



Leseprobe aus Minkenbergh, Listen to your Neighbourhood,  
ISBN 978-3-7799-7012-5 © 2023 Beltz Juventa  
in der Verlagsgruppe Beltz, Weinheim Basel  
[http://www.beltz.de/de/nc/verlagsgruppe-beltz/  
gesamtprogramm.html?isbn=978-3-7799-7012-5](http://www.beltz.de/de/nc/verlagsgruppe-beltz/gesamtprogramm.html?isbn=978-3-7799-7012-5)

# Inhalt

Vorwort	7
<b>1 Theoretische Grundlagen</b>	
Community Music and the Civic Imagination <i>David A. Camlin</i>	10
Community Music – ein „Upgrade“ für Musik in der Sozialen Arbeit? <i>Oliver Giefers</i>	22
Mehr als eine Kunst. Soziokultur als Gesellschaftslabor <i>Mechthild Eickhoff</i>	41
Kommunikative Musikalität – Konzert und Unterricht – Community Music. Hochschulausbildung in gesellschaftlicher Verantwortung <i>Wolfgang Rüdiger</i>	50
Von der Community zur Society? Kritisch-konstruktive Überlegungen zum Konzept einer „Artistic Citizenship“ <i>Wolfgang Lessing</i>	75
Schritt für Schritt – Zu einer Didaktik und Methodik der Musik in der Sozialen Arbeit <i>Hubert Minkenberg</i>	87
Community Music als Ausdruck vom Kontext? <i>Alicia de Bánffy-Hall</i>	99
Kulturelle Bildung für eine Positionierung in einer Welt fehlender Gewissheiten <i>Reinhold Knopp</i>	108
Kulturelle Strategien im Sozialraum. Vielfältige Herausforderungen und eine lebendige Praxis <i>Jochen Molck</i>	119

## **2 Praxis**

Community Music an der Landesmusikakademie

Nordrhein-Westfalen

*Antje Valentin*

132

Finanzierung von Community Music

*Jochen Molck*

146

UFO gesichtet! Das mobile Musiktheater der Deutschen Oper  
am Rhein in Duisburg-Bruckhausen. Ein Erfahrungsbericht –

Community Music in der Praxis

*Michaela Dicu*

153

## **3 Bibliografie**

163

## Vorwort

An der Hochschule Düsseldorf wurde von November 2020 bis Juni 2022 in den Lehrgebieten Soziologie mit Schwerpunkt Kultursoziologie und Kultur und dem Modul „Ästhetik Medien“ (KÄM) ein auf drei Semester befristetes Projekt zu Entwicklung eines interdisziplinären Ansatzes und dessen Umsetzung in der Lehre in beiden Lehrgebieten durchgeführt.

Konkret ging es dabei um zwei Schwerpunkte: einerseits um Musik in der Sozialen Arbeit und Community Music, andererseits um Stadt- und Kultursoziologie und Gemeinwesenarbeit.

Aus soziologischer Perspektive stellte sich die Frage nach Teilhabe und Partizipation ebenso, wie die nach dem „sozialen Kitt“, also nach dem, was Gemeinschaft in der Gemeinwesenarbeit fördert und zusammenhält.

In der Soziokultur ist die „Soziale Kulturarbeit“ ein Schwerpunkt, vielfach verknüpft mit Stadtteil- und Nachbarschaftsarbeit. In diesem Themenbereich stellen sich soziologische Fragen, bezogen auf die gesellschaftliche Funktion von Kultur und dem Zugang dazu.

Ziel des Projektes war es, Möglichkeiten zu erkunden und zu entwickeln, auf welche Weise die individuelle und kollektive Handlungsfähigkeit in der Kulturarbeit gefördert werden kann, und auf welche bereits bestehende lokale Strukturen sie sich stützen kann.

Bezüglich der Community Music stand die Erfassung des aktuellen Forschungsstands und die Entwicklung neuer Ansätze in Theorie, Lehre und Praxis im Fokus.

Anders als im englischsprachigen Raum, insbesondere in Großbritannien, war bisher das Konzept von „Community Music“ in Deutschland noch wenig präsent. Es fehlte – bis auf die grundlegenden Veröffentlichung zum Thema von Alicia de Banffy Hall und Burkard Hill von 2017 – weitestgehend an grundlegender Forschung zur Systematik, Analyse und zu theoriegeleiteten Konzepten, wengleich Community Music tatsächlich in zahlreichen Bereichen, darunter auch in der Sozialen Arbeit, tagtäglich und tatsächlich praktiziert wird.

Zugleich erscheinen die verschiedenen Formen der Musikvermittlung in Deutschland gleichermaßen vielfältig wie auch voneinander abgegrenzt und teilweise von einem überholten Wertekanon geleitet (vgl. Banffy-Hall/Hill 2019). Von Musikhochschulen über Musikschulen bis hin zu Grund- und weiterführenden Schulen wird Musik häufig noch leistungsorientiert gelehrt. Der Faktor des Sozialen spielt dabei oft eine nachrangige oder auch gar keine Rolle, obwohl die Bedeutung von Musik als „sozialem Kitt“ (Krieger/Marquardt 2019) unumstritten ist.

