Helping to Transform Community Identity with Public Art:
An Asset-Based Strategy for
Healing and Renewal of Marginalized Neighborhoods

Robert L. Russell[1*] and Mahyar Arefi[2]

[1]*School of Art, College of DAAP, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio 45221-0016, USA*
[2]*School of Planning, University of Cincinnati, Cincinnati, Ohio 45221-0016, USA*

*Correspondence author. E-mail: robert.russell@uc.edu.

ABSTRACT

This paper looks at community renewal and how public art might play a constructive role. Based on the premise that "the poor" are people struggling fundamentally with destructive shame (debilitating feelings of dependency, deficiency, and self-disdain), guidelines for creating public art that may help in countering this shame are proposed. In countering it, public art may assist in a long process of transforming the identity of a marginalized community from one of shame to one of dignity (constructive feelings of autonomy, sufficiency, and self-respect).

Key words: Community Development, Public art, Asset-based strategy, Shame, Marginalized neighborhoods

INTRODUCTION

This paper poses one way public art might play a constructive role in community renewal. Based on the premise that "the poor" are people struggling fundamentally with *destructive shame* (debilitating feelings of dependency, deficiency, and self-disdain), guidelines for creating public art that may help counter this shame are proposed. In countering it, public art may contribute to transforming the identity of a marginalized community from one of shame toward one of *dignity* (constructive feelings of autonomy, sufficiency, and self-respect), a long process of healing and renewal.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

These guidelines are an outcome of conceptual research that relates three areas of study: (1) psychology of shame and related psychotherapy, (2) community planning, and (3) public art. By drawing on concepts and principles from these areas, three relevant sets of factors are considered. Respectively they are (1) the individual, who experiences shame, and ways to resolve shame; (2) the group/society/context and theories of community development; and (3) the object/subject–concepts of public art and related strategies for creating it.

First, the problem of marginalized communities is described with respect to "shame," in the destructive sense of the word. Second, different strategies for community renewal are

reviewed and contrasted. Third, different strategies for creating public art are considered, pointing to those most useful for opposing destructive shame. Fourth, steps in psychotherapy are applied analogously to creating public art for community healing and renewal. Fifth, and finally, these steps are synthesized with principles earlier in the paper to derive general guidelines for creating public art that will support a sense of dignity and renewal in the community.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The Problem of Marginalized Communities as Destructive Shame

Shame is a complex and broad ranging phenomenon of the human condition. For example, etymologically meaning "to cover," shame is "a painful feeling of being exposed, uncovered, unprotected, vulnerable", (Schneider, 1990). It is also . . . "the dominant feeling state of failure, inferiority, defect, and insignificance in the attainment of personal and culturally valued aspirations and ideals", (Morrison, 1998). Based on the work of Nathanson (1992), Fowler (1993) posits that shame is neurologically rooted in our behavior from infancy. It is a physical-cognitive-affective experience of our *being,* a foundation of *the self.* "Evolved to be the custodian of our essential relatedness with others" and "triggered when we anticipate disapproval, rejection or exclusion by those who matter to us," shame is a *relational* concept (Fowler, 1993). Shame becomes destructive when the negative feelings of defenselessness, defectiveness, and/or worthlessness are consciously or unconsciously held.

As shame is inherently relational and groups are composed of individuals, shame would seem as applicable to social identity as individual identity: a *collective shame.* In this respect, marginalized neighborhoods struggle with a sense of shame in perceiving themselves as vulnerable, overly dependent, defective or deficient, and generally judged negatively by the larger, "central" society. The intent here is to explore how the creation of public art might assist a peripheral neighborhood in working toward transforming that identity, from one ensnared in the *shame of dependence, deficiency and self-disdain,* whether acknowledged or not, toward one liberated in the *dignity of autonomy, sufficiency, and self-respect.*

The words "dignity," "autonomy," and "sufficiency" in these descriptions require brief explanation before proceeding. "Dignity" was selected in place of "pride," as "pride" can take both "healthy" and "unhealthy" forms (Fowler, 1993). "Dignity" seems to connote "pride" in a healthy sense.

