

Scholarly Article-Forthcoming

“From Slam to *Def Poetry Jam*: Spoken Word Poetry and its Counterpublics.” *Poetry Worlds*, eds. Bill Marsh and Jenifer Vernon. Editors are currently seeking a publisher for a 2012 or 2013 publication date.

- Acceptance letter from editors, 8/18/11
- Poetry Worlds preface by Bill Marsh and Jenifer Vernon, eds.
- “From Slam to Def Poetry Jam” abstract and submitted article



Susan B. A. Somers-Willett <susanbasw@gmail.com>

Poetry Worlds

Marsh, William <WMarsh@qcc.cuny.edu>

Thu, Aug 18, 2011 at 11:14 AM

To: "Susan B. A. Somers-Willett" <susan@susansw.com>

Cc: "Jrvernon@uas.alaska.edu" <Jrvernon@uas.alaska.edu>

Dear Susan,

We're very impressed with your chapter overall and have just a few suggestions for revision.

Two issues that came up in our readings are (1) your analysis in the middle of audience response to the Sia poem, which for at least one of us (Bill) presents opportunities to deepen and strengthen your argument overall in re counterpublics and the complexities of poetry slam as a subversive activity, and (2) your conclusion, where likewise there may be an opportunity to "connect the dots" in important ways.

Beyond that, we think it's nearly ready to go and is a wonderful contribution to this volume.

(From Bill: Please see the attached annotated version for comments, including some areas where I think statements could be clarified somewhat or where I stumble a bit with the wording, punctuation, etc. [see bolded passages, with comments or questions in brackets following]. Feel free to write back with questions if you have any.)

Thanks again for contributing!

All best,
Bill



Somers-Willett-notes.doc

141K

Preface: Poetry Worlds
by Bill Marsh and Jenifer Vernon, eds.

What is poetry? Who makes it and why? How is poetry produced, and who determines the terms and conditions of its production? These questions, broad as they are, suggest a point of departure for this book. They are leading questions: To ask about poetic production is to begin from the premise that poetry is in fact made or produced by individuals and groups working with particular aesthetic goals in mind. Often these goals intersect with issues of community construction, group membership, inclusion and exclusion, identity making, and personal and social empowerment, all of which manifest in various forms of poetic practice. Our aim with this collection is to foreground some of the ways in which poetry, often understood as a private act of literary creation, depends on a range of social, political, cultural and economic relationships. Poetry, in other words, is a social activity involving people, organizations, resources, routines and conventions configured in various ways to support different forms of poetic production. Viewed in the aggregate, these people and processes help define the ‘poetry worlds’ that make poetry possible.

We are indebted to sociologist Howard Becker and his concept of ‘art worlds’ for the title of our collection and its organizing principle. Drawing on examples from music and the visual arts, Becker’s groundbreaking study of art world interaction, *Art Worlds* (1982), argues that “all artistic work, like all human activity, involves the joint activity of a number, often a large number, of people” (p. 1). The usual products of that activity—such as paintings, photographs, books, song albums and sculptures—show “signs of that cooperation” and “patterns of collective activity we can call an art world” (p. 1). Becker suggests that what we often take to be the definitive mark of artistic work, the artwork itself, exists as a particular instance of art world

activity assuming a given form in the context of much broader collaborations and interactions. *Art Worlds* is a primer, in that sense, on how to study the “core activity” of artistic work by looking at the contributions of “all the people who cooperate via an art world’s characteristic conventions” (p. 35). In studying the core activities and characteristic conventions of particular poetry worlds, the contributors in this collection draw on a number of works from the fields of cultural studies (Damon, Damon and Livingston, Rose, Fisher, Gregory, Somers-Willett), literary studies and poetics (Bernstein, Epstein, Hejinian, Perelman, Golding), performance studies (Dolan, Conquergood, Auslander), and the sociology of art (Becker, Bourdieu, Fine).

Though composed of a diverse set of poetry world studies, the book delivers one basic argument: By examining the core activities of particular poetry worlds, we can learn a great deal about how poetry is produced and communicated between audiences and poets at different historical moments, in different locales, and under different circumstances. Each of the studies that follows looks at a particular poetry world, or the activities associated with poetry production within a given world, as a means of defining and elucidating the patterns, processes, meanings, event structures, central artifacts and forms within it. In some cases the worlds overlap or share common borders. Some studies engage ethnographically with contemporary practices and practitioners. Others are historical, the “signs” and “patterns” suggestive of past poetry worlds that either no longer exist or exist in different forms today.

In soliciting work we invited authors to consider a number of intersecting issues, among them: the cultural politics of the poetry communities and the practices studied; the ways in which poetry world participants or members define poetry and performance; the communicative mediums through which poetry and poetic discourses travel or have traveled; and the cultural, social and political meanings of the poetry world, including its intersections with larger social

forces and concerns, such as race, class and gender. We asked a number of questions, including: What dynamics lead, or have led in the past, to the emergence of poetry worlds? What are the boundaries of a given poetry world and how fixed or porous are its edges? In answering these questions, our contributors bring approaches from Sociology, Literature, Communication, [Geography] and English Studies and arrive at their claims by way of a variety of methodologies, including ethnography, interpretive phenomenological analysis, discourse analysis, personal and cultural history, literary analysis and performance studies. These approaches and methodologies combine to offer the reader an interdisciplinary path into a range of poetry worlds and the tools with which to analyze and interpret them.

Before briefly introducing each chapter, we should explain our use of the word ‘world’ to signify the kinds of structuring structures discussed in this book. In part we are being bluntly strategic in echoing Becker’s title. More importantly, we opt to use the word ‘world’ to connote a wide range of human interactions among specific groups of human actors. In particular, we define ‘poetry world’ as an emergent cultural constellation of individuals who come together around a particular form of poetic activity in particular times, places and spaces. As the studies collected here suggest, however, the different kinds of ‘coming together’ that lead to poetry world formations are not necessarily limited to particular social networks, groups or communities of practice, and the human actors involved, despite specific group or community allegiances, may interact in surprising ways. The word ‘world’ is useful, therefore, because it can imply both a broadly imagined space whose inhabitants share an assumed sense of size, borders, completeness and wholeness and—at the same time or conversely—a very particular space or locale equipped with a contingent set of conventions, practices and rituals that may or may not resemble those found in other worlds.

Thus, a ‘poetry world,’ as we define it here, subsumes multiple forms of community interaction while remaining open and inclusive enough—as both conceptual framework and metaphor—to allow for wide-ranging interpretations and responses. Indeed, our call for work functioned in large measure as a call to interpret poetry and poetic production toward a better understanding of what a ‘poetry world’ is or can be. In that spirit we recognize in each chapter a contribution to a growing definition.

As for the contributions themselves, in chapter [x] Helen Gregory examines “Youth Slam” and “Word Cup” poetry competitions in the UK, analyzing slam poetry in relation to arts education and young people’s empowerment in the public schools. In chapter [x], Stephanie Berger and Nicholas Adamski venture into “The Poetry Brothel,” an international poetry phenomenon offering an immersive experience that locates poetry, in the authors’ words, “in the lush interiors of a figurative bordello.” Jenifer Vernon’s in-depth study of live poetry performance in chapter [x] documents the emergence and eventual collapse of an open-mic poetry event in San Diego, California, examining the ways in which this weekly event became a site for the rehearsal of democratic ideals. In chapter [x], Bill Marsh looks to print publishing and editorial correspondence as a form of poetry world activity wherein questions of inclusion, group membership and border management intersect with more mundane concerns about editing, book making and product marketing. Corey Frost’s rhetorical analysis of the “anti-spoken word scene” in chapter [x] also takes on questions of border/boundary management and, through a close reading of recent “skirmishes” between spoken word poets and their critics, demonstrates some of the ways in which poetry communities often maintain hierarchies through exclusion.