Im Zuge der Erfassung des Forschungsstands wurden bisherige Forschungsergebnisse in der einschlägigen Literatur analysiert und bewertet, um ein theore-

tisches Fundament für die weitere Beschäftigung in der Disziplin „Community Music“ zu schaffen. Zudem erfolgte eine Bestandsaufnahme laufender Projekte der Community Music sowie verwandter Ansätze im Feld der Musik im Hinblick auf die praktische Anwendung in der Sozialen Arbeit. Insbesondere die Anforderungen an Community Musicians beziehungsweise „Facilitators“ wurden genauer betrachtet und in einer Übersicht zusammengetragen. Weiterhin wurden verschiedene Ansätze von Community Music mit dem Ziel untersucht, einen Katalog von Merkmalen, Zielen und Methoden zu erstellen.

Im Bereich der Theorie wurde ebenfalls zunächst ein Kriterienkatalog der „Community Music“ und der Musik in der Sozialen Arbeit erarbeitet, der zentrale Merkmale, Voraussetzungen, Werte, Methoden und Kompetenzanforderungen umfasst. Zusätzlich wurden systematisch „Best-Practice“-Projekte und Prozesse in der Disziplin der Community Music erfasst, um unter anderem eine Überprüfung der Übertragbarkeit in die Lehre und Praxis der Sozialen Arbeit zu ermöglichen.

Mithilfe des Aufbaus von Kooperationen mit Hochschulen, Kultureinrichtungen, „Community Musicians“ und weiteren Experten sollte der nationale und internationale Diskurs um das Thema „Community Music“ belebt und bereichert werden.

Im universitären Bereich sollte ein intensiverer Austausch zwischen den Akteur\*innen in der Community Music und den Akteur\*innen im Bereich Kultur-Ästhetik-Medien in den Angewandten Sozialwissenschaften angeregt werden. Die theoriegeleitete Entwicklung eines Curriculums mit geeigneten innovativen Ansätzen für den Einsatz von Musik in der Sozialen Arbeit und dessen Umsetzung im Fachbereich Sozial- und Kulturwissenschaften der Hochschule Düsseldorf stellte ebenfalls ein wesentliches Ziel dar.

Zum Abschluss des Forschungsvorhabens war eine Tagung zu den genannten Themen geplant, die leider aufgrund der Corona-Pandemie nicht stattfinden konnte. Deshalb haben sich die Verantwortlichen dazu entschieden, die geplanten Tagungsinhalte in Form der vorliegenden Buchveröffentlichung vorzunehmen.

Das gesamte Forschungsvorhaben sowie die vorliegende Veröffentlichung wäre nicht denkbar gewesen ohne die gelungene Zusammenarbeit der unterschiedlichen Fachgebiete, vertreten durch Reinhold Knopp, Jochen Molck und Oliver Giefers. Dem letztgenannten gebührt mein besonderer Dank für die Hilfe bei der Erstellung der vorliegenden Veröffentlichung.

Ebenso möchte ich allen Kolleg\*innen danken, die mit ihren differenzierten, wertvollen Beiträgen das Entstehen dieses Buchs ermöglicht haben.

Bei der Vorbereitung der Tagung wurden wir tatkräftig unterstützt von Charlotte Sperling und Alica Breuer, auch diesen sei an dieser Stelle herzlich gedankt. Zum Schluss ein herzlicher Dank an die Initiative „Musik von den Elbinseln“ für die Überlassung dieses schönen Titels „Listen to your Neighbourhood“.

# 1 Theoretische Grundlagen

# Community Music and the Civic Imagination

David A. Camlin

## Introduction

In this chapter, I outline, how Community Music (CM) might be considered a resource of the civic imagination in the broader quest for ways of addressing complex global challenges. Over the last few decades, the full potential of CM<sup>1</sup> to bring about social transformation has been paradoxically diminished by its coupling to political agendas, and this has led to two complex and related challenges. On the one hand, being musical has gradually been commodified into serving those political agendas – around social impact and more recently health and well-being. On the other hand, increasingly those same political systems have become a barrier to addressing the world's most pressing problems, especially environmental degradation brought about by the 'great acceleration' (Anthropocene Working Group, 2019) of human population explosion, climate change and species extinction. As a result, by cosyng up to political agendas, CM might have inadvertently become a resource to help people 'cope' with the challenges of living in this period of human history (Camlin, 2018), rather than being part of a wider movement to change those conditions.

