

Cultural Value Curating Community? The Relational and Agonistic Value of Participatory Arts in Superdiverse Localities

Dr. Alison Rooke



Background

Executive Summary

The Curating Community Workshop developed out of an interest in urban regeneration, cultural policy and participatory art. It drew on the extensive experience in developing, delivering and evaluating community interventions that span participatory arts. The Workshop brought together artists, commissioners, researchers, educationalists and practitioners from community development and from a range of arts practices including community art, socially engaged art practice, participatory theatre and participatory arts. The participants critiqued the ideological presuppositions which often assist participatory art: that participation has straightforward positive social impacts on participants, that there is a clear cause and effect relationship between participation and participants behaviour, and that this social impact can be evidenced through evaluative 'toolkits'. The Workshop discussion recognised the fact that that artists and arts organisations are often negotiating a complex urban context, creating spaces of dialogue and exchange through participatory social programmes in a context of increased socio-economic inequality and population churn. The Workshop invited participants to reflect on these matters, placing emphasis on the relational encounters that characterise this work, rather than its value as an instrument of urban policy. Focusing on art that occurs in urban regeneration and post-regeneration contexts – and the extent to which communities in super diverse neighbourhoods are constituted through such projects – Workshop participants considered the troubled relationship between the aesthetic dimensions of 'participative', 'collaborative' or 'socially engaged' art practice and the politics of community education, engagement and empowerment. A second area of discussion was the governmentality of evaluation and its accompanying methodologies that can overlook, underestimate and distort the agonistic significance and community and 'relational impact' of participatory art interventions. Alternatives to the norms and forms of evaluation were explored. The Workshop explored the following questions: how are forms of 'community' instantiated and negated through participatory arts? How far can artists make apparent the conflicting positions of stakeholders in arts participation projects? What would be the consequences of this? What is the 'community impact' of participatory arts? What is its relational significance? Is antagonism and heterogeneity in participatory arts valuable in relation to civil society? How do affinities and connections between people and space emerge from collective arts participation and other organised social activities?

Researchers and Project Partners

Researcher

Alison Rooke
Goldsmiths

Principle Project Partner

Marta Rabokowska
University of Hertfordshire

Key words

Participation
Socially engaged
Evaluation
Critical friends
Regeneration
Gentrification
Intention
Adaptation
Inequality

Curating Community? The Relational and Agonistic Value of Participatory Arts in Superdiverse Localities

Introduction: Regeneration, Gentrification and Urban Change

In UK cities, the case for art and culture in urban regeneration is long established. The Labour Government's recognition of, and investment in, the cultural sector in the 1990 and early 2000s was evidenced by a combination of culture-led regeneration programmes (Evans 2005) and a commitment to making a case for the economic value of arts sector and its social impact. This policy context provided what is seen by some as a 'golden era' of public funding of the arts in the UK (Lees and Melhuish, 2013) whilst others argue that this instrumentality is a 'perverted side-effect of on-going neoliberalism' (DeBruyne and Gielen, 2013). The *Curating Community Expert Workshop* was organised out of an awareness of a body of literature concerned with the cultural politics surrounding regeneration and gentrification, debates in arts evaluation and research into the micro-politics of arts participation.

The presence of art, artists and artist spaces (such as 'pop up' studios and galleries) are visual signs of the gentrification of urban neighbourhoods. However, the presence of artists – what Zukin (1977) terms the 'pilot fish' of gentrification – have consequences that are often unintended. Neighbourhoods which were attractive to artists and creative workers for their cheap rents and affordable studio spaces become attractive to investors and property speculators looking for 'up and coming', 'cheap', 'bohemian', 'edgy', 'vibrant' neighbourhoods to promote, which are consequently targeted for regeneration. In this process artists and arts organisations can be displaced (see e.g. Bowler and McBurney, 1991; Deutsche, 1996; 2003; Zukin, 1982). As David Ley argues, gentrification represents an intensification of capital accumulation that simultaneously commodifies art and art production itself and re-evaluates cultural capital within the context of the harsher, more individuated civil society produced by neoliberal economics. (Ley 1996).

