

UNIVERSITY OF ARTS IN BELGRADE

UNIVERSITE LYON 2

Interdisciplinary postgraduate studies

UNESCO

Chair for Cultural Management and Cultural Policy in the Balkans

Master thesis:

PUBLIC ART

(Public Art Policy and Legal and Financial Policy
Instruments)

by:

Slavica Radišić

Supervisor:

Jelena Todorović, PhD

Belgrade, September 2007.

Acknowledgments

I would like to express my thanks to my supervisor, Dr. Jelena Todorović, for her invaluable assistance and encouragement.

I also want to express my profound gratitude to my professor Dr. Milena Dragičević Šešić for her support, interest in my work and valuable hints.

Finally, I would like to give my special gratitude to my family and to Daniel Kostić whose patience and support enabled me to complete this work.

Table of Contents:

Abstract

List of Illustrations

Introduction

Chapter One

The Public Art

1.1. The Public Art. Definition.

1.2. The “Art and Architecture” and Monuments,
Precedents of the Contemporary Public Art Practice

1.3. The Beginning of the Contemporary Public Art Practice

Chapter Two

The City

2.1. Characteristics of the Urban Development (19th and 20th Century)

2.2. Post-war years: The United States of America

2.3. Post-war years: The Western Europe

2.4. City in Crises: Emergence of the Culture led Urban Development Programs

Chapter Three

Case Study: The United States of America

3.1. Federal Programs

3.1.1. *GSA - Art in Architecture Program*

3.1.2. *NEA – Art in Public Places Program*

3.1.3. *The Tilted Arc*

3.1.4. *GSA and NEA after the Tilted Arc Case*

3.2. Public Art on the Local Level

3.2.1. Financing Mechanisms

3.2.1.1. *Public Art as a budget item*

3.2.1.2. *Percent for Art*

3.2.1.3. *Public-Private Partnerships*

3.2.2. Planning Mechanisms

Chapter Four

Case Study: France

4.1. Early Period

4.2. Post -War Period

4.3. New Developments in the Eghities

4.4. Public Art Policy Instruments

4.4.1. *Percentage for Art Regulation*

4.4.2. *Public Commission /Commande publique program*

4.4.3. *Other Financial Sources*

Chapter Five

Case Study: The United Kingdom

5.1. Post-War Period

5.2. New Developments in the Eghties

5.3. Public Art Policy Instruments

5.3.1. *Intersectorial Cooperation*

5.3.2. *National Lottery Programme*

5.3.3. *The Percent for Art Policy*

5.3.4. *Section 106 Planning Agreement*

5.4. Planning

Conclusion

Resume

Bibliography

Illustrations

Short Biography

Abstract:

The main focus of this thesis is the exploration of the issues related to the contemporary public art in the built environment and its role in the recent urban redevelopment programs. The starting point of the conceptual analysis assumed in this research might be the best articulated by Hilde Heine's narrow definition of public art according to which "*public art is art installed by public agencies in public places and at public expense.*" In line with this definition of the public art the main aim of this research was to identify and explore reasons for governmental support of public art projects as well as to present the main goals of the existing official public art programs in the developed world, their legal foundations, and currently implemented financial and planning mechanisms. Special attention is devoted to the percentage for art regulations - a regulation that requires that 1% of all public buildings constructions costs should be spent on public art, as one of the dominant legal mechanism in this domain.

The research was conducted in a form of the case studies analyses through which I investigated how the public art policy and its legal and financial instruments as well as planning mechanisms are developed and implemented in three countries, the US, France, the UK, as the main representatives of the three different types of cultural policy models. The US's approach was chosen as a representative of the liberal (facilitator) cultural policy model, France's as the architect model and the UK's as the arm's length model.

Through the case studies analysis I demonstrated which are the modifications of the typical percent for art regulation introduced by those three countries in recent times. Besides the 1% for art regulation, in the thesis are also presented some other ways for the realization and financing of the public art projects which could be classified in two ways: as projects supported through the public funds and projects supported through the public-private partnerships.

It was concluded that although all three countries approached and organized public art policy in different ways their legal and financial policy instruments in the domain of the public art remained very similar.

Key words: public art, built environment, public art policy, legal and financial policy instruments, percent for art, planning mechanism.

INTRODUCTION

In the last fifty years due to specific cultural and social circumstances the public art has undergone a transformation from the simple sculpture on the plaza, through the site specific interventions in the urban environment, all the way to the contemporary, socially engaged artistic interventions and community arts projects, aimed to reclaim and humanize the urban environment. In effect, today under the term public art one can include almost *all artworks created by artists for places accessible and used by the public*.

Throughout history the correlations between art and the public (urban) space were constantly marked by the historical conditions in which artists were, as well as their relations with patrons whether private or public. Apart from this artist – patron relation, there was also a problem of the production and the political management of the public space built or non-built: whether there was a monarchist or a public control of the urban space. Therefore, it is important to emphasize that every discussion concerning public art is inseparable from the analyses of urban and public policies. Public art could not be possible without some kind of a public commission and the particular **institutional procedure** concerning financing the public art projects by different public institutions like the ministry of culture, local authorities or some other public organisations.

In envisaging this thesis I initially sought to reveal and analyze the existing procedures and policies for the public art commission in Serbia, particularly in Belgrade. But surprisingly, during more than three months of extensive research my investigation yielded very little in the way of publishable results. By interviewing the active public art advocates and public officials, artists and managers, by poring through newspapers and legislative documents, city's master plans and strategies, I have learned that public art is seldom a subject of any debate concerning cultural policy or city development issues in Serbia. All existing master plans, cultural and economic planning documents, do not mention at all public art projects as a part of the overall city development strategies.

My original line of inquiry, which was identifying *the existing public art policies and procedures, from the planning level and financial issues, through commissioning and selection process to maintenance issues*, it was proven to be a frustrating endeavor

because there are only few exiting policies and procedures to explore. During this research I have realized that in order to make a case for the public art development in Belgrade (and Serbia) in the future, it is necessary to get acquainted with the exiting ways of dealing with this subject on the international level.

Thus, having in mind existing situation of the public art domain in Serbia, it was imposed, as the main aim of my thesis, a need **to identify reasons for governmental support of public art projects as well as to present the main goals of the existing official public art programs in the developed world, their legal foundations, and currently implemented financial and planning mechanisms.** By exploring the development of public art policies and existing planning and financial measures, I hope to illuminate lessons that can be used by the public art advocates, planners, and political figures in Belgrade and other Serbian cities, to recognize and capitalize on public art as a potential engine for economic development and community revitalization.