For all of us – whether we like it or not – the whole earth is our neighbourhood. And we are making quite a mess of it. Broadly defined as the Anthropocene (Anthropocene Working Group, 2019), we are at a point in geological history, where human activity is having a direct impact on the Earth System and its capacity to sustain life – human and non-human. Yes, our current political orthodoxy of nation-states has gradually become enormously successful in creating conditions of relative stability for humans to thrive. Over the last hundred years, human population has quadrupled, from c.2 billion in 1930 to 8 billion today (United Nations, 2015). However, this political orthodoxy has also ultimately accelerated environmental degradation, such that our rapid growth as a species has come at a high price. The relentless drive to capitalise the earth's natural resources to fuel the human population explosion has released huge amounts of stored carbon into the earth's atmosphere, bringing about irreversible climatic changes and destroying animal habitats which lead simultaneously to accelerated rates of species extinction alongside a rise in zoonotic diseases (UN Environ-

---

1 and Community Arts more generally

ment, 2020), the Covid-19 pandemic being the most recent, but certainly not the last.

As ethicist Clive Hamilton (2015) expresses it, ‘the Earth System as a whole has been mobilised [...] diverted onto a different trajectory and there is no going back’. The earth itself is calling out for humans to find alternative ways of co-existing on the planet to the destructive ways that have accelerated environmental degradation. Musicing might seem an unlikely place to start to look, but as a uniquely human activity with a 230,000 year evolutionary history, I believe there is much that music might offer by way of imagining more sustainable ways of ‘becoming-with’ (Haraway, 2016, p. 168) the planet which supports both our existence, and also the other non-human entities who share it with us. It is time to scotch the myth once and for all – started by Stephen Pinker – that musicing confers no evolutionary advantage, that it is merely ‘auditory cheesecake’ (Pinker, 2003, p. 534) designed to tickle the senses. If that were true, adult humans would have stopped singing to their infants millennia ago. The fact that we haven’t, that every adult human on the planet intuitively knows how to use Infant-Directed Speech (IDS) to communicate with human babies (Mithen, 2007, p. 74), points to music’s enduring legacy as an evolutionary adaptation. As we grapple with the existential crises we currently face, music might therefore warrant a closer look in terms of its evolutionary potential.

However, such a potential might have become somewhat obscured by music’s increasingly close relationship to national political agendas. In allowing itself to be coupled with such agendas, musicing – and its most accessible form CM – has risked becoming part of the life support of a political system which has achieved much, but at an enormous price, in terms of environmental degradation. Redeeming CM from being part of the problem of intractable global challenges means thinking about it differently, hence an appeal to its potential as a resource of the civic imagination. It is time to put musicing back to service, to recover its evolutionary potential as a resource to help us make the transition from a warring species whose competitive and acquisitive instincts are destroying the conditions to sustain life on earth, to one that is capable of living more harmoniously and more sustainably.

Drawing on idealist traditions, I suggest that decoupling CM from political agendas is one way of addressing some of these challenges, using the experience of musicing as a resource for both imagining *and* performing a set of (post)humanistic values which can help us think beyond the ideological limits of capitalism into alternative ways of materialising human relationships. Rather than helping people ‘cope’ with the existential challenges we face, CM can instead be viewed as part of the social fabric of a new way of co-existing – with each other and with the planet itself and all of its myriad critters.



## The Politics of Community Music

### CM and national policy

In the UK, perhaps the most obvious moment to identify the start of the symbiotic relationship between participatory cultural activities and political agendas is the publication of Francois Matarasso's Use or Ornament report (Matarasso, 1997), which reached a number of important conclusions:

- Participation in arts activities brings social benefits;
- The benefits are integral to the act of participation;
- The social impacts are complex but understandable;
- Social impacts can be assessed and planned for. (p. 10)

These conclusions formed the justification for a raft of arts and social impact initiatives around the turn of the millennium in the UK, and a 'golden age' of Socialist government funding for participatory arts activities predicated on the idea that active participation in the arts contributes to social change, an age which lasted until just after the economic downturn of 2008. Of course, social impact measurement is more complicated than simple cause-and-effect (Perry, 2013), and structural inequalities persist, despite significant investment aimed at reducing them (Belfiore & Bennett, 2008; Camlin, 2021a, forthcoming; Neelands et al., 2015). By 2018, the political landscape had shifted again, with 'social prescribing' emerging as a term to describe the use of cultural activities as alternative measures to tackle health and wellbeing inequalities which ultimately save governments money because 'many of these social cures are cheaper or free' (Hancock, 2018), further highlighting the commodification of cultural activities by their social utility as well as their economic value.

It is therefore worth noting that many community artists – those born after 1990, say - may only have known cultural participation in the political context of art as an 'intervention' (Fancourt, 2017; Higgins, 2012, p. 3) in social or health outcomes. The relationship between the arts and their capacity to deliver on political agendas has become a central feature of cultural policy across many parts of the world. Before the 1990s, community arts activities were perhaps more directly focused on social change and alternative ways of living *because* they operated without political subsidy, under the radar of national government interests.

### The Sovereignty of the States

Sadly, it is these same national government interests which now appear to be somewhat at odds with the 'universal moral imperative' (Rowson, 2014) to ad-

dress environmental challenges. At the recent COP summit in Glasgow in November 2021, the assembled nations 'ignored difficult issues such as agriculture and coal, while shutting developing countries, that are destined to feel the effects of climate change first, out of the decision-making process' (KCLID, 2021). It is difficult for nation-states to put global imperatives above their own more partisan interests, and this causes considerable frustration for environmental activists, as without a lead from national governments to respond fully to the global climate emergency, their prevarications come across as little more than 'blah blah blah' (Thunberg, 2021).