Culture and creativity are integral to corporate-led strategic regeneration. Creative sector involvement in contemporary regeneration provides income and opportunities for the professional development of (some) artists and creative sector professionals, whilst generating considerable value for developers. Under the Coalition Government, regeneration is increasingly achieved through global private sector investment. Local Authorities, operating in a climate of fiscal 'austerity' are creating local conditions to attract hyper-mobile global private investment: selling or giving publicly owned land to developers in return for investment in housing, infrastructure (such as transport) or facilities. This 'reconfiguration of the regeneration state' (Lupton and Tunstall 2008: 111) means that 'existing communities may be positioned as holding back

transformation, either because of democratic processes are too slow, or because of potential resistance' (ibid: 113)

Artists and arts organisations occupy complex positions in these processes. In regeneration contexts, artists and arts organisations working with local communities, often through participatory processes, can be caught between corporate and public bodies driving property building and infrastructural development. For residents this is often an experience of coping with disruption and uncertainty, learning to navigate complex and unfamiliar systems of local governance, and experiencing demographic change and the rapid rebranding of one's neighbourhood.

Artists and arts organisations engaging with 'local communities' are also working in a social context complicated by global hyper-mobility, which results in diverse and uneven urban landscapes. London is a global city characterised by super diversity (Vertovec 2007) with high rates of population 'churn' and a long history of wealth and poverty existing side by side. Older models of migration and ethnic diversity are challenged by the demographics and increasing economic polarisation of contemporary London. The attraction of London as a tax haven for elite migrants is shaping the city in very specific ways. These flows complicate urban governance and everyday multiculturalism, civic participation and social cohesion.

Curating Community?

The Curating Communities Workshop took as its focus the relationship between artists and communities in this urban context. The work of 'curating' communities, posed in the Workshop title, refers to the process of bringing local people together, and working with them. The use of the word 'curation', rooted in the Latin 'To Care', is also an acknowledgement of the affective labour of care involved in much of this work. The desire to curate communities has mixed motivations. These include arts organisations' and institutions' desire and need to enhance the traditional demographics of gallery audiences through 'education' 'community' or 'local' programming (in part driven by arts policy itself, and pre-empting accusations of elitism). It is also motivated by an agenda of social justice which targets sometimes disparate individuals, community groups, or 'vulnerable' groups (refugees, young people, older people, Black or migrant groups, ex-offenders, LGBT groups), through participatory processes. Alongside this strategic approach to working with communities, artists are also (sometimes simultaneously) involved in self-initiated and 'activist' activities. This work is characterised by artists working together with, or as part of, communities in critical and creative responses to the processes and effects of regeneration and gentrification. There are numerous examples of artists responding to the processes

and effects of displacement, the privatisation and securitisation of urban space, as well as the paradoxes and failures of consultation processes. Here artists are often making apparent the social consequences urban development and gentrification.

As public, third and private sector bodies increasingly recognise the potential of participatory and socially engaged art as a means to 'restore the social bond' (Ranciere 2006; 57) or 'tighten the space of social relations' (Bourriaud 2002:15) 'socially-engaged' or 'participatory' art practice has become more professionalized (see Hope 2011). However, there is an uneasy fit between a tradition of arts participation, which has evolved out of radical practice, as part of a project of social justice and societal change (Negri 2011; Bruyne and Gielen 2011), and the *instrumental* deployment of arts participation in regeneration a global scale. The tensions raised in these processes are indicative of the contradictory conditions that these practices are deployed in, where socially engaged and participatory practice is used to reach aims defined through social policy and corporate interest. There is typically a wide spectrum of participation in these projects; however, the question of the purpose of participation remains. Some projects merely encourage publics or communities to 'get involved' and move out of being a passive audience member, while others aim to offer opportunities for all involved to reflect critically and respond to the social and personal situations which participatory art intervenes in. Here there is recognition that participatory art can address social problems. However, this may not be in ways that bring about behavioural changes defined by the state, the corporate world or other social bodies not directly involved in the day-to-day lives of those most impacted by, inequality and social injustice. In negotiating these factors working participatively in the context of regeneration, artists face complex ethical, political and political dilemmas.

Commissioning Participation

Discussion in the Expert Workshop focused on the history of UK cultural policy with regard to the commissioning and evaluation of socially engaged and participatory practice. Today's predominant 'top down' arts commissioning and delivery models, whereby cultural organisations, housing developers, health trusts and regeneration partners are a legacy of the promotion of arts participation as a tool for 'social inclusion' within the context of the 'social impact' agenda (Matarasso 1996). Today however, funders and commissioners commissioning participatory and socially engaged art are not merely concerned with 'inclusion'. The presence and visibility of artist and art in an area, participatory or not, is attractive for its potential to enhance

capital-led regeneration through public and socially engaged arts commissions, increase the inclusivity of cultural organisations, deliver the 'cultural legacy' of the regeneration programmes, contribute to a visitor economy and increase the social bond and community 'resilience'. This instrumental use of participatory arts in regeneration settings is paradoxical, as art and artists are instrumentalised as the Creative Class (Florida 2005) generating economic change *and* as socially-engaged arts practitioners increasing social cohesion.

In the Workshop, contemporary 'top-down' creative sector strategies aimed at increasing 'enterprise and innovation', and the participatory projects and evaluations which accompany them, were contrasted with an earlier 'bottom up' approach to cultural policy. This was embedded in a UK tradition of cultural democracy, where artists, responsive to grounded local contexts, were commissioned by community organisations and funded by city-wide and borough local authorities. The Greater London Councils funding programme for community arts sought to fund 'cultural activities which were 'of the people', which belong to, and are part of ordinary people's lives and experiences" (see Hope 2011 for further discussion). Rather than art projects being commissioned and funded with the aim of bringing communities together, funding was awarded to projects that demonstrated the a priori participation of communities in *both* decision making processes, (including commissioning) and arts and cultural production. As one participant with over forty years of community arts experience observed, '*artists don't create communities*'; rather they work with them, according to their collectively identified desires and needs. This funding and commissioning model recognises the value of vernacular cultural capital. The ability to organise and to identify needs and desires was considered an indicator of a community group's capacity to organise deliver successful and locally relevant art engagement. Such a model also recognised that the social capital of grassroots groups is legitimate and worthy of investment.

This 'top down' commissioning models demonstrate a contrasting understandings of cultural capital (Bourdieu 1986). Strategic policy-driven investment in cultural strategies and opportunities for arts participation places faith in the potential cultural and economic uplift afforded by the creative industries. This deficit model of local culture and social capital overlooks diverse, vernacular and economically significant, cultural forms. The example was given of Nigerian and Nepalese film production in South East London, and the transnational flows of these cultural forms that rarely register on the radar of cultural industries strategies and mapping exercises.

Artist as Curator? Consultant? Facilitator? Community worker?

Socially engaged artists are skilled in facilitation, negotiation, inter-cultural dialogue and creatively responding to local circumstances. As agents of change in neighbourhoods, artists and arts organisations are working in contexts filled with difficulty and contradiction as they negotiate a path between the strategic frameworks, agendas and demands of the agents who commission them and the expectations, hopes, demands and desires with the people they are working with 'on the ground'. These contradictions include those that arise from the fit, or lack of fit, between commissioning intention, artistic intention, and local needs and desires. These often competing and divergent demands and criteria of success mean that artists are often working 'between a rock and a hard place', negotiating complex socio-political agendas and ethical obligations. Furthermore, whilst some commissioners and funders have an understanding of the dialogical and aesthetic potential of socially engaged practice to provide a local, and sometimes critical, perspective on the gentrification and regeneration, others see these commissions as merely providing opportunities for the participation of local people (and local is often used as shorthand for 'working class'). In the context of regeneration, participation in local art projects can mirror participation in public consultation. Existing research (Minton 2014, Campkin et al 2013) demonstrates that community consultation about regeneration has been characterised by broken promises, being merely a performative enactment of democracy. At times, socially engaged art and the dialogue it facilitates provide a meaningful proxy for participatory political democracy. Furthermore, the contradictions facing artists and the short-term nature of these commissions mean that it can also be similarly disappointing.

Gallery Education and 'Diversity'

The Workshop examined the relational and agonistic dimensions of gallery 'community education' or 'local programming'. Discussion focused on the purpose of this work, the beneficiaries of these projects and the agendas it addresses. Workshop participants noted that institutions often position this 'pedagogical' work as external to the main work of curation, and in that process the imagination, engagement and inclusion of 'diverse publics' is often problematized. The work of gallery education and 'local' departments of larger galleries and arts institutions aimed at increasing cultural 'inclusivity' through 'art education', 'community' or 'local' programming was scrutinised. The effects of this work are mixed and at

times contradictory. Gallery education departments, and their work with 'excluded groups' are often assigned with doing the work of institutional diversity. Examples were shared of the ways this socially and symbolically creates an impression of more diversity than actually exists whilst maintaining institutional status quo (see Morshe 2011, Allen 2008, Graham 2010). Rather than transforming the institution itself, such 'diversity' work participates in and reproduces the hierarchies of institutions which allow racism and inequalities to be overlooked (Ahmed 2012, Appignanesi 2010) when it is merely attached to existing institutional cultural values. Examples were given whereby creative activity and arts considered typical of Black culture, such as 'sound systems', were effectively marginalised in the very process of inclusion in the 'education' work of a large gallery. By bringing Black cultural expressive forms in to 'decorate public areas' with the colours of diversity, while and not being integrated into mainstream gallery programming and critical discourse, (and thereby recognised as legitimate cultural form) was discussed as a process of social inclusion and simultaneous symbolic marginalisation. Furthermore, well-meaning but unreflexive and entrenched approaches to increasing diversity can in fact re-enact and reproduce the status quo of elitist institutions. The role of large cultural institutions as agents of culture-led regeneration was also critiqued for its reproduction of 'neo-colonial' relationship between centre and periphery and the replication of inside/outside dynamics. Here a large arts institution's claim of impacting positively on the local economy and social inclusion were problematized. The example of the refurbishment of a small seafront café, which provided a starting point for a long-term arts and research engagement was shared. The café provided an opportunity to qualitatively investigate the efficacy of arts-led regeneration, providing an alternative to quantitative externally imposed economic measures of success. This project demonstrated how difficult it is to actually engage with working class and migrant population local people through an arts led approach to inclusion, within a complex local context of low levels of trust, nationalist nostalgia, hostility towards and between migrant groups, and poor local institutional support. The difficulties facing this embedded, patient and committed engagement project threw doubt upon claims of 'social inclusion' offered by a large institution. The research revealed that this regional gallery was seen as intimidating to many local people. Furthermore the work of the 'education' department was revealed to have had little reach or relevance to the local population. The increased presence of visitors and professionals 'down from London' left local people feeling as if they were 'living in a zoo'. This casts doubt upon claims from cultural-industries advocates claiming successful culture-led regeneration, inclusion or local impact.

This was also an example of the ways that working class, migrant and ethnic 'others', who are frequently invoked when discussing 'community arts' and 'community engagement' but are rarely present in arts institutional conversations about the relationship between galleries and communities and how to improve it.

Structure Intention and Adaptation

A distinct characteristic of socially engaged art practice is the continuous and skilful navigation of the relationship between artistic intention and adaptation to circumstance and local conditions. It is this on-going dialogue and exchange between all 'stakeholders' which often shape a project (described by Kester as 'dialogical aesthetics' (2004)). This places artists in difficult situations facing complex ethical dilemmas. A distinct characteristic of socially engaged art practice is the continuous and skilful navigation of the relationship between intention and adaptation. Workshop participants discussed the ways that over-determined project planning, structured delivery and predetermined outcomes and outputs can result in ethical dilemmas. The most ethical projects are those that genuinely offer opportunities for communities to work with artists, finding questions they wish to explore together. This experience of questioning and opening up an agonistic space offers emerges out of an ethical commitment to work *with* communities. However, this iterative and democratic approach can be at odds with the demands of delivering the planned and predetermined projects with clear aims, outputs and outcomes. The 'quality of an invitation' to work with communities was suggested as an indicator of both a commission's local appropriateness and community embeddedness. Paying attention to this could provide a means of avoiding untenable and ethically compromising situations.

Due to its dialogical nature, socially engaged practice is particularly suited to agonistic situations. It has the capacity to reveal the on-going, unpredictable, and multiple dialectics between power and resistance. Rather than predictably reproducing an illusion of unity and a cohesive convivial community, socially engaged practice is able to mediate and negotiate difficult social relations and offer a creative response to them. Community art projects, funded through agendas which seek to produce democratic outcomes (such as civic awareness, active citizenship, community cohesion, equality, inclusion) are paradoxical as these aims must be 'deconstructed', and sometimes disrupted in the course of the project if an agonistic approach is to be successful (Mouffe (2007)). An on-going critical exchange and 'dialogical aesthetic' (Kester as 2004) between all 'stakeholders' often shapes a projects eventual realisation.

An example was given of a self-initiated project concerned with 'belonging'. This open-ended and less predetermined example of community art that navigated the labyrinth of competing demands demonstrated art's agonistic potential. Conflicts and problematic issues or antagonisms were, in Mouffe's words, essential 'impurities'. This led to developing a local filmmaking project in an area where there was little 'cohesion' between white working class residents, and newer middle-class and recent migrant populations from North Asia and West Africa. This project, which successfully developed a programme of media education followed by a film competition and local film festival was considered a 'failure' by its funders, as it did not deliver the promised outcomes (specifically numbers of local people participating). However, the project was successful in exploring the affective experiences of belonging, navigating the tensions between local populations and making apparent these agonistic circumstances.

In participatory work, agonism almost inevitably exists. Working with the agonistic aspect of socially engaged and participatory processes art is not a case of merely solving conflict in order to get on with the work of produce a satisfactory output or outcome. It is more a case of finding value in naming conflict and tension, and making it apparent through the collective creative process. However, this flexible, open and iterative approach can be at odds with the demands of delivering planned projects with predetermined aims, outputs and impacts. These differing demands places those working in social practice in difficult ethical positions, torn between the desire to 'start from the middle' and 'navigate the labyrinth' of the competing demands and desires of communities, and the obligation to meet predetermined aims and objectives of project 'delivery'. The ability to juggle these demands, cope which periods of chaos, pull a project together and make sense of it critically, is one of the skills of the socially engaged artists. Workshop participants discussed the value in making agonism apparent by 'naming it' and analysing it collectively with all stakeholders. Examples were given of a project which extended its agonistic reach in order to interrogate roles and dynamics and collectively examining budgets and influence as part of a commitment to allow the open analysis of power at work in participatory interventions.

The mediation and facilitation skills that socially engaged artists have are often overlooked and unrecognised. The potential of collaborations between artists, arts organisations and mediation and community development practitioners was explored. It was recognised that these professionals also have the skills and training to work with the conflicts that can arise.

Evaluation, Epistemology and Ethics: Who Evaluates Who and Why?

One of the main points of discussion throughout the Workshop was the role of evaluation as an instrument of governmentality in participatory interventions. Participants shared their extensive experience of either being evaluators or of being evaluated. The limits of orthodox target setting, 'box ticking' and 'traditional' summative, external evaluation were identified as institutional and structural barriers to developing evaluative approaches that allow for an understanding the value of the participatory process and the relational significance of engagement. These traditional evaluative approaches were identified as particularly unhelpful and inappropriate to understanding participative processes in community settings. The monitoring and evaluation of participatory projects generally work to confirm success and re-enforcing discourses of 'good practice' found in in commissioning and evaluation literature. This elides the conflicts, problems, failures and antagonisms – Mouffe's 'essential 'impurities' of democracy – found in participatory art projects. It was generally agreed that evaluation has considerable potential as a critical practice which is generative and integral to the creative process. However in practice evaluation is often reduced to tidy summative reports which are then employed as tools for the advocacy of organisations seeking further funding or funders who seek recognition, positive publicity and evidence of corporate social responsibility. The Workshop participants debated the extent to which evaluation could be unshackled from its advocacy role in order to meet its potential as critical practice that could value relational and agonistic processes. It was recognised that this is a very risky strategy in today's climate of fiscal austerity and currently only afforded by commissioning and funding arrangements with 'more enlightened' funders.

The strengths and weaknesses 'Emic and Etic' approaches to evaluation were discussed extensively. In order to unleash evaluation's potential to facilitate, understand and offer a critical account of the relational and agonistic value of participatory art, the current epistemological attachment to research 'objectivity' was interrogated for what it achieves. Whilst research objectivity and the accompanying language and tools of a neutral, pseudo-scientific perspective of external evaluators is valued by funders, this 'spectre of objectivity', is dismissed by those critical of arts evaluation orthodoxies. It was agreed that 'objectivity' assures commissioners that their money has been well spent and that their expectations have been met. However, external evaluation also outsources expertise and diminishes the reflexive capacity of artists and organisations in delivering, and articulating the value of their own practice. External evaluation also frames a project in

'outside' terms, re-narrating a project for external agendas. Some participants spoke of experiences of 'censorship' and of evaluation reports becoming marketing tools for commissioners. Thus external evaluation acts as a form of disenfranchisement as it places organisations in a position of being 'self referential' and 'deferential' to an external expert and consequently the internal relational complexity and subtlety of delivery can be negated.

One question raised was 'who benefits from evaluation?' Whilst evaluation provides a coherent account of a project, which is beneficial to funders and commissioners, it was felt that those who participate in a project should benefit from the opportunity to learn and reflect. In contrast to external evaluation's focus on developing 'good practice' and evidencing success, internal, processual evaluation is often concerned with making sense of unintended outcomes, the things that *didn't* happen and lessons learnt. Internal process evaluation lends itself well to developing an understanding of the 'community impact' of participatory arts, which allows for the relational significance of participation for individuals and the 'communities' that are curated in these processes. This approach to evaluation is coterminous with the values of participatory art, as it extends the ethos of exchange, participation and collaboration. It generates conversations, raises questions of significance and value, and provides a sounding board to inform next steps. Including community members in defining the terms of evaluation can capture 'community impact'. This process, in itself, is an enactment of agonism as the terms of success and the meaning of the project are negotiated by all stakeholders. However, it was recognised that at present evaluation, like other spaces of participation that arise out of regeneration, sometimes mirrors the pitfalls of consultation (discussed above) where the answers to preformed questions are asked, one's answers are noted, conflict and antagonism are captured, but also diffused, while there can appear to be little change, and no clear outcome as a result of being asked one's opinion.

Several participants were experimenting with and experienced in alternatives to the current orthodoxies of external project evaluation, which were generative and integral to the creative process. These included 'Critical Friends' models whereby professional practitioners, workers and participants, had the opportunity to reflect on commissioning and delivery processes. In this model, past and current participants collectively decide which commissions are researched and evaluated, and how this will be done. This includes interviewing commissioned artists and organisation staff, and in this process "developing creative ways of investigating, critiquing and feeding into the commissioning of public and collaborative art" (see Hope 2009). Others were

experimenting with evaluation as a form of participatory action research. This approach includes facilitating a cycle of reflective and collaborative training and practice reflection, adaptation, action, reflection between museums and their community partners, and furthermore, to collaborating with these partners in recording/writing up these reflections in order to ensure that community partners play an active role in the research and its dissemination. Others were participating in a process of triangulated peer review with other community arts organisations which involved regularly reviewing each other's work.

Evaluators are often negotiating an insider/outsider role. Examples were shared of an academic partnership model, evaluating a transnational urban arts intervention, whereby evaluators are project partners, integral to the project, informing its structure and process. This allows evaluators to provide an intellectual context and critical framework for the arts and community partnership. In this model, evaluators sustain the network, rather than making external judgements, becoming the 'messenger' between partners. In this way they bring the network into being. In this example In this example, evaluation becomes a neutral 'back door' where multiple perspectives on a project can be shared and agonism between partners can be explored without jeopardising the project. It was pointed out that when funders are involved in these critical approaches and the conversations they generate there is an enormous gain for all involved. This approach also has an element of sustainability in that's legacy is a network practiced in critical discussions, interrogating power relations of an institution.

Many of these models had emerged out of a desire to critically reflect on project difficulties, rethink the terms of success and democratise commissioning and evaluation. They opened up a space for dialogue and reflection which is 'dangerous', in today's fiscal climate and governmental evaluation culture. Putting this information in a 'final report' for funders was recognised to be a risky strategy.

Finally the norms and forms of evaluation were discussed. It was recognised that there are some examples of evaluation that discuss the arts work but often, reflecting a concern with instrumentality, the significance of the arts is overlooked in favour of individual impact.

In conclusion the workshop provided a valuable opportunity to reflect on 'cultural value' in relation to participatory practice in urban regeneration contexts. This raised questions of whose culture was being valued? Whose culture was overlooked, and ultimately whose values were being promoted? In interrogating these questions the participants identified the value of an ethic of doubt and uncertainty. This includes doubt about the nature of the projects that artists are entangled in, their

potential for criticality, their impact, and their performativity. There is currently little space for this ethic of doubt within many participatory arts commissions. Institutional discourses of change and 'impact', together with the positive publicity and advocacy that surround socially engaged and participatory practice are obstacles to critical reflection, honesty and uncertainty. Relationships between individuals and urban structures and institutions are unavoidable. However, they are also relational, intersubjective and co-dependent. The lack of a space to reflect on these complex entanglement is an obstacle for understanding the value of agonism and the relational and intersubjective nature of participatory process. This continues to be a missed opportunity for learning and a source of frustration for practitioners and researchers alike.

References and external links

Ahmed, 2012 *On Being Included: Racism and Diversity in Institutional Life*. Duke University Press Durham, NC, USA. 2012.

De Bruyne, P & Gielen, P. (eds.) *Community art : the politics of trespassing*. Valiz, Amsterdam: Antennae (2011)

Graham, J. 'Spanners in the Spectacle: Radical Research at the Front Lines'. Fuse Magazine 33:2 Spring (2010)

Hope, C.S. Participating in the Wrong Way? Practice Based Research into Cultural Democracy and the Commissioning of Art to Effect Change' 2011. <http://sophiehope.org.uk>

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

Lees, L and Melhuish, C 2013. *Arts-led regeneration in the UK: The rhetoric and the evidence on urban social inclusion* European Urban and Regional Studies January 3, 2013

Lupton, R., Tunstall, R. *Neighbourhood regeneration through mixed communities: a 'social justice dilemma'?* Journal of Education Policy, 23 (2). pp. 105-117. (2008)

Ley, D. *The New Middle Class and the Remaking of the Central City*. Oxford University Press (1996).

Mörsch, C. Alliances for Unlearning: On Gallery Education and Institutions of Critique. Afterall. 26. Spring (2011)

Rancierre, J. *The Politics of Aesthetics*. Bloomsbury Publishing, 2006

Weblinks

Lorette Lees and John McKeirnan Art-led regeneration in Margate: learning from Moonbow Jakes Café and Lido Nightclub intervention
www.platform-7.com/#!margate-essay-lees-mckiernan/c1727

Bernadette Lynch on working through conflict in museums
<http://objectsinconflict.wordpress.com/about/the-proposal>

Anna Minton on the privatisation of public life and consultation
<http://howtoworktogether.org/think-tank/anna-minton-common-goods-redefining-the-public-interest-and-the-common-good>

Ben Campkin et al Case studies in regeneration.
www.ucl.ac.uk/urbanlab/news/UrbanPamphleteer2RegenerationRealities

Felicity Allen on the development of gallery education in the UK as a series of distinct, radical and strategic art and pedagogic practices.
<http://felicityallen.co.uk/writing/situating-gallery-education>