"Autonomy," is understood *not* in an absolute sense, which is impossible, but in the reciprocal sense that makes for *community,* what Engel (1992) calls "belonging:"

 . . ."that complex, entangling, and freeing experience of *simultaneous choosing and being chosen,* which lovers, committed members of marginalized groups . . . and others know . . . (It involves) . . . dependence without sacrificing the integrity of individual selves or communities."

"Sufficiency" implies both needs and assets but where assets balance or exceed needs, at least in vision. In marginalized communities assets often go unrecognized, unappreciated,

and underutilized, thus not acted on nor weighed in self-appraisal. Accordingly, the transformation of community identity from one of shame will build on the assets of a neighborhood's internal resources rather than external largess, the latter which can help perpetuate a sense of dependency and inferiority. This is the operant principle of the "asset-based" approach to community development described next.

Community Renewal Strategies

Critical to neighborhood renewal, as just indicated, is recognizing the resources a community has, as well as what it lacks. This understanding is developed through on-site study of neighborhood, such as interviewing residents and inventories of local resources. The strategy to capitalize on community assets is characterized as *"asset-based,"* described by Kretzmann and McKnight (1993) as follows:

> Creative neighborhood leaders across the country ...are discovering that wherever there are effective community development efforts, those efforts are based upon an understanding or map of the community's assets, capacities and abilities. For it is clear that even the poorest neighborhood is a place where individuals and organizations represent resources upon which to rebuild.

One technique of the asset-based strategy just noted is an *inventory* of a neighborhood's resources, sometimes called "asset-mapping." *Asset-mapping* has recently gained some popularity as a grassroots response to neighborhood blight, especially among the local youth. For example in Crenshaw, California a group of young people ranging from 16 to 23 years old set about finding "what's right" rather than "what's wrong" with their neighborhood. They catalogued the products, services, and skills offered by local businesses; explored residents' shopping habits; and surveyed what else the locals would like to see in the community. The youth then put this information on a website for residents' access (Liu, 1999). Asset mapping is also a part of the service-learning program described at the end of this paper.

The contrary strategy to asset-based development is often called "need-based" development. The need-based approach identifies the needs of a community and then attempts to meet them. The asset-based approach identifies the assets of a community in addition to its needs, using the assets on which to rebuild and eventually to meet the needs. Because the resources that a community has are the focus of an asset-based strategy, the strategy advances in the opposite direction from the need-based strategy: fundamentally proceeding *inside out* rather than *outside in.* In addition, those employing an asset-based strategy conceive of the community in opposite ways from those employing a need-based strategy. These are juxtaposed in Table 1 to help clarify them. (Please note the dotted line down the middle of the table. It is intended to suggest that the opposing concepts are two sides of a coin, rather than separate from each other.)

Table 1. Needs-Based Compared to Asset-Based Community Development.

NEED-BASED COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT	ASSET-BASED COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
Restores What a Community Lacks	Builds on What a Community Has
Proceeds Fundamentally Outside-In	Proceeds Fundamentally Inside-Out
Problems-Oriented	Possibilities-Oriented
Communities of Privation	Communities of Promise
Victims	Survivors
Clients	Providers
Consumers	Producers

Public Art Strategies

Different Orientations to Public Art

For the purpose of introducing students to the range of public art, Russell (2002) has suggested three general orientations to creating public: "hero on a horse (pre-modernist), "form and freedom" (modernist), and "collaborate and create" (postmodernist). In *oversimplified* terms:

Hero on a horse focuses on or favors works that are:

- the individual conceptions of the artists, which
- emphasize heroic themes and idealized visions for social/political purposes
- expressed in realistic/naturalistic styles.