The problem of nation states limiting global imperatives is of course, not new. When Bruno Latour (2017) suggested that 'l'Europe est seule, mais seule Europe peut nous sauver' (Europe is alone, but only Europe can save us), what he was inferring was the political union of the European project – putting aside national interests in the pursuit of common and collective flourishing – is the only means to prevent a perpetual state of conflict<sup>2</sup> between those competing interests. The resurgence of nationalism in all its forms across the globe is a stark reminder of the fragility not just of the European ideal, but also of the ways that global discourse so easily falls into competing national political interests.

## Civic Imagination

By contrast, the civic imagination is a purposeful disavowal of conventional political solutions to complex social problems, recognising that local action (in the global interest) can feel more empowering and agential than waiting for politicians to do more than merely talk about change. The original authors of the civic imagination (Baiocchi et al., 2015) identify a number of 'dialects' within it, which operate in different ways:

Re-distributing power and privilege – using direct action to address structural problems, adopting more confrontational tactics and not shying away from conflict (p. 60);

Building community solidarity – bringing people together to develop 'community identity and collective culture', as a means of fostering civic engagement (p. 62);

Solving problems – empowering people, and spurring their creativity to generate new ideas which create solutions to 'even the most complicated social problems' (p. 64)

Each of these dialects may operate independently, or in combination. Some individuals and groups may prefer one dialect over another, while others may

---

2 and indeed war, as we currently see resurging on Europe's eastern boundary

deploy each dialect under different circumstances. We might recognise the activities of Extinction Rebellion, for example, as falling more within the dialect of redistributing power and privilege, disrupting the lives of other citizens in order to raise awareness of important issues, while a less confrontational approach to building community solidarity might involve bringing people together for a concert or community event, or a practical workshop with a community group to collectively address a local problem. In each case, engaging in acts of civic imagination is a way for citizens to ‘change the world within my reach’ (Erelli, 2006) rather than waiting for or even expecting politicians to intervene, which leads to people feeling less helpless in the face of complex social challenges.

## Performing Community Music

I hope it’s clear to see how CM might engage with the various dialects of the civic imagination, whether as part of a protest march around a pressing concern, or song-writing workshops to focus people’s creativity on raising awareness of the same issue, or simply bringing people together to build community solidarity around an issue through musicing. In that respect, musicing may be simply one of a number of possible creative approaches to addressing a social challenge. However, I also think there are some good reasons for considering more particular ways in which musicing lends itself to the various dialects of the civic imagination.

## Performance of Relationships

A participatory musical activity – or a CM workshop – is a performance, but we should think of it as a different kind of performance to that of its more presentational counterpart i.e. a public performance for a listening audience (Turino, 2008, p. 25). Turino provides an excellent summary of the differences in musical characteristics of presentational and participatory performances (p. 36–62), and while I shan’t elaborate on them here, I would encourage you to be familiar with his excellent account. At its heart, Turino recognises that participatory performance is a performance of relationships, in the same vein as Christopher Small’s suggestion that ‘the act of musicing establishes in the place where it is happening a set of relationships, and it is in those relationships that the meaning of the act lies’ (Small, 1998, p. 15). Unlike a concert hall recital where the successful realisation of a musical work through its public performance is paramount, when people make music together as part of a social encounter, it matters *who* is participating and *how* everyone is involved in the realisation of a musical expression of that togetherness, leading to powerful feelings of social connection and com-

munitas, or collective joy (Camlin et al., 2020; Camlin & Reis, forthcoming; Turner, 2012).

## Performance of Values

Musicing is also about the performance of a set of values which underpin collective musical expression, and which are in themselves entangled within the musical activity itself. These values include love, reciprocity and justice, and are humanistic in that they are concerned with collective human flourishing. However, I refer to them also as (post)humanistic values, in that they transcend the biological and cultural differences which critics of classical Humanism suggest are evoked by Da Vinci's 'Vitruvian' human ideal – male, white and able-bodied – at the heart of Humanist thinking (Braidotti, 2013, p. 13). They speak to ways of connecting with one another which transcend biological and cultural differences, and might therefore be seen as ways of materialising what Freire refers to as our common 'ontological and historical vocation [... to become] more fully human' (Freire, 1970, pp. 17–18).

First of these values is love, by which I mean the sense of 'feeling felt' which occurs 'when we attune to others [and] allow our own internal state to shift, to come to resonate with the inner world of another' (Siegel, 2011, p. 27). I make the case elsewhere (Camlin, 2021b, forthcominga) that the reason a sense of 'feeling felt' is evoked during musicing is because of the particular ways that the 'communicative musicality' (Malloch & Trevarthen, 2010) at the heart of a musical exchange establishes a sympathetic entanglement between the 'resonance circuitry' (Siegel, 2011, p. 61) of participants' neurobiology. In order to make music together, we need to 'tune in' to one another, and this act of attunement happens at a neurobiological level as well as a musical one. In this sense, love is a universal human value expressed through music in that it is characteristic of *all* humans on account of our neurobiological commonalities rather than any biological or cultural differences. Musicing therefore might be seen as a potent resource for addressing some of the complex needs of human attachment.