In chapter [x], Susan B. A. Somers-Willett compares the “U.S. National Slam” competition and HBO’s “Def Poetry Jam,” addressing issues of poet-audience interaction, poetry

commodification and poetry performance as a form of public message delivery. Urayoán Noel, in chapter [x], examines and challenges performance identities associated with the Nuyorican Poets Café and Nuyorican poetics more broadly, reflecting as well on his own ongoing collaborative performance project, *Noricua*, which, in Noel's words, "embraces an anti-foundationalist, deterritorialized, and practice-centered Puerto/Nuyo Rican poetics/politics." In chapter [x], Juliet Lynd analyzes the "tumultuous poetry world of 1973 Chile" by telling the story of an unpublished manuscript by Chilean poet Cecelia Vicuña. Finally, in chapter [x], Michael Bruner writes about two performance troupes he co-founded in Los Angeles between 1984 and 1991—The Lost Tribe and The Carma Bums—the former emerging out of the underground Hollywood poetry scenes of the 1970s and 80s, the latter based on improvisational techniques borrowed from the Living Theater in New York. [+ poetry maps, if they come.]

Taken as a whole, *Poetry Worlds* offers an interdisciplinary approach to the study of poetry worlds that we hope will help propel other richly contextualized studies of poetry activities either going on today or sealed away in the vaults of poetic history. As this collection should make abundantly clear, poetry cannot be defined or meaningfully explained outside of the contexts and the people, the places and the spaces, and the times in which it originates. Thus, each chapter suggests new opportunities for further poetry world research—and new methods for conducting that research. In our afterword, we offer more specific recommendations for further poetry world research, as well as some concluding remarks in response to the particular issues raised in the following chapters.

References

- Auslander, Philip. (1999). *Liveness: Performance in a mediatized culture*. London: Routledge.
- Becker, Howard. (1982). *Art worlds*. Berkeley, CA: University of California.
- Bernstein, Charles. (Ed.). (1998). *Close listening: Poetry and the performed word*. New York, NY: Oxford.
- Bourdieu, Pierre. (1995). *The rules of art: Genesis and structure of the literary field*. (Susan Emanuel, Trans.). Stanford, CA: Stanford University.
- Conquergood, Dwight. (2002). Performance studies: Interventions and radical research. *TDR: The Drama Review*, 46 (2) 145-156.
- _____. (2006). Rethinking elocution: The trope of the talking book and other figures of speech. In Judith Hamera (Ed.), *Opening acts: Performance in/as communication and cultural studies* (141-162). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Damon, Maria. (1993). *The dark end of the street: Margins in American vanguard poetry*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota.
- Damon, Maria and Ira Livingston. (Eds.). (2009). *Poetry and cultural studies: A reader*. Chicago, IL: University of Illinois.
- Dolan, Jill. (2005). *Utopia and performance: Finding hope at the theater*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan.
- Epstein, Andrew. (2006). *Beautiful enemies: Friendship and postwar American poetry*. New York, NY: Oxford University.
- Fine, Gary Alan. (2004). *Everyday genius: Self-taught art and the culture of authenticity*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago.

- Fisher, Maisha Tulivu. (2003). Open mics and open minds: Spoken word poetry in African diaspora participatory literacy communities. *Harvard Educational Review*, 73, 362-389.
- Golding, Alan. (1995). *From outlaw to classic: Canons in American poetry*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin.
- Gregory, Helen. (2008). The quiet revolution of poetry slam: The sustainability of cultural capital in the light of changing artistic conventions. *Ethnography and Education*, 3, 63-80.
- Hejinian, Lyn. (2000). *The language of inquiry*. Berkeley, CA: University of California.
- Perelman, Bob. (1996). *The Marginalization of poetry: Language writing and literary history*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University.
- Rose, Tricia. (1994). *Black noise*. Middletown, CT: Wesleyan.
- Somers-Willett, Susan B.A. (2009). *The cultural politics of slam poetry: Race, identity, and the performance of popular verse in America*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan.

From Slam to *Def Poetry Jam*: Spoken Word Poetry and its Counterpublics

Susan B. A. Somers-Willett, Montclair State University

ABSTRACT

First designed, according to creator Marc Smith, to stand in contrast to dry, exclusive, and author-reverent readings organized by some academics, the poetry slam has evolved to create a populist model for poetry's reception while rallying its audiences around liberal political stances and support for marginalized poets and identities. Through a unique combination of open participation, political exchange, and public critique, the practice of slams in the US create what scholar Nancy Fraser calls *subaltern counterpublics*—"discursive arenas where members of subordinated social groups invent and circulate counterdiscourses ... to formulate oppositional interpretations of their identities, interests, and needs" (Fraser 67). In his book *Publics and Counterpublics*, Michael Warner understands counterpublics as open, self-organized communities formed through attention, the circulation of discourse, and expression of a world view while also being "constituted through a conflictual relation to the dominant public" and "maintain[ing] at some level, conscious or not, an awareness of its subordinate status" (118, 119). They are also spaces in which their members, through open critique and exchange, hope to transform certain paradigms of dominant culture, not merely to replicate that subordinate status. In this regard, counterpublics can be discursive arenas where their members' identities are both formed and reimagined (57, 122).

Even as there may be an emphasis on social and cultural marginalization in the slam community itself, both slam poets and their audiences hail from a variety of backgrounds including dominant ones. Audiences for the National Poetry Slam, for example, tend to be predominately white and/or middle-class (Somers-Willett 78-9). On a more local level, Jessica Simon's 2005 survey of the three largest New York city slam venues found about 42% of audiences identified as white, 64% had incomes over \$30,000, and 69% had at least a college degree (90-97). Given the slam's reputation as a renegade, populist alternative to academic poetry readings and a stage for voices that the literary canon excludes, simply showing up at a slam can afford these participants a sense of subalternity even as they may hail from traditionally dominant groups.

This sense of subalternity formed through the shared value of difference held between slam poets and audience members is also at play in contemporary American spoken word poetry. As an example, I consider Russell Simmons's *Def Poetry* projects—the longstanding Home Box Office original series *Russell Simmons Presents Def Poetry* and the theatrical production *Def Poetry Jam on Broadway*. Through the mediums of live performance and television, these projects create discursive spaces where poets and audiences come together to celebrate difference, marginalized identities, and engage in critique of dominant culture through the performance of poetry in ways similar to the slam. Several poets have migrated from the National Poetry Slam stage to appear on *Def Poetry*, sometimes performing the very same poems in each venue. Nevertheless, I believe the discursive space *Def Poetry* creates is more tangled than that of its competitive counterpart. Simmons's projects mimic the sound and sensibilities of

the slam's open counterpublic, encouraging marginalized poets, critiquing dominant culture, and replicating at least in spirit a similar discursive space through poetry's performance. Yet because they are rife with product placements of Simmons's own clothing line, selective choices about who receives stage time (and therefore the space to speak and offer lyrical critique), and the overall branding of their poets and poetry with the "Def" label, the counterdiscourses the *Def Poetry* projects present are also painfully tied up with the interests of dominant commercial culture. This fact presents poets with a quandary: to participate in a commercial system and potentially change the minds of a larger mainstream public, or to be heard by fewer people in more open, democratic, counterpublic ways? Both avenues for consumption have possibilities and drawbacks. Further complicating the issue is the unlicensed circulation of the *Def Poetry* performances beyond the original series, particularly in new media venues such YouTube. In comparing the kinds of publics formed by poetry slams and the *Def Poetry* projects, I hope a better understanding of the critical and cultural exchanges these poetry communities enact, as well as what possibilities they present, can emerge.