Form and freedom focuses on or favors works that are:

- the individual conceptions of the artists, which
- emphasize formal qualities over/to the exclusion of "extraneous" concerns such as social/political issues
- expressed in abstract/non-objective styles.

Collaborate and create focuses on or favors works that involve:

- at least some collaborative conceptualizing between the artist and the public
- for the explicit purpose of addressing political/social issues
- expressed in any one or a combination of styles (unlike either modernist or pre-modernist).

When the characteristics of these orientations are compared with those of the asset-based strategy and alleviating the problem of destructive shame, an alignment with the postmodern, collaborate-and-create approach to public art becomes clear. This claim warrants closer examination.

The *primary* purpose of this orientation is to serve the needs and interests of the public or audience, rather than the artist. Of course indirectly it serves the artist's interest too, as the artist chooses aesthetic or personal actualization through this orientation. Nevertheless, this

approach is unabashedly instrumental, seeking social/political change beyond aesthetic response to artwork itself (contrast modernist *form and freedom*). For example, "performance works" often have healing as an explicit purpose, as do many environmental artworks and parks, seeking *healing* of the land and/or people through their experiences in utilizing the landscape.

The pre-modernist orientation has political/social aspirations as well, as the title *hero on a horse* implies. However, the post-modernist agenda is more likely to be "reformative" than the "conservative" bent of the pre-modernist. And though post-modernist works sometimes include heroic themes, they are less likely *by intent* to be *idealized* than pre-modernist works. In this respect, then, the post-modernist orientation is most in tune with the asset-based strategy, which is to realistically acknowledge and address the community's needs while building on its assets.

The assets of any community include its people, and it is the post-modernist, *collaborate-and-create* orientation more than any other that capitalizes on this reality. At least some collaboration between the artist and the public is involved to create an artwork and/or artistic process that will profoundly affect a particular community or audience usually in a particular locale or situation. The type and degree of this collaboration can be seen to fall along a continuum, between what Russell (2002) calls "listen and lead" and "confer and defer." In the *listen-and-lead* strategy the artist has final aesthetic responsibility for the work but is informed and assisted by public input from the work's inception. Often the projects are interdisciplinary. Thus the artist's initial vision and final conception emerge out of *dialogue* with others. The artist accepts responsibility to truly *listen* to and to a degree accommodate input from others before and during designing the work, which may even involve a *transformative experience* for the artist. The artist, nevertheless, guides the creative process and determines or directs the "final" piece.

In the *confer-and-defer* strategy the artwork is designed or directed by "non-artists." The artist's role is at minimum to confer (bestow) the status of art on the object, process or activity, directly or indirectly. Additionally, the artist may consult on or otherwise support the creative process but in non-determinative ways. This approach has few *prominent* examples to date, which may continue as long as dependable "aesthetic results" are a concern of the artist and non-artist creators.

Because the post-modernist, collaborate-and-create orientation builds on a community's resources out of dialogue with its members, it aligns with an asset-based strategy of community development. And because the community members contribute to the reality and realization of the artwork drawing on assets within the community the process is *potentially* empowering working against a sense of shame and *potentially* toward a sense of dignity.

Two Types of Activist Public Art

Lacy rightfully characterizes new genre public art as an aesthetic activism: art that hopes to invoke *action.* It is argued here, however, that "activist" public art falls along a continuum with *"protest and confrontation"* at one end and *"healing and renewal"* at the other. The former is at its worst marked by sermonizing, moral imperative and stereotype (here I am following the lead of Kuspit [1993]). Human sympathy and sensitivity to human

differences, by way of contrast, mark the latter, while not ignoring negative reality. The contrasting ways these two orientations seem to relate to a marginalized neighborhood are juxtaposed in Table 2.

Table 2. Art of Protest & Confrontation Contrasted with Art of Healing & Renewal.