A further (post)humanistic value evoked during musicing is that of reciprocity, which Daniel Barenboim expresses as a 'simultaneous dialogue' between voices: 'each one expressing itself to the fullest while at the same time listening to the other' (Barenboim, 2009, p. 20). Being musical with other people requires trust and sensitivity, and a willingness both to 'tune in' to what someone else is expressing, and also to respond appropriately. This mutuality is fundamentally non-competitive – everyone involved must work together, to the best of their ability, to achieve the most optimal result. This is a virtuous approach to collaboration which represents 'a shared concern for goods which are the goods of both and therefore exclusively of neither' (MacIntyre, 1981, p. 185). We might there-

fore also identify musicing as a form of 'gift' economy (Hyde, 2012), where there is an expectation of mutual exchange in term of participants' musical expressivity and embodied vitality.

Similarly, the value of justice can also be performed during musicing, and especially in non-auditioned situations. If there is no audition of capability beforehand, there is a clear indication that what is valued in the musicing is the participation of the individuals themselves, 'regardless of the quality of their contributions' (Turino, 2008, p. 35). An important implication of this value in practice is that – in order for the music to be successfully realised – no-one can be left behind or end up feeling that they're not good enough to participate. This is a clear manifestation of what John Rawls terms the 'difference principle' (Rawls, 1999, pp. 76–83) which lies at the core of 'just' approaches to collective actualisation: it is important that there *are* differences in ability within a musicing group, so that the more experienced musicians can lead and shape the music, but this cannot be at the expense of the least experienced musicians' involvement. Difference is necessary, but only insofar as it supports *everyone* in the group to develop and contribute meaningfully to the resulting music, providing 'the greatest benefit to the least advantaged' (p.302). In other words, non-auditioned musicing becomes an exercise in democratic equality, 'where the collective ambition of the group cannot be realised at the expense of the development of its least musically accomplished participant' (Camlin, forthcomingb).

## Performance of Identities

Founded on the performance of relationships, and equipped with a set of (post)humanistic values which are also 'performed' as an integral part of the musical encounter, musicing is therefore also about the performance of identities, in a number of intricate and related ways. Literature around musical identity makes an important distinction between identities-in-music (IIM) and music-in-identities (MII). The former is to do with how people identify musically, through 'established cultural roles and categories, such as "musician," "composer," "performer," "improviser," "music teacher," or "critic"' (MacDonald et al., 2017, p. 15). The latter is more to do with 'how we use music within our overall self' (p. 15). While these performances of identity can be extremely diverse – how we 'perform' ourselves through musicing in terms of our gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, religion, tribe (literal or metaphorical), cultural affiliation and so on – what I am most interested in here is how musicing – and CM activities in particular – can materialise particular identities of political affiliation. In order to explore this theme, it is first necessary to make an important distinction between what we might term 'social' and 'biographical' identities.

## Social and Biographical identities

A ‘social’ identity is ‘generated through roles and relationships between people’ (Government Office for Science, 2013, p. 10). Our social identities are to do with the relationships we form with those around us – those who we know; our families, friends and social networks. By contrast, ‘biographical’ identities ‘are more “standalone” identities which individuals might use to describe themselves to another or how they perceive themselves’ (p. 10). A biographical identity describes our relationship to a wider collective identity, which might include our geographical affiliation (either local, regional or national) but also our ‘tribal’ affiliations to sports teams, styles of music, religious beliefs, political movements and so forth. In the case of a biographical identity, we do not necessarily know the other people we share that identity with, or are ever likely to meet them, but there is still a sense of ‘kinship’ with these other nameless people who may enjoy the same activities, belong to the same religion, or simply live in the same locality.

Social and biographical identities intra-act (are mutually constituent) and music can form a key means of mediating the differences and tensions which such intra-actions evoke, especially in situations of social uncertainty (Cross & Woodruff, 2009; Pearce et al., 2015). At the level of social identity, music facilitates social bonding through the various mechanisms implicit in ‘communicative musicality’, tuning in to one another in the same way that a human infant and care-giver do through music to establish a sense of togetherness and connectedness, exchanging vitality dynamics (Stern, 2010) through musical exchange – and interpersonal neurobiological attunement – which build mutual trust and a sense of kinship.

It is this same sense of kinship through musicing which is established at the level of a biographical identity, although in this case the connection is more imagined than actual, as the group may involve other people who are not known to each other socially, or not necessarily even co-present, for example an extended religious community who may sing the same songs every week, but never meet the singers in other churches other than through the collective imagination. In a similar vein, intoxicating large groups of adult males liberally with alcohol and then herding them into an enclosed space might carry with it a reasonable expectation of violence, but when that space is a stadium and all are wearing the same football shirt and chanting the same songs, their violent potential is transformed into a powerful sense of *communitas*, which lifts collective spirits and bonds the group in a sense of common purpose, at least *within* the group of relative strangers; the disparate individuals become a ‘we’.