From Slam to *Def Poetry Jam*: Spoken Word Poetry and its Counterpublics

Susan B. A. Somers-Willett, Montclair State University

Poetry slams—raucous poetry competitions where poets perform their own compositions and judges selected from the audience score them from 0.0-10.0—are practices rooted in the public sphere. These local performance poetry competitions, which originated in the mid-1980s in white working-class Chicago bars as the brainchild of ex-construction worker Marc Smith, have spawned national and global competitions. Now, over twenty-five years since the slam's birth, the National Poetry Slam (NPS) annually hosts teams from nearly eighty cities across the U.S. and Canada. As slam entered the twenty-first century, its poets started to appear on larger and more public stages, including documentary and feature films, cable television, Broadway, the White House, and the Opening Ceremonies of the 2010 Winter Olympics. This exposure has, at times, ventured toward the cliché; in 2004, slam poetry garnered the dubious honor of becoming the subject of a book in *The Complete Idiot's Guide* series (M. Smith & Kraynak, 2004), and parodies of and references to poetry slams have appeared on MTV, episodes of *The Simpsons*, *The Daily Show*, and *Oprah* to name a few. Both parodies and serious critiques of poetry slams characterize their poets as soulful loudmouths with a grudge—against either mainstream society, a specific oppressor, or the ever-elusive “man.” The most oft-quoted of these critiques came from Harold Bloom, who remarked in *The Paris Review*, “I can't bear these accounts I read in the *Times* and elsewhere of these poetry slams, in which various young men and women in various late-spots are declaiming rant and nonsense at each other. The whole thing is judged by an applause meter which is actually not there, but might as well be. This isn't even silly; it is the death of art” (Bloom et al., 2000, p. 379).

Although such images of the poetry slam and the poets they attract are caricatures—for slams attract a range of people from sonneteers to slacktivists, and both Pulitzer Prize winners and National Book Award finalists have passed through its ranks—it does bring to the fore the poetry slam’s characteristic stances against dominant culture and the academy. First designed, according to Marc Smith, to stand in contrast to dry, exclusive, and author-reverent readings organized by some academics (2003, pp. 117-18), the poetry slam has evolved to create a populist model for poetry’s reception while rallying its audiences around liberal political stances and support for marginalized poets and identities (Hoffman, 2001, p. 49; Somers-Willett 2009, pp. 3, 68-95). Through a unique combination of open participation, political exchange, and public critique, the practice of slams in the U.S. can create what scholar Nancy Fraser (1990) calls *subaltern counterpublics*—“discursive arenas where members of subordinated social groups invent and circulate counterdiscourses . . . to formulate oppositional interpretations of their identities, interests, and needs” (p. 67).

The concept of counterpublics offers a more specialized understanding of Jürgen Habermas’s *public sphere* (1989), a discursive space created when private citizens come together to engage in public rational-critical debate and through which “political participation is enacted through the medium of talk” (Fraser, 2009, p. 57). In his book *Publics and Counterpublics*, Michael Warner (2002) defines counterpublics as open, self-organized communities formed through attention, the circulation of discourse, and expression of a world view while also being “constituted through a conflictual relation to the dominant public” and “maintain[ing] at some level, conscious or not, an awareness of its subordinate status” (pp. 118, 119). They are also spaces in which their members, through open critique and exchange, hope to transform certain paradigms of dominant culture, not merely to replicate that subordinate status. In this regard,

counterpublics can be discursive arenas where their members' identities are both formed and reimagined (pp. 57, 122).

Even as counterpublics are formed in the interest of marginalized groups, participation in a counterpublic is not always limited to those with marginalized identities or statuses as Fraser's definition may suggest. Warner notes some youth culture and artistic communities work as counterpublics even as many of their members may not otherwise identify as subaltern (p. 57). Such is the case with poetry slams. Even as there may be an emphasis on social and cultural marginalization in the slam community itself, both slam poets and their audiences hail from a variety of backgrounds including dominant ones. Audiences for the National Poetry Slam, for example, tend to be predominately white and/or middle-class (Somers-Willett, 2009, pp. 78-79). On a more local level, Jessica Simon's 2005 survey of the three largest New York city slam venues found about 42% of audiences identified as white, 64% had incomes over \$30,000, and 69% had at least a college degree (pp. 90-97). Given the slam's reputation as a renegade, populist alternative to academic poetry readings and a stage for voices that the literary canon excludes, simply showing up at a slam can afford these participants a sense of subalternity even as they may hail from traditionally dominant groups.

This sense of subalternity formed through the shared value of difference held between slam poets and audience members is also at play in contemporary American spoken word poetry. The term *spoken word* itself has a number of different referents (radio performances, coffeehouse musings, audiobooks, avant-garde sound experiments, etc.), but I use *spoken word poetry* here in the more specific way many popular American audiences currently use it: to indicate cadenced, performed poetry that engages both commercial culture and, increasingly, the aesthetics and tropes of hip-hop. In this chapter, I first generally consider the counterpublics formed by the

practice of slams, using evidence from independently produced anthologies and films, close readings and descriptions of iconic slam performances by Patricia Smith and Beau Sia, and my own perceptions as a participant-observer in the National Poetry Slam community since 1996. I then compare this to the kinds of publics formed through the longstanding Home Box Office original series *Russell Simmons Presents Def Poetry*, citing performances by repeat *Def Poetry* cast members Black Ice and Suheir Hammad. Through the media of live performance, television, and the Internet, the cable series creates discursive spaces where poets and audiences come together to celebrate difference, marginalized identities, and engage in critique of dominant culture through the performance of poetry in ways similar to the slam. In fact, several poets have migrated from the National Poetry Slam stage to appear on *Def Poetry*, performing the very same poems in each venue. Nevertheless, I believe the discursive space *Def Poetry* creates is more tangled than that of its competitive counterpart. Simmons's series mimics the sound and sensibilities of the slam's open counterpublic. Yet because they are rife with product placements of Simmons's own clothing line, selective choices about who receives stage time (and therefore the space to speak and offer lyrical critique), and the overall branding of their poets and poetry with the "Def" label, and because they offer few opportunities for discursive critique, the counterdiscourses *Def Poetry* presents are also painfully tied up with the interests of dominant commercial culture. Only when these performances are wrested from their commercial producers (usually through bootleg Internet practices) is *Def Poetry*'s counterpublic potential fully realized.

Projects like *Def Poetry* present spoken word poets with a quandary: to participate in a commercial system and potentially change the minds of a larger mainstream public, or to be heard by fewer people in more open, democratic, counterpublic ways? Both avenues for consumption have possibilities and drawbacks. In comparing the kinds of publics formed by

poetry slams generally and the *Def Poetry* series specifically, a better understanding of the critical and cultural exchanges these poetry worlds enact, as well as what possibilities they present, can emerge.

Poetry Slams as Counterpublics

From its beginnings, the poetry slam has adopted an open-door policy: anyone can sign up to slam, and anyone in the audience is qualified to judge. Poets in the film *SlamNation* describe the poetry slam as “a representative democracy,” a “level playing field” in which equal access is granted to those denied more traditional poetic recognition such as publication by esteemed presses and participation in academic writing communities (Devlin, 1998). Furthermore, slam audiences are invited if not expected to respond positively or negatively to a poem’s performance as it happens, and in this respect, I believe is relevant to talk about how the poem exists in the discursive space *between* the poet and his or her audience rather than treat a slam performance as a kind of top-down delivery from author to listener. The kind of critique that takes place at a slam goes beyond the scores given to poets. Slams often take place in rowdy atmospheres where audience participation is fostered—ranging from simple boos and applause to the more irreverent “feminist hiss” and “masculine grunt” encouraged at Chicago’s Green Mill venue. The kind of dynamic, discursive space the slam creates is somewhat different from the one created at more traditional poetry readings, where audiences maintain the expectations of silence and reverence, reserving applause for the beginning and end of a reading. Of course, there are exceptions to this rule. Audiences at a Billy Collins reading, for example, often respond audibly to Collins’s poems through laughter and applause, but rarely does such a response take a critical form, nor are the poems overtly or publically evaluated through this hospitable exchange

(Jones-Dilworth, 2010, p. 75). By contrast, the slam audience's opportunity to evaluate, praise, and critique a poet's performance (rather than simply consume and appreciate it) fuel the slam's potential to create counterpublics.