ART OF PROTEST & CONFRONTATION	ART OF HEALING & RENEWAL
Sermonizing	Presenting
Moral Imperative	Empathy
Stereotyping	Reflecting Uniqueness & Diversity
Symbol: Clenched Fist of the Crusader	Symbol: Open Hand of the Healer

A Therapeutic Approach to Public Art

We want now to consider how a public artwork might help in facilitating transformation of community identity. The principles posed here are in part derived from the psychology of shame that analyzes the nature of abuse and its subsequent shame and from psychotherapy that seeks to heal it. Elaborated on is a process called "projective identification," advanced by the psychotherapist Ogden (1982) and the pastoral psychologist Frazier (2000). This process is postulated to account for how shame is acquired by an individual through abuse and how it might be ameliorated and possibly eliminated with the aid of therapy. As shame is inherently relational, the psychological process may apply generally to social relationships, as well. And by way of analogy, the role of the therapist might transfer in some sense to the function of a public work of art.

Frazier (2000) states that "To be abused is, automatically, to be shamed.". This happens for two reasons, he argues. First, it is shaming because a stronger person or group usurps the autonomy of a weaker person or group rendering the weaker powerless or less powerful. For example, a person can be "stronger" or "weaker" than another person relative to physical strength and/or social status both physically and socially, as an adult is stronger than a child.

The second reason that abuse is shaming, according to Frazier (2000) is because the stronger person or group has *projected* something unwanted into the weaker person or group. In the deepest dynamic, Frazier (2000) insists, this "something" is shame. The violator attempts to be rid of his own humiliating sense of dependence and inadequacy by imposing it on another too weak to resist and often one that represents a category of people falsely perceived as the cause of the humiliation. A victim has been chosen, consciously or subconsciously, to contain another's shame. In this regard, we can imagine one group viewing another group as the receptacle of its "waste:" the refuge of its unwanted and disowned parts.

Now let us consider this destructive process and how it might be reversed in terms of *"projective identification."* Projective identification, as Ogden (1982) and Frazier (2000) note, can be either "unhealthy," as in abuse, or "healthy," as in therapy. I refer to them as *"harming"* and *"healing,"* respectively. Ogden (1982) and Frazier (2000) describe projective

identification as involving a *three-phase cycle* of interaction between a *"projector"* and a *"recipient."* I have found it useful to break this interactive cycle into *four* rather than three phases. The harming and healing cycles are juxtaposed in summary form in Table 3. It should be noted that the type of abuse described here is directed outward, toward another, but abuse can be turned inward, on oneself, as well. This inward abuse is not examined in this paper.

Table 3. Projective Identification between Projector & Recipient.
The Harming & Healing of Individual/Community Identity.