Nations have capitalised extensively on this capacity of music to foster biographical identity at the level of the state, through the singing of national anthems, and developing repertoires of national music which are meant to repre-

sent national values and cultural identity. To be ‘of this country’ is to be at least passingly familiar with its national songs, and thus a biographical identity at the level of the nation can be established, fostered and strengthened (Camlin, forthcoming). It is not the only means by which a national identity can be developed, but it is certainly one of the most potent, establishing a set of emotional values which stand for a feeling of collective belonging and national pride.

However, it is an imaginative ‘trick’ to be part of a collective expression of national sentiment, and to experience such collective action as shaping a particular biographical (national) identity, by giving the impression of a social connection to people one has not met and does not know. Because music possesses a ‘floating intentionality’ (Cross, 1999; Cross & Woodruff, 2009), we are relatively free to assign its meaning to an intended performance of a particular biographical identity. When one sings one’s national anthem, an imagined social connection is thereby invoked – and extended across time – to all others who might also be singing, have sung, or will sing it in the future. It’s no surprise that the singing of national anthems accompanies all national sporting successes. To reiterate, it is the fundamental blurring of identities – performing a biographical identity *as if it were* a social identity – which is one of the key ways that musicing is able to build a sense of kinship with other people – and by extension other entities known *and* unknown – outside of one’s immediate social circle.

It is important to note that it is not the musical work *per se* which lies at the heart of such a sense of kinship and unity. Yes, particular musical works can be particularly effective at fostering a sense of interpersonal connection and evoking a particular biographical identity, but such connections are cultural imaginings, not permanent arrangements. Rather, it is the *intention* with which a musical piece is performed which more firmly establishes its meaning. Consider for example the way that a song from *Les Misérables* ‘do you hear the people sing’ was appropriated by Hong Kong activists to evoke a dissensual HK identity in the recent civil unrest (Lam, 2022). In a literal sense, the song is about the revolutionary emancipation of French peasants in the 1832 June Rebellion in Paris, but its more universal themes of dissent and revolutionary fervour speak across cultural difference and historical distance, through the imaginative act of singing with the intent of establishing a biographical identity – a ‘we’ where there was not one before – which can in turn effect political change.

In this way, it is possible to yoke the sense of kinship established through musicing to the formation of higher-level biographical identities – “we, the people”, “we, the nation” – using a trick of the imagination to harness music’s ‘floating intentionality’. The nub of my argument is simply that it should also therefore be theoretically possible to consider musicing as a resource for imagining more cosmopolitan identities – “we, the planet” – simply by using the same imaginative ‘trick’ of music’s floating intentionality to evoke a biographical identity which transcends national identity in order to establish a more global one.

## Terrapolis: The Universe Next Door

Of course, while Cosmopolitanism presents a laudable ideal where ‘each human being has responsibilities to every other’ (Appiah, 2007, p. 113), it is not without its critics (Gahir, 2016; Goldberg-Vååg, 2018; Miller & Ury, 2010), who suggest that the term can also be invoked to imply a form of anthropocentric global identity which is both elitist, and perpetuates structural inequalities. If we need to find alternative terms which perform a similar function, we might consider the posthuman notion of ‘terrapolitanism’ (Camlin, forthcomingb; Haraway, 2016) - or earth-centred citizenship - less contentious and more over-arching in terms of expressing human ethical responsibilities which extend beyond exclusively human interests to include non-human entities and indeed to the planet itself as a complex ecological and geological system.

For Haraway, Terrapolis is an ‘*n*-dimensional niche space for multi-species becoming-with’ (Haraway, 2016, p. 11) where humans co-exist with other species and natural systems without bringing them - or us - to the point of destruction. For me, Terrapolis is the ‘universe next door’, a promising alternative site to the everyday reality of living in Late Capitalism, where we can come together through musicing (Elliot 1995) to collectively imagine *and perform* the kind of world we really want to live in. Although Terrapolis is a future imagined world, we begin to inhabit it when we intentionally invoke it in our musicing, using the same act of musical intentionality to invoke a more Terrapolitan identity.

This same sense of building a common identity beyond national limits clearly emerged in recent research into the international Ethno music project, where young people from different countries are brought together for collective musicing, which ‘opens up a different kind of environment where participants can encounter each other in ways that are qualitatively different to the experience of their everyday lives’ (Camlin & Reis, forthcoming). One of the organisers specifically noted how joining the programme ‘gave me the choice to evolve as a musician, outside of my country’s borders, and learn about other cultures’, while another talked about the profoundly transformational experience of ‘gathering people that would never have met, in a nice atmosphere, to share a moment in music (no more borders!)’.

It is this blending of very locally situated musicing with a more global mindset where musicing and the civic imagination most fruitfully combine. I am certainly not suggesting that there should be a movement to develop ‘global’ anthems as opposed to national ones, to help us think more globally. Rather, in the spirit of the environmental maxim ‘think global, act local’, individuals and groups can perform repertoire which is locally meaningful, whilst feeling part of a global invocation of love, reciprocity and justice through the collective act of musicing with the *intention* of global harmony. Not so much performing the same repertoire in order to evoke a global biographical identity, but instead ‘performing’ the



same (post)humanistic *values* which are necessary for more sustainable ways of living on a fragile planet.