The poetry slam's open and democratic model of participation performs two main oppositional functions, both of which serve to critique dominant structures and enact (or at least imagine) counterpublic alternatives. The first deals with poetry's ensconcement in academic institutions, a complaint made fresh twenty years ago by Dana Gioia's 1991 essay "Can Poetry Matter?" which argued that the proliferation of academic creative writing programs and the career tracks it created had contributed to the erasure of poetry from public view (Gioia, 2002, p. 2). Slam poets and audiences similarly resist the literary world's seeming insiderism. The target of this resistance goes by various handles—"the canon," "academic poetry," "MFA programs"—and although a good number of slam poets have gone on to achieve academic credentials and institutional praise, many competing slam poets and their audiences have claimed their independence from such institutions, figuring themselves as populist underdogs countering the cultural hegemony of the literary canon and academic practices. In the 2007 *National Poetry Slam Poet's Guide*, for example, slam champion Roger Bonair-Agard remarks, "We know 'canon' is narrow-minded and for all its beauty needs to be sacked and overturned if it is to be made more [culturally] expansive" (p. 4). Poet Jeffrey McDaniel (2000) comments that to slam, poets "don't need a degree or a letter of recommendation," citing the community's multiculturalism and openness (p. 36). Another sign of this resistance to the academy is the physical home of many slams: they commonly occur in coffeehouses, bars, or bookstores but rarely take place in academic venues (with the exceptions of the College Unions Poetry Slam Invitational and some youth slams).

So although some slam poets and audience members may come from academic backgrounds, poetry slams are usually (truly or falsely) established in resistance to what Charles Bernstein (1999) has called “official verse culture”—the cadre of institutions including academic creative writing programs, literary journals, and conferences that create a “tyranny of taste” in contemporary American poetry. In addition to fostering a countercultural atmosphere and disseminating poetry in non-traditional or grassroots venues, the slam has thrived through the exercise of certain democratic ideals meant to counteract exclusive or elitist academic conventions. Marc Smith (n.d.) describes slam competitions as places where “any and all are welcome” and which produce “poetry of, by and for the people.” The poetry slam is continually welcoming new audiences and practitioners into its ranks, all of whom can have a say in what is rewarded at the slam and where the artform is going. This last impulse is why Miguel Algarín, co-founder of the Nuyorican Poets Café, dubbed the practice of poetry slams “the democratization of verse” (1994, p.14). In addition to the slam’s open-door policy, the accessibility of a poetry slam is facilitated and perhaps demanded by the medium of performance, which is bounded by time, space, and—perhaps most importantly—an audience’s attention span. In nationally-certified slam competitions, poems are limited to an approximate three-minute window, which poet Bob Holman notes is the length of a pop song (2000, p. 17).

The second oppositional function of the poetry slam’s counterpublic is sociopolitical. Several poems performed at slams show resistance to dominant public culture by critiquing white suburban culture, jingoism, conservatism, or corporate interests. Many slam poets seem deeply invested in speaking from and about marginalized social positions—those of women, queers, the underclass, people of color, or otherwise oppressed groups—and slam audiences seem deeply invested in supporting such expression. Exactly why this happens supersedes the

scope of this chapter, but the phenomenon itself is nevertheless key to understanding slam as a counterpublic. For over a decade at the NPS, readings specifically showcasing Asian American, African American, Native Americans, Latino, female, and queer poets have been held in addition to the regular bouts. Recently, self-proclaimed “nerds” have also claimed their place in this smorgasbord of subalternity (and which, it should be noted, is the one NPS-designated event in which straight white men claim a marginalized identity).

As the grouping of these readings might suggest, the slam community’s larger discourse about marginalization has found a focus in racial identity. Poet and musician John S. Hall remarks, “issues of race are really important in slam poetry.... [I]t has attracted a lot of blacks and Latinos who want to do personal identity poetry” (Aptowicz, 2008, p. 296). Slam’s relative openness to and support of poets of color also translates to its winner’s circle. Of the nineteen NPS Individual Champion titles awarded, for example, fifteen were awarded to people of color. Such an emphasis on marginalized racial identity is not always present in local slam venues, but slams in large urban centers tend to reflect a similar pattern. A canvas of one New York City slam venue over nine months revealed about 65% participation by poets of color; as the field narrowed to the venue’s slam-off to determine a local team, almost 84% of the finalists were of color (Gonzalez, 2000). Of course, a poet’s talent and resonance with an audience plays an integral part in determining these statistics—not everyone can write or perform a poem well. Still, I believe the extraliterary factors at play here are inherently wrapped up with the literary ones. In *Voicing American Poetry*, Lesley Wheeler (2008) writes of slammers’ anti-academic attitudes that, “mainstream literary establishments, while far more inclusive than formerly, still demonstrate the superior cultural power of white people, heterosexuals, and men” (p. 151). In this regard, the “perceived hostility between the poetry slam and academia” (Aptowicz, 2008, p.

316) is part and parcel with the slam's sociopolitical emphasis on multiculturalism and race.

The impulse to perform and celebrate marginalized identity in ways that resist dominant culture and the literary establishment appears fundamental to the slam, and the interactions (judging, applause or booing, playful banter, post-performance discussion, and critique) between poets and audience members, or between audience members themselves, can enact discursive moments of counterpublicity. As I have argued in *The Cultural Politics of Slam Poetry* (2009), slams enact not just artistic renderings of one's identity in culture, slams *are* culture; they are places where marginalized identities are constructed, negotiated, judged, and affirmed or re-figured (p. 9). In this regard, the poetry slam and the work it engenders begs to be regarded not only as a movement in poetry or performance, but also—as creator Marc Smith once suggested—a social movement (Lewis, 1998, A20), one particularly linked to the performative nature of identity itself.

Slam's focus on identity is enabled by NPS rules stipulating that individual poems can only be performed by their authors. Poets also for the most part perform work written in the first person, encouraging the audience to receive a poem as a personal confession of the author even as it may be fictionalized. With this in mind, slam poets don't just write and then speak the poem aloud; they doubly perform the voice of a poem and a sense of self at a slam. As Wheeler (2008) notes, poems performed at slam often “intensify audience attention to the speaking body” precisely because of the physical demands of live performance. So, “[w]hen Joshua Fleming jokes about his own obesity, we can visually confirm it; when Ragan Fox refers to himself as ‘gay and lispy,’ we register his physical performance of homosexuality; when light-skinned Aaron Cuffee recounts how airport officials refused to believe that a black man could be his father, we must notice the poet's coloring, his hair, his features” (p. 151). With the poet and his

or her body as a referent for the poem's voice, audiences often experience little or no distance between the speaker of the poem and the author speaking the poem. The use of persona is an important exception in this one-to-one relation, but persona poems also rely on the visual marker of the body in the slam context. In performance, the identity of poet performing, along with all of the physical and vocal markers of identity he or she embodies, becomes an integral part of a slam audience's experience of a poem, either as a foil to the persona (as in an ironic performance) or a complement to it (as in an actor's rendition of a dramatic monologue).

Proclamations of identity abound at slams, but I would like to consider a particularly well-known and powerful example employing a persona: "Skinhead" by four-time National Poetry Slam Champion and National Book Award Finalist Patricia Smith. In her performance, Smith, an African American woman, embodies the voice of a male white supremacist.