Harming Cycle Projector has Power Advantage over the Recipient at Locus of Abuse	Healing Cycle Recipient has Empowerment Advantage over Projector in Some Respect for Healing	Aesthetic Re-Visualizing Cycle Recipient & Projector have Different Empowerment Advantages
1 Projector struggles to be rid of unwanted parts (thoughts, emotions & related shame) fantasizing that they belong to another assumed to be inferior and/or representative of the origin of unwanted parts. In this fantasizing the unwanted parts are *projected onto the identity* of the recipient.	1 Projector struggles to be rid of unwanted parts (thoughts, emotions & related shame). Unlike abuse, the projector may *not* be projecting unwanted parts onto the identity of another, as in the case of a child who simply wants the bad feelings to go away.	1 Neighborhood residents struggle to be rid of unwanted parts (thoughts, emotions & related shame). Some residents may be projecting these unwanted parts onto other people but other residents may be simply struggling to be free of them.
2 Recipient experiences pressure to think & feel as the violator does, *succumbing* to the projected thoughts, emotions & related shame.	2 Recipient experiences pressure to think & feel as projector does, *accepting proactively* the unwanted thoughts, emotions & related shame *identifying empathetically* with projector.	2 Interacting with the neighborhood over a substantial period of time, the artist strives to *identify empathetically* with the residents and their predicament.
3 Recipient *internalizes* the projection, owning the thoughts, emotions & related shame as deserving them, as part of one's own identity, and often taking the blame for what occurred.	3 The recipient *processes* projection of unwanted thoughts, emotions & resultant shame, separating out unhealthy elements—a kind of *emotional dialysis*—and/or reorienting them so they are less damaging, neutral, or even constructive—a kind of *emotional reconciliation.*	3 Artist and local residents collaborate to *process* the reality of "place," re-vi sualizing community identity aesthetically in a public artwork: a visual-spatial unification/reconciliation of neighborhood needs and assets.
4 Projector's fantasy is confirmed, temporarily feeling relieved of the unwanted thoughts, emotions & related shame, the need to confront them, and the need to take responsibility for the abuse. The elimination of unwanted parts is an illusion & they soon reassert themselves.	4 If *ready & willing* the projector's internalized identity of shame can begin to change as the returned projections of detoxified and/or reoriented thoughts and emotions are internalized, thus gradually replacing the destructive identity.	4 *If the artwork is effective and residents are ready & willing* the residents may find in the re-visualized aesthetic projection of their community identity an impetus for changing their current one. This would seem most likely to occur for residents who participated directly in creating the work and for those who respond most deeply and frequently to it.
Abusive cycle repeats, eventually destroying both violator & victim.	Healing cycle is an ongoing process.	Aesthetic re-visualizing cycle is an ongoing process.

Harming Cycle (Abuse)

To picture this general process it may help to think of a particular kind of abuse, such as rape. The violator (rapist) is the *projector* and the victim is the *recipient*. Critical to understanding this cycle is that the projector has a *power_advantage_*over the recipient where the recipient is vulnerable. The projector may not have power over the recipient in other respects. This power advantage can be physical, psychological, social, or circumstantial. "Power advantage," rather than simply "power," is used to avoid the connotation that the recipient necessarily has no power at all in confronting the abuse but certainly has inadequate power relative to the power that the projector is able to exert.

Phase one. The projector struggles to be rid of unwanted parts: thoughts and emotions such as inadequacy, dependency, and rejection by others that contribute to destructive shame. The projector fantasizes that these unwanted parts belong to another assumed to be inferior and often representing the origin and cause of the unwanted parts. In this fantasizing the unwanted parts are *projected onto the identity* of the recipient, as if depositing the waste in another.

Phase two. Through personal interaction with the projector, the recipient experiences pressure to think, feel, and behave in a manner congruent with the projector's unwanted thoughts, emotions and related shame, *succumbing* to them, and having insufficient wherewithal to resist. This pressure is coercive and often physically violent.

Phase three. The recipient *internalizes* the projection, owning the thoughts, emotions, and related shame as one deserving them, thus as part of the recipient's own identity. The recipient now carries the projector's identity of destructive shame. Often the victim takes the blame for what occurred, preferring that to a sense of complete powerlessness or lack of control or in fear of loneliness or abandonment from rejecting perhaps his or her one intimate contact.

Phase four. Having internalized the violator's projected shame the recipient is unable to return the projection any differently from what the projector fantasized. Thus the projector's fantasy is confirmed, relieving the projector of the unwanted thoughts, emotions and related shame, the need to confront them, and the need to take responsibility for the abuse. Relief from the unwanted parts is only temporary, however, as their elimination is an illusion. Within a few days or weeks the unwanted parts reassert themselves, and the cycle of abuse is repeated. If unstopped, the cycle of abuse will eventually destroy both victim and violator.

Healing Cycle

To picture this general process it may help to think of the parent-child relationship or the therapist-patient relationship. The child or patient is the projector; the parent or therapist is the recipient. Critical to understanding this cycle is that the recipient has an *empowerment advantage* over the projector in one or more respects such that the recipient can serve as a healing agent for the projector. The recipient may not have an empowerment advantage over the projector in other respects. Note that "empowerment" generally connotes a positive or constructive sense while "power" can connote either a destructive or constructive sense. Accordingly, "power advantage" in the destructive sense applies to the harming cycle;

"*em*powerment advantage" applies to the healing cycle. Note also that in the harming cycle the "advantage" is with the projector while in the healing cycle the "advantage" is with the recipient. The word "advantage" is used to avoid the idea that the projector has no empowerment for self-healing at all. Rather the recipient's empowerment has an advantage that the projector's does not. For example, the parent usually has the advantage of maturity and hindsight over the child, and the therapist usually has the advantage of psychological training over the patient. In any case, psychological healing requires at least some ability and readiness to heal on the part of the projector, thus a reciprocal, *outside-inside* exchange between the recipient and projector is required. This is in stark contrast to the one-way, *outside-in* direction of abuse.

Phase one. A projector struggles to be rid of unwanted parts (thoughts, emotions and related shame). Unlike abuse, the projector may not be projecting unwanted parts onto the identity of another, as in the case of an infant or child who is simply trying to get the bad feelings to go away.

Phase two. The recipient through interpersonal interaction with the projector experiences pressure to think, feel and behave in a manner congruent with the projector's unwanted thoughts, emotions and related shame. In a healing parent-child relationship the adult experiences pressure to *empathize* with the child's thoughts and feelings, to a degree sharing the child's experience. When our loved ones hurt, we hurt. The same general point can be made about the patient-therapist relationship, though the pressure to empathize may be primarily professional. The recipient then takes in *proactively* the unwanted thoughts, feelings and related shame *empathetically.* In empathizing with the projector's unwanted thoughts, emotions and related shame the recipient is in affect *identifying* with the projector and his/her predicament. This *empathetic identification* is in stark contrast to abuse in at least two respects.

1. Where in the harming cycle the recipient *succumbs* to the unwanted parts from coercive pressure and, often, violent assault; in the healing cycle the recipient takes in the unwanted parts *proactively,* freely and deliberately.
2. Where in the harming cycle the recipient takes in the unwanted parts *internalizing them,* incorporating them into his or her own identity; in the healing cycle the recipient takes in the unwanted parts only *empathetically.*

Phase three. In this frame of mind the recipient *processes* the projection, analyzing and conceptualizing it differently from the projector. This process can include recognizing and "separating out" unhealthy and unwarranted elements. It is in this latter sense that Frazier (2000) suggests thinking of the healing process "as a kind of *emotional_dialysis,* with the recipient used to absorb the projector's toxins and thus purify that person's emotional life". But just as important, and in some instances more important, in my view, is casting a new or different light on at least some of the destructive elements or joining them in new relationships, sometimes with constructive elements, so that their "chemistry" (or meaning) is altered. These last two types of processing do not separate out harmful parts but "neutralize" them or change their effect so that they *can be integrated into the community* in less damaging, neutral, or even constructive ways, as eventual sources of power and liberty rather than weakness and bondage. In this respect, the healing process might be thought of as

a kind of *emotional reconciliation.* It involves integration as when healed wounds or scars become part of the recovered body, perhaps made stronger through the ordeal.

Phase four. In this phase the projector through interpersonal interaction with the recipient is encouraged to think, feel, and behave in a manner congruent with the now healthier thoughts and emotions processed from the former unhealthy ones. *If ready and willing,* the projector's internalized identity of shame, composed of destructive thoughts and emotions, can begin a slow process of revision and reformation in relation to the returned projection of detoxified and/or reoriented thoughts and emotions. As the healthier projection is processed it can gradually replace the unhealthy one. Like dialysis, many cycles are required, each cycle removing more toxins, though some toxins remain at non-lethal levels, ready to multiply without recurring cycles. Reoriented elements can also change back to their original orientation, requiring ongoing adjustments into the future: an ongoing process of healing, rather than a once-and-for-all cure.

Aesthetic Re-Visualizing Cycle

When we turn to consider how all this might apply analogously to the process of healing/empowering a particular community with the help of public art, we can look to the healing process for guidelines of what to do and to the harmful, abusive process for what to avoid. Projective identification as an aesthetic re-visualizing cycle is derived primarily from concepts in the healing cycle. It does, however, have some significant differences. One is that both the artist and the local residents participate in projector and recipient roles during the process and are considered to both have sources of empowerment of different kinds. To picture this general process think of an artist working alongside residents in their neighborhood to collaboratively create a public artwork that embodies their community's identity authentically.

Phase one. Neighborhood residents struggle to be rid of unwanted thoughts, emotions and related shame. Some residents may be projecting these unwanted parts onto other people but other residents may be simply struggling to be free of them.

Phase two. Interacting with the neighborhood residents over a substantial period of time, the artist strives to undergo their experience authentically, *identifying empathetically* with the residents and their predicament. During this period, the artist and residents cooperate on an "inventory" of the community's assets, physical and social, as well as its needs. In an impoverished neighborhood the assets are most important because they are most likely to be ignored or overlooked. It is critical that the neighborhood become aware of its "wanted parts," which are a source of self-respect and hope, not just its "unwanted parts," which are a source of self-disdain and despair.

Phase three. Artist and local residents work collaboratively to *process* the reality of "place" (both the physical and social characteristics of a neighborhood) re-visualizing community identity aesthetically in a public work of art. This aesthetic re-visualization is accomplished through a visual-spatial unification or reconciliation of neighborhood needs and assets, disparate and conflicting though they are, such as a *rich spirit* of solidarity among many of its residents and their *material poverty.* Thus the artwork is not an aesthetic recapitulation of a prior perfect neighborhood, which never existed, nor is it a wholly new

aesthetic replacement for what presently exists. The resources for healing community identity are already there. It should be noted that whether or not the artist and other coworkers are originally from the neighborhood, their efforts are focused inside the neighborhood, thus the healing occurs *inside out.* Contrast this with the outside-in direction of abuse and much protest art of sympathetic outsiders.

The focus and amount of leadership between artist and residents in conceiving, fabricating, and installing the work will vary from project to project depending on the dispositions of the artist and the community representatives, ranging from a "listen and lead" approach to a "confer and defer" approach (Russell, 2002). The likelihood that the work will authentically reflect the community to a significant degree is greater in either of these approaches than it is in any of the other three approaches.

Phase four. *If the artwork is effective and residents are ready and willing* the residents may find in the re-visualized aesthetic projection of their community identity an impetus for changing their current one. This would seem most likely to occur for residents who participated directly in creating the work and for those who respond most deeply and frequently to the work.

Guidelines for Creating Public Art in Marginalized Neighborhoods

When the above concepts and principles are considered together, the following general guidelines emerge.

1. From the inception of the piece the artistic process is *collaborative* between the artist/artists and the public for which the work/works will be created. ("Listen-and-lead" or "confer-and-defer" strategies are indicated.)
2. The artist listens to members of the community so that the artwork is created out of *dialogue,* evolving *inside-out,* rather than outside-in.
3. The goal for the artist is to genuinely empathize with the residents and their predicament, so that an authentic experience of the community is realized within human and other practical limitations.
4. The artist and residents collaborate on *asset-mapping* the community's resources, physical and social, in conjunction with related needs so that each informs the other.
5. Results from the mapping inform a new vision of "place" leading to an *aesthetic re-visualizing of community identity* in a public artwork or project of these works.
6. The artwork(s) should reflect a *healing-and-renewal* posture, rather than one of protest-and-confrontation, though realizing the former can eventually lead to the latter.