## Examples

I conclude with a few examples from my own practice as a community musician, and how ideas of the civic imagination are shaping that practice. In doing so, I am not claiming anything special about what I do. Rather, I am merely highlighting how the flow of ideas and practice play out in uniquely situated ways. I reflect on my practice from the premise that ‘I – like every musician – can only ever be *this* musician, making music in *this* situation with *these* people and *these* materials, within *these* cultures and traditions’ (Camlin, forthcomingd). Having brought ideas of the civic imagination into my practice, they have begun to shape it; this is what the civic imagination looks like in my practice, and I don’t expect it to resemble what might happen elsewhere. Our collective imaginations, and the significantly different materials we each create music with, means that what we all do is bound to be materially different to one another.

Most of what I do as a community musician these days involves group singing in the remote rural part of Northern UK where I live, the Lake District. The civic imagination started to appear explicitly in what I do in a mountain-top singing project in 2018, and which I have written about more extensively elsewhere (Camlin, forthcomingd; Camlin et al., 2020). The Fellowship of Hill and Wind and Sunshine was a commission for the UK National Trust (National Trust, n.d.), to commemorate the centenary of the end of the first World War 1914–18, and the subsequent ‘great gift’ of mountain summits by a group of mountaineers to the nation as a memorial to their fallen comrades. I composed and arranged a cycle of songs for a ‘scratch’ choir to sing on the various summits, including a setting of the dedication given by poet-mountaineer Geoffrey Winthrop-Young at a special service on Great Gable in 1924. The powerful sense of connection felt by the participants – to each other, to the mountaineers who gifted the summits, to their fallen comrades and to the land itself – was a strong collective experience, and very much about building community solidarity.

We followed this up in 2019 with a site-specific Arts Council England (ACE)-funded project in the wild Ennerdale valley, including a residential event we called The Universe Next Door, where participants got to explore the valley in imaginative new ways with myself and a team of inspiring artists using a range of creative materials including voices, tuned and untuned percussion, cathedral organ pipes, deep listening, and willow animal sculpture. I established a new choir Wild Chorus during lockdown in 2020, formed around the premise of ‘freeing our voices to sing together in wild places’ to capitalise on the ideas generated by the previous two years’ work. Our first project coming out of lockdown in 2021

was an outdoors singing project funded by ACE called *Communitas*, creating ‘pop-up’ moments of harmony across the north of England to support people back into face-to-face singing, whilst emphasising the importance of the natural world for fostering both human wellbeing and interpersonal connection. In the autumn of 2021, the new group started to become more closely involved with local environmental issues, including protests against plans to establish a new coal mine in our area, and also at environmental events around COP26. In 2022, these different directions coalesced in a further ACE-funded project entitled *Earthsong*, building a ‘living installation’ of singing humans and willow ‘critters’ who are popping up in wild places across the north of the UK, from wildflower meadows, lakes, rivers and mountains as well as the Solfest music festival, and culminating in a community event in September at a local wildlife park to celebrate World Rivers Day.

I don’t think of these activities as being *explicitly* activist, in the sense of the first dialect of the civic imagination i.e. redistributing power and privilege. The area where we live is a close-knit rural community strongly in favour of things like mining because of weak local employment opportunities and high levels of disadvantage, and so a more confrontational approach would be likely to promote conflict and cause many of the participants discomfort and embarrassment. Instead, what I hope our activities achieve is more gently persuasive, materialising both the expression of (post)human values through the group singing, while also being a visual metaphor for the precarity and inter-dependence of sustainable human and non-human co-existence. In doing so, we create a space where it’s okay to be an advocate for the natural world – to speak for and with it – and we can do so gently but assertively by ‘performing’ our relationship with Nature. In performing with the collective intent of raising awareness of environmental issues and building community solidarity, we are ‘performing’ the change we want to see in the world, which in turn we hope helps to bring the complexity of those issues more into the public consciousness.

Of course, on its own, this kind of modest practice as a community musician is not about to change the world, and nor is it seeking to. However, it is attempting to ‘change the world within my reach’ (Erelli, 2006), and by extension, to change the worlds within the reach of my co-participants and our audiences. For us, listening to our neighbourhood means listening to – and speaking both with and for – the natural world. Through musicing underpinned with (post)humanistic values, I hope that everyone involved (including myself) experiences what we do as a resource to help materialise those values – of love, reciprocity and justice – more strongly in the world, and ultimately feel part of a more hopeful future.

# Community Music – ein „Upgrade“ für Musik in der Sozialen Arbeit?

Oliver Giefers

Die Community Music findet seit einigen Jahren auch in Deutschland in den Disziplinen Musikpädagogik, der kulturellen Bildung und vor allem der Sozialen Arbeit Beachtung. Die umfangreiche Literatur wift dabei eher mehr als weniger Fragen auf: Ist Community Music ein theoretisches Konzept, eine musikpädagogische Methode, ein Programm, eine Variante musikalischer Bildung, eine politische Haltung oder gar „life itself“ (Price 2017, S. X)? Als eine erste Annäherung wirft dieser Beitrag einen Blick auf die Merkmale, den Wertekanon, die Ziele und die Methoden der Community Music, geleitet von der Frage, was diese in Deutschland zur Weiterentwicklung der kulturellen Bildung im Allgemeinen und des künstlerisch-ästhetischen Bereichs in der Sozialen Arbeit im Besonderen beitragen könnte.

## 1 Stand des Diskurses – Community Music in Deutschland

In Deutschland ist der Begriff *Community Music* dank der Initiative von Alicia de Bánffy-Hall, Burkhard Hill und einigen anderen Protagonist\*innen<sup>1</sup> spätestens seit einem Symposium im Jahr 2015 in die Fachöffentlichkeit gelangt. Neben einer ersten „Institutionalisierung“ durch das „Community Music Netzwerk“<sup>2</sup>, das seine Aktivitäten kontinuierlich ausweitet, haben sich vereinzelt Studiengänge, universitäre Projekte<sup>3</sup> und ausdrückliche Community Music-Aktivitäten etabliert. Dennoch zeigt sich, wie auch die Beiträge im aktuellen Themenheft zum Thema „Community Music“ belegen, außerhalb eines kleineren Zirkels eher

---

1 z. B. Alexandra Kertz-Welzel, Elke Josties, Annette Ziegenmeyer, Marion Haak-Schulenburg, Hubert Minkenberg, Thomas Grosse.

2 <https://communitymusicnetzwerk.de>

3 z. B. an der Uni Hildesheim:

<https://www.uni-hildesheim.de/center-for-world-music/community-service/uebersicht/>;  
der Universität Eichstätt-Ingolstadt:

<https://www.ku.de/studienangebot/musikwissenschaft-angewandte-ba>;

TH Regensburg: <http://www.oth-regensburg.de>; Fachhochschule Clara Hoffbauer Potsdam:

<https://www.fhchp.de/studienangebot/musik/>

wenig Bewegung. Community Music<sup>4</sup> scheint in Deutschland zurzeit noch eher ein Potenzial als praktische Realität zu sein. Ungeachtet dessen ist aber die Diskussion in Gang gekommen: Wie neu ist Community Music? Wie relevant? Ist sie eine Konkurrenz für die Nachbardisziplinen wie Musikpädagogik, Musik in der Sozialen Arbeit oder Soziokulturelle Bildung oder ist sie „überflüssig“? Oder im Gegenteil eine Bereicherung?

Die eigene Erfahrung und die Inaugenscheinnahme praktischer Projekte in Deutschland lässt einen ganz anderen Schluss zu: Community Music passiert seit langem! Es finden sich in der Szene der freien Musikpädagogik und der Sozialen Arbeit seit Jahrzehnten zahlreiche Ansätze und Projekte, die eine enge Verwandtschaft zum Community Music Ansatz aufweisen (vgl. Sons 2017, S. 96; Josties 2016, S. 27; de Bánffy-Hall/Haak-Schulenburg/Eberhard 2021, S. 3), ohne in einen musikpädagogischen oder theoretischen Kontext eingeordnet zu sein. Sie finden in der Schulsozialarbeit, der Senior\*innenarbeit, der kulturellen Bildung im Sozialraum, der Jugendarbeit, in der Musikpädagogik und nicht zuletzt in der überaus reichhaltigen Landschaft der „Amateurmusik“ statt. Es existieren große Schnittmengen mit der Community Music: sehr oft geht es um aktives Musizieren in Gruppen, um Improvisation, um Kreativität und um einen niedrighschwelligen Zugang zu Musik (vgl. Dansereau/Ilari 2017, S. 238). Auch in der Fachwelt setzt sich die Erkenntnis durch, dass Aktivitäten in den Bereichen Musikpädagogik, Sozialer Arbeit und weiteren Feldern der Musikvermittlung gerade in Deutschland innovativer, offener und entwicklungsfähiger sind als vereinzelt unterstellt. Daher liegt der Schlußschluss von Community Music und verwandten Disziplinen, insbesondere der Sozialen Arbeit nahe (vgl. Göppel 2007, S. 251f). Die Soziale Arbeit stützt sich darauf, dass es beim gemeinsamen Musizieren um mehr als die Etablierung eines Musikstücks geht, „... sondern vielmehr bietet es Gelegenheit, sich und andere kennenzulernen, aufeinander zu hören, sich mitzuteilen, sich einzuordnen, sich gegenseitig zu helfen und auch Hilfe anzunehmen, Geduld zu üben, Rücksicht zu nehmen, die Bedürfnisse anderer wahrzunehmen und zu achten.“ (Platz 2017, S. 89, vgl. auch Rolle 2015, S. 19)

---

4 Diskussion Musikpädagogik (86) 20, 2020.