. Welch (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of music education* (pp. 21–39). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Bowman, W. (2013). The ethical significance of music-making. *Music Mark: The UK Association for Music Education*, 3(Winter), 3–6 (<http://musicmark.org.uk>).
- Cross, I. (2011). Music and biocultural evolution. In M. Clayton, T. Herbert, & R. Middleton (Eds.), *The cultural study of music* (pp. 19–30). London, UK: Routledge.
- Dewey, J. (1934). *Art as experience*. New York, NY: G. P. Putnam's Sons.
- Elliott, D. J. (2012). Music education as/for artistic citizenship. *Music Educators Journal*, 99(1), 21–27.
- Elliott, D. J., & Silverman, M. (2012). Rethinking philosophy, re-viewing musical-emotional experiences. In W. Bowman & A. L. Frega (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of philosophy in music education* (pp. 37–62). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Elliott, D. J., & Silverman, M. (2015). *Music matters: A philosophy of music education* (2nd ed.). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

- Gabrielsson, A. (2001). Emotions in strong experiences with music. In P. N. Juslin & J. A. Sloboda (Eds.), *Music and emotion: Theory and research* (pp. 431–49). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Gloag, K. (1999). *Tippett: A child of our time*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Huron, D. (2003). Is music an evolutionary adaptation? In I. Peretz & R. Zatorre (Eds.), *The cognitive neuroscience of music* (pp. 43–61). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Huron, D. (2006). *Sweet anticipation: Music and the psychology of expectation*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Liu, E., & Hanauer, N. (2011). *The gardens of democracy: A new American story of citizenship, the economy, and the role of government*. Seattle, WA: Sasquatch Books.
- Panksepp, J., & Bernatzky, G. (2002). Emotional sounds and the brain: The neuron-affective foundations of musical appreciation. *Behavioral Processes*, 60, 133–155.
- Regelski, T. (1998). The Aristotelian bases of praxis for music and music education as praxis. *Philosophy of Music Education Review*, 6(1), 22–59.
- Sandoval, C., & Latorre, G. (2007). Chicana/o activism: Judy Baca's digital work with youth of color. In A. Everett (Ed.), *Learning race and ethnicity* (pp. 81–108). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Schechner, R. (2006). A polity of its own called art? In M. Schmidt Campbell & R. Martin (Eds.), *Artistic citizenship: A public voice for the arts* (pp. 33–42). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Schmidt Campbell, M., & Martin, R. (2006). *Artistic citizenship: A public voice for the arts*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Art and Citizenship

The History of a Divorce

DAVID WILES ■

Today we are accustomed to thinking of ourselves as being, preeminently, individuals—that is, unique personalities complete with feelings that we assume are peculiar to ourselves—and it is an article of faith that we are endowed with free will that equips us to make democratic choices. Seen through this contemporary lens, citizenship is a function of “me,” not “us.” In this chapter, I will take a long view from history that calls into question prevailing assumptions about the relationship between art and the citizen. Our modern common sense is challenged when we try to get inside the head of Aristotle, who declared nearly two and a half millennia ago: “It is clear then that the state is of its nature prior to the individual” (*Politics* 1.1253a).¹ Most of Aristotle’s contemporaries would have agreed with him, and reasonably enough, for no human being can grow up or survive without social interaction. From this Greek perspective, there was no distinction between selfhood and citizenship, because it is in the nature of developed human beings to gather themselves in communities. A view from the ancient world gives us a critical purchase on what it is to be a “citizen” and will help us understand how citizenship could, should, or might relate to what we have learned to call “the arts.”

DEFINITIONS

The ancient world has bestowed on us the language that we use in present-day discussions of art and citizenship, and understanding that vocabulary encourages us to make assumptions that are deeply ideological but pass for common sense. I will begin by tracking some of the key terms in the debate, to show how their meaning is a potential source of confusion.

Art. From the Latin *ars* meaning simply a skill, the word morphed at the end of the 18th century to invoke a domain of the purely aesthetic, of “works of art” that aimed not to be useful but to be beautiful. The equivalent Greek term *techne* morphed in the other direction to yield words like technology, things useful but frequently not beautiful.

Citizen. Someone who had full rights in a mediaeval *city*. Radical French thinking in the 18th century gave increased ethical loading to the French term *citoyen*, which imparted itself to English and American conceptions of citizenship, building on sentiment that had already been attached to the word *citizen* by English puritans rebelling against the English crown.

Civics. From the Latin *civis*, a citizen of Rome—a legal rather than a local concept, for a citizen might live anywhere in the Roman Empire. Civics is a US term that has never transferred to monarchical England, and implies a training in civic virtue and knowledge. The word relates etymologically to *civilization*. It was commonly thought in the French Enlightenment of the 18th century that men needed the beautifying polish of civilization (or *civility* in a world that has now vanished) to be full members of civil society.

Community. The ambiguity in the root word *common* (Latin *communis*) is that it relates on the one hand to the simple idea of sharing, but on the other hand to common people as distinct from a social elite.

Culture. From the root Latin word meaning growing (as in “horticulture”), the word evolved via 19th-century German thought in two distinct directions. It implied on the one hand a set of beliefs and customs that distinguished one ethnic *culture* from another in a colonized globe, and on the other hand (with a capital C) high *Culture*, the arts, effectively the ethnic culture of an elite social class.

Music. In its Greek usage (*mousike*), the word referred to all that came under the domain of the chorus of Muses. It embraced the performance arts of singing, dancing, dramatic enactment, storytelling, and instrumental accompaniment, which combined together in most performance practice, integrating voice with body. Christian monks used their voices to glorify God while trying to stop their bodies from dancing, but it was above all the emergence of the pianoforte that allowed “music” to be abstracted from the human body. The etymological link of *music* to the Muses implies that artistic creation is not merely a learned skill but requires divine inspiration.

Politics. From the Greek *politikos*, someone who acts as a citizen, a fully functioning member of a Greek *polis* or city-state within a participatory democratic system. Greek men distinguished their political activity from the domestic or “ecological” sphere, and were encouraged to regard it as more significant. In modern “representative” democracies, political life tends to sit on the sidelines of a social and personal life.

Society. *Societas* lives at the heart of Cicero's system of moral values, and he uses the word to capture the horizontal relations of fellowship that link humans together, relations potentially reinforced by the togetherness of listening to a piece of music or theater. Now "society" has become so much of an abstraction that Margaret Thatcher could famously deny its existence.

THE DANCE CULTURE OF GREEK ANTIQUITY

Modern conceptions of citizenship have traveled from antiquity by two distinct routes, from Greece and from Rome. Greek conceptions of citizenship were bound up with living in the face-to-face environment of a city-state, and democracy was the logical extension of citizenship. Greek democracy had little to do with the modern practice of voting every 4 or 5 years in the privacy of a booth to elect some representative who will make decisions on our behalf, because citizens in democratic Athens participated both in the legislature and in the rotating executive. Democracy meant far more than voting together; it also meant fighting together and dancing together, two closely linked activities that involved surrendering one's individual body to a common rhythm.

Plato's blueprints for an ideal society give us a vivid picture of what it felt like to live the democratic life. Plato explains that creating a harmonious society is a matter of rhythm, and to build a society more stable than democratic Athens, he proposed to establish dance rhythms to which the bodies of citizens would become habituated. The skills of a politician are, from this perspective, identical to those of a choreographer. Plato claims that people like himself, intent on designing a new society, "are the poets of a tragedy as beautiful and noble as it can possibly be. That is, our entire polity has been set up as a mimesis ['artistic representation'] of the most beautiful and noble life, so we may describe it as the truest tragedy." Plato goes on to express the hope that "this most perfect of dramas constitutes the culmination of the one true law"—the word used for "law" here being *nomos*, which also means a musical mode or song (*Laws* VII.817). The key to becoming a good citizen lies not in conscious acts of decision making, but in the development of appropriate psychophysical habits and reactions. Plato's vision of a harmonious society maps onto a perfectly trained and coordinated human body, and onto a conception of the universe as a harmonious system with the stars dancing in a heavenly chorus, their movements reducible to mathematically perfect ratios.

Plato's vision of dance as the glue that holds society together corresponded to social reality. When the cities of Arcadia in the mountains of southern Greece formed themselves into a federation in 371 BCE, they were at pains to build a theater and to legislate so both boys and young men under 30 would dance in public every year, funded by the state. Military training was undertaken in the form of dance routines to the music of the piper. The purpose of this new federated city (called Megalopolis—the "great city") was self-defense, in face of the threat from

nearby Sparta. The theater that the Arcadians built was probably the earliest circular stone auditorium in the Greek world, an architectural expression of civic harmony used both for political assemblies and for different forms of “music.” The Greek historian Polybius came from Megalopolis, and he proudly set out the function of music in terms that would impress forward-thinking European intellectuals in the 17th and 18th centuries.

The first Arcadians had sense in bringing music so comprehensively into the constitution, making it a compulsory part of the upbringing not just of boys but of young men up to the age of thirty, a counter to the austerity of their general lifestyle. It is common knowledge that the Arcadians are unique in the way children are legally obliged from infancy to learn to sing hymns and paeans in which they all celebrate the patronal heroes and gods of their particular localities. Later, they learn the tunes [“laws”] of Philoxenus and Timotheus, which they dance zealously every year in the theaters at the Festival of Dionysus to the sound of the flute, boys in the boys’ contest, youths in what is called the men’s contest. In the same general way, through the rest of their lives they take part in these musical contests, never using imported musicians but challenging each other to perform in rotation. . . . The young men display their marching to the sound of the flute, and are supported and funded by the community to rehearse their dancing every year in performances before their fellow citizens. This was instituted, I gather, by an earlier generation who contemplated the independence of the population and the harshness of their working lives, and gave heed also to their austerity of character, formed by the cold and gloomy climate typical of the region. . . . Desiring to soften and break up these stubborn and unbending natures, they introduced all the measures I have mentioned and additionally they established communal meetings and a multitude of sacrifices involving both men and women, and dancing by girls as well as boys—and in short they worked out everything to ensure that through the management of rituals a rigid temperament would be tamed and softened. (*Histories* IV.20)

Polybius went on to contrast the Arcadians of Megalopolis with a neighboring city that lacked this musical culture and was reviled for its brutality.

What Polybius describes here is a conscious use of the arts to create social cohesion. Children from different communities within the federation offer songs and dances (the two were always conjoined) related to their own local gods, and the structure of competition helps bind together the competing groups—just like the Olympic Games at a national level. Marching together in rhythm helps to create a cohesive fighting unit in which no individual will ever think to turn and run, and provides stamina for marching across the mountains and energy for a charge at the Spartan army. The division of the population according to age and gender creates a mapping of the community independent of family and locality, and helps people identify themselves as fundamentally part of Megalopolis. The

introduction of this dance culture was designed to counter the instincts that arose from a world where everyone toils on their own singular plot of land. What Polybius remarks upon as a political innovation was the replacement of custom by law: It was no longer a social expectation but a legal requirement that every child should participate in collective dancing.

Thinkers of the Enlightenment like Voltaire relished Polybius's argument that culture is a humanizing force. Shocked by the horrors of a century or more of religious wars, the men of the 18th century developed a feminized culture of feeling, where the ability to weep in public was a token of one's humanity, and theater and opera were dominated by the figure of the actress. Polybius implies that those who sing and dance become kinder and better people. Although dance was the basis of military training, he stresses the importance of female participation in ritual to take the edge off male aggression. In this respect, Megalopolis was more like Sparta than Athens, because the Athenians gave little place to women in public life on account of their determination to downplay domestic life and family ties for the sake of an expanded democratic structure.

THE THEATER CULTURE OF ATHENS

Polybius portrays Megalopolis as a culture of participation. In his *Politics*, Aristotle set out a very different ideal, that of the gentleman of leisure, conceived of from the perspective of a slave society as an adult male who was fully free because he did not work with his hands. Aristotle was anxious that someone who played the *aulos* (the Greek double flute) was engaged in a kind of manual labor and distorted the natural beauty of his face. It followed from this argument that the truly free man was the spectator, and it was this mindset that led Aristotle to write his famous *Poetics*, a work that separated the poetic or literary text from the festive, material, and embodied world of its performance. Athens did not go quite so far as Megalopolis in insisting upon a culture of participation. While young citizens danced the choruses of a tragedy, the actors and flute player in the performance of tragedy were commonly foreigners. Athens was a trading state, made rich by its exported ceramics and by its military conquests, and it could afford to import the best international artists.

Polybius mentions the Festival of Dionysus but has nothing specifically to say about tragedy, or what we would now call "theater." Plato wanted to banish tragedy from his utopian republic because it involved constant innovation, disrupting the traditional "laws" of music. Since we inevitably imitate that which we watch (as indeed modern neurology confirms), then to watch men dressed up to dance like women or like foreign slaves was to break the psychophysical habits that were for Plato the basis of morality. If people learn by taking on positive role models, what can they possibly learn by imitating and thus becoming a morally bad person? Tragedy pictured a world of disharmony, where conflict seemed part of the human condition, incapable of any final resolution. Though choral dancing always entailed competition as a spur to excellence, public disagreement

about ethical principles was a different matter. Tragedy was traceable historically to the moment when an individual actor stepped out of the chorus and created drama through the dissident relationship he created with the chorus, but Plato preferred pure chorality, with no space for any tension between the desires of the individual and the needs of the collective. Tragedy, as Plato saw it, was essentially choral dancing supplemented or contaminated by speeches delivered by impersonated characters, and his determination to ban tragedy from his ideal state has a logic that is hard to refute: What place can there be for the portrayal of conflict in a society that is at peace with itself? Of course, as many have pointed out, Plato assumes that a perfect and wise ruler will emerge to oversee this world of harmony, and perfect rulers have through history been conspicuously lacking. What Plato refuses to countenance in his model republic is freedom of speech as a check upon those who claim to be perfect rulers. The right to freedom of speech was a cornerstone of Athenian democratic thinking; both tragedy and comedy were a response to that principle.

This ideal is most obvious in comedy, where Aristophanes in his early plays delivered a series of satirical attacks on a politician called Cleon, whose base of support lay among the poor, and who championed military expansion. Cleon tried in vain to take legal action against Aristophanes. How far Aristophanes wrote on behalf of the landed classes, and how far it was in the nature of comedy as a festive genre to celebrate peace rather than war, is unclear. The plays of Euripides that reflect the horrors of the long Peloponnesian war fought against Sparta are likewise also often thought to have a political agenda. More broadly, and much more importantly, Athenian tragedy provided a mass education in citizenship through the gripping and outrageous moral and political arguments that characters pit against each other within the fiction of the play. Men who followed the cut and thrust of arguments put up by masked figures in tragedy were much better equipped to do the same thing in the murky and complex environment of the assembly or law court, where it was harder to see the issues for the personalities. With the question of freedom of speech, we come to the main tension in modern debates about art and citizenship. What is the purpose of art—to bind people together into some kind of community, or to provide a radical dissenting voice that subverts an unthinking status quo? My own patterns of intellectual thought were shaped in the 1960s, when subversion was the be-all and end-all, but in the 21st century no revolutionary utopia seems to be on offer, and there is much more emphasis on citizenship being grounded in consensus.

Athens was much larger than any other Greek city-state, and as a political entity it embraced a multitude of surrounding towns and villages. While Megalopolis insisted on a culture of participation, Athenian tragedy marks the first step in creating a culture of spectatorship. In the city of Athens, only a tiny number of citizens danced in the chorus, but a huge number could share in the act of spectatorship, laughing and weeping in full view of their fellow citizens, caught up together in the rhythms of the performance. A distinctive new feature of tragedy was that the text (including musical notation) could be separated from the performance, which meant that many more citizens could take part as both

dancers and spectators when those same scripts were reperformed in the outlying towns and villages. Tragedies began their lives as scripts that the political officers of the moment had to approve and ended up lodged in an Athenian public archive. In the course of this process, the author's work of art increasingly separated itself from the people designated to embody it. Comedy worked differently because the script was tied more directly to its original time and place: The leading figure in Aristophanic comedy was always an Athenian, resolving in some bizarre and fantastical manner the political issues of the moment. Once comedy was reinvented after Aristophanes's death as a love story in a domestic setting, it was ripe for export across the whole Greek-speaking Mediterranean world—a transportable commodity like olives or ceramics.

ART AND EMOTION: ROME, THE RENAISSANCE, AND THE ENLIGHTENMENT

In Rome, citizenship conferred legal rights rather than a significant stake in government. There was not, as in Greece, any obvious connection between the idea of citizenship and the idea of democracy. The great and abiding strength of the Roman tradition of citizenship, sustained by its philosophical roots in Stoicism, lay in its challenge to the values of tribe, nation, and ethnicity. The strength and longevity of the Roman Empire owed much to its insistence that all citizens were legally, if not economically and politically, homogeneous. During the American and French Revolutions, the men who spoke lyrically about citizenship looked to Republican Rome rather than to Athens for their model. Romans were members of the Republic (literally, “the public thing”) by virtue of their birth, but more importantly because they owned property, and the Athenian principle that every citizen should have an equal vote and an equal right to be heard seemed an intolerable threat to the right of property. Wealth conferred on certain Roman citizens both the duty and the privilege of serving the Republic more fully. The arts in Rome fell under the general rubric of *ludus*—“play” or “festival.” Music and theater were bracketed with chariot racing and gladiator fighting as pleasures that a rich man could offer his fellow citizens to secure their approval for appointment to a political office. Though Greek ideas about culture slowly percolated into Roman thinking, it was a long-standing assumption that the functions of a performer were incompatible with those of a Roman citizen.

In the Renaissance, with Rome rather than Greece providing the reference point for a better world, actors modeled themselves less upon the masked actor performing to massed crowds in an open-air theater than upon the orator, a figure whom Cicero idealized as the ultimate servant of the Republic. The persona of public speaker helped actors to justify themselves against the assault of Christian reformists, who claimed that actors merely incited audiences to vice and had no place in the City of God. The works of three Roman dramatists survive. The two writers of comedy, Plautus and Terence, were both social outsiders: Plautus came from an Umbrian town captured by the Romans only 17 years

before his birth, and initially worked in a style of comedy associated with the Oscan dialect, while Terence was a North African slave. Seneca the tragedian, on the other hand, was at the center of Roman political life as tutor to the emperor, with impeccable social credentials as the son of a famous orator. Seneca's tragedies do not address the political world, which of course he knew intimately, but use the theatrical medium to explore extreme situations, part of a philosophical and pedagogical project to understand and manage emotion. Until the late 19th and 20th centuries, it was the prevailing assumption that people went to the theater and opera for the pleasure of experiencing intense emotions in a safe environment, and Seneca's tragedies were from this perspective just as valuable as the intellectually provocative dramas of the Greeks. Theater of high emotion related to citizenship because of the social relations set up in the auditorium, not because dramatists and librettists were in a direct sense teachers of citizenship. It was indeed only in recent times that people began to read Greek plays as plays of ideas, plays that are about individual acts of moral choice.

The Platonist and Roman prejudice that good actors cannot be good citizens had a long afterlife. Diderot, for example, was one of the key philosophers of the French Enlightenment who helped put "citizenship" back on the agenda as a moral ideal powerful enough to replace the repressive morality of Christianity, so preparing the ground for the secular ideals of the French Revolution. In his *Paradox of the Actor* (c. 1770), Diderot imagined a conversation between an obliging member of the acting profession and himself, the author of a moralistic play that had become a hit at the Comédie Française. In this dialogue, the author remarks to the actor that no one ever entered the modern acting profession "through a taste for virtue, through a desire to be useful in society, and to serve one's country or one's family. . . . I see nothing that distinguishes them [actors] from other citizens unless it be vanity that amounts to arrogance, and jealousy that fills their company with discord and hatred" (Diderot, 2005, pp. 314–315). This was Diderot's platform for maintaining that the actor should be in absolute rational control over feeling, and by implication should function as an obedient tool of the playwright, who alone has the capacity to impart morality to an audience of citizens. Diderot the moralist falls victim here to the old Platonist prejudice that actors are professional pretenders and as such cannot be honest members of the political community. Nevertheless, he did not completely close his eyes to the insoluble conundrum set out by Rousseau: How can theater preach virtue effectively, when spectators seem to abandon their normal moral personas upon entry into the theater auditorium and apply a quite different set of values to what they see on stage (Diderot, 2005, pp. 318–319)? This conundrum may explain why Diderot chose not to pursue his career as a playwright and preferred to try and change the world through his philosophical writings.

In the remainder of this chapter, I shall focus on a libretto by Bertolt Brecht, written for children in hopes that it would serve as an education in citizenship. This project illustrates some of the fundamental tensions that underlie the inherited classical ideal of citizenship. Like Diderot, Brecht set out to use theater to inspire the audience to build a better world, but unlike Diderot, he also respected

the intellect and ethics of the actor. The particular interest of this case study lies in its Japanese source material, which I shall use to highlight some of the Westernness of the classical ideal of citizenship.

BRECHT: OPERA AS EDUCATION

Brecht wrote *Der Jasager* (“He Who Says Yes”) for a festival in Berlin in 1930, at the request of his musical collaborator Kurt Weill. This was a critical historical moment, when the ethnic and nationalistic values of fascism were on the rise, and the old republican values of freedom were being suppressed. The German president assumed dictatorial powers in that year, and the Weimar Republic would soon be transformed into the Third Reich—theoretically, a third incarnation of the Roman Empire. Brecht himself was inspired by Marxism, which has a problematic relationship to the ideal of citizenship because of its commitment to the ultimate withering away of the state. At this moment of political crisis, Brecht felt that he needed to abandon his own anarchic and individualistic tendencies and commit himself unreservedly to a cause, Communism. His operas written in partnership with Weill, *The Threepenny Opera* and *Mahagonny*, had both delighted and scandalized public audiences, but there was little indication that they had transformed hearts and minds, or had any prospect of changing society. A different kind of social intervention was required to build a better world. He therefore wrote a sequence of *Lehrstücke*—he preferred the English translation “learning plays” to the more literal “teaching plays” (Steinweg, 1976, p. 150)²—for amateur performance, working different variants on the same theme that preoccupied him: the need of the individual to suppress his or her immediate human impulses for the sake of a long-term collective good.

The text that ended up as Brecht’s *Der Jasager* originated from a mediaeval Noh play called *Taniko*. The power of that Japanese text relates to the clash of cultures that it articulates. On one level, it is a Confucian parable celebrating extreme filial piety: A boy sacrifices his life for the sake of his sick mother by undertaking a rigorous pilgrimage into the mountains to pray for her. However, it is also a witness to Buddhist values of compassion, demonstrated by all the characters but most notably by the master, who has been persuaded to take his pupil on this dangerous expedition. It justifies furthermore to a Buddhist faith in prayer and reincarnation, for the play represents the practice of an extreme Buddhist sect that sought access to divinity by subjecting their bodies to extreme hardship in the mountains, and it is the rule of this sect that anyone who falls sick has to be thrown over a precipice to save contaminating the others; after the boy has been killed in this ritual manner, the long-dead founder of the sect materializes to call up a demon who rescues the boy from death. The inhabitation of the mountain by demons relates also to the animist tradition of Japanese Shintoism. The emotional power of the story has something in common with the Judeo-Christian story of Abraham called by God to sacrifice his son: All parties behave with absolute integrity and are rewarded by a miracle.

The practice of Noh theater had a strong spiritual dimension. The successful actor had to develop extreme physical self-discipline and practice the elimination of ego; the beauty of the poetry and the dance is inseparable from the ethical and spiritual values that the play explores. The celebrated Noh actor Zeami clarified the social function of this in his account of the origins of Noh theater. When unbelievers disrupted a dedication ceremony conducted by the Buddha in India, a performance of 66 entertainments by three of the Buddha's disciples soothed their unruly behavior and allowed the ceremony to go forward. When Buddhism reached Japan, there was a reincarnation of the Chinese emperor at the Japanese court, another scene of political unrest. This miraculous emperor performed the 66 dramatic entertainments at the Royal Palace, while the Japanese prince carved 66 masks for the performers, and these performances brought peace to the country. Zeami adds that when the capital was transferred to Kyoto, it was accepted that dramatic art, in addition to spreading the teachings of the Buddha, would "call forth happiness, so that the country will remain in tranquillity, bringing gentleness and long life to the people" (Zeami, 1984, pp. 32–35). The basic assumption is clear: theater had a positive social function, because inner tranquility yields political tranquility.

Taniko reached the West when it featured in a volume of Noh plays translated by Arthur Waley and published in 1921. The simple act of publishing a translation immediately created a timeless work of art that seemed to have life independent of its users, separating the text (which formerly only existed in divergent manuscripts held by the different schools) from the choreography and music once impossible to dissociate from the script. Though a scrupulously precise translator, Waley's intervention was radical. He excised a lot of the poetic and spiritual material, and the entirety of the climax, so the play ended with the death of the boy. Waley's first degree was in Classics, and he did not believe that any single Noh play was "so complete a poem as the tragedies of Sophocles" (Waley, 1921, p. 55); consequently, he remolded the play for an English readership as a Sophoclean tragedy where the young hero makes an idealistic but misguided choice (a *hamartia* in Aristotelian vocabulary) and meets his inevitable doom. Waley brought the play into line with the classical paradigm of conflict between the individual citizen and the collective represented by the chorus. Greek theater offered helpful analogs to the Japanese story in the figure of Iphigenia, who sacrifices herself to prevent revolution in the Greek army, and Evadne, who throws herself into a funeral pyre to demonstrate solidarity.

The classical ideal of citizenship was close to Waley's heart. Being of German-Jewish extraction, he could not identify with the nationalistic bloodletting that had recently taken place in the Great War, and he looked for a different set of aesthetic principles in keeping with his socialist upbringing. Noh theater had been popularized by a volume of translations entitled *Certain Noble Plays of Japan*, introduced by W. B. Yeats (1959) and published in Ireland—as the volume declared—"in the year of the Sinn Féin uprising." Yeats was attracted by the aristocratic and esoteric elements in Noh and used it as an inspiration for his own dance dramas based on Irish mythology. Waley had no taste for nationalism or

spirituality, and offered his readers an entirely different version of Noh theater. He reproduced a diagram of a large 15th-century acting arena to emphasize the parallel with Greek tragedy and stressed that “Nō at its zenith was not an exclusively aristocratic art. The audiences were very varied.” He stripped out esoteric language from his own text to make it accessible to all English social classes. He introduced *Taniko* as one of two plays that “deal with the ruthless exactions of religion” and gave an entirely negative account of the ascetic Buddhist sect at the center of the story (Waley, 1929, pp. 11, 316, 229).³ All this was in keeping with his political orientation. The play in his edited text became not a celebration of Buddhist faith but a critique of superstition. In a sense, he aspired to turn the Japanese into citizens of the modern world.

Waley’s *Taniko*, translated into German by Brecht’s secretary and collaborator, Elizabeth Hauptmann, caught the eye of Kurt Weill, who asked Brecht to transform it into a libretto for the annual summer festival of contemporary music.⁴ The stripped-down language, minimal characterization, and use of chorus made it an ideal vehicle to address a political issue. Brecht did little to the Hauptmann/Waley text beyond secularizing it even further, changing the religious pilgrimage into a journey to fetch medicine, and adding a new section that gave the play its title *Der Jasager*. The boy is asked to agree to his own execution, and Brecht makes him reply, “Yes.” This addition firmly placed the boy at the center of the story—an archetype of the individual subordinating self to the needs of society. For Brecht, the play formed part of a sequence of short works that explored the pain and necessity of acquiescing in the will of the majority, and the socialist moral of the story seemed clear. In terms of Brecht’s oeuvre, it was a first sketch for his fully authored libretto *Die Massnahme* (“The Decision”), which represents Communist agitators in China, one of whom agrees to be executed because he cannot resist giving way to his human instincts. Brecht wanted the two works to form a double bill at the festival, but when the modernist organizers could not swallow the politics of *Die Massnahme*, Brecht and Weill removed *Der Jasager* to a school context.

Here the opera proved a great success. Owing much to Weill’s music, it touched the emotions. It had the force of a modern Greek tragedy with its story about the experience of a boy who is doomed, and whose only real choice concerns the manner of his death. Weill’s score helped create the sense of narrative closure with a grand climax when the boy says yes, and there was no attempt to establish any dissonance between music and text. Brecht often felt that his plays had succeeded with the public for the wrong reason, and the case this time was more serious than ever. As his musical collaborator on *Die Massnahme* complained, *Der Jasager* rested on feudal values, and it became clear, when the opera was performed by large numbers of schoolchildren, that the idea of sacrificing oneself for the majority sat very comfortably with Nazi ideology. The pilgrims who subject their bodies to hardship for the sake of spiritual gain behave much like young fascists, and the piece that had aspired to be a lesson in citizenship became all too easily a lesson in National Socialism. Music was a significant part of the problem: *Gemeinschaftsmusik* or “community music” slid easily from a

socialist orientation—music made by ordinary people—to a nationalist orientation, music with roots in the German folk. The problem threw Brecht back to the fundamental question: How does one use theater to educate the young in the values of citizenship, serving society rather than nation?

In the short term, Brecht salvaged his text by consulting the working-class boys who performed the opera at the appropriately named Karl Marx School in Berlin. The boys' responses encouraged him to do a rewrite where the social necessity of the expedition is underlined, and every attempt is made to save the hero before he asks to die quickly rather than be abandoned. Brecht also developed an alternative ending, where the sick boy refuses to be thrown over the precipice and the expedition has to be abandoned. The play "He Who Says Yes" now had the capacity to transform itself into "He Who Says No," increasing the focus on moral choice and the lack of inevitability in human history. What is really significant here is not the new text but the new process: writing a script that develops in dialogue with the participants and engages them not just as recipients of the work of art, and of the playwright's message, but as fellow makers of the script, fully engaged in the problem that the play confronts.

THE THEORY OF THE "LEARNING PLAY"

Looking back on the success of his previous collaboration with Weill—*Mahagonny*—Brecht struggled to think of how to make an opera more than merely "culinary": that is, more than a simple source of pleasure for an audience hungry for cheer in difficult times. Recognition of this problem had led him to formulate his ideal of "epic theater," which "turns the spectator into an observer." Brecht hoped that the new spectator would not simply be immersed in a sensory and emotional experience, but would gain a capacity for action, forced by the foregrounding of the narrative into taking decisions. The music for this purpose needed to become gestural rather than directly emotive. In formulating the new ideal of a detached spectator, Brecht built upon his earlier evocation of a sporting expert contemplatively smoking cigars while enjoying a boxing match. This subverting of received German traditions of spectatorship made sense in the context of the public opera house, but seemed much less helpful now in a school context, where children were likely to respond in a more spontaneous and instinctive manner. The solution lay in participation. In a school environment, it was possible to put on operas or oratorios with a mass chorus and with no spectators.

Accordingly, Brecht formulated in 1930 not only his famous distinction between "dramatic" and "epic" theater but also a very different "theory of pedagogy":

There is no distinction between true philosophy and true politics. From this recognition stems a proposal by the Thinking Man that young people should be educated by means of theatre—induced by the proposed curriculum to become both active and contemplative ["spectatorial"] beings. The yearning for mere contemplation is harmful for the State; likewise the

yearning for mere action. When young people transform a play into an action that has been subject to contemplative thought on the part of each individual, then they are being educated for the State. The plays must be so devised and performed that (the actor thereby gains pleasure, and) the State benefits. The value of a speech or a gesture or a plot-line is not determined by its beauty, but rather by how far the State benefits from the way the actor delivers his speech, shapes his gesture, and renders the story. The hoped-for benefit derived by the State would be much reduced were simpleminded people to allow the actors to perform merely stories judged to be socialistic. On the contrary, the performance of antisocial stories by those in the very process of becoming citizens of the State is precisely what benefits the State most, particularly when vivid and defined models are followed. The State can best attenuate the antisocial tendencies of human beings, which stem from fear and ignorance, when it forces their awareness of consequences, impossible to grasp by isolated individuals. This is the outline of a scheme to make theatre performance a useful part of education. (From "Aus dem Fätzer-Komplex," in Steinweg, 1976, p. 71)

This text constitutes an argument with Plato, on three important counts. First, Plato maintained that acting could not form part of a citizen's education, because the enactment of antisocial characters meant that actors themselves became antisocial, imitation being the basis of learning. Brecht argues that the reverse is the case: The enactment of antisocial behavior patterns is the best mode of education, provided the performance of a role both is the product of thought and engenders thought. Second, Brecht counters Plato's division of mind from body and thought from action. While Plato wanted the philosopher to double as political ruler, Brecht insists that true philosophical contemplation is inseparable from action, and this is why theater is a crucial tool for education. Third, Brecht discards the ideal of beauty. While Plato assumed that beauty was bound up with virtue, Brecht is only interested in usefulness. His thinking was informed by the *Neue Sachlichkeit*, the "New Objectivity," an artistic movement that assumed that perfection of form relates to perfection of function. These assumptions would later be fundamental to the TIE movement that emerged in the Anglophone world in the 1960s.

In an interview given toward the end of his life, Brecht likened the *Lehrstück* to warm-up exercises undertaken by athletes, and he sought an athletics of the mind that would create good dialecticians. Reflecting back on *Die Massnahme*, he maintained that the play was created neither to be read nor to be watched, but solely to be performed:

It is written not for an audience of readers nor for an audience of spectators, but exclusively for those few boys who are going to buckle down and study it. Each of them must move from one role to the next and take up in turn the positions of the accused, his accusers, the witnesses, the judges. By this means each of them will be broken in to the exercise of discussion, and will

end up by acquiring the understanding—the practical understanding—of what is dialectic. (Interview with Pierre Abraham in Steinweg, 1976, p. 199)

In this play, it was not a matter of agreeing which argument is right or wrong, but of acquiring the skill to identify and articulate multiple viewpoints. The same argument can be applied to *Der Jasager*: The educational value of the play properly lies in the ability to think through the problem, not in an emotive message about the value of sacrifice. The ideal of one actor playing all the parts and having no audience to pander to was Brecht's ultimate answer to Plato. It is clear that Brecht no longer regarded participation in a mass chorus—like the three factory-based choral societies who first performed *Die Massnahme*—as a valid educational exercise.

Brecht's double commitment in 1930, at once to the principles of "epic" theater, which he would later relate to the idea of estrangement or the *V-effekt*, and to the participatory principles of the *Lehrstück*, relate to two fundamentally opposed traditions of citizenship: the ideal of immersive participation in the rhythms of a face-to-face society, as articulated by Plato and Polybius, and a code of ethical responsibility focused on choices made by individuals, which can be connected to Aristotle's theory set out in the *Poetics* that dramatic character is a function of moral choice. The theoreticians of the Enlightenment were pulled to and fro by these competing ideals (see further Wiles, 2011). In the event, Brecht did not have to choose, because he was forced into exile, where he functioned perforce as a man of letters, uprooted from the community in which he had formerly worked. When finally back in communist East Berlin, under close surveillance, he had little scope for community involvement. His role in pushing the boundaries of what could be said in the public sphere was more significant in this context than it had been in the liberal Weimar Republic, where anything could be said but nothing was likely to be taken seriously.

In a poem of 1929, Brecht mused upon the nature of art, and what exactly a work of art is.

How long
do Works last? So long
as they remain ready.
So long as they demand effort
they don't decay.

Inviting effort
rewarding participation
their essence lasts, just so long
as they invite and reward.

Useful Works
require people
artful Works
allow space for Art
wise Works

require wisdom
 Works designed to be complete
 display gaps
 long-lasting Works
 are ever on the point of collapse
 those designated as major Works
 are ready for nothing .
 (“Über die Bauart langdauernder Werke,”
 in Brecht, 1967, p. 387)

Brecht here deconstructs the notion of the autonomous work of art, a notion that became embedded in Western culture in the 18th century. The evolution of *Der Jasager* illustrates perfectly Brecht’s principle of art as process: a participatory event, constantly being remade, with no single point of authorship, and serving different uses at different times, when made “ready” at different historical moments. Embedded in the text or texts of *Taniko* are a series of older Japanese poems given new life in a 15th-century context, so it is impossible to track back to any ultimate point of origin for this “Work,” which of course secures new opportunities for readiness when *Der Jasager* resurfaces in an English translation.

It is an accident of history that Brecht went into exile and could not work through the implications of his *Lehrstück* project; yet it is not an accident that Brecht has been turned into a canonized author, his plays resurfacing in examination syllabuses, and in the repertoire of theaters that do classic works. In the postwar years, left-wing directors attempted to do Brecht’s plays in what they took to be the orthodox style prescribed by the master, while liberal intellectuals tried to disengage Brecht the enduring poet from the ideologue who was a man of his time. Brecht has been absorbed into Western culture as the author of dramatic masterpieces, alongside his lasting contribution of “alienation” to the language of dramatic theory. Yet much of his theoretical work on the *Lehrstück* remains untranslated. The institutions of high culture have not until recently had any investment in what is now usually classed in the United Kingdom as “applied theater.”

EAST AND WEST

The tension between the two Brechts of 1930 relates to the problematic that is the focus of this volume: the relationship between citizenship, focused on what is socially useful in the present, and art, with its connotations of transcendental and lasting value. Two fundamentally opposed ideas of why we should value art—its hold on our emotions, its articulation of ideas—relate to opposed ideas about what it means to be a citizen: the person who surrenders ego for the sake of the collective, or the morally autonomous individual tasked with making responsible choices. This impossible choice between an affective and a cognitive account of citizenship has remained unresolved for two and a half millennia, and therefore it is at least worth considering in an age of globalization whether the wisdom of East

Asia may have something to contribute. The radical reprocessing of a Japanese Noh play by Waley and Brecht to make it consistent with long-standing Western discourses about citizenship is a spur to addressing this important question.

For Confucius, who wrote just before the great age of Greek tragedy, China was too vast an entity to conceptualize as a state. The most important relationships for him were vertical rather than horizontal, and there was no way to distinguish the loyalty one owed to a parent from the loyalty one owed to the emperor, regarded as a kind of extended parent. There was no abstract code of law that could be distinguished from interpersonal codes of obligation, nor any sense of the citizenry as a group of equals ready to take up weapons to defend themselves at the first opportunity. To be in harmony with one's family was to be in harmony with one's social superiors and inferiors, and—as the Daoists would later emphasize—in harmony also with the natural world. Fundamentally, Confucian thought does not recognize the distinction between public and private life that lies at the heart of the classical conception of citizenship, and of Greek tragedy in particular, with its structural tension between actor and chorus (see Hsiao, 1979; Nuyen, 2002). From the perspective of ancient China, a culture not touched by the Greco-Roman tradition, one can discern some of the difficulties that arise when the classical ideal of citizenship is exported to modern Asia and Africa. We can see more clearly some of the unresolved tensions within this resilient Western ideal.

Confucian thought resists any abstraction of the state, while Daoism and Shinto resist the idea that human beings can be abstracted from their environment. Western culture thrives on abstraction, thanks in part to the inflected nature of classical languages, while Eastern culture prefers analogy, thanks in part to the pictorial nature of Chinese writing. Citizenship has tended to be a Western ideal because it turns upon the state, an imperceptible entity in terms of our day-to-day interpersonal relationships, yet something to which we believe we have a binding moral duty. Brecht used the Waley/Hauptmann *Taniko* to work through his anguish when faced with duty to this abstraction—concretized in *Der Jasager* as a need to secure medicines for persons unknown. In performance, at the moment of its “readiness,” the power of *Der Jasager* related to the tension between young flesh-and-blood actors (plus instrumentalists) and the scalpel-like text that engages this abstraction with a pure dialectical logic.

The climax of *Der Jasager* is the moment of decision by an autonomous ego. The stage direction was added for extra clarity in the revised version, after Brecht had received participant feedback:

THE TEACHER: So you are consenting that you should be left behind?

THE BOY: I will think it over. (*He pauses for thought.*) Yes I am consenting.

In the Japanese version of this moment, there is no identifiable act of choice:

LEADER: If only I could take your place,
How gladly would I yield my life!
But nothing I can do will help.