

winners. For example, Highlander pursued concern for the environment after the civil right movement no longer needed their assistance; but they do not dramatize their efforts. A study of survivors does not yield the renewal of creativity or the capacity to live with contradictions that past efforts suggest. I look forward to seeing the mural by Joe Jones from the walls of Commonwealth of the three industries of Arkansas: cotton, timber, and lynching. Like his book, Cobb presents a poor reproduction of this painting with no understanding of its plan or meaning.



Mitchell, S. (2001). *Partnerships in Creative Activities Among Schools, Artists and Professional Organizations*. Lewiston, NY: Edwin Mellen. Pages: 288. Price: \$ 89.95 USD (cloth).

Reviewed by Roberta Lamb, Queen's University.

This is a complex book addressing complex issues, and worth the reading time. As an experienced arts educator I found myself frustrated by it, occasionally offended, but also nodding in agreement, sighing at the problems documented and shouting with enthusiasm for the ideas presented.

Mitchell's book gathers together documentary and anecdotal evidence on numerous arts partnership education programmes, including the more well-known such as the Getty, Artsvision, and Lincoln Center and the more regional or local, such as Calgary Arts Partners in Education or the ABC in South Carolina. He presents the familiar problems arts educators and arts organizations face: the competition among arts organizations for funding; the divisions between arts educators in the schools and artists-in-residence; the adherence to particular artistic and/or pedagogical ideologies. He documents how various projects and programmes have met these challenges or have been diminished by not meeting them. His concluding chapter provides ten recommendations for successful partnerships.

Mitchell brings two novel ideas to his analysis of arts partnership education programmes: one comparison to sectarian religion and another

to social justice movements. The analogy of competing artistic and pedagogical ideologies to religious groups is effective, pointing out the counterproductive aspects of passionate and orthodox commitment to a belief. I chuckled as I read this chapter — it rang so true! — even as such division saddens me in my daily work. The chapter suggesting that arts partnerships education could learn from social movements, particularly those related to civil rights or ethnic diversity, fascinated me. One of my frustrations has always been the lack of apparent connection between the arts and politics, yet we practitioners are always in the midst of politics, whether through a lack of power or power struggles. Mitchell may be quite right in pointing out the gains to be made through political work.

Another unique aspect of this book is that it presents a sociological analysis of arts partnerships education. It is not from the viewpoint or theoretical framework of either the arts or arts education. This analysis of politics and power would be beneficial to those of us working in arts partnerships education. We are so focused on our artistic and pedagogical endeavours that we rarely see how these arts projects fit within social structures.

Personally, what intrigued me most was how I kept tripping over my own history in music and arts in education through every chapter! Reading this book connected several prominent influences in my career. Please bear with the following aside that outlines these congruencies:

Frustrated with secondary school, I found a socially acceptable way to quit by enrolling in near-by Mount Angel College, Oregon, where I studied fine arts with prominent artists, at least one of whom had studied at Black Mountain College. I did not stay but transferred to graduate from a more traditional university music department. Subsequently I began my career as a music teacher in the schools, while also teaching studio lessons and continuing to perform in a semi-professional capacity. One place I taught studio lessons was Catlin Gabel School in Portland, Oregon, which had been headed by a former student from Black Mountain College. Mitchell analyses BMC as a precursor to the arts integration model and cites Catlin Gabel as a continuation of the BMC vision. A few years later I am working on a music education doctorate at Teachers College, Columbia University. I study aesthetics with Maxine

Greene, who introduces me to the Lincoln Center model. I receive an Arts Resident Educator assistantship to work with the Lawrence Schools, Long Island, developing curriculum to complement artists-in-the-schools programming. Maxine Greene agrees to be on my dissertation committee. Mitchell has a lot to say about Greene and Lincoln Center. Upon graduation, I take a job at Brandon University, Manitoba, and meet with the people in Saskatchewan who are developing the arts education degree Mitchell discusses wherein university arts education students 'major' in two arts and are introduced to two others. Now I'm at Queen's University where a major project is an arts partnership linking resources from the university music school, the two local school boards and the Kingston Symphony. I recognize intimately the conflicts and satisfactions of working with community partners that Mitchell documents. This resonance with my own experience provokes me to think further on Mitchell's recommendations as I continue my work with arts partnerships.

There are some inaccuracies in the book, e.g., a reference to the U.S. Music Educators Association, which is actually the Music Educators National Conference (MENC). I also think that the characterization of Greene was unduly harsh, especially since the only quotations were from a 1979 publication, and her thinking has changed during the past 21 years, as is evidenced in her publications of the late 80s and the 90s. Then there's the difficulty of insider-outsider information: I found myself wanting more of an understanding or explication of artistic processes as we who do arts understand them; yet, it takes someone from 'outside' to identify the structural problems clearly. So while I do not agree with or accept Mitchell's conclusions as a whole, I find them provocative, and worthy of consideration.

This book makes an important contribution to our understanding of how arts partnership education functions.