As an example of how these guidelines have been applied, consider the now eight-year-old program titled "Art in the Market," in Cincinnati, Ohio (Russell and Russell, 2001). It is administered jointly by the Community Design Center and the Art Education Department in the College of Design, Architecture, Art and Planning, University of Cincinnati, and two community-based youth-service organizations: the Citizen's Committee on Youth and Impact Over-the-Rhine. The University of Cincinnati, the Ohio Urban University Program, and a grant from the Ohio Arts Council fund the program. The program seeks to help revitalize an impoverished neighborhood of Cincinnati called Over-the-Rhine.

This it does by helping the neighborhood recognize and utilize some of its own resources, particularly its adolescents with their artistic-aesthetic potential, and the physical-social-economic assets of the local community, particularly Findlay Market. During the fall and winter terms a university graduate assistant provides basic art instruction to the youth after school. During in the spring term as part of an interdisciplinary, "service-learning" course titled "Community-Based Environmental Art" university art and art-education students work with the youth to conceive and design public artworks to be constructed and installed during the summer. These works are intended to give visual-aesthetic form to the human and physical resources of the Market and surrounding neighborhood.

The *service-learning* principle of course design employed here fits the asset-based approach. For example, in "service-learning" as defined by Bringle and Hatcher (1996) the community working with the university identifies the issues to be addressed. A partnership of *reciprocity* is set up, with an agreed upon balance of benefits and responsibilities for both partners. Each partner is understood to have its "expertise." For example, where the university has theoretical understanding and technical skill, the community has in-depth knowledge of itself from having lived with a set of circumstances for an extended period of time. Thus the community and the university are each "serving" and "being served" by the other, and each is benefiting and learning from the other. The general aim is to extend beyond the expression of one's own experience to the experience of others.

In sum, the university student artists work *collaboratively* with their youth interns to research the resources (physical, economic, spiritual, and organizational) of the Findlay Market neighborhood, as well as the resources it lacks. The art that the teams design is intended to *express the community's assets in the context of its needs*—needs providing impetus for change and challenges to be faced and assets suggesting the means and directions for that change. The resulting artworks are thus intended to reflect a potential for healing and renewal in the community that occurs *inside out.*

REFERENCES

Bringle, R. G., and J.A. Hatcher. 1996. Implementing service learning in higher education. Journal of Higher Education 67: 221-239.

Engle, M. P. 1992. Election. p. 145-148. In D. Musser and J. Price (eds) A new handbook of Christian theology. Nashville: Abingdon Press.

Fowler, J. W. 1993. Shame: Toward a practical theological understanding. The Christian Century, August 25 to September 1, p. 816-819, USA.

Frazier, R. T. 2000. The subtle violations–abuse and the projection of shame. Pastoral Psychology 48 (4): 315-336.

Kretzmann, J. P. and J.L. McKnight. 1993. Building communities from the inside out: A path toward funding and mobilizing a community's assets. Chicago: Acta Publications.

Kuspit, D. 1993. Crowding the picture: Notes on American activist art today. p. 255-268. In A. Raven (ed) Art in the public interest. New York: Da Capo Press.

Liu, C. 1999. Survey team shops around for what's right with Crenshaw. Los Angeles Times, p. B1-B5.

Morrison, A. P. 1998. The culture of shame. Northval, NJ: Jason Aronson, Inc.

Nathanson, D. 1992. Shame and pride: Affect, sex, and the birth of the self. New York: W. W. Norton & Co.

Ogden, T. H. 1982. Projective Identification and Psychotherapeutic Technique. Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson Inc.

Russell, F. P., and R. L. Russell 2001. Art in the market: A program integrating service learning with asset-based community development in Cincinnati, Ohio. Paper presented at the meeting of the 27th annual Social Theory, Politics and the Arts conference, San Francisco, CA, USA.

Russell, R. L. 2002. A Beginner's Guide to Public Art. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Schneider, C. D. 1990. Shame. p. 1160-1163. In R. J. Rodney (ed) Dictionary of pastoral care and counseling. Nashville: Abingdon Press, USA.