I sit here and watch niggers take over my TV set,
 walking like kings up and down the sidewalks in my head,
 walking like their fat black mamas *named* them freedom.
 My shoulders tell me that ain't right.
 So I move out into the sun where my beauty makes them lower their heads,
 or into the night
 with a lead pipe up my sleeve, a razor tucked in my boot.
 I was born to make things right. (P. Smith, 1992, pp. 67-68)

Even as it is a dramatic monologue written in the voice of a skinhead, the performative effect of the piece still hinges on Smith's own identities as black and female. When performing this poem, Smith stands solidly, almost muscularly, in front of the microphone and makes few movements. The tone of her speech is in line with her character's—aggressive and tinged with her subject's sense of anger against blacks.¹ Smith reflects on this piece: "I wanted to understand

¹ My observations of Smith's performance of "Skinhead" are based on seeing the poem performed live on several occasions in the slam context and at readings. To view representative performances, see Smith (2008) and Lathan (2003).

a man who unconditionally hated what I was [W]hen I perform the poem, audiences are jolted by his voice coming from the mouth of a black woman” (P. Smith, 2000, p. 73). The clash between this persona and Smith’s visible race and gender characteristics can be shocking, creating a powerful space for identity’s critique and play. Of course, having a black female perform a skinhead’s voice has a unique effect; this exchange of voices would prove awkward if not socially inappropriate for many others to perform. Such was the case at a 1998 NPS tribute reading, when white male poet Taylor Mali performed “Skinhead”; the performative effect of the poem was lost and the audience balked (Somers-Willett, 2009, p. 93).

One of the reasons this poem reads so powerfully to a slam audience—besides Smith’s powerful writing and performance of the poem, of course—is that it makes the slam poet’s construction and negotiation of identity overt. Smith makes this purpose clear by shifting from the Skinhead’s persona back into her own voice at the end of the performance, asking audience members to consider the nation’s, and perhaps their own implicit, support of the skinhead’s views on race:

I’m riding the top rung of the perfect race,
my face scraped pink and brilliant.
I’m your baby, America, your boy,
drunk on my own spit, I am goddamned fuckin’ beautiful.

And I was born

and raised

right here.

(P. Smith, 1992. p. 69)

In performance, Smith makes an unscripted addition to her poem, pausing dramatically after “I was born / and raised” and tossing her head back in malicious laughter, then dropping the amusement and saying “right here” with urgency and anger while pointing to the ground in front

of her. The addition is slight, but it immediately and effectively puts her own identity and the skinhead's in sharp relief. It is as if Smith has chosen to speak the very last line in her own voice, suddenly driving home the nearness of the skinhead's threat and recasting her aggressive physical stance as Smith's own bristling response to that threat. In a dramatic turn, the audience is offered a moment of revelation, confronted with their own implied complacency in allowing such prejudice to exist. In this moment, she turns her social commentary into a moment of counterpublicity, where she not only imagines but reimagines the meaning of the identity she invokes.

Beau Sia is another poet famous for re-figuring narratives about identity. An Oklahoma-born Chinese-American, Sia commonly performs lightning-quick, breathless, and humorous missives about Asian stereotypes which parody or invert those stereotypes. An example is his irreverent "Horse Cock Manifesto," a tongue-in-cheek response to an imagined rumor that

"asian men are hung like horses!"

i don't know why these things happen,
as someone had to reveal that we are great with laundry
and convenience stores
and someone else let loose how we all know martial arts,
and just recently I found out that everyone knows how goddamned good at math
we are,

but now
I face the most humiliating release of our culture,
as the woman who has sworn vendetta on us has claimed that
"asian men are hung like horses." (Sia, 2000, 174-5)

Performed in an exclamatory, incredulous manner, "Horse Cock Manifesto" enacts a comedic counterpublic critique. Through sarcasm and parody, Sia is able to playfully invert a racist stereotype (that Asian men have small genitals) and invoke a gender stereotype (that penis

size is related to masculinity and virility) in order to show the faulty logic of both. Sia's performance is one of loud, breathless incredulity at news of the rumor, and this exclamatory style in both his writing and performance serves as a cue to his audience that he is poking fun at the myths he is invoking. He treats this "rumor" with the air of an unauthorized leak of confidential information, lamenting how now that everyone knows about Asian men's secret sexual prowess, he and his counterparts are barraged with sexual requests by women—"marked men" with "phalli rubbed too raw for description." Treating well-known racist stereotypes—that Asians are "great with laundry / and convenience stores," or are good at "martial arts" and "math"—in the same manner as this newly rumored sexual stereotype lets the audience in on the joke as cultural conspirators. Sia makes a more serious nod to this in the conclusion of his poem:

I don't know how to act around people anymore,
as eyes remain fixated
on my crotch,
and now I fear the day that someone
starts spreading the rumor that

"asian men have narrow eyes!"

because I don't know how we'll go unnoticed again. (Sia, 2000, p. 176)

Closing the poem with this mention of a phenotypic trait brings the poem home. In shifting from one subjective physical trait (being "hung") to another ("narrow eyes") that has so often been used to debase Asians, Sia makes visible the faulty logic and rhetoric of stereotype itself.

Notably, Sia's critique hinges on an imagined woman releasing the secret, a "vindictive whore" who has a "vendetta" against Asian men and who must have announced the rumor "at a really big party, very loudly." He mentions the anonymous woman twice in the poem as the source of the rumor, and alongside the discussion of women around the world who are

disgruntled by their male sexual partners—“women in sweden” lamenting their “blonde,” “blue-eyed beau’s miniscule proportions”; “girls in africa” who are “disgusted / at the lack of feeling / between legs”; or “southern belles” wishing for more than “the triteness of redneck penetration”—Sia frames his parody in a strictly heterosexual paradigm which itself relies on ethnic stereotypes. Citing women’s desire to be pleased by Asian men (itself an inversion of the fetishization and sexualization of Asian women), Sia incites the logic of eugenics, saying that Asian men’s sexual prowess has “ruined ... the breeding patterns of the whole world.” Furthermore, given the poetry slam’s sense of liberalism, the use of the word “whore” might strike its audience as unsettlingly misogynistic, threatening the comedic effect of the poem. However, if the audience’s increasingly loud laughter as the poem progresses is any indication, it seems that the playful critique of the racial stereotype carries the most weight.² The seeming privilege of racial marginalization by Sia’s audience isn’t an isolated phenomenon at a slam. Performance artist and slam veteran Ragan Fox (2005) suggests that the performance of a marginalized racial identity at a slam can “trump” the performance of marginalized gender and sexual identities: “I can’t count the number of times I’ve heard racial identity poems that score well bashing women and queers. It’s as if the claim to racial identity neutralizes homophobia and misogyny There seems to be a definite performative mechanism that is woven into the judging process and its *excessive* co-optation of a *certain kind* of liberalism.” This is not to say that Sia privileges his racial commentary over gender or sexual identity for scores, only to say that slam audiences may be more invested in one than the other.

² My discussion of Sia’s performance and his audience’s reaction is based on his presentation of “Horse Cock Manifesto” at the 1996 National Poetry Slam, chronicled on *SlamNation* DVD (Devlin, 1998).

Smith and Sia's poems underscore the potential of the poetry slam as counterpublic. Through the performative exchange of the poem, the poet (in his or her delivery) and audience (in their reception, discussion, and evaluation of the poem) engage in a critical response not just to the poem but to culture, creating a shared the value of difference and imagining values outside of the dominant models of power. Performance studies scholar Jill Dolan (2005) coins such effects "utopian performatives"—small but profoundly hopeful moments in which an audience envisions the possibilities of alternative culture (p. 5). Even Michael Warner (2002) gives poetry slams a nod for "creat[ing] a counterpublic hybrid discourse" that spans both text and performance (p. 82). Although the counterpublics formed by slams seem to me to be less than utopic (a fact made plain by the competitive aspects of slam and Sia's reliance on heterosexist representations to enact a critique of racial marginalization), it is relevant to ask what happens when a counterpublic like slam, either through independent means or through appropriation, tries to engage the realm of official public culture when it enters the commercial sphere. This is the pressing question, I believe, that arises when considering Russell Simmons's *Def Poetry* series.

