

Primus oeuvre within the context of jim crow racial politics, anti-colonialism, a...

[History](#)



**ASSIGN
BUSTER**

The paper " Art Is a Weapon for Social Change" is a perfect example of an essay on history. In an article written by Tammy Brown especially at the preliminary paragraphs of it, Pearl Primus is introduced as not just an artist, but also as an educator and political activist. This is a prelude to the reader that Primus is consistent both in the arts and in the concept of ongoing social activities, especially in the political arena. The intent of the written article is clear. Brown is, therefore, trying to provide a vital connection between the art and its sociological context. For this reason, the work at hand tries to establish the point that art is a weapon for social change. Let us have first an essential background of the life of Primus as an artist. It is not of an accidental point that Primus develops an affinity for creating a substantive and bright future for multiculturalism. This artist adheres to the point of revising the narratives of American history, the process of return and re-vision as what she would want to exemplify. For Brown and by understanding the work of art of Primus would simply mean that, " Going backward meant revising the narratives of American history that omitted the accomplishments of peoples of African descent. This process of return and re-vision would transport black and white Americans into more, multicultural future." In this context, it is clear that Brown is emphasizing the elemental role of the art in trying to establish a better multicultural future. This is quite evident when Primus' works are critically analyzed by Brown, especially in the context of studying both the masterpiece and the sociological context and their theoretical principles. As stated in Brown's article, " Hence, this article is the first to take a historical approach in critically engaging with Primus' oeuvre within the context of Jim Crow racial politics, anti-colonialism,

Afro-centricity, and multiculturalism.” Now, in this line of argument, readers are fed with the information that there is a hint of establishing the art as a weapon for initiating political propaganda or at least a move to establish some political or social suggestions, at some level. Brown’s article is critical about this point. In fact, he further justifies, by heralding, “ Primus intended her work to serve grand humanitarian goals of interracial dialogue and mutual cultural respect.” In other words, Brown is depicting the work of Primus as not just primarily a piece of art, but above anything, something with a socio-cultural message that could primarily establish the future, at best.

This hope of Brown is supported by another relevant perspective that radical artists in 1930s embraced the idea that art could be the weapon for social change and those artists involved in it were considered servitors of the future.

Perhaps, the songs of Bob Marley were mostly popular in the 20th century. Aside from their musicality and style or genre for artistic compilations, the lyrics were very controversial, because they are revolutionary, depicting the reality and providing essential direction for the future. Radical thought for these songs may be underrated, but considering intuitiveness in their ways of touching one’s emotion may be quite acceptable. One of Marley’s popularized songs, like “ Buffalo Soldiers” may even touch one’s emotion and even to the deepest level of an individual’s understanding of the history of the past.

Obviously, it is evident that art may be manifested in various forms like dance, music, drama and so on, and they could eventually be considered one

way or another, as weapons for social change. Art, after all, can control the behavior of men, because they have effects on emotions and sentiments. This simply tries to point out the viewpoint that art can be a remarkable tool for social control. Art is universal at some point. In fact, from inception until the onset of human civilization, art was already an integral component of society. Thus, it is quite safer to argue that art is indeed a relevant tool for social change, at some point.