Given the great differences of the public art polices on the international level, due to historic, ethnic, social, economic and other differences between countries and regions, there could never be such a thing as an “overall model” of the public art policy. For that reason I decided that the best way to present the development of public art policies will be through the case studies analyses of three different cultural (and the public art) policy approaches – the United States, France and the United Kingdom. The main reason that influenced my decision to carry out case studies analyses of those three countries and their public art policies, was a fact that they represent three distinct models of cultural policy, of its formation and implementation, with each policy regime being deeply embedded in the history and power structure of the country.

According to cultural policy studies six basic cultural policy models¹ could be distinguished, but (to my knowledge) only within three models one can find formal and institutionalized public art policy and the specific legal and financial policy instruments. Those models are:

¹ Dragičević-Šešić Milena, Stojković Branimir, *Kultura – marketing, animacija, menadžment*, CLIO, Beograd 2003.

a) **Liberal (or facilitator)** cultural policy model, in which a variety of private actors play a very significant role in the policy making process. The main specificity of this model is proclaimed government's neutrality in the domain of culture and its main task is to encourage private and civil sector to invest in culture. The main representative of this model are the **United States of America**.

b) **Arm's Length or Patron state model**. In this model, government acts as a patron and offers a support to art and culture. Arm's length principle assumes indirect distribution of the funds, through different specialist arts councils that relies on the peer evaluations of cultural the practitioner's excellence. A main representative is the **United Kingdom**.

c) The third model of direct state involvement or the **State Architect model** represents more directive approach to the cultural development where culture becomes the responsibility of the ministry of culture. In this model of cultural policy, cultural development focus is on the public sector. This model, which is characteristic for **France**, recognizes culture as a principal constituent of national identity and determining factor that is supposed to bring an international reputation and prestige to the country.²

Through the analyses the main representatives of those three cultural policy models, I will try to shed some light on the dependence of the public art policies from the specific political and cultural context of those countries and subsequently to present their characteristic legal and financial public art policy instruments, with focus on the percentage for art regulations. All three countries have some similar experiences in the domain of public art, which results in implementation of some corresponding policy mechanisms. However, thorough investigation of the public art policies in the USA, France and the United Kingdom demonstrates that historically constituted assumptions frame national debates, which in effect produces some nationally specific concerns and the public art policy initiatives.

Having in mind all existing differences and similarities, my main objective was to characterize existing structure and strategies of the public art policy development and implementation by using the case studies analyses, in order to highlight the specific institutional arrangements of these countries.

² Ibid.

One of the main problems that I encountered during my research was that despite the great publicity and considerable funding available each year for this kind of projects in all three countries, the methodical researches that would treat these issues from a cultural policy and management in culture standpoints are still rare. This becomes more obvious when one takes into account a fact that a branch of science which would deal with the public art from the policy standpoint is not yet fully defined. Although at first glimpse, it seems that there is an extensive literature on the topic of public art, the majority of literature is mostly concerned with the analysis of artistic qualities of this type of art. In a better case they are concerned with some particular relations between politics and art in a public space, as well as with public art in the process of defining and expressing different types of social and national identities throughout history. Scientific analyses concerned with the public art from the standpoint of contemporary cultural policy and management in culture are still very rare as well as studies which compare different public art policies approaches. However, besides this scarcity of the relevant critical literature in the domain of the public art policy, additional obstacle that has set boundaries to the further development of my research was that some relevant literature on this subject regrettably was not available to me.

Some of the most important books and articles which I used for this research are: amongst general bibliography on sculpture and public art - Malcolm Miles, *Art, Space and the City*, Penelope Curtis, *Sculpture 1900-1945*, Tom Finkelppearl, *Dialogues in Public Art*, *Mapping the Terrain*, edited by Suzanne Lacy, and articles such as Hilde Hein's *What is Public Art: Time, Place and Meaning*; literature on city and urban issues – Lewis Mumford's *City in History*, Jane Jacob's *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*; for critical analyses of the contemporary city economy Richard Florida, *Rise of Creative Class*, Comedia publications such as *The Art of Regeneration* and related articles from Urban Studies journal such as Graeme Evans text *Measure for Measure: Evaluating the Evidence of Culture's Contribution to Regeneration* as well as some more critical investigations on this subject such as books by Rosalyn Deutshe *Evictions: Art and Spatial Politics* and Sharon Zukin *The Cultures of Cities*. The most important literature

that I consulted for case studies analyses differentiate from the general texts on cultural policy issues such as David Loosely text *Return of the Social: French Cultural Policy and Exclusion*, book of Philippe Urfalino *L'Invention de la politique culturelle*, and some more specific reports as Gilbert Smadja's *l'Art et la Ville, et sa prise en compte dans l'aménagement urbain*, for the French case; Hariette Senie *The Tilted Arc Controversy: Dangerous Precedent, Art and the Public Sphere* edited by W.J. T. Mitchell, as well as comprehensive guidebooks for the development of public art programs such as *Public Art by the Book* by Barbara Goldstein and *Going Public* by Pam Korza and Jeffrey L. Cruikshank all for US case study, and at the end of this short list are critical papers on the different public art issues, emerged during the last decade in the UK such as texts: *Public Art and Urban Regeneration: Advocacy, claims and critical debates* by Tim Hall and Ian Robertson and *Public Art: A Local Authority Perspective* by Hamilton, Forsyth and De Longh.

Besides the aforementioned critical literature I have also consulted a vast range of other documents - surveys, reports, evaluations, policy papers and legal documents.

As we can see from the following, my research was leaning, from the methodological standpoint on two distinctive instruments: *interdisciplinarity* and *case study analyses*. Considering the specific character of the Public Art and the circumstances of its appearance, interdisciplinarity imposed itself as the only appropriate and fruitful approach to public art issues. This means that in my work I tried to deal with issues of the art in a public space from different perspectives, starting from contemporary art history and its methodology, urban history and sociology, but also from the perspective of cultural policy and art management and administration, in order to provide in depth understanding of this phenomenon.

For the same reason I decided to base it upon the case studies methodology, an approach founded on the qualitative research of the variety of data sources, which provides a systematic way of looking at subject and at the same time assures the best and complete understanding of the problem. As a form of qualitative and descriptive research, case study approach emphasizes the exploration and the description. For that reason I tried to make all three case studies analyses as extensively descriptive as possible, with

the most problematic issues often referred to as being the determination of the right combination of description and analysis.

This thesis is arranged in five chapters, grouped in two sections: the first two introductory chapters and three case studies. Two introductory chapters of the thesis set the background for the research of the existing public art policies. The first chapter deals with the public art phenomenon in general terms, and provides an (art) historical overview of its development and definition. The second chapter provides a broader context of the public art development, dealing with the historical trajectory of urban development in the Western Europe and the USA from the beginning of the 20th century until recent times. This chapter outlines the evolution of officials' approaches to the urban development and the various concepts of urban developments programs. Special attention is given to the period of the eighties and emergence of the culture led development programs that had a great impact to the public art advocacy in recent times. Central part of the thesis represents the case study analyses and descriptions of the USA, the UK and France experiences in the field of public art. In each case study substantial amount of attention is devoted to the historical origins and development of the public art policy, and its specific legal, financial and planning mechanisms in that domain are identified. Further, in all three case studies, as much it was possible, special emphasis is given to the relation of public art with urban redevelopment programs, as one of the dominant frameworks for the development of public art in the second half of the twentieth century.

CHAPTER I

THE PUBLIC ART

1.1. The Public Art Definition

The term public art was introduced for a first time into the artistic-theoretical discourse at the end of the sixties. At that time it was used to denote two different types of artistic expression. Both types were fundamentally different from the traditional monumental art, in a sense that they did not meant to express a collective memory. One of them represented diverse conceptual, minimal, land art, artistic interventions within the urban environment, and the other emerged as a part of the public administration's attempts to transform and animate dull urban environment. An example of the latter were various installations of the big modernist sculptures on the plaza.

If we look back in time, we can see that public art in some way has always been a part of the urban fabric. Its predecessors are ranging from the fresco cycles of the Medieval, Renaissance and Baroque churches and cathedrals to abundance of architectural decoration and public monuments during the 19th century. Though, there is a lot of similarity between the contemporary public art and the art of some other historical periods, in their essence those artworks are very different. The main distinction could be made on the ground of the different concept of art. Before the 20th century every artwork was seen primarily as an artisan work, with their value deriving from the repetition of traditional models. Nevertheless, with emergence of the Romantic Movement and later also modern art movements this kind of perception has changed.

Phenomenon and understanding of the public art in modern times is the central subject of the Hilde Hein's text *What is Public Art?: Time, Place and Meaning*³. As she explains, the modern philosophical aesthetic focuses almost exclusively on a subjective experience and a comodified work of art. This new modernistic comprehension of art caused that today the term public art carry contradictions in itself or how Heine remarked

³ Hilde Hein, *What is Public Art?: Time, Place and Meaning*, The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism, Vol. 54, No. 1, Blackwell Publishing 1996.

“*public art is oxymoron according to modernist art theory*”.⁴ In modernism art is taken to be a product of individual and autonomous act of expression and its appreciation is a private act of contemplation. The autonomous individual is glorified in the person of the artist and his/hers created artwork transcends the public. The art denoted, is explicitly not that of the self-effacing tribal (public) artists who reflect culture of the community, but that of a private individual. By contrast, as a public phenomenon art must entail artist’s self-negation and deference to a collective community. However, in modernism art has ceased to reflect the culture of the community and an artist becomes self-affirming individual.⁵ Moreover, modern and contemporary art privileges individualism and subversion of the previous mainstream artistic position. The result is that contemporary art appeals to a specialist public for whom this self-referential development has a meaning, but its relocation to public space does not in itself increase access to it.⁶

It is interesting to observe that the recognized art of nearly all cultures, including that of the Western Europe before the Renaissance, embraces just collective model, indulging the difference among individuals as variant manifestations of the common spirit. As we know, the art of the Middle Ages does not exalt the private vision of an individual artist as much as it bespeaks the shared values and convictions of the cultural communities, and accordingly those artworks could be find in religious edifices or open spaces where people regularly gather to commemorate those same values and convictions.⁷

Always more an illusion than a reality, the notion of the common culture began to collapse by the end of the 1860s, and by the time of the First World War, artists had explicitly divorced themselves from the general public. Their appeal became elitist and generally incomprehensible to the people.⁸ The wrong type of art had merely created a culture gap that had grown into an abyss. Modernism has united art with subjective expression and with the new construction of freedom based on the possession of libertarian rights. However, if we except that contemporary artists are self-affirming

⁴ Heine, p.1

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ Malcolm Miles, *Art, Space and the City*, Routledge, Lodon & New York 2006, p.15.

⁷ Hilde Hein, *What is Public Art?: Time, Place and Meaning*, The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism, Vol. 54, No. 1, Philadephia 1996, p.2.

⁸ Ibid.

individuals, whose work doesn't reflect culture of the community anymore, question imposed is what is public art today? Who is the public and what makes art public – its essence, its patron or its location? In literature there are many different answers to this question because concept of the public art, like some other social ideas, has undergone a lot of changes during the last forty years, and considering recent cultural, economical and technological evolutions this process is still ongoing. The simplest explanation of the public art phenomenon is that the term public refers to the artwork's origin, history, location, and social purpose, although rarely can one artwork satisfy this definition in all of these dimensions.⁹

How are then we to define an object as a work of public art, if neither collective origin, nor spiritual cohesiveness nor central placement nor even popularity serves to determine it? A crudely pragmatic and narrow definition of public art equates it with the *art installed by public agencies in public places and at public expense*.¹⁰ Although, this definition is hardly sufficient to encompass all characteristic of the public art phenomenon, and especially the explosion of non-traditional projects that now lay claim to designation as public art, I will base my research on this definition because it fits the best with the subject of research – an overview of public art policy development as a part of the urban regeneration programs.

Before we deal with urban regeneration and public art policy issues, in the next chapter we will give a short historical overview of the precedents and early beginnings of the public art phenomenon.

⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰ Ibid. and Daniel Hunting, *Public Art Policy, Examining an Emerging Discipline*, Perspectives in Public Affairs, vol. 2, Phoenix 2005. Similar definition of public art gives Mitchell according to whom the Public Art is art "commissioned, paid and owned by the state", Mitchell W.J. T. (ed.), *Art and the Public Sphere*, University of Chicago Press Journals, Chicago 1993.

1.2. The “Art and Architecture” and the Monuments, Precedents of the Contemporary Public Art Practice

Throughout the history the specific feature of the *public sculpture* had always been a representation of the monarch and its power. Since in bourgeois society power was no longer in the hand of one person (or a few) role of the public sculpture started to change and its function became more broadly based. Whereas monuments had previously shown the king, the emperor, or the victorious general, the monumental form now came to express the ideals of the bourgeois state. Using the models of ancient Greece and Rome, an architectural decoration and public monuments depicted historic events and people. Principles like justice, liberty, and equality were often abstractly personified in this art, which intended to portray national and public values and ideals. Statues were erected not simply to commemorate the achievements of the great men, but also to show how state celebrated them, making visible the bond between the elected assembly and the people, revealing an open society where merit was recognized and rewarded. Governments habitually stressed the fact that the impetus came from the individual and not from the authoritarian state.¹¹ Thus, the monument was made to seem as if it arose out of the will of the people, joined in voluntary association with the artist. This active association of the state, the citizen and the artist was in the full swing across the Europe and the United States by the 1900, and its success can be measured by the increasing numbers of statues on the streets. Governments encouraged programs of statufication tacitly rather than explicitly, leaving it to their citizens to choose which schemes to support with their subscriptions. This strategy was so successful that citizens themselves usually paid the costs for a commission, and very often initiated subscription themselves, on the ground of the local and national pride. Municipal initiatives were only slightly bigger than those which came from different societies and special associations. A committee who launched the subscription, circulating the details to the potential supporters including local and national government, backed most monuments. The burden of raising the funds was borne by private individuals who resorted group efforts to bolster the sums raised by

¹¹ Penelope Curits, *The Tradition of the Monument*. In :Sculpture 1900-1945, Oxford University Press 1999, pp. 38-71.

subscription. Postcards, gala evenings, exhibitions, commemorative medals were just some ways of raising funds.¹²

It is generally agreed that in Victorian Britain the death of Robert Peel¹³ in 1850 initiated the spread of monuments to the middle class. In France, following the Franco-Prussian War, this trend took hold with the establishment of the Third Republic after the 1875. In the United States that period began after the Civil War and with the assertion of the national identity. The French love of statues quickly surpassed the British so in only one generation the French capital was suffering under effect of *statuomanie*. However, by the 1904 Parisian municipal authorities decided to impose a ten-year moratorium after death to any potential subject of statufication. Around the 1910 number of statues started to drop and that tendency continued in the second decade of the 20th century.¹⁴

In the same time in the United States the expansion and specialization of the federal government necessitated the construction of many government buildings, courthouses and the state capitols, all of which brought work for the sculptor. The new urbanism of metropolitan cities required building that depicts status. The New York Tribune noted in 1897, "*cautions proprietors...see now that without sculpture a new building looks somehow inferior to its neighbors. In other word, art is getting to be the fashion...'*"¹⁵ One year later sculptor, Karl Bitter, in writing to Municipal Affairs, suggested that '*it will be necessary for the landscape gardener, the architect and the sculptor to go hand-in-hand...'*"¹⁶

Despite all the importance that was given to the public sculpture in that period, authors of those works were largely ignored and few ever expected to be named. Public sculpture was rendered anonymous in different ways: in term of its ownership, its function, its physical position, and the collective nature of its fabrication. Much of the public sculptures were nominally owned by the citizenry, but those were not considered to be the works of art, but only as a utilitarian object such as a fountain, a marker or a tablet. Sculpture was still considered only as an artisan work and was rarely assessed as

¹² Ibid., 38.

¹³ Robert Peel was Conservative Prime Minister, from 1834 to 1835 and once again from 1841 to 1846.

¹⁴ Penelope Curits, *The Tradition of the Monument*. In :Sculpture 1900-1945, Oxford University Press 1999, pp. 38-4.

¹⁵ Ibid., p.29.

¹⁶ Ibid.

art. It was made for other arenas where it followed a different set of conventions. Sculpture had a task to perform, it was filtered to something else beyond itself. When sculpture had a commemorative function it was designed to preserve the names of the commemorated people and was recognized by their names and the sculptor's name was rarely known. On the other side, when the sculpture was a part of the architectural decoration it was subordinated to the architecture and placed on facades or fountains where it was almost invisible. In those cases individual sculpture had to be subordinated to an overall design.

This status of sculpture did cause sculptors some concern, but more worrying was sculpture's secondary position to the architecture. Most of the sculptors were educated to work with the architects and a question was not how to disengage from this relationship, but how to make the collaboration more actively equal.¹⁷ This concern about how to establish real collaboration artist-architect is even today one of the most significant issues in the domain of public art.

However, the close relation between art and architecture was a given throughout the history. From the Classical Greece and Rome, to the Renaissance and Baroque and even in the 20th century with Bauhaus movement, the collaboration between art and architecture was a vital, significant and evident feature within society. It is well known that the most important artists throughout history, such as Michelangelo, Da Vinci and Bernini, could intervene at the same time in art and architectural domain. Therefore, until the 17th century the division of the artistic genres and with it attached division of socio-professional organization really did not exist - artist and architect were as one.

Beginning of a separation of different artistic practices and its institutionalization, which still exists today, was marked in France by the creation of two different Academies, the Academy of Painting and Sculpture in 1648 and the Academy of Architecture in 1671. Up to the 19th century this separation was broadly accepted, and the prevalence of the "*order of the architect*" by comparison with one of the sculptor came to impose itself in the layout of public space.

However, around the turn of the 20th situation was partly changed due to some architects who showed an increasing interest in blending architecture and sculpture into a more likable whole. The condemnation of sculpture added as an afterthought lay behind

¹⁷ Ibid., p. 14.

many of the projects, which characterize the new partnerships of the early twentieth century. Progressive architects associated their projects with the active contribution of the sculptors, rather than with the artwork ordered from outside contractors.¹⁸

The interest for the architectural-sculptural collaboration was well suited to the concern of new the artistic movements such as the Art Nouveau to unify aesthetic environments by collaborative work across a number of disciplines. One way of being modern in the decades at the turn of the century was to be interested in collaboration, necessarily putting individual preeminence to one side. Sculpture had to look as if it was not simply added on the end, but was thought through, from the beginning, by a sculptor in tandem with an architect, as a fundamental part of the building. In that period there was a lot of different examples of successful partnerships of this kind. But this kind of collaboration though it looked like medieval workshops, was doing a little to challenge the traditional position of the architect.¹⁹

Architects still had the leading role, and they believed that it is essential for sculpture to be subordinated to architecture. They wanted to train sculptors specifically for the architectural work, in context in which they will have control. In these circumstances sculptors became more and more aware that they would never be in parity with the architects. So they gradually started to seek autonomy of their own terms. Consequently the wave of popularity of this kind of “equal” collaboration didn’t last for long and ties, on which sculptors and architects had worked so hard to create at the beginning of century, finally fell apart.

In 1929 a major topic at the annual National Sculpture Society meeting was this rift between sculptors and architects. Moreover, new zoning regulations in New York forced buildings to grow up rather than out and that diminished the potential role of sculptors. New attitude of architecture towards sculpture can be well understood from the words of the Raymond Hood, one of the N.Y. city's architects in 1931, who said that:

“ There has been too much talk about the collaboration of architect and sculptor and

¹⁸ That was an idea of the English architect John Belcher worked on the London's Institute of Chartered Accountants (1893) together with a sculptor Hamo Thornycroft. They were both founding members of the Art Workers Guild pledged to unite all aesthetic arts. In one speech Belcher entitled “The Alliance of Sculpture and Architecture” he begged architects to treat the work of sculpture “as a jewel whose beauty is to be enhanced by an appropriate setting.” Ibid., p.14.

¹⁹ Ibid., p.16.

*painter but nowadays, the collaborators are architects, the engineer, and the plumber...*²⁰ In the same time in Europe the father of modern architecture Le Corbusier declared that architecture is an event in itself that can exist quite independently. For him there was no need of either sculpture or painting, because the visual arts are subservient to the architecture.²¹ Adolph Loos expressed the same negative opinion about relation between architecture and sculpture in his essay *Ornament as a Crime*.²²

All of this signaled parting of the architecture and sculpture. Architects gave up from sculptors and sculptors started to work on the new type of sculpture which was more intimate and reflected sculptor's individuality.²³ Rodin first showed to younger sculptors how private themes might hold more for sculpture than even the most prestigious public projects.²⁴ For the first time in the history one could see sculptural ensembles which were fusing, in themselves, introverted and personal vision of the sculptor with conventional forms and sculptural languages of the large public sculpture. In this way the sculpture laid its claim to exist in the public space, in equality with the architecture.²⁵

At the beginning of the 20th century, under the influence of modern painting, sculpture for the first time in its history becomes independent and self-referential art, and broke all connections with architecture and public space. This break lasted for few decades, until the end of the Second World War, when sculptors decided that it is time to get back into the public space again, but this time due to modernistic aesthetic theory, in the essentially different manner.

Certainly, this does not mean that sculpture completely vanished from the architecture and the urban environment. Actually during the 1930s in the United States, at the time of the most extended economic downturn, a public authority continued to

²⁰ Ibid., p. 29.

²¹ Le Corbusier, *Ka pravoj arhitekturi*, Beograd 1999.

²² Adolf Loos, *Ornament i zlocin*. In: *Izabrani eseji*, Beograd 2000.

²³ Penelope Curits, *The Public Space of Sculpture*. In: *Sculpture 1900-1945*, Oxford University Press 1999, p.28.

²⁴ the best example for this is Roden's "The Gates of Hell" firstly conceived for entrance of the new Museum of Decorative Arts in Paris, but Roden absorbed and internalized project in such a measure that on the end he totally abandoned the idea of its ever being used as a public commission. Ibid., pp.30-32.

²⁵ Beside Roden we can cite examples of Swedish sculptor Carl Milles and his sculptures in Stockholm suburbs but also the work of Ivan Mestrovic and his mausolea with sculptural cycles like for example the "Temple of Vidovdan". Ibid.

commission artworks for public buildings. However, besides all of those government's efforts and advocacy in favor of public art and architectural decoration, most of the private companies in the United States preferred to work with modern and more streamlined oriented architects who weren't using sculpture in their design.

Nevertheless, in the domain of the public commissions there were also introduced some significant differences in comparison to the earlier public art practices. Those changes were not connected so much with the artistic issues but more with the process of the financing and commissioning of the public art. Although, the government constantly encouraged decoration of the public buildings the decision and choice of decoration always depended on the architect's recommendation. Nevertheless, with the parting the ways of architecture and art, and with the decision of many architects to dismiss decoration from their buildings, the government officials had to find a new way of decorating public buildings. For them function of the architectural decoration was not only a beautification of public buildings but also it had significant role in the celebration of values of the democracy and the American society. One of the ways for continuing with the practice of decoration of public buildings was seen through the implementation of the new public policy instruments in order to the governments take on responsibilities in that domain.

Despite the fact that the 1930s were represented usually as a period of the public art stagnation, this period is marked by the first occurrence of the contemporary public art policy and ordinances. Some of the today's most popular public art regulations as the percent for art concept date back to the New Deal period, precisely in 1934, when the Treasury Department and its Painting and Sculpture section were established.²⁶ The main task of this program had been to finance and administer a process of decorating federal buildings through the setting aside for this purpose approximately the 1 percent from all construction costs. Artists were chosen through the anonymous competition, although especially accomplished artistes could receive commissions directly. This program essentially continued the earlier practice of the public buildings decoration but with one main difference - the selection of the artist was transferred from architects to the separate

²⁶ Wetenhall, John, *A Brief History of Percent-for-Art in America*, Public Art Review, Fall/Winter, St. Paul 1993.

committees of experts who administrated competitions. This new selection process was intended to encourage and publicize development of American art.²⁷ Declaratively, the main goal of this project was, besides the securing high quality art for public buildings, a commitment to stimulating appreciation of art by the American people as well as offering to the little known artists means of recognition through the open competitions. In practice, the competitions often provided the specific narrative themes to assure that the final work would please the local community, a practice that led juries to employ mainly academic sculptors and to favor styles of Beaux Art architectural and allegorical sculpture, and contemporary realism. In concretizing on the recognizable, local themes, the selection comity hoped to inspire an essentially democratic appreciation of fine art at the grass-roots level. Unfortunately, this practice didn't last for long and when national priorities were realigned by the World War II, public art ordinances gradually lost impetus and officially disbanded in 1943.

Almost at the same time as in the United States, in 1937, the French Government also adopted the first official public art directive²⁸ in the form of the 1% for art regulation intended in that time exclusively for financing decoration of public schools and universities.²⁹ Contrary to the American regulation French regulation determined that selection of the artworks is still in the hand of architects in charged for construction. At the beginning, this regulation was not mandatory so it was rarely implemented and depended on architect decision. After the war, this 1% for art regulation from the 1937 come under revision. In 1951 the new law was passed which this time made mandatory decision of setting a side the 1% of all construction cost in the domain of national public education for decoration.

Apart from the percentage for art introduction, the first half of the 20th century saw a movement away from a built environment that for centuries incorporated art with architecture. Disappearance of art from the public realm was a result of specific cultural and political considerations. For the most of the modernist architects architectural decoration and public sculpture personified values of the corrupt and unequal society so

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Those kind of regulations were for the first time adopted a few years before in Denmark and Sweeden. Henry Lydiate, *Public Patrons. Percentage for art*, 1982, <http://www.artquest.org.uk/artlaw/patrons/28615.htm> , retrieved : February 6, 2007.

²⁹ However, those regulations started to apply only after new set of regulations in the 1951.

by insisting on plane and functional architecture they were reacting against social inequality.³⁰

In these circumstances there was no place for the Beaux Art traditional sculptural decoration or public monuments, which for modernists represented only values of upper classes. In the same time new introspective modernist sculpture was still in the process of formulating of the new formal language and a far away from finding its way back to be incorporated in the public space.³¹ There was a few successful attempt of the modernistic public sculpture during the 30s at the first place of Brancusi and Picasso, but those were just individual cases. However, connection between the modernist sculpture and the public space will be established only after the Second World War but in a completely different way then before.

1.3. The Beginning of the Contemporary Public Art Practice

There is a lot of literature concerning the subject of the contemporary public art but as Suzanne Lacy stated in her introduction for “*Mapping the terrain*”, “*no overview has been agreed yet, about the history of contemporary public art*”.³² We can try to trace its development in the United States in many different ways: through the list of public commissions, passing the public art regulations, or a way of distribution of 1% for art money, emergence of different artistic practice in the urban space, appearance of different critical articles on this subject, etc. However, there is still not enough critical literature dealing with this subject from all of these standpoints in the same time.

Situation in the Western Europe was almost the same, with some important differences. In the most of the Western European countries, except France, the real popularity of the public art begun with the eighties when public authorities started actively to promote those kind of art, as a result of the introduction of new urban reconstruction programs. Before the eighties, in all Western European countries existed

³⁰ Juliet Hamilton, Leslie Forsyth & Daniel De Iongh, *Public Art: A Local Authority Perspective*, Journal of Urban Design, vol.6, issue 3, Routledge 2001, pages 283-296.

³¹ There was a few successful attempt of modernistic public sculpture during the 30s at the first place of Brancusi and Picasso but those were just individual cases.

³² Suzanne Lacy, Introduction. In: *Mapping the Terrain – New Genre Public Art*, ed. Suzanne Lacy, Bay Press, Seattle 1996, pp 19-47.

practice of installing modernistic sculptures in public spaces but those were only individual cases and there was no official public art policy, so one can hardly speak about the public art movement or the role of public art policy in defining of the new relations between art and public space, as was in the United States at the same time.

One of the points on which all involved in public art can agree, is that history of the contemporary public art begins with dismissal of traditional “*cannon in the park*”³³ - the consideration of the public art as the display of sculptures glorifying national history and virtues of upper classes whereby excluding the large segments of the population.

One of the public authorities’ intentions behind the provision of the public art was a desire to bridge this gap between the culture of the elite and culture of the masses, a desire driven by the existence of the different political options in that time. In former times, before the Second World War, the masses were always excluded *de facto* if not *de jure* from the culture of the elite. However, the modernism with its great social aspirations had a strong will to change this situation. Unfortunately and despite of all its intentions post-war high modernism completely failed to ‘socialize’ culture. However, it was still regarded itself as left wing, libertarian, egalitarian and radical. The only alternative to the high modernism and its public sculpture in that time was a representational or commemorative monument (besides war memorials) that belonged to the conservatism.

Therefore, when in the 1960s urban places came to be seen as a potential new exhibition space for art previously exhibited in galleries, museums, or kept in private collections, the high modernistic art intruded in the world of the traditional commemorative art with the explanation that its main goal is to make the art more accessible to all.³⁴As Suzanne Lacy cynically stated “*the impetus was to expend the market for sculpture, and this included patronage from corporations*”.³⁵

The majority of the commissioned art during the sixties was the modernist sculptures which although abstract in form was still frequently expected to fulfill the

³³ The term used by public and community artist, Judith Baca in text: Judith Baca, *Whose Monument Where? Public art in Many-Cultured Society*. In: *Mapping the Terrain – New Genre Public Art*, ed. Suzanne Lacy, Bay Press, Seattle 1996, pp. 131- 139.

³⁴ Suzanne Lacy, Introduction. In: *Mapping the Terrain – New Genre Public Art*, ed. Suzanne Lacy, Bay Press, Seattle 1996, p. 21.

³⁵ *Ibid.*

traditional functions of the monuments and memorials. Those artworks in most of the cases were commissioned from famous artists such as Picasso and Calder, and in the nutshell they were just large-scale versions of their abstract gallery art. They functioned primarily as civic and corporate logos, with Calder's *La Grande Vitesse* as the most famous example.³⁶

Parallel to this practice of commissioning of the large modernistic sculptures for city's plazas or corporative headquarters emerged a new generation of experimental artists like Morris, Serra, Andre, Christo, Heizer, and later also Turrell and Sonffist, who based their artistic investigations in the domain of the site-specificity. *Site specificity had a special relevance for the public art since it acknowledged and integrated the public site as part of the artwork's content.* It was usually established through formal aesthetic links or through the historical and cultural references. However, for the majority of the experimental artists from the sixties, the public art meant more than a mere site specificity and relation with the physical site, and the real content of their works were different social issues, which were treated through direct dialogue with the public.

In the introductory text for *Mapping the terrain* Suzanne Lacy stated that all those experimental artistic movements, including minimal, environmental, conceptual art, and happenings, represent a part of the alternative history of the public art which differ from the official public art history in its understanding of art not as parallel ad separated reality like in the case of the High Modernism, but more as a social process. Lacy in her need to precisely differentiate those socially engaged public art interventions, in form and in content, from the modernistic public sculpture and installation sited in the public space, for those kinds of artistic interventions used term "*the new genre public art*".³⁷

The main difference between the *new genre public art* and the modernist public art was in their intention. New genre public art usually used both traditional and nontraditional media in trying to communicate with the different public and it is mostly based in engagement.³⁸ The term itself is used to describe all art that departs from the

³⁶ Cruikshank, Jeffrey L. and Korza, Pam, *Going Public: A field guide to developments in art in public places*, Arts Extension Service, Amherst 1988.

³⁷ Suzanne Lacy, Introduction. In: *Mapping the Terrain – New Genre Public Art*, ed. Suzanne Lacy, Bay Press, Seattle 1996, pp 19-47.

³⁸ Ibid.

traditional boundaries of media. That means that included in it are artworks in different media as installations, conceptual art, performances and all other experimental media. The main characteristic of this art and what it makes public in the real sense of the term is its sensibility for the public (audience) and its social strategy.³⁹ New genre public art is precedent of the contemporary community art practice, which is characterized by the interaction and dialogue with the community. The value of the new genre art and the community art lie in their ability to initiate a continuing process of social criticism, and to engage defined publics on issues from homelessness to domestic violence and AIDS, whilst its purpose is to resist the structures of power and money which have caused abjection.⁴⁰

Nevertheless, almost until the eighties artists practicing in the domain of the site specificity and the new genre public (and community) art could not get any official public commissions and were on the margins of the developing field of the public art. It would take some time before public authorities recognize possibilities and advantages of those new approaches to the public art as important contribution to animation of the urban and natural spaces. Change of emphasis in the domain of the public art firstly occurred at the end of seventies at time of the large urban crisis and political and social turmoil, which caused that many American cities were torn apart by unrest and their downtown areas abandoned. In order to solve those problems the federal agencies were starting to explore the scale of the public spaces they created, as well as the extent to which those spaces functioned efficiently and what was their influence on the local community. In those circumstances new approaches to the public art became increasingly justified, not so much in the aesthetic terms, but rather on the basis of its supposed social contribution to what might broadly be termed as urban regeneration.

As we can see, in the past three decades due to the changed urban situation and new objectives in a field of the urban development and community revitalization, the public art itself has undergone a transformation and moved from the simple sculpture on the plaza towards a more socially inclusive and esthetically diverse practices such as the site specificity and community arts. It has attended much broader meaning so the term now

³⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁰ Ibid.

could be used to refer, equally, to *all types of artistic expression that can be found in an urban environment, starting from traditional monuments to art performances, events and community art projects, and recently it is also started to be used for different decorative architectural details, designed urban moblier such as benches, public lighting, etc.*

CHAPTER II

THE CITY

2.1. Characteristics of the Urban Development (19th and 20th Century)

One of the characteristic of city development from the World War II until now is that programs of urban regeneration, through both public and private sector initiatives, are one of the three principal markets (with the public transport and health services in the recent time) in which the commissioning of public art has largely expanded. Today the public art projects are often considered as an integral part of many urban redevelopment programs and they could take many different forms, what is advancement comparing with its previous role as a simple architectural decoration or a public monument. To understand better and contextualize the public art and its role in the urban regeneration programs, it is necessary to define what is the urban regeneration and what is considered as the main objectives of the urban regeneration project in the contemporary postindustrial city as well as its relationship with the culture and contemporary art.

The phrase - ‘urban regeneration’⁴¹ - embodies various assumptions, firstly - it gives primacy to the perpetuation and development of urban, as opposed to rural settlements and lifestyles and secondly it presupposes that something is wrong with existing cities, and that they are in a state of degeneration and need a redevelopment. In literature the urban regeneration has been usually defined as the *physical, social and economic transformation of a place—residential, commercial or open space—that has displayed the symptoms of physical, social and/or economic decline by breathing new life and vitality into an ailing community, industry and area and bringing sustainable, long term improvements to local quality of life, including economic, social and environmental*

⁴¹ Some researchers such as David Williams, avoid to use this phrase because it is overly used in the political vocabulary which limited its sense. David Williams, *The Anxious City: British Urbanism in the late 20th Century*, Routledge, Oxford 2004.

*needs.*⁴²

Taken in general terms the urban regeneration is not a new phenomenon. From its early beginnings the urban history is marked by the constant human aspirations for the improvement of the city environment as well as living conditions of its inhabitants. Nevertheless, we could not really talk about planned urban redevelopment programs before the 19th century and an emergence of the modern city during the industrial revolution.

In the two last centuries the idea of the urban development and regeneration has been a subject of many modifications and interpretations and took a very contrasting forms, starting from the early examples such as renovation of Paris by Haussman followed by the many other European cities, through the 19th century social movements such as the City Beautiful in the US or the Garden City in the UK, and the 20th century Corbusier's socially beneficial modernists urban projects, and all the way to present time and the contemporary projects of the Culture led Developments. The main aim behind all those different attempts has always been a finding the way for fulfilling social and economic objectives that go beyond just the physical form and arrangements of the buildings, streets, parks and other parts of the urban environment. In a way it was, and it still is, an effort of the modern society to shape and improve the city's environment and life of its residents. However, those efforts can take many forms, which were not always socially beneficial for all city inhabitants nor they were synonymous with the local regeneration objectives such as the improvement of conditions for the further development of the existing communities and its economies.

However, from the period of the Industrial Revolution in the 19th century, when the first urban development and planning projects in the modern sense appeared, and especially since the World War II, those kinds of programs are regarded as the main force that shaped the contemporary urban history. All that time public art has been in some measure part of the urban redevelopment project whether from aesthetic or social reason, or both.

Although, there is such a fundamental difference among public art of today and

⁴² LGA (Local Government Association), *A Change of Scene: The Challenge of Tourism in regeneration*, LGA/DCMS, London 2000. Quoted in: Graeme Evans, *Measure for Measure: Evaluating the Evidence of Culture's Contribution to Regeneration*, Urban Studies, Vol42, Nos.5/6, Glasgow 2005. p.9

all of its historical predecessors we can trace some important historical similarity between the recent public art boom and popularity of architectural and public sculpture in the late 19th century.

The 19th century was a period characterized by the enormous urban development and a time of great changes in the social and economical domain. In that period as a result of the industrial revolution many American and European cities were in sizable expansion. However, this rapid rise of the city's population caused enormous problems for the most of the 19th century cities in Europe (and the United States) because they didn't have required infrastructure to accept all people wanting to live in the city. As a result, the physical structures of the cities inherited from the preindustrial centuries were subjected to the great modification required by the rapid growth of the factory system and the mass production. Some of the first cities which took this kind of renovation and urban change were London⁴³ and Paris⁴⁴ and their example was followed fast in other European cities, first of all Vienna and Brussels.⁴⁵

However, all those renovated cities with the new grid plans and the wider boulevards were still empty spaces that demanded embellishment of identity. As cities were rerouted and re-planned, sculptors were employed to provide definition, or focus, or simply to fill unsightly gaps. Some crossroads were filled with important commemorative statues, while others were adorned with more decorative sculpture, often in the form of pools and fountain arrangements, marking the 'improved spaces' made possible by the new municipal planning.

Under the European influence around the turn of the centuries in the United States emerged movement under the name of City Beautiful. The main goal of the movement and its originator Daniel Burnham⁴⁶ was a demand for the greater civic planning – wide

⁴³ At beginning of the 19th century, London was transformed and offered to community large public parks and new sewer system. In: Mumford Lewis, *Grad u historiji*, Zagreb 1988.

⁴⁴ In 1852 Napoleon III commissioned from Baron Georges Eugene Haussmann renovation project for Paris. Renovation included all aspect of urban planning in centre of Paris: new boulevards, regulations imposed on facades of buildings, public parks, sewer and water works. In: Mumford Lewis, *Grad u historiji*, Zagreb 1988.

⁴⁵ Penelope Curits, *Sculpture 1900-1945*, Oxford University Press 1999.

⁴⁶ City Beautiful movement was based on idea of Progressivism. Burnham believed that beautiful city could inspire its inhabitants to moral and civic virtue. In: Mumford Lewis, *Grad u historiji*, Zagreb 1988.

boulevards punctuated with public spaces adorned with decorative features-in order to deal with the dramatic urban growth. Under the influence of the City Beautiful movement in the first decade of the 20th century, the partnership of municipal government and powerful trustee bodies ensured that the new buildings of New York's museums and libraries were realized on the ambitious scale, with an important place for architectural sculpture.

As we can see all through the 19th century, urban planning was centered on the beautification and social reform, however most of the movements emerged in that period were utopian in their nature.⁴⁷

One of the most innovative and influencing planning concepts of the early 20th century was the *Garden City*, firstly described in Sir Ebenezer Howard's famous 1898 book, *Garden Cities of Tomorrow*. Contrary to the previous movements such as the *City Beautiful* that existed only on ideal level, founder of *Garden City movement*, Howard, even succeeded to practically implement his ideas and to set up two garden cities. One of the main subjects of his book *Gardens of Tomorrow*⁴⁸ was his discontent with the living conditions and social life of the modern cities. The main aim of this movement was a revitalization of the community.⁴⁹ He considered that large industrial cities with their enormous growth of population and transport become overpopulated and started to decay. He wanted to make a new city that would join in itself a village and its natural life conditions and a city with its good economical and social possibilities, local employment and a spirited community life.

In the period between two wars emerged a number of new cities throughout the world modeled after the Howard's Garden Cities. In this period for the first time appeared also a new modernistic urban theory, however the first cities and housing estates based on this approach will appeared only after the World War II.

⁴⁸ Mumford Levis, *Grad u historiji*, Zagreb 1988, pp. 524-527.

⁴⁹ Interest for a life of community will be one of dominating concerns later in the 20th century, and public art will become important means for regeneration of the community life.

2.2. Post-war years: The United States of America

Rapid rise of the private automobiles as the most popular form of personal transportation in the developed countries, became one of the most significant events for the urban development in the 20th century, especially after the World War II. From the 1920s to the present time, cities across the United States embarked on major road-building programs, while perfectly functional urban transit systems were bought up by the new oil and auto industries and dismantled.

Although the US cities avoided destruction during the World War II, many of them were destroyed later by the construction of the new highways which were usually accompanied with the neglect for the old cities neighborhoods which became ruined as effectively as if they had been firebombed. Cheap land lured urban job centers to the suburbs, and the once thriving inner cities were simply abandoned to crime and physical deterioration.

Nonetheless, in the first post-war decades those problems were still distant and the American society enjoyed in happy times of the great prosperity and industrial development.

By the 1950 suburbanization became main characteristic of the new American society. At that time population in the suburbs already increased by the 45%. Although, people choose to live in suburbs they were usually continuing to travel to city for work. In those new circumstances, a great need has emerged for a new and improved expressways, which soon were started to be built at a feverish rate. Clearing the land in the old city neighborhoods for the construction of the expressways and highways caused rapid destruction of the existing city's neighborhoods and even more facilitated and strengthen the ongoing process of suburbanization.⁵⁰ Not only symbolically but often also literally, highways were contributing to the destruction of the neighborhoods and the community life.

The goal of those kinds of expressways may have been to make city more efficient but in the reality cities' loss was a suburbs gain. Nevertheless, even if one accepts some of the stated reasons of planning establishment that living conditions in

⁵⁰ Tom Finkelpearl, *Dialogues in Public Art*, The MIT Press, Cambridge 2001.

suburbs were much better than in the city, we can not overestimate a negative social change brought by the suburbanization. One of them was dissolving of the community life and increased importance given to the right to privacy.

At the same time with the process of the ruining the old city neighborhoods and communities and moving out middle and upper class from the city to the suburbs, large northern cities took a large number of black migrants, pushed off the land by changes in the agricultural technology and attracted initially by the war time job opportunities. They were starting to live in old inner city neighborhoods but because of aggravated economical conditions in the city and accompanying problems such as racism, very soon those neighborhoods become ghettos, which were literally a slums. In the seventies this process of ghettoization and an inner city decay become one of the most important issues for the urban America and revealed all contradictions in the existing federal urban policy. On the one hand, federal government supported initiatives like massive highways project and contributed to the suburbanization of the United States. On the other hand, abandonment of the city and inner city decay became national concern. Mid of the 60s American cities were in crisis and the riots were frequent.⁵¹ One of the consequences was that many of city based manufactures decided to leave the city. There was also an increased number of the greenfield investments which even more strengthen the ongoing process of the suburbanization. At the same time there was enormous trend of the municipal bankruptcy.

Planners and bureaucrats were lobbying for the vast urban renovation projects which meant bulldozing the old city in favor of the cleaner replacement. All new low income units constructed under the urban renovation programs were generally gigantic high-rise projects in plain modernist style of the time. It is noteworthy fact that post-war architecture and urbanism were dominated by the high modernist thought, particularly by the design and theories of Le Corbusier. His intention was to bulldoze the old city in favor of the clean, logical, vision of the future. One of the main characteristics of his urbanism was a separation of the function, work and housing, and pedestrian transport from the vehicle traffic. Moreover, under the modernist urban planning the green areas gained great importance, which were usually surrounding housing units. In this way

⁵¹ *ibid.*

planners wanted to achieve better living conditions but also to diminish population density. These are the principles on which first urban reconstruction projects during the 60s were based.

However, this approach to urban planning was shown as an inadequate in many ways. The main problem with those newly erected buildings was that a number of constructed units was always smaller than a number of a previously existed units. In those circumstances many people were deprived of their homes, and they had to move out of the city. The other problem was that this kind of housing was not enabling but rather preventing any real social interaction and community life. Furthermore, those urban redevelopment plans contributed even more to the process of the city's decay and the death of neighborhoods.

Jane Jacobs, in her book *The death and life of the great american cities*, about the interactions that takes place on the traditional urban street, stated that Le Corbusier was planning not only physical environment but also social utopia. For her the freedom of Le Corbusier is freedom from the others. Jacobs contrasts this with the freedom of the city that she sees as more traditional urban space, of a complex order of intricate interplay. She was the first one to argue for a more democratic design process that included the voice of the user.

By the end of the 60s a failure of the planning establishment had become obvious. Under the president Lyndon Johnson's *Great Society*⁵² program and its series of the mid-1960s laws, it was radically changed the focus of the federal urban development policy. With those laws the rate of the urban renewal demolition and displacement declined and the emphasis shifted to the housing rehabilitation rather than clearance and the number of the subsidized units constructed in renewal areas was tripled.⁵³

The new approach to the urban renewal involved the community participation what was a radical departure from the top-down development practices. There was one serious attempt in this domain with the initiation of the Community Action Program, whose main goal was assisting to the poor in development of autonomous and self managed organization competent to exert political influence. Nevertheless, this attempt

⁵² Lyndon B. Johnson, *Great Society Speech*, 1964.

<http://coursesa.matrix.msu.edu/~hst306/documents/great.html> retrieved : May 22, 2008.

⁵³ John Mollenkopf, *Contested City*, Princeton University Press, New Jersey 1983.

was failed because the local politicians were against giving the power to any kind of community based groups.

However, those developments show that changes were inevitable, and as a consequence many architecture and planning schools broadened their focus to become more interdisciplinary and responsive to community needs in their work. That was the first move towards the reconstruction of communities and neighborhoods in order to save cities from the negative consequences of the renewal projects.

In the *Crisis of the Inner City*, published in 1979, Martin Loney was writing about different approaches to the urban regeneration in the United States. He argued that the United States government's regeneration programs had evolved gradually, from an early regeneration programs with narrow focus on buffering the worst effects of an inevitable decline, to more vigorous pro-active approach encouraging industry and people to return and re-invest in inner cities.⁵⁴

During the seventies several American cities – Pittsburgh, Baltimore, Boston, introduced the urban regeneration programs in which cultural activities had important role. The interest of arts organisations coincided with attempts of the city officials to improve image of the central city areas. This new concept of the mixed use development led to creation of the cