CORA Cork Open Research Archive
Cartlann Taighde Oscailte Chorcaí

Title	Community arts, community development and the â €œimpossibilityâ€ and â€œnecessityâ€ of cultural democracy
Authors	Meade, Rosie R.
Publication date	2018
Original Citation	Meade, R.R. (2018) 'Community arts, community development and the "impossibility" and "necessity" of cultural democracy', in Sue Kenny, Brian McGrath and Rhonda Phillips (eds) The Routledge Handbook of Community Development: Perspectives from Around the Globe, New York: Routledge, pp.210-226. isbn: 9781315674100
Type of publication	Book chapter
Link to publisher's version	10.4324/9781315674100
Rights	© 2018. This is an Accepted Manuscript of a book chapter published by Routledge/CRC Press in The Routledge Handbook of Community Development on 18 October 2017, available online: http://www.routledge.com/9781315674100. It is deposited under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, and is not altered, transformed, or built upon in any way. - http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/
Download date	2026-11-02 21:17:59
Item downloaded from	https://hdl.handle.net/10468/16771

UCC
University College Cork, Ireland
Coláiste na hOllscoile Corcaigh

Citation: Meade, Rosie (2018) 'Community arts, community development and the "impossibility" and "necessity" of cultural democracy', in Sue Kenny, Brian McGrath and Rhonda Phillips (eds) *The Routledge Handbook of Community Development*: *Perspectives from Around the Globe*, New York: Routledge, pp.210-226

Final Accepted Version

Community Arts, Community Development and the 'Impossibility' and 'Necessity' of Cultural Democracy

Rosie R. Meade

This chapter considers the 'impossibility' and 'necessity' (see St Louis, 2009) of cultural democracy as a foundational principle for community arts activities. The phrase 'impossibility' and 'necessity, is itself a borrowing and inversion of the words of Stuart Hall (2000), when he pondered the political and discursive utility of the concept 'identity'. And while this chapter is not about 'identity' or its theorisation, the phrase helps to capture a sense of ambivalence and provisionality. It evokes the importance of, as Brett St Louis (2009: 560) suggests with respect to Hall's original provocation, 'grappling with a profound problematic', whether and how it might be 'necessary to inhabit and work within the constraints' of a confining or limiting social position, 'while attempting to move beyond it towards a freer human existence'.

As will be argued in this chapter, a commitment to cultural democracy is *necessary* because it counters dominant understandings of 'culture' and the 'arts'[1] that are shaped by and are reflective of social hierarchies and inequalities. Class and educational barriers mediate engagement with the arts (Holden, 2010; Lunn and Kelly, 2008; Matarasso, 2007) and there is widespread misrecognition of the cultural agency of 'disadvantaged' or 'socially excluded' communities (Cameron, 2016; McGonagle, 2007; Willis, 2005). Against this, the promise of

[1] I acknowledge that 'culture' is an even more porous, contested and potentially inclusive concept that the 'arts' and that the arts are just one dimension of culture, which can also be understood in an 'anthropological sense' (Duncombe, 2007: 490). But in the interests of clarity and specificity, it is culture that manifests as arts works, arts processes or arts objects that is the primary concern of this chapter.

cultural democracy may inspire or infuse community arts processes that nurture participatory and collectivised forms of cultural consumption, production and distribution. Cultural democracy thus implies a 'democratising of culture', whereby access to and representation within mainstream arts and cultural institutions is equalised. Crucially, though, it simultaneously proposes greater public recognition of and support for the diversity of expressive forms, aesthetic practices and spaces of production within society.

This chapter begins with my interpretation of and response to the 'Voices from Shandon' arts programme that took place in Cork, Ireland and culminated in 2013. My, admittedly impressionistic, account of that programme is followed by a fuller theorisation of the concept of cultural democracy, which, I argue, must be underpinned by the kind of cultural materialist analysis that is proposed by Williams (1981) and Moran (2015). Cultural materialism draws attention to the political economy of (community) arts; it demands recognition of the materiality of all cultural production and its embeddedness within a set of really existing economic relationships.

The chapter then discusses the diverse origins of community arts in Ireland acknowledging that the term *community arts* embraces a diversity of methods, expectations and outcomes, thus exhibiting a certain semantic mutability. For Tony Fegan (2003) community arts practice is distinguished by its anchoring in particular communities: community members actively identify, organise and develop artistic projects that reflect their interests and enthusiasms, or that speak to their social experiences. Activities are collective and collaborative, and collaboration may or may not include professional artists. This praxis is perhaps distinguishable from *community based art*, where programmes or initiatives mirror and are physically present in given communities, but where there is less emphasis on ownership or authorship on the part of community members themselves. In such instances professional artists or arts organisations may play a more decisive leadership and creative role (Fegan, 2003). To add to the confusion, the terms *community arts* and *community based arts* are often used interchangeably with the concept of *socially engaged arts.* This latter term is, however, also suggestive of a consciously political stance by arts practitioners to work in solidarity with communities in the hope that the 'arts might help lead out on change, positive change' (O'Baoill, 2012: n.p.). Even if it were possible to establish precisely and convincingly the nuances in this terminology, rigid definitions are unlikely to be sustainable in practice where *community arts* tends to be used as a catchall term for the very wide variety of activities undertaken by, in, with and about communities. Furthermore, given communities and artists *de facto* reliance on statutory or philanthropic funding to sustain arts activities, the

determination of aims and the evaluation of outcomes may be contentious, particularly if the arts are expected to serve ameliorative or therapeutic functions (Kester, 2004). Indeed it is likely that such tensions will sound familiar to community development workers, because just like community development, diverse applications and assumptions mean that we cannot take democratic commitments for granted.

For the purposes of this chapter community development is understood simply as a 'process through which ordinary people collectively attempt to influence their life chances' (Meade, Shaw and Banks, 2016: 4). Behind this apparent simplicity much complexity prevails. Conceptions of community may be rooted in places, occupational or social relationships, common interests or identities, religious or ethnic affiliations, and they may invite local, national and even transnational expressions of solidarity. Communities may appear to be already formed and buoyant or, alternatively, in states of emergence or decline. The impetus for development may be determined and led by members of the putative community, while in other instances the process of community development may be initiated by state, professional, philanthropic or other 'outside' actors (Meade, Shaw and Banks, 2016). The focus of 'development' may embrace infrastructure and services; employment and education opportunities; policy or legal changes; transformations in power, political and democratic configurations; or new forms of social or interpersonal relationship. Processes may even position the arts and culture as central to their development agendas; so that the enhancement or recognition of people's participation in the cultural life of their communities is seen as valid in its own right. *In such cases community arts processes can be regarded as a form of community development*. Against this, however, community arts activities and projects may be regarded as elements that 'enhance and improve the community development enterprise rather than as substantive stand-alone entities' (Cullen, 1995: 14). Therefore, they may entice people to get involved in projects and they may contribute to the processes of capacity building, education, personal development and skills learning that are themselves seen to constitute steps towards citizen empowerment and participation (Cullen, 1995; Kay, 2000). *Here community arts processes may be viewed as adjuncts to or instruments of community development.* Whatever the terms of their mutual engagement, community arts and community development activities typically invoke common 'values' such as participation, empowerment and the validation of process over outcomes (Ife, 2013); and for both there are real or recurring challenges in ensuring that those values become more than buzz words or rhetorical claims (Banks, 2011; Shaw, 2013).

In the final section I apply a cultural materialist analysis to the political and economic factors shaping and inhibiting community arts processes at the current historical juncture. Paying particular attention to the Irish context, I highlight arts sector ambivalences regarding the purposes and value of community arts; public policy's tendency to instrumentalise the arts; and wider trends in the global political economy, which responsibilise artists and communities to engage in competitive forms of creativity and urban regeneration. The aspiration of cultural democracy seeks acknowledgement of and a contestation with these 'impossibilities'. And to this critique community arts praxis may add the aesthetic statements of communities as they communicate in and through culture.

What if...

Cork is a hilly city, and one of the best views of its higgledy-piggeldy, irregular streetscapes can be found in Bell's Field at the top of Richmond Hill. While off the beaten track for most tourists, Cork City Council has planned, since 2007, to 'regenerate' the field, in order to optimise visitor up-take of is 'panoramic' qualities (Irish Examiner, 2012). From Bell's Field it is possible to distinguish many of Cork's landmarks, among them St Anne's Church, possibly its best known building. St Anne's distinctive limestone and sandstone tower is itself a magnet for tourists, who come to ring the bells and treat locals to renditions of 'Three Blind Mice' and other classics. The four clock-faces near the top of the tower have been notoriously unreliable time-keepers, leading to its ironic designation as the 'four-faced liar', while above them is the golden salmon-shaped weather vane widely known as 'de goldie fish. St Anne's is central to the spatial geography and the iconography of Cork City, and in recognition of this status, between 2011 and 2013, it became the focal point for an arts project that sought to affirm local meaning-making and cultural expression.

Arturo Escobar (2001) observes that understandings of place have tended to be downplayed in the social and human sciences: place has typically been deposed in favour of space, the former suggestive of narrow particularity, the latter presenting unlimited and open-ended possibility. Against this Escobar (2001) reminds us that cultural practice is inevitably and necessarily 'emplaced', that places are simultaneously sites of production and contestation. They are produced by the interplay between broader, even global, political-economic forces *and* everyday social practices, relationships and imaginings (see also Massey, 2004). Therefore we must acknowledge

> that place, body, and environment integrate with each other; that places gather things, thoughts, and memories in particular configurations; and that place,

> more an event that (sic) a thing, is characterized by openness rather than by a unitary self-identity. (Escobar, 2001; 143)

Cork Community Artlink[2] (CCAL) is a city based arts organisation that has been in existence since 1993 (CCAL, 2011). In its various arts programmes, CCAL collaborates with community groups and individuals, in the ethical and aesthetic re-imagining of place, space and local environments; including, public streets, schools, community centres, parks, libraries, institutional settings, hoardings, signposts, walls, benches or even bollards. Following its move to Shandon in 2004, and to coincide with Cork's European City of Culture, CCAL launched the 'What if...' programme in 2005 (CCAL, n.d.a). As a title 'What if...' evokes inquiry, new possibilities and longings, and the programme is spatially and socially grounded in Cork's urban neighbourhoods. There have been six iterations of 'What If...' since 2005, four of which have centred on Shandon (2006, 2008, 2009, 2011-2013), albeit still engaging volunteers and communities of identity and interest from within and outside the area (CCAL, n.d.a). Arguably, 'What if...' thus promotes an inclusive and porous conception of community in place, one that proposes on-going dialogue about what is and what might be and about the very constitution of community itself. Potentially, it seeks to transcend the traps of nostalgia, essentialism, reification and homogeneity that render invocations of community so problematic (Bauman, 2001; Mulligan, 2015; Rose, 1997; The Critical Art Ensemble, 2002).

What if …' is a Public Art programme for creative research, exploration and project development', which emphasises 'partnership with communities and groups to develop temporary, outdoor art works which explore the dynamics of urban public space' (CCAL, n.d.b). 2009's 'What if...' project, 'the Big Wash Up', involved the power-washing of giant reproductions of photographs of Shandon's past onto the walls of its most prominent buildings. This temporary installation was the culmination of an extensive process of trust-building, community engagement and cultural co-production that involved local residents along with, artist Philippe Chevrinais and organisations such as Artitillerie (France), Northside Folklore Project, the Firkin Crane, Shandon Street Festival, St Mary's Road Library and Shandon Youth Club[3] (CCAL, n.d.c; Grant-Smith and Matthews, 2015). In their analysis of the consultations and participatory processes around which 'the Big Wash Up' was structured, Grant-Smith and Matthews (2015) point to the crucial, and necessarily challenging, role of negotiation and

[2] I have been closely involved with CCAL since 2000 and am currently on its board of directors. I acknowledge this 'insider' status and recognise that my response to its work is framed by that experience. All of the views and analyses expressed in this chapter are my own, and in no way attributable to CCAL.

[3] See CCAL (n.d.d) for technical aspects of the power-washing process.

deliberation in this kind of cultural praxis. 'Community-based and site-specific public art requires a relationship between the artist, artistic institutions, the community and the local site. The relationship is based on an understanding of the history of the area and the constituency of the art audience, the social relevance of the project, and the input of multiple stakeholders' (Grant-Smith and Matthews, 2015; 148).

Reverting to Bell's Field and the summer of 2013; gazing across at Shandon you could see 1,000 flags on 2,000 metres of rope suspended from St Anne's. This was the site specific installation and culmination of CCAL's 'What if…' project, 'Voices from Shandon'[4]. From that distance the tower radiated colour in all directions, the constant flickering of flags creating motion around the building's solidity, while the ropes literally and figuratively anchored the flags and tower in 'place'[5]. Viewed from afar, this was Shandon's joyful gift to the city, what might be regarded as one example of how a 'grounded community' (Mulligan, 2015; 349) or community in place might project itself beyond its spatial borders. As Mulligan (2015: 349) notes, '"grounded communities" only manifest themselves to the extent that they are constantly created and recreated', and 'Voices from Shandon' asserted the importance of the visual, of song and the imagination for community building and solidarity. Moving closer, walking around Shandon a better sense of the multiplicity of 'visual voices' (CCAL, n.d.e) on display was possible. This was not just a function of quantity, the sheer number of flags, but was evident from the idiosyncrasies and creative choices presented in the individual artworks.[6] Paul Willis (2005; 74) contends, 'everyday life is full of expressions, signs and symbols though which individuals and groups creatively establish their very presence, as well as important elements of their purpose, identity and meaning'. 'Voices from Shandon' functioned as a kind of public gallery for the 'sense-full-ness' of participants' 'lived aesthetics' (Willis, 2005; 76), and how they might use material/fabric to signify their presence in the city.

---

[4] 'Voices from Shandon' was a three year programme, culminating in the flag raising of June 15th 2013. Workshops with a range of community, youth, education and voluntary groups, and individual volunteers, centred on working with textiles and 'invited participants to create their own visual voice through a creative exploration of flag making, symbolism and community' (CCAL, n.d.e). The process was supported by Cork City Council's Arts Office and the Arts Council. Although site specific, it had a strong international dimension, with French artists Didier Gallot Lavallée and Andre Verrier, Bulgaria's *Art Machina*, and coinciding with Ireland's EU presidency (Arts Council, 2013a). 'Voices from Shandon' was inter-disciplinary, using multi-media and incorporating 'visual voices' and 'singing voices'. Its project team included a composer, song-writer and music facilitator, working with around 100 children from local schools to co-create songs to celebrate the flags' unveiling (words and music at http://www.whatif.ie/voices/)

[5] This account is necessarily partial – based on my reception of the images. It does not evaluate or represent the experiences of participants or the intentions of facilitators. (For video and textual accounts, see CCAL, 2013; CCAL, n.d.e; Hegarty, 2013; LocalTVIreland, 2013).

[6] CCAL has created an online gallery (http://www.whatif.ie/voices/) of the flags and the written testimonials of their makers.

In the contemporary world we are besieged by images, and increasingly images of brands, that call out for publicity, consumption, envy, and emulation (Berger, 1972; Klein, 2000; Willis, 2005). 'Voices from Shandon' might be regarded as a speaking back to this visual assault. And in their speaking back, individuals expressed their love of nature's really existing creatures - penguins, dogs, cats, snakes, tigers, horses, ducks, swans – and more magical hybrids – the unicorn/sheep, the mouse/cat, dragons, zombies, faeries, angels and cartoon characters. Some worked with concepts – evoking love, family, community, craziness, coolness, strength, uncertainty, health, passion – while others represented place – Shandon, Poland, Cork, home towns, the beach – and others, symbols of identity – barrel top wagons, caravans. Against common assumptions that the purpose of community art might be to 'bring' arts or culture to the people, participants claimed rich cultural lives – with testimonials to the arts of drawing, dancing, music-making, skateboarding, soccer-playing, gardening, reading, hurling, painting, gaming – and manifold illustrations of a fondness for colour and form in their own right. There were memories of the past and pledges for the future – to travel to space, to be a princess, to become a vet – as well as political commitments and celebrations of self – pride in people's own bodies, hands, faces. Representations of objects and work-tools hung alongside impressions of the sun, moon and stars. As the flag display continued over the summer of 2013, it exhibited what Declan McGonagle (2007: 428) proposes as a defining principle for democratic arts practice and policy, 'a parity of esteem' for 'different intentions and the different forms those intentions take'.

Cultural democracy: the arts as more than our 'grace after meals'

> Art can perform many functions. For pages and pages, the various functions could be listed like a catalog of stylistic -isms: Art can represent its commissioners and producers; it can be a definer and caretaker of identity; it can affect snobby allures and satiate the bourgeois hunger for knowledge and possession. Art can fatten up the leisure time of the bored masses; it can serve as an object of financial speculation; it can transmit feelings and cause one's heart to vibrate. Furthermore, the many functions are also enmeshed in one another. (WochenKlausur, n.d.: n.p.)

This quotation comes from the Vienna based WochenKlausur artist group, which since 1993 has participated in arts and socio-political interventions in settings that include Berlin, Limerick, Leeds and New York. Its Limerick project was conceived as a free cinema for immigrants, running out of the Belltable Arts Centre in the city. A project in Plymouth (UK)

focused on the need for a community centre in Efford; prompting the self-organisation of a committee of local residents and the crafting of a mobile tent as a temporary centre and symbol of the community's continuing desire for long-term solution. From WochenKlausur's (n.d.) perspective, art should confront societal problems and in turn stimulate and propose progressive responses. Conceptualised thus it has an affinity with community development processes: they too seek to engender improvements in people's every-day, political and social circumstances through actions or *interventions* that may kick-start processes of collective identity formation and empowerment. There are affinities too in the need to read art and community development dialectically, to acknowledge co-existing progressive and regressive properties, and the often conflicting expectations they are expected to serve – a tendency that is evoked starkly in the WochenKlausur quote.

Proponents of critical forms of community development highlight the ways by which power, social structures, ideology and human agency interact to shape relationships or outcomes in community contexts (Kenny, 2002; Ife, 2013; Meade, Shaw and Banks, 2016; Shaw, 2013). Critical praxis means taking seriously the politics of material conditions *and* of our ways of naming, thinking and talking about such conditions and the people occupying them. If the arts are to contribute to or operate as a form of democratic community development practice then they too demand sustained critical interrogation. In this regard, Raymond Williams' book *The Long Revolution* (1965) offers helpful conceptual resources. Williams decries the long-standing convention whereby the 'relevance' of the arts requires special pleading because they are viewed as a luxury – a 'grace after meals' (1965: 133) – disconnected from the necessary business of economic and societal management, or indeed community development. He links this dubious status to two paradoxical yet overlapping discourses. On the one hand 'art is degraded', portrayed as 'mere reflection' of the polity and economy, on which it is assumed 'to be parasitic', whilst on the other hand it is 'idealized', represented as a transcendent 'sphere of aesthetics' and thus as removed from real life (Williams, 1965: 134). These attributions are not always externally imposed. Artists and critics often cultivate and find sanctuary in images of the artist as an outlier genius or of arts works as difficult and unreadable to the masses. Kester (2004: 34), for example, explores how some tendencies in modernism and Abstract Expression, with their distinctive conception of the avant-garde, seemed to 'naturalize the elitism of art as a historically inevitable condition'.

The continuing relevance of Williams' analysis was graphically revealed with the announcement of recession in Ireland after 2008. As mainstream political and media commentary fixated on the causes of our collective predicament, the salience of global

economic restructuring and processes of financialisation (Dukelow, 2015) tended to be ignored in favour of a relentless reckoning of individual failures, personal greed and the vulgarity or ostentation of the consumerist Irish (O'Flynn et al, 2014: Meade, 2012a). If this 'democratizing of blame' (O'Flynn et al, 2014: 926) helped to rationalise the extension of austerity and neoliberalism's disciplinary logics (Dukelow, 2015: Mercille, 2013[7]), it was often juxtaposed with claims that the comparatively uncorrupted/incorruptible artistic and cultural fields could salvage the country's reputation (Meade, 2012a). Advocates for the arts began to self-consciously and uncritically talk about their contribution to international competitiveness, 'brand Ireland', 'the smart economy' or 'tourism', resorting to 'defensive instrumentalism' (Belfiore, 2012) to offset the threat of funding retrenchment[8]. Special pleading in defence of arts budgets hinged on the idea of a transcendent arts sphere while simultaneously privileging its commodifiable rather than its cultural value.

However compelling they may seem, it is important that we contest efforts to either elevate or degrade the arts. This calls for a materialist analysis that is soldered to a wider vision of cultural democracy. What Williams (1981: 64-5; also Moran, 2015) calls 'cultural materialism is the analysis of all forms of signification' or meaning making 'within the actual means and conditions of their production'. It begins by acknowledging that art-works are never untainted by their historical contexts or their physical and social environments: they are produced, albeit sometimes to express resistance or transgression, by situated, embodied actors. They are experiments in communication, which demand an audience beyond the self (Kester, 2004: Williams, 1965). The cultivation of taste, dispositions or the passing of judgment that constructs objects or practices as art is necessarily 'social', and as such potentially contestable. Culture is a site of hierarchy and a source of capital that in turn apportions social benefits and marginality (Bourdieu, 1986). The arts draw upon materials or materiality, often producing commodities, the exchange value of which inflect and are inflected by the unequal social and economic organisation of resources, wealth, time and leisure (Bryan-Wilson, 2009; Williams,

[7] Mercille (2013: 11) reviewed Irish newspaper's – the Irish *Times, Irish Independent* and *Sunday Independent* - representations of government's 'fiscal consolidation' polices from January 1, 2008 to December 31, 2012 , finding 'significant support for fiscal consolidation' (2013: 11) and comparatively little evidence of opposition to austerity.

[8] 'Defensive instrumentalism' was predictable given the scale of austerity post-2008. Government budget proposals for 2010 targeted €760 million in social welfare cuts, followed in 2011 by reductions of an estimated €873 million (Mercille, 2013). Harvey (2012: 13) contends that between 2008 and 2012 the community and voluntary sectors were disproportionately impacted by retrenchment; initiatives against drugs, family support projects and the Local Community Development Programme lost up to 29%, 17% and 35% of funding respectively.

1965; 1981: Moran, 2015). Although the form, content, aesthetics or imputed meanings of arts-works are not simply determined by these contextual elements, they inevitably leave their imprint. Therefore, a cultural materialist analysis insists 'upon the material and productive nature of cultural forms – and correlatively, the "cultural" character of "the material world"' (Moran, 2015: 63). It urges an on-going critical engagement with the interdependencies of politics, policy, economy, aesthetics and arts practice, and so is a pre-requisite for understanding why cultural democracy remains a necessary if often contradictory or seemingly impossible project.

When community development or arts processes grapple seriously with the concept of 'cultural democracy', they challenge dominant understandings of how we think and talk about aesthetics and the arts. Firstly communities and their members are positioned not merely as audiences or consumers, but as active agents of and through culture. This upends inherited assumptions – internalised by many of us - about who is 'arty' and what qualifies as 'real' art (Holden, 2010; McGonagle, 2007; Willis, 2005). It raises significant challenges for policy makers: determining a balance between privileging 'excellence' and democratising participation has been a recurring dilemma for cultural policy and institutions (Benson, 1992). Secondly, a commitment to cultural democracy demands that access to, recognition within and opportunities to engage with the arts are seen as centrally *relevant* to people's lives, and by implication, as falling within the purview of community development; and not just as an instrument to be put to work towards 'real' development. Advocates such as Francois Matarasso designate cultural expression as a 'fundamental human right' that 'allows individuals and groups to define themselves and their beliefs, and not only be defined by others' (2007: 457), although the legacies of economic, political and social inequality internationally ensure that there are significant differentials in how that right is realised (Holden, 2010; Lunn and Kelly, 2008). In 2005 in Dublin the community-led Fatima Regeneration Board, reflecting that working class area's distinctive history of collaborative and participatory arts practice, asserted residents' right to 'an active and enriching cultural life in which the arts are a primary source of inspiration and learning' (Whyte, 2005: 74). Notably, Fatima Regeneration Board ensured that an explicit arts and cultural strategy was embedded within its wider strategy for community development and regeneration. This strategy valued arts participation as a right in itself and not merely as an adjunct to or tool for more crucial development outcomes (Whyte, 2005). Significantly, it also specified the policy, infrastructural, educational and financial commitments required to make that right more widely amenable to community members.

Thirdly, cultural democracy means recognising that culture is already and always 'happening'. For Williams (1989: 8) culture is 'ordinary' in the sense of reflecting forms of sociability, behaviours, or beliefs that 'are made by living, made and remade'. Ordinary culture deploys or integrates the arts to enhance its capacity for communication, and the resulting 'lived aesthetics' (Willis, 2005) may range across the emotions, the imaginative or quotidian, past, present and future. Appeals to/for cultural democracy acknowledge and demand parity of esteem for the diverse media, materials and practices through which people share meanings and expectations of the world (McGonagle, 2007). And as with processes of community development, there are tensions between validating such communication on its own terms *and* hitching it some other instrumental or governmental project. These tensions are explored in more detail in the final section of the chapter, but in advance of that discussion I explore the origins and purposes of community arts in a little more detail.

The (cultural) politics of community arts.

In 1951, the *Arts Act*, provided for the establishment of the Arts Council, which still plays *the* central role in implementing cultural policy and funding the arts in Ireland[9]. In the post-Independence period, innovation in arts policy and practice were hindered by the ideological hegemony of Catholic nationalism, the blending of law and piety in the determination of censorship codes, and the overarching commitment of the burgeoning state to fiscal rectitude and the avoidance of economic crisis (Benson, 1992; Kennedy, 1990/1991). With the establishment of the Arts Council, Ireland emulated a governmental project to activate public appreciation of modern art that was already underway in the UK (Fitzgerald, 2004). The Irish Council was expected to 'stimulate public interest in the arts', 'promote the knowledge, appreciation and practice of the arts', 'assist in improving the standard of the arts', and 'organise or assist in the organising of exhibitions (within or without the State) of works of art and artistic craftsmanship' (Ireland, 1951).

The establishment of the Arts Council was progressive because it normalised and activated the principle of public subsidy for and popular encounters with the arts. Nonetheless, as Clancy (2004) and Benson (1992) suggest, since its inception the Council has had to navigate and reconcile divergent expectations; the (sometimes) conflicting views of its members regarding the Council's role; the subordinated status of the arts within government policy and

[9] Following implementation of the 2003 *Arts Act*, Local Authorities are obliged to 'prepare and implement plans for the development of the arts within [their] functional area', which might include 'stimulating public interest', promoting 'knowledge, appreciation and practice' and 'improving standards in the arts' (Ireland, 2003).

budgets; competing resource demands from individual arts organisations, institutions and professionals; and the critique offered by artists and citizens committed to the principles of cultural democracy. In recent decades the Arts Council has built commitments to wider arts participation into its strategic plans and it has interrogated the scale of cultural exclusion and inequality in Ireland[10]. However, a strategic review of the Council, published in 2014, highlighted 'an almost exclusive emphasis on the production/consumption model of the arts' where there seems 'little emphasis on engagement and participation as a fundamental and valued aspect of the arts in Irish society' (Arts Council Strategic Review Steering Group, 2014: 5). It also noted that the Council has been stymied by the absence of a clear or unified national arts policy and the constraints intrinsic to its role in disbursing state funding to professional arts. Clearly, the birth and subsequent form of community arts practice in Ireland needs to be understood with reference to the political economy of this institutional and policy context.

The emergence of community arts can be traced to the convergence of a number of developments in the political and artistic spheres internationally during the 1960s and 70s. Among them can be included the New Social Movements that posited 'culture' and 'identity' as politically significant sites of oppression and struggle, while often utilising songs, drama, dance or poetry to critique existing and imagine alternative social relationships (Eyerman and Jamison, 1998; Cameron, 2016). In the Republic of Ireland the discourses and practices of community arts were consciously adopted by disparate groups in Dublin and other cities from the mid-1970s onwards: e.g. Dublin's Grapevine Arts Centre, Waterford Arts for All, Theatre Omnibus in Limerick and Sligo Community Arts Group (Bowles, 1992; Fitzgerald, 2004). As the language of cultural democracy gained traction, there was growing criticism of structurally embedded inequalities in arts access and opportunities (Benson, 1992; Clancy, 2004) but the politics of community arts embraced other material issues as well. Fitzgerald (2004) and Bowles (1992) highlight how creative collaborations between artists and activists responded to crises of unemployment, marginalisation and alienation in urban areas, while also demonstrating the agency of the working class communities living there. Notably, these beginnings also coincided with a period when community solutions to social problems seemed particularly attractive to policy makers. From the 1960s onward re-discoveries of poverty, in the USA, UK, the EEC and Ireland, were followed by governmental programmes that sought

[10] The Council's (2010) Strategic Overview 2011-2013 prioritised broadening participation and the creation of new and more socially inclusive audiences for the arts. Those commitments were re-iterated in its more recent strategy (Arts Council, 2013b) and respond to recurring evidence of significant class-based, geographical, educational, age-related and other societal barriers arts engagement in Ireland (Lunn and Kelly, 2008; Moore, 1997).

to 'empower' the poor through strategies of community participation and development (Cruikshank, 1999: Meade, 2012b).

Adopting an internationalist perspective we can factor in other formative influences on the cultural politics and aspirations of community arts. Among these are Dada and Situationism's deconstructive questioning of the nature of art, its social purpose, and the status of the artist in the face of the 20th Century's surges towards militarism, massification and consumer fetishism (Debord,1967/1995; Sanouillet, 2009). Berthold Brecht and Augusto Boal's radical re-interpretation of the authorship, form and staging of theatre breached borders between actors and audiences, and embedded a dynamic social praxis within the 'performance' of plays. Today Boal's dialogical *Theatre of the Oppressed* and *Forum Theatre* are extensively used in community development settings to explore issues of power and inequality as they impact people's intimate, familial, local, institutional and national contexts[11]. Colin Cameron (2016) discusses the centrality of poetry, cabaret and comedy to the fermentation of disabled people's collective and political identity. He also highlights the vital contribution of the disability arts movement, including organisations such as the London Disability Arts Forum, to the eventual formulation of an alternative 'affirmation' model of disability. Some arts institutions have sought to fashion new relationships with communities that have been regarded (implicitly) as non-patrons of museums and galleries (Davoren, 1999; Gibson, 2008; McGonagle, 2007). At their best such efforts have not only democratised access to the physical space of the institution or 'diversified' audiences, they have embraced a more substantive vision of cultural democracy, by ensuring that communities' own aesthetic statements have been recognised and displayed as art of equal standing[12].

Community arts practice is multi-disciplinary; supporting cultural production though painting, murals, sculpture, movement, music, poetry, storytelling, puppetry, theatre, video, photography, ICT and a range of other media or materials. It can revitalise and revalidate 'forgotten' art forms like quilting (Clover, 2007), or traditional crafts and trades, such as

---

[11] For an account of *Theatre of the Oppressed* praxis and its application in the UK, see Cardboard Citizens (n.d.) which uses *Forum Theatre* to engage with currently and formerly homeless adults. Abah (2007) discusses *Theatre of the Oppressed* and *Forum Theatre* 's contribution to participatory development in Nigeria. The group Stut, based in Utrecht, the Netherlands, used theatre with Dutch, Moroccan and Turkish communities to explore shared ways of living and sociability, and to probe perceived differences and contentious issues such as discrimination (Van Erven, 2013). Connolly and Hussey (2013) interrogate some tensions in the use of such methods with community based or adult learner groups.

[12] The partnership established between the Irish Museum of Modern Art (IMMA) and St Michael's Family Resource Centre in Inchicore during the 1990s synthesised commitments to community development, socially engaged arts practice and adult education. It generated powerful exhibitions of collaborative art that were hosted in IMMA; *Unspoken Truths* (1991-96) and *Once is too Much* (1995-98) (McGonagle, 2007: Davoren, 1999).

carriage or wagon-making[13]. The collectivist orientation of community arts practice may disrupt what The Critical Art Ensemble (2002: 24) denotes as the 'totalizing belief that social and aesthetic value are encoded in the being of gifted individuals'. They argue that this belief remains foundational to the value-base and structures of professional artist education. Participants, facilitators and funders may differentially emphasise community arts' status as social critique, moral-improvement, leisure, fun, self-expression or mutuality. Practices may seek to move the consumption or performance of art out of the concert-hall, theatre or gallery and into streetscapes, public spaces and social services (Abah, 2007; Cardboard Citizens, n.d.; Grant-Smith and Matthews, 2015). Alternatively or even simultaneously they may represent a taking back or re-imagining of museums and institutions (Davoren, 1999; McGonagle, 2007). Finally, community arts processes may reinforce or solidify an existing community's sense of itself, but they may engage more dialectically and dynamically with the idea of community, highlighting fissures and power imbalances that both shape internal relationships and those with the 'outside' world (Rose, 1997).

However, there are tensions in community arts praxis that remind us of some recurring challenges for community development. Often although certainly not always, community arts processes are initiated as collaborations between an artist or group of artists and a community. In their optimal form these are occasions of skill-sharing, the overturning of preconceptions, and opportunities for the making of arts works that reflect the authorship of diverse participants. But to fashion and maintain *democratic* processes demands an acknowledgment of and a confrontation with the differential forms of power and interests that may arise within such partnerships. Kester (2004: 139) observes that artists may regard themselves as working with communities in 'need of empowerment' or that they judge as somehow alien. As with community development, such judgments, along with the assumption that communities require professional interventions in order to 'better' themselves, are expressions of governmental power (Cruikshank, 1999). This power might well be resisted or renegotiated by the communities and artists involved, and thus may not be a stumbling block to deeper dialogue and partnership. It is, nonetheless, important to recognise traces of paternalism or what Kester

[13] Coinciding with Cork's designation as European City of Culture in 2005, the Cork Traveller Women's Network initiated a participatory arts project centred on the building of a barrel-top wagon. The forced assimilation of Irish Travellers has marginalised their nomadic heritage and lifestyle. This project drew on Traveller traditions of carpentry, design, wheel-making, upholstery and decorative arts to collaboratively build the wagon; a symbolic representation of shared identity. It was later exhibited in Cork Public Museum (O'Connell, 2005).

(2004) calls 'Victorian reform' in some discourses and interventions associated with community arts.

Evidently arts facilitators may fall prey to this tendency even when their practice seeks to transcend a narrow vision of service to communities (Kester, 2004) and to subvert structural inequalities. Against this a materialist informed conception of cultural democracy recognises community members as cultural producers by right and disposition; therefore affirming that community art participants are *already* active, critical subjects in the world and not merely objects of intercession. Furthermore, a cultural materialist framework (Moran, 2015; Williams, 1981) makes us attentive to the resourcing, outcomes and ownership of collaborative arts processes. It engenders questions like, who gets paid and who works for free? What are the working conditions of facilitators and volunteers (Harvie, 2011)? Are artists 'doing community work' in the absence of alternative opportunities for professional development in the demonstrably exploitative creative industries (McGuigan, 2009; McRobbie, 2011)? Do artworks provoke nuanced understandings of a given community or do they turn 'the site into an exciting, fashionable, exotic, disaster-scene destination' (Harvie, 2011: 119)? Whose names and reputations are built by collaborative practice? And to what extent might a residency in a 'disadvantaged community' enhance the street-cred and market value of an individual artists' portfolio? Or is it more an encumbrance when individualism and signature performance are so highly prized in the arts world?

Posing these questions is not an attempt to demean community arts practice – especially since critically engaged workers and facilitators continuously wrestle with their implications (Connolly and Hussey, 2013; Hussey, 1999; Murphy, 2013). Instead it is an assertion that cultural democratisation demands on-going interrogations of the material, human and professional relationships within any such cultural practices.

The 'impossibility' of cultural democracy?

A cultural materialist framework also helps us to identify the economic, political and policy contingencies that limit community arts' democratic potential. Again there are strong parallels with community development, in that recurring problems with funding, infrastructure and employment conditions, undermine the sustainability of arts projects. Public subsidy for community arts is especially precarious, scattered and ad hoc; it is provided by an inconsistent range of statutory bodies, many of which are more directly concerned with other social goals, e.g. health or employment (Clancy, 2004; Creative Communities, 2013; Joint Committee, 2014). A recent Oireachtas (i.e. government) Joint Committee (2014: 12) acknowledged that

‘[m]any arts organisations have to cope, on a continuous basis, with insecurity of tenure in the premises they occupy… they have ongoing difficulties in meeting their day-to-day administrative expenses. The current system of providing once-off grants or grants for specific programmes does not take account of these difficulties’. Furthermore, the normalisation of austerity post-2008 resulted in withdrawals or rationing of social services, the winding down of many community development initiatives and the implementation of new income levies and charges (Harvey, 2012). Notwithstanding lobbying by arts organisations to at least maintain existing grants (Meade, 2012a), austerity had significant repercussions for the arts, with an estimated 30% reduction in the funding of the Arts Council between 2008 and 2013 (Arts Council, 2013c). And as noted already, a political and policy context where the arts must constantly prove their ‘brand’ relevance, is not conducive to economic redistribution in favour of cultural democratisation.

Transformations in the Irish community development landscape may have further implications for community arts practice. During the 1990s and early 2000s the state’s conception of community development and its interactions with community groups were primarily couched in the discourse of ‘partnership’. This brought increases in the scope and range of statutory support for community development programmes. While partnerships were not always seamless or lacking in conflict, it did appear as if successive governments were now committed to resourcing community development as a social inclusion/anti-poverty strategy (Meade, 2012b). However, in recent years the state’s commitment has become more fragile and contested. There have been controversial reforms to and realignments of high profile programmes: between 2009 and 2015, the Community Development Programme was integrated with the Local Development Social Inclusion Programme and became the Local and Community Development Programme, which in turn was rationalised to become the Social Inclusion and Community Activation Programme. Such changes are not merely cosmetic; they signal a recalibration of the state’s expectations of community workers and the implementation of new governmental techniques (McGrath, 2015; Meade, 2012b). Oversight has been transferred from local management committees or partnerships to the local government system; community development priorities are heavily weighted towards work activation and service delivery; there are increased expectations of value for money, evidence based practice and the quantification of inputs and outputs; and community workers are responsibilised to operate within more ‘clearly defined parameters’ reflecting government demands that its priorities are ‘more effectively translated and focused’ (McGrath, 2015: 11).

Given the proximity and often overlapping character of community arts and community development, and their shared discourses of empowerment and participation, these transformations may prove inimical to the project of cultural democracy. They reflect a centralisation of power and control within government, and the extension of a managerialist and performance culture to community programmes. If and when arts facilitators and artists are commissioned to contribute to social inclusion initiatives, they will be expected to fall into line with centrally prescribed targets and monitoring systems. While this does not render impossible arts processes that are critical, resistant and founded on communities' own cultural priorities, at the very least the space for alternative visions or purposes within mainstream community development has been narrowed considerably.

We might also think critically about why it is assumed that the arts can alleviate social exclusion, and thus begin to question the extent to which the culture should be instrumentalised in the name of local or national welfare objectives. In the UK there has been much debate about the content and tone of cultural policy under New Labour, where arts programmes were tasked with generating social impacts and mitigating urban alienation, unemployment, ill-health, or crime (Hewison, 2014). In Ireland this has been replicated in the Oireachtas Joint Committee's (2014) concern that the arts 'combat disadvantage'. Critics contend that social impacts are often exaggerated or poorly demonstrated and, more fundamentally, that these expectations reflect an instrumentalist view of the arts that ultimately locks them into the kind of managerialist 'targets culture' that was actively cultivated by New Labour (Belfiore, 2012; Belfiore and Bennett, 2010; Gibson, 2008; Gray, 2008; Hewison, 2014 Clive Gray (2008) directly links such instrumentalism to the ascendance of New Public Management in the UK's public sector and, as noted above, it is apparent that centrally determined concepts of value, purpose and accountability are shaping the direction of the Irish arts and community sectors also (McGrath, 2015; Meade, 2012a, 2012b) .

There is a risk of slippage between problematizing cultural exclusion or inequality and freighting arts programmes with a responsibility to redress deeper structural contradictions. The cordiality, fun, distraction and spirit of collective enterprise that may be stimulated by arts projects may alleviate aspects of alienation and personal disaffection that are consequences of social inequality. Alan Kay (2000) has recorded how arts activities may supplement processes of urban regeneration by supporting personal development, improving the look and feel of an area, and encouraging participants to engage with further training and education. But social exclusion is a function of factors that include, income inequality, hierarchies of wealth and opportunity, precarious work, and institutional racism, and it is exacerbated by the

retrenchment of welfare and the dismantling of public services. It cannot be undone by the buzz factor of arts participation alone: to claim otherwise is to displace politics.

Finally there is another invidious but politically powerful form of instrumentalism, one that recasts culture and creativity as servants of investment, marketization and profit. In 2013 the then Irish Arts Minister, Jimmy Deenihan, responded to Dáil questions about cultural policy as follows:

> The arts underpin policies in attracting foreign direct investment, in the creation of an imaginative labour force, in establishing an innovative environment in which the creative and cultural industries can thrive and in the area of cultural tourism. The arts are a significant economic contributor and employer in their own right and they are also important building blocks for those economic policies the Government has identified as crucial for our economic recovery. (Dáil Éireann, 18/09/2013)

In neo-liberalised capitalism the insatiable desire for new markets and commodities, ensures that all categories of citizens – the artists and the rest of us – are responsibilised to 'create and sustain the central elements of economic well-being' (Rose, 1999: 141). The concept of creativity, embodied by the entrepreneurial self, is central to the discourses and rationalities of contemporary neoliberalisation, running alongside the glorification of knowledge/information societies, intellectual property, and the credo of ceaseless innovation (Osborne, 2003; Peck, 2005). Richard Florida's (2002) bestselling manifesto for urban and economic regeneration, *The Rise of the Creative Class*, argued that 'creatives', such as artists or scientists, are attracted by socially tolerant, pluralistic and welcoming neighbourhoods. Their presence provides an economic stimulus of its own through their contribution to the creative industries, but it also transforms cities into the kind of 'cool' places (McGuigan, 2009) that can better compete for additional investment. Minister Deenihan, although not explicitly naming them, appears to agree that 'creatives' enhance the look, feel and spirit of local economies, thus boosting global competitiveness. According to Florida (2002: 249) the 3 Ts of economic development are 'technology, talent and tolerance', acclaiming Austin (Texas, USA) and (pre-bust) Dublin (Ireland) as singularly effective in harnessing the energy of their creative classes. Cities aspiring to emulate their achievements should note their thriving music scenes, their success in attracting high-tech industry and their 'attention to the creative ecosystem in which all forms of creativity can take root and thrive' (Florida, 2002: 298).

There is much that can be said about the limitations of the Irish development paradigm adopted during the first decade of the 21st Century (Dukelow, 2015), and Dublin's ersatz

coolness brings cold comfort in the face of austerity and recession. As cities internationally invoke Florida's tenets to plan for economic regeneration, where arts scenes and cultural workers must become storm-troopers of urban renewal, critics highlight some recurring contradictions (McGuigan, 2009; McLean, 2014; McRobbie, 2011; Peck, 2005). Negative consequences abound: gentrification, with working class communities especially vulnerable to dislocation; increased housing costs linked to the commodification of land; employment in the creative industries that is highly stratified in respect of rewards, status, and tenure; and the displacement of public policy, where every strategy from the provision of parks – remember the plans for Bell's Field mentioned at the start of this chapter – to the allocation of rehearsal space is subjugated to the greater good of competiveness. The recruitment of communities and artists to the project of urban regeneration needs to be carefully analysed in light of the dominance of this creative agenda. Are they being invited to aestheticise neighbourhoods towards future economic exploitation; exploitation which ultimately aggravates inequality and social differentiation? Or can arts processes hold out for alternative models of regeneration, such as envisaged by the Fatima communities of Dublin (Whyte, 2005) - models where, to borrow from Escobar (2011), culture sits proudly and defiantly in places?

Conclusion

Clearly many of the practices of community arts that have been referenced here are easily reconciled with a robust vision of cultural democracy. But it is also apparent that perennial issues of power, ownership and purpose must be navigated whenever communities interact with artists, institutions and the state. A cultural materialist framework helps us to recognise how and why neither communities nor artists can be regarded as sole authors of their destinies when it comes to cultural production. The arts are not removed from or transcendent of material conditions: contextual factors such as, the wider economy, prevailing forms of social stratification, the distribution of wealth and inequality, all help to constitute what we recognise as arts works. However, cultural materialism as outlined by Williams (1981) and Moran (2015) doesn't boil culture down to these economic determinants alone. It recognises that cultural production is on-going, universal and open-ended, and it thus cautions against the dominant forms of instrumentalism that steers arts, regeneration, and, we might add, community development policies internationally in these neoliberal times.

As Gibson (2008) contends, instrumentalist conceptions of the arts are not entirely new and she cites examples of Victorian and early 20th Century cultural polices that sought to positively impact the population's health and moral standing or that promised tangible social

and economic dividends. It may even be impossible to avoid some form of instrumentalism when talking about the arts: to assert that art communicates, beautifies, or educates, is to instrumentalise it somewhat, while claims of 'art for art's sake' lack the urgency of other political and social claims in the face of austerity or economic crisis. But by repeatedly pegging the worth of the arts to some other policy or outcome, we persist in our denial that cultural practice is central to human interaction and relationships. We refuse to recognise that art forms such as poetry, music and drama make possible a desire for communication, expression or, indeed, community that is valid on its own terms. And we relinquish our responsibility to find ways of thinking and talking about aesthetics, why they matter to people, and why they should matter in community development, thus ceding that vital dimension of our humanity to the cultural 'experts', the institutions and maybe also the market.

References

Abah, O.S. (2007) "Vignettes of communities in action: an exploration of participatory methodologies in promoting community development in Nigeria", *Community Development Journal*, 42(4): 435-48.

Arts Council (2010) *Developing the Arts in Ireland: Arts Council Strategic Overview 2011 – 2013*, Dublin: Arts Council.

Arts Council (2013a) "Culture Connects – update on the EU Presidency culture programme", *Newsletter,* 10(9): http://newsletter.artscouncil.ie/w55nq1awbbl [date accessed 23/06/2015]

Arts Council (2013b) *Developing the Arts – Arts Council Strategic Statement*, Dublin: Arts Council.

Arts Council (2013c) "Arts Council Chair says State should take wider view on stimulus plans", 27 June, http://www.artscouncil.ie/News/Arts-Council-Chair-says-State-should-take-wider-view-on-stimulus-plans/ [date accessed 16/07/2015]

Arts Council Strategic Review Steering Group (2014*) Inspiring Prospects – Report of Steering Group,* Dublin: Arts Council, http://www.artscouncil.ie/uploadedFiles/Inspiring-Prospects-Report-2014.pdf [date accessed 14/07/2015]

Banks, S (2011) 'Re-gilding the ghetto: community work and community development in 21st Century Britain', in M. Lavalette (ed.) *Radical Social Work Today***,** Bristol: Policy Press, pp 165-186.

Bauman, Z (2001) *Community – Seeking Safety in an Insecure World*, Cambridge: Polity

Belfiore, E. (2012) "'Defensive instrumentalism' and the legacy of New Labour's cultural policies", *Cultural Trends*, 21(2): 103-111

Belfiore, E. and Bennett, O. (2010) "Beyond the 'Toolkit Approach': arts impact evaluation research and the realities of cultural policy-making", *Journal for Cultural Research*, 14(2): 121-142,

Benson, C (1992) "Towards a cultural democracy", *Studies: An Irish Quarterly Review*, 81(321): 23-33.

Berger, J. (1972) *Ways of Seeing*, Harmondsworth: Penguin.

Bourdieu, P. (1986) "The forms of capital", J.G. Richardson (ed.) *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*, New York: Greenwood, pp. 241-258.

Bowles, J. (1992) *Developing Community Arts*, Dublin: CAFE

Bryan-Wilson, J. (2009) "Art versus work", *Art Work – A National Conversation about Art, Labor and Economics*, pp. 4-5; http://www.artandwork.us/download/ [date accessed 8/7/2015]

Cameron, C. (2016) "Disability arts: the building of critical community politics and identity", R.R. Meade, M. Shaw and S. Banks (eds) *Politics, Power and Community Development,* Bristol: Policy Press, pp 199-216.

Cardboard Citizens (n.d.) 'Theatre of the Oppressed', http://cardboardcitizens.org.uk/theatre-oppressed [date accessed 15/07/2015]

Clancy, P. (2004) "Rhetoric and reality – a review of the position of community arts in state cultural policy in the Republic of Ireland", in S. Fitzgerald (ed.), *An Outburst of Frankness*, Dublin: New Island Press, pp. 83-114.

Clover, D. (2007) "Feminist aesthetic practice of community development: the case of Myths and Mirrors Community Arts", *Community Development Journal*, 42(4): 512-22

Connolly, B. and Hussey, P. (2013) "The war against people: adult education practice for critical democracy", *The Adult Learner 2013*, http://www.aontas.com/download/pdf/aontas_adult_learner_journal_2013_web.pdf [date accessed 15/07/2015].

Cork Community Artlink (2011) *Strategic Plan 2010-2015*, Cork: Cork Community Artlink.

Cork Community Artlink (n.d.a) "What if... a creative exploration of public space", http://www.whatif.ie/ [date accessed 22/06/2015]

Cork Community Artlink (n.d.b) "Cork Community Artlink – making life in Cork better by making art together", http://www.corkcommunityartlink.com/ [date accessed 22/06/2015]

Cork Community Artlink (n.d.c) "The Big Wash Up – crubeens, shawlies and washed walls", http://www.whatif.ie/bwu/ [date accessed 22/06/2015].

Cork Community Artlink (n.d.d) "The Big Wash UP (the process) by Cork Community Artlink", https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3YlHY5jE3lY [date accessed 22/06/2015]

Cork Community Artlink (n.d.e) "Voices from Shandon", http://www.whatif.ie/voices/ [date accessed 23/06/2015]

Cork Community Artlink, (2013) "Voices from Shandon – teaser", http://www.whatif.ie/voices/ [date accessed 22/06/2015]

Creative Communities (2013) *Report,* Galway, http://www.bluedrum.ie/documents/CreativeCommunitiesReport-GalwayJune2013.pdf [date accessed 16/07/2015]

Cruikshank, B (1999) *The Will to Empower*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Cullen, B. (1995) *Creating Connections: An Exploration of the Contribution of Community Arts to Community Development in Five Local Projects*, Dublin: Combat Poverty Agency.

Dáil Éireann, (18/09/2013) 'Written Answers Nos. 731-744', *Dáil Debates*, 813(1): http://oireachtasdebates.oireachtas.ie/debates%20authoring/debateswebpack.nsf/takes/dail2013091800093?opendocument [Date accessed 14/07/2015]

Davoren, A. (1999) "Access and engagement: adults and the Irish Museum of Modern Art", *The Adult Learner 1999*, http://www.aontas.com/download/pdf/adult_learner_99.pdf [date accessed 15/07/2015]

Debord, G. (1967/1995) *The Society of the Spectacle*, New York: Zone Books

Dukelow, F. (2015) "State to the rescue: the bank guarantee and Ireland's financialised neo-liberal growth model", in R.R. Meade and F. Dukelow (eds) *Defining Events*, Manchester: Manchester University Press, 143-160.

Duncombe, S. (2007) '(From) cultural resistance to community development', *Community Development Journal*, 42(4): 490-500.

Escobar, A. (2001) "Culture sits in places: reflections on globalism and subaltern strategies of localization", *Political Geography* 20(2): 139–174

Eyerman, R. and Jamison, A. (1998) *Music and Social Movements*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fegan, T. (2003) *Learning and Community Arts*, Leicester: NIACE.

Florida, R. (2002) *The Rise of the Creative Class*, New York: Basic Books.

Fitzgerald, S. (2004) "The beginnings of community arts and the Irish Republic", in S. Fitzgerald (ed.), *An Outburst of Frankness*, Dublin: New Island Press, pp. 64-79.

Grant-Smith, D. and Matthews, T. (2015) "Cork as canvas: exploring intersections of citizenship and collective memory in the Shandon Big Wash Up murals", *Community Development Journal*, 50(1): 138-152.

Gray, C. (2008) "Instrumental policies: causes, consequences, museums and galleries", *Cultural Trends*, 17(4): 209-222,

Gibson, L. (2008) "In defence of instrumentality", *Cultural Trends*, 17(4): 247-257

Hall, S. (2000) "Who needs 'identity'", in P. du Gay, J. Evans and P. Redman (eds.) Identity, a Reader, London: Sage, pp 15-30.

Harvey, B. (2012) *Downsizing the Community Sector***,** Dublin: Irish Council of Trade Unions, http://www.ictu.ie/download/pdf/downsizingcommunitysector.pdf [date accessed 10/07/2015]

Harvie, J. (2011) "Democracy and neoliberalism in art's social turn and Roger Hiorns's Seizure", *Performance Research: A Journal of the Performing Arts,* 16(2): 113-123.

Hegarty, S. (2013) "Voices of Shandon", https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=bCL9wssnT_o [date accessed 23/06/2015]

Hewison, R. (2014) *Cultural Capital*, London: Verso.

Hussey, P. (1999) "The Jesus of Rio Syndrome", *The Adult Learner 1999*, http://www.aontas.com/download/pdf/adult_learner_99.pdf [date accessed 15/07/2015]

Ireland (1951) "Arts Act, 1951", *Irish Statute Book,* http://www.irishstatutebook.ie/1951/en/act/pub/0009/ [date accessed 16/07/2015]

Holden, J. (2010) *Culture and Class*, London: Counterpoint, http://www.bluedrum.ie/documents/CultureAndClassStandard.pdf [date accessed 7/9/2015]

Ife, J. (2013) *Community Development in an Uncertain World*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ireland (1951) "Arts Act, 1951", *Irish Statute Book,* http://www.irishstatutebook.ie/1951/en/act/pub/0009/ [date accessed 16/07/2015]

Ireland (2003) "Arts Act, 2003", *Irish Statute Book,* http://www.irishstatutebook.ie/2003/en/act/pub/0024/index.html [date accessed 16/07/2015]

Irish Examiner (2012) "Panoramic tourist spot plan on hold", *Irish Examiner*, November 20, http://www.irishexaminer.com/ireland/panoramic-tourist-spot-plan-on-hold-214502.html [date accessed 22/06/2015]

Joint Committee on Environment, Culture and Gaeltacht (2014) *Report of the Committee on Utilising the Arts to Combat Disadvantage,* Dublin: Houses of the Oireachtas.

Kay, A. (2000) "Art and community development: the role the arts have in regenerating communities", *Community Development Journal,* 35(4): 414-24

Kennedy, B.P. (1990/1991) "The Arts Council", *Irish Arts Review Yearbook*, pp. 115-125.

Kenny, S (2002) 'Tensions and Issues in Community Development: New Discourses, New Trojans', *Community Development Journal,* 37(4): 284-299.

Kester, G.H. (2004) *Conversation Pieces, Community and Communication in Modern Art*, Berkeley: University of California Press.

Klein, N. (2000) *No Logo*, London: Flamingo.

LocalTVIreland (2013) "A Thousand Flags at Shandon", https://www.youtube.com/watch?t=20&v=TFzfJm48wDc [date accessed 23/06/2015]

Lunn, P. and Kelly, E. (2008) *In the Frame or Out of the Picture? A Statistical Analysis of Public Involvement in the Arts,* Dublin: ESRI/NESF.

Massey, D. (2004) "Geographies of Responsibility", *Geografiska Annaler*, 86 B(1): 5–18.

Matarasso, F. (2007) 'Common ground: cultural action as a route to community development', *Community Development Journal*, 42(4): 449–458.

McGonagle, D. (2007) "'A New Deal': art, museums and communities – re-imagining relations", *Community Development Journal*, 42(4): 425-434

McGuigan, J. (2009) *Cool Capitalism,* London: Pluto Press.

McGrath, B. (2015) "Reflecting on 'evidence' and documentation devices in 'translating' community interventions", *Community Development Journal*, advance access http://cdj.oxfordjournals.org/content/early/2015/03/04/cdj.bsv007.full.pdf+html?sid=2a2a7760-9582-440b-8bb4-50f0c97dc61b [date accessed 16/07/2015]

McGuigan, J. (2009) *Cool Capitalism*, London: Pluto.

McLean, H. (2014) "Digging into the creative city: a feminist critique", *Antipode*, 46(3): 669–90

McRobbie, A (2011) "Re-thinking creative economy as radical social enterprise", *Variant,* 41(Spring): 32-33.

Meade, R.R., Shaw, M. and Banks, S. (2016) "Politics, power and community development: an introductory essay", in R.R. Meade, M. Shaw and S. Banks (eds) *Politics, Power and Community Development*, Bristol: Policy Press, pp 1-27.

Meade, R.R. (2012a) "'Our country's calling card', Culture as the Brand in recessionary Ireland", *Variant*, 43(Spring): 33-35.

Meade, R.R. (2012b) "Government and community development in Ireland: the contested subjects of professionalism and expertise", *Antipode,* (44)3: 889–910

Mercille, J (2013) **"**The role of the media in fiscal consolidation programmes: the case of Ireland", *Cambridge Journal of Economics,* doi:10.1093/cje/bet068,

http://cje.oxfordjournals.org/content/early/2013/12/10/cje.bet068.full.pdf+html [date accessed 27/06/2015]

Moore, J. (1997) ***Poverty: Access and Participation in the Arts***, Dublin: Combat Poverty Agency/The Arts Council of Ireland.

Moran, M. (2015) *Identity and Capitalism*, LA/London/New Delhi: Sage.

Mulligan, M. (2015) "On ambivalence and hope in the restless search for community: how to work with community in the Global Age", *Sociology*, 49(2): 340-355.

Murphy, A. (2013) "Should I stay or should I go now? Temporal economies in socially engaged arts practice', *Fugitive Papers*, 5, http://www.vagabondreviews.org/PDF/shouldIstay.pdf [date accessed 7/9/2015]

O'Baoill, N. (2012) 'Niall O' Baoill from Fatima Groups United speaking about Community Arts, have your say on May 29th', DCTV, https://vimeo.com/42264414 [date accessed 7/9/2015]

O'Connell, B. (2005) "Keep on rolling", *Irish Times*, 5 May.

O'Flynn, M., Monaghan, L. and Power, M. (2014) "Scapegoating during a time of crisis: a critique of post-Celtic Tiger Ireland", *Sociology*, 48(5) 921–937.

Osborne, T. (2003) "Against 'Creativity': a philistine rant", *Economy and Society,* 32(4): 507–25.

Peck, J. (2005) "Struggling with the creative class", *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 29(4): 740–770

Rose, G. (1997) "Spatialities of 'community', power and change: The imagined geographies of community arts projects", *Cultural Studies*, 11(1): 1-16.

Rose, N. (1999) *Powers of Freedom*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sanouillet, M. (2009) *Dada in Paris* [translated by S. Ganguly], Massachusetts: MIT Press.

Shaw, M. (2013) 'Community work today: competing demands in practice', *Concept,* 4(2): http://concept.lib.ed.ac.uk/index.php/Concept/issue/view/28 [date accessed 13/01/2016]

St Louis, B. (2009) "On 'the necessity and 'impossibility' of identities'", *Cultural Studies*, 23(4): 559-82.

The Critical Art Ensemble (2002) "Collective cultural action", *Variant*, 2(15): 24-25.

Van Erven, E. (2013) *Community Art Dialogues*, https://parliamentofdreams.files.wordpress.com/2013/07/ca-dialogues.pdf [date accessed 15/07/2015]

Whyte, J. (2005) *8 Great Expectations*, Dublin: Fatima Regeneration Board, http://free.yudu.com/item/embed/249998/8-Great-Expectations [date accessed 13/07/2015]

Williams, R. (1965) *The Long Revolution*, Harmondsworth: Pelican.

Williams, R. (1981) 'Marxism, Structuralism and Literary Analysis', *New Left Review,* I(129): 51-66)

Williams, R. (1989) *Resources of Hope*, London: Verso.

Willis, P. (2005) "Invisible aesthetics and the social work of commodity culture", in D. Inglis and H. Hughson (eds) *The Sociology of Art*, Basingstoke: Palgrave, pp 73-86.

WochenKlausur (n.d.) 'From the object to the concrete intervention', http://www.wochenklausur.at/kunst.php?lang=en [date accessed 10/07/2015]