Def Poetry and the Commercialization of Slam Poetry's Counterpublics

In the midst of the poetry slam's burgeoning popularity at the turn of the twenty-first century, Def Jam recording label CEO Russell Simmons explored mixing the work of slam poets, hip-hop artists, and celebrities in a media format that would reach a mainstream public. The result was *Russell Simmons Presents Def Poetry*, a series that ran for six seasons from 2002-2007 on the cable channel Home Box Office (HBO). Soon after the series debuted, a live stage version of *Def Poetry* opened in San Francisco, a show which eventually rounded out with a cast of nine poets (Beau Sia, Black Ice, Staceyann Chin, Steve Colman, Mayda del Valle, Georgia

Me, Suheir Hammad, Lemon, and Poetri) to run on New York City's Broadway circuit from November of 2002 through May of 2003. The HBO series won a Peabody award, and the Broadway show garnered a Tony (Simmons, 2003). The cable series advertised its performers as "Def Poets," and several of them have competed in one or more National Poetry Slams. According to Bruce George, former Co-Executive Producer of the HBO series, the producers initially considered naming the series "Def Poetry Slam," but decided to go with "jam" after running into resistance from Poetry Slam Incorporated, the non-profit organization that runs the NPS (personal communication, July 14, 2002).

Simmons's branding proved consistent across the HBO series, as well as on the DVDs of the series which continue to be widely available today. Aside from the "Def" label, which audiences recognize from both the Def Jam recording label and the successful *Def Comedy Jam* series, the *Def Poetry* logo is very similar to that of the recording label's. The host of the HBO show, popular rapper and actor Mos Def, opens every episode with a title segment in which he steps up to a vintage, chrome-plated microphone and recites the lines of a well-known poet before announcing the author's name in this fashion: "Langston Hughes, Def Poet." Some syncopated cello riffs accompany his recitation, and directly after he bestows the title "Def Poet," a driving hip-hop beat strikes up, launching a slick title sequence in which the recitation of selected lines from poets echo over the music. The camera then cuts to a hip, young, multicultural live studio audience applauding as Mos Def takes the stage to introduce the evening's poets. Mixed among the up-and-coming spoken poets featured each half-hour episode are TV stars (such as Jamie Foxx, Cedric the Entertainer, and Dave Chappelle), hip-hop artists (such as Common, Kanye West, Talib Kweli, Alicia Keys, and Jill Scott) and established poets (such as Amiri Baraka, Sonia Sanchez, Nikki Giovanni, Sharon Olds, and Yusef Komunyakaa).

performing poetry of their own. Several poets on the series wear clothing from Simmons's fashion lines Phat Farm or Baby Phat, most of which bear their logos prominently and have been given to performers gratis. Simmons himself makes a brief appearance at the end of every episode of the HBO series, always dressed in Phat Farm clothing, and always delivering his customary lines—"Thank you. I hope you were inspired. God bless,"—stamping the episode's poets and poetry with the signature of his presence. Episodes typically premiered late on Friday nights in the HBO lineup and the series developed a steady following through on-demand programming and re-runs (Aptowicz, 2008, p. 261)

Many poets crossing over from slam to jam performed the same kind of counterdiscourses about marginalized identity (and in some cases, the same poems) in both venues. Much of the work selected to appear on the series also had ties to hip-hop. Poet and slam historian Cristin O'Keefe Aptowicz writes that with the emergence of *Def Poetry*, "the marriage between hip-hop and spoken word was finally consummated. It was no longer unusual for poets to perform with a strong hip-hop influence, and conversely for rappers to call themselves poets" (2008, p. 262). Black Ice, a poet performing on both the *Def Poetry* cable series and Broadway show, employs the tropes of identity and hip-hop in his performance of "410 Days in the Life." A former coke dealer from Philadelphia, Black Ice expounds on his own difficult position as a young African American male from the projects faced with the dilemma of hustling either in drugs or words:

I
gotta be a nigga
that's how I pay the bills,
and I'll do that
if I have to sling coke
or exploit these rhyme skills.
See,

America makes you an opportunist
and at the same time,
they institutionalize you.

So,
the fact that niggas get
big record deals,
big money,
and
then go to jail
shouldn't surprise you.

.....
They got us choppin', baggin', and servin' that shit
to niggas sixteen bars at a time.

(Black Ice, 2003, pp. 20-21)

Performed in a semi-regular cadence that reflects but does not perfectly reproduce the strict tetrameter of rap, “410 Days in the Life” makes plain Black Ice’s criticism of record labels and hip-hop artists who capitalize on the image of the thug and his violent, consumptive lifestyle. His criticism is evident in the parallel he draws between his own former lifestyle “sling[ing] coke” and that of rap performers who “get big record deals” and “chop” “bag,” and “serve” their hip-hop rhymes like a drug “sixteen bars at a time” to the black community. He uses this parallel throughout the poem to underscore the lack of choices African American underclass men have, decrying the detrimental effects of some mainstream rap that promotes “thugs, drugs, and killing” and lands its rappers in jail. In a very self-aware moment, he frames obtaining a record deal as both an opportunity and a way for America to institutionalize young black men.

In the first half of the poem, Black Ice seems to put himself in the same position as these rappers and hustlers, using the first person frequently and proclaiming himself a “nigga,” as in the passage above. Toward the end of the poem, though, he comes to the realization that

WE'RE NOT GROWING!!!
Nigga I give a fuck how
slick you flowin'

if you ain't showin' nothin'
 to these kids
 or
 adding nothing positive
 to the Earth...
 Black Ice been destined
 to touch the world ever since
 I was born,
 to be real,
 fuck a record deal...
 God
 Gives me what I'm worth.
 (Black Ice, 2003, p. 22)

Black Ice explicitly refutes the materialistic and violent image of the thug rapper with a record deal, creating a new identity for himself as a spoken word poet and adding something “positive to the Earth.” This is both compounded and complicated by his appearance on *Def Poetry*. A number of artists appearing on the HBO program make similar critiques of hip-hop artists and recording labels, citing the glorification of materialism, misogyny, or violence that can circulate in mainstream rap.³ The irony, of course, is that Black Ice is presenting this critique under the auspices of recording label CEO Russell Simmons himself, and is so branded as a “Def Poet.” In effect, Simmons is collecting from both sides of the rhyme aisle: he is profiting off of the dominant cultural model of rap, while also profiting off of its countercultural foil, spoken word poetry. Here, Black Ice is disavowing one form of commodification (the rapper) for another (the Def Poet), albeit a more politically positive one.

Another *Def Poetry* cast member who re-figures marginalized identity within the hip-hop context is Suheir Hammad. A Palestinian American raised in Brooklyn during its hip-hop boombox upstart, Hammad’s work melds urban idioms and wordplay with hard-nosed critiques

³ For representative examples, see Jessica Care Moore’s “Hip-Hop Cheerleader,” Sekou da Misfit’s “The Rapper,” Black Ice’s “Front Page,” or Shihan’s “Poemcee.”

about being Muslim and female in America. In her poem “Mic Check” appearing on Season 5 of *Def Poetry* and as part of the Broadway show, for example, Hammad recounts being selected for a post-9/11 airport security check:

Mic check 1
2 can you hear me mic
check 1-2

Mike checked my bags
at the airport in a random routine check

I understand Mike, I do
You too were altered that day
and most days
most folks operate on fear
often hate
this is mic check your job
and I am always random

(Hammad, 2003, p. 94)

Hammad opens her performance with a phrase common to hip-hop lyrics—the familiar “1-2” test to check the volume of a microphone—and with a street-smart Brooklyn accent.

Considering that no microphone appears on stage, the “mic check” isn’t literal; rather, by repeating this phrase throughout her performance, it serves as way to hail the poet and her audience as fans of hip-hop. Affirming this hailing, her Def Poetry audience responds “yeah!” when she asks, “can you hear me”? This figurative “mic” becomes the “red cheeked with blonde buzz / cut” TSA worker “Mike” selecting her for a “random” screening at airport security, which the poet believes is racially or religiously motivated as she intones sarcastically, “and I am always random.” presumably because of her brown skin. Alluding to the 9/11 attacks and her own Muslim heritage, she muses almost apologetically, “I understand it was folks / who looked, smelled maybe / prayed like me” but then states firmly:

Mike check

folks who looked like you
 stank so bad the Indians smelled them
 mic check before they landed
 they murdered 1-2 1-2
 as they prayed,
 spread small pox as alms

(Hammad, 2003, pp. 94-95)

Using the same criteria for profiling (skin color, smell, religion) that she imagines Mike has used to single her out for a search, Hammad draws a striking parallel between those orchestrating recent attacks on the World Trade Center and Anglos invading Native American lands during in the colonial period—one which her audience interrupts her performance to applaud. The poem ends in a potentially counterpublic moment in which she inverts her language to change the power dynamic between them; “Mic check” literally turns to “check Mike” as she ends her poem with the question, “Hey yo, Mike, Who’s gonna check you?” (p. 95). In this regard, the poem moves from describing the poet’s feeling of marginality in dominant culture to imagining a place where her identity is normalized and the male Anglo Christian’s is on display for investigation.

Engaging the discourses of identity marginalization and centrality, Hammad and Black Ice level sociopolitical critiques of dominant culture similar to those of Sia and Smith. But do they create counterpublics when performed in the *Def Poetry* context as opposed to the poetry slam? The studio audience response to the poets appearing on *Def Poetry*—applause, moments of call-and-response, laughter, audible interjections of support—might suggest a discursive space in which alternative publics are imagined. However, *Def Poetry*’s constructed and edited nature, relative lack of openness, and limited methods of critique (for poets are not scored or evaluated by the audience, merely appreciated) figure the *Def Poetry* space otherwise. For example, producers made open calls for audition tapes via the HBO website, then invited a number of artists to audition (Aptowicz, 2008, p.262). One poet auditioning for the cable series reported

being told by the production staff that poets would be selected on the bases of ethnicity first, gender second, and on the quality of their poetry third (A. Buck, personal communication, May 4, 2005). While this doesn't suggest that the poetry performed under the *Def Poetry* marquee isn't quality work, it does suggest that extraliterary factors are important if not primary reasons for a poet's selection for the series. This also might indicate that the *Def Poetry* series was looking to reproduce the same sociopolitical, counterpublic effect of poetry slams, but did so by divorcing such effects from an audience's critical role in forming them.

Of course, the live studio audience of the cable series provides a level of critical engagement based on their response to performers in the form of laughter, applause, and audible comments to poets like "Alright," and "Preach!" and "Love you girl." Post-performance discussions and threads appearing on HBO's *Def Poetry* online discussion boards also signal a kind of critical engagement of a counterpublic nature. Yet some of these moments of counterpublicity happen in ways that serve the interests of HBO and Def Jam themselves rather than spark open, public debate. Many core cast members of *Def Poetry Jam on Broadway*, for example, appear multiple times on the HBO series, sometimes two or three times a season. The quality of their writing and performance is presumably an important factor in their frequent appearances. Still, no other poets appear as frequently as the Broadway cast members, and their appearances also have the effect of promoting the show and Simmons's brand and clothing line. This is compounded by Russell Simmons's unabashedly pro-commercial stance. Reflecting on the poets appearing in his *Def Poetry* projects, he said, "These niggas are honest as the day is long. They are commercial as the day is long. They are commercial niggas like me, and there's nothing wrong with that" (Fuller & Henry, 2006). With this in mind, it appears *Def Poetry* has taken the discursive model of the slam (where poets and audiences critique dominant culture and

each other) and replaced it with a model of consumption (where audiences buy and appreciate poets' countercultural narratives but cease to have a discursive, critical relationship with them).

Conclusion

The shift one sees from slam to jam—one that I've tried to highlight in considering the work of Smith, Sia, Black Ice, and Hammad—is a crucial shift in how the discourse of marginalization circulates, one that can change its reception and meaning. The discourse of exchange, negotiation, critique, and support that hinges around the performance of marginalized identities and that circulates at the National Poetry Slam—the very discourse which constitutes the slam as a counterpublic—shifts in the *Def Poetry* context with its motives of profit and branding to constitute an extension of commercial culture masquerading as a counterpublic. Even as the poetry or poets in both venues may be the same, the methods of circulating performances of marginalized identity, as well as the motives behind circulating them, determine the difference between an open, discursive counterpublic and a closed, for-profit, product of dominant corporate culture. This is not to say that poets appearing in the *Def Poetry* context are disingenuous about their counterdiscourses. On the contrary, the *Def Poetry* stages afford poets a larger and more mainstream audience than the slam, and the wider a counterdiscourse can circulate, the more possibility it has to change minds. My critique here is of the *Def Poetry* enterprise itself, which seems to capitalize on the counterdiscourses its poets circulate while simultaneously profiting off of its relationship to more dominant systems.

In this regard, I respectfully differ from Jill Dolan (2005), who views *Def Poetry on Broadway* as a form of utopic “public sphere in which social relations might be rehearsed” between poets and audiences (p. 92). Although I agree that there is potential and validity in the

resistance many of the Def Poets perform and that audiences can experience transformation through them, we also must remember that these are selected and highly constructed expressions that ultimately serve the Def Jam enterprise. For the Broadway show, audience ticketing is open (to the public who can afford it), but the cast, as well as the show, is selected to deliver a particular kind of countercultural narrative, one dominated by black urban discourse and the hip-hop idiom. For the HBO series, both the lineup of the poets and the studio audience is constructed in the same way. Although I admire Dolan's scholarship on the subject of performing utopia at the theater (for I too think real transformation can occur through the medium of performance), in the case of the *Def Poetry* projects, I find the representations produced politically fraught.

Since the first whispers about the *Def Poetry* projects, poets in the slam community have weighed the benefits of reaching a larger mainstream audience with the negative associations conjured by going commercial; but for the majority of these poets, the former outweighs the latter. For instance, Steve Colman and Mayda del Valle, two performers appearing on the cable series and in the Broadway show, are reportedly "happy to see their brand of spoken word performance in its 'commercial infancy,' despite the fact that some might consider them sellouts" (Katz, 2002). Simmons himself makes no apologies for his or his performers' commercial intentions, remarking in another interview that spoken word poetry "is evolving to where it is very commercial. So it's just the natural growth of the movement that merited a vehicle" (Ferguson, 2002).

This line I am drawing between counterpublic and commercial culture begs the question: Can one still be subversive while operating within the commercial framework? I believe the answer is yes, but not without making compromises and relinquishing some of the autonomy

(and certainly the openness) afforded by a counterpublic. I don't want to suggest that it is impossible for poets and audiences to engage in imagining alternative publics and social debate through the *Def Poetry* projects. I do, however, think that their exchange can be fraught as it is mediated (sometimes invisibly) by commercial interests invested in promoting certain types of counterdiscourses. Queer poet and activist Staceyann Chin, who appears on both the HBO series and the *Def Poetry* theatrical production characterizes the dilemma this way:

The dance of survival in this new world of art and money is the dance of the middle ground—one has to straddle the commercial/mainstream and the not-for-profit/underground I am walking a tightrope between poetic prostitution and art—and that, my dear, is the only way not to die as an artist. (Chin, 2004)

Further complicating this dynamic is the fact that *Def Poetry* continues to find new and ever-widening audiences through multiple media. Beyond its initial live studio audience, *Def Poetry* also reached “for profit” cable television audiences and continues to be seen on DVD. *Def Poetry* also has a persistent and perhaps even larger audience online; message boards in which audiences posted their thoughts about poems (frequently alongside their own poems in attempts to appear on the show) were hosted during the life of the series on the HBO website. But perhaps the most interesting audience for *Def Poetry* is one that continues to grow; legions of fans have broken copyright law to post their favorite *Def Poetry* segments to online video services like YouTube. Black Ice's poem, for example, has received well over a million views since it was uploaded to YouTube in March, 2006. In the comments to these videos, discourse between *Def Poetry* audience members about the poems and their sociopolitical stances has blossomed, usually in uncritical ways but at times sparking extended and meaningful discussions about the poet, the politics of identity, and his or her reception. In these free online communities where the performances are subverted away from its commercial producers and returned to

audience members who respond to it critically, *Def Poetry*'s counterpublic potential seems most fully realized.

References

- Algarín, Miguel. (1994). The sidewalk of high art. In Miguel Algarín & Bob Holman (Eds.), *Aloud: Voices from the Nuyorican Poets Café*. New York, NY: Owl Books/Holt.
- Aptowicz, Cristin O'Keefe. (2008). *Words in your face: A guided tour though twenty years of the New York City poetry slam*. New York, NY: Soft Skull.
- Black Ice. (2006, March 19). Black Ice - Def Poetry 1. [Video file]. Retrieved from <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=SY7pM8k8moY>
- Black Ice. (2003). 410 days in the life. In Danny Simmons (Ed.), *Russell Simmons Def Poetry Jam on Broadway—and more: the choice collection* (pp. 19-22). New York, NY: Atria.
- Bernstein, Charles (1999). Interview with Charles Bernstein. *The Front Table*, Seminary Co-op Bookstore, Feb./Mar. Retrieved from: <http://epc.buffalo.edu/authors/bernstein/interviews/SemCoop.html>
- Bloom, Harold, David Barber, Stephen Burt, Frank Kermode, Richard Lamb, David Mendolsohn, Richard Poirier, and Helen Vendler. (2000). The man in the back row has a question VI. *Paris Review*, 154, 370-402.
- Bonair-Agard, Roger. (2007). In memoriam: Sekou Sundiata. *The National Poetry Slam poet guide*, 4-5.
- Chin, Staceyann. (2004, March 1). Almost famous: An original Broadway Def Poetry Jam cast member learns that the trick is to survive after the stage lights go down. *Black Issues Book Review*, Mar.-Apr. Retrieved from <http://www.highbeam.com/doc/1G1-113936962.html>
- Devlin, Paul (Director). (1998). *SlamNation: The sport of the spoken word*. [DVD, 2004]. United States: Slammin' Entertainment.

- Dolan, Jill. (2005). *Utopia in performance: Finding hope at the theater*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan.
- Ferguson, Chaka. (2002, March 25). Rap mogul Simmons takes poetry mainstream with HBO series. *The Augusta Chronicle*. Retrieved from http://chronicle.augusta.com/stories/2002/03/25/liv_340778.shtml
- Fox, Ragan. (2005, February 15). I wrote this in 2003; still seems topical today so I thought I'd re-post it here [Comment 5]. Retrieved from <http://slam-theory.livejournal.com/1738.html>
- Fraser, Nancy. (1990). Rethinking the public sphere: A contribution to the critique of actually existing democracy. *Social Text*, 25/26, 56-80.
- Fuller, Kyle & Henry, Mike (Directors). (2006). *Slam planet: War of the worlds*. [Motion Picture]. United States: Slam Channel.
- Gioia, Dana. (2002). *Can poetry matter?: Essays on poetry and American culture* (10th anniversary ed.). Saint Paul, MN: Graywolf.
- Gonzalez, Guy LeCharles. (2000, June 6). Slam: Some interesting stats.... DataWranglers National Poetry Slam Listserv.
- Habermas, Jürgen. (1989). *The structural transformation of the public sphere: An inquiry into a category of bourgeois society*. Cambridge, MA: MIT.
- Hammad, Suheir. (2003). Mic Check. In Danny Simmons (Ed.), *Russell Simmons Def Poetry Jam on Broadway—and more: the choice collection* (pp. 94-95). New York, NY: Atria.
- Hoffman, Tyler. (2001). Treacherous laughter: The poetry slam, slam poetry, and the politics of resistance. *Studies in American Humor*, 3(8), 49-64.

- Holman, Bob. (2000). The room. In Gary Mex Glazner (Ed.), *Poetry slam: The competitive art of performance poetry* (pp. 15-21). San Francisco, CA: Manic D.
- Jones-Dilworth, M. Elizabeth. (2010). *The role of the poet: Performance poetry at the beginning of the twenty-first century*. Retrieved from The University of Texas at Austin Digital Repository: <http://hdl.handle.net/2152/ETD-UT-2010-05-1060>
- Katz, Leslie. (2002, July 17). Universal language of poetry. *San Francisco Examiner*. Retrieved from http://www.examiner.com/ex_files/default.jsp?story=X0719DEFw
- Lewis, Anne. (1998, September 10). Poetry in motion: Slam dunking with words. *Wall Street Journal*, p. A20.
- McDaniel, Jeffrey. (2000). Slam and the academy. In Gary Mex Glazner (Ed.) *Poetry Slam: The competitive art of performance poetry* (pp. 35-37). San Francisco, CA: Manic D.
- Lathan, Stan (Director). (2003). *Russell Simmons presents Def Poetry*, Season 2, Episode 2. [DVD, 2005]. HBO Video.
- Sia, Beau. (2000). Horse Cock Manifesto. In Gary Mex Glazner (Ed.) *Poetry Slam: The competitive art of performance poetry* (pp. 173-76). San Francisco, CA: Manic D.
- Simmons, Danny. (2003). *Russell Simmons Def Poetry Jam on Broadway—and more: The choice collection*. New York, NY: Atria.
- Simon, Jessica G. (2006). *Poetry's outsiders: Why the academy should embrace poetry slam and its audiences*. (Unpublished Thesis). Syracuse University, Syracuse, NY.
- Smith, Marc Kelly & Kraynak, Joe. (2004). *The complete idiot's guide to slam poetry*. Indianapolis, IN: Alpha.

Smith, Marc Kelly. (2003). About Slam Poetry. In Mark Eleveld (Ed.), *Spoken word revolution: Slam, hip-hop, and the poetry of a new generation* (pp. 116-120). Naperville, IL:

Sourcebooks MediaFusion.

Smith, Marc Kelly. (n.d.). Poetry of, by and for the people. Retrieved from
<http://marckellysmith.com/#/ideology>

Smith, Patricia. (2008, February 19). Skinhead. [Video file]. Hampshire College Slam
 Collective. Retrieved from <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8uT84IUgLRo>

Smith, Patricia. (2000). Persona poem. In Gary Mex Glazner (Ed.) *Poetry Slam: The competitive art of performance poetry* (pp. 70-75). San Francisco, CA: Manic D.

Smith, Patricia. (1992). *Big towns, Big talk*. Cambridge, MA: Zoland.

Somers-Willett, Susan B. A. (2009). *The cultural politics of slam poetry: Race, identity, and the performance of popular verse in America*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan.

Warner, Michael. (2002). *Publics and counterpublics*. New York, NY: Zone.

Wheeler, Lesley. (2008). *Voicing American poetry: Sound and performance from the 1920s to the present*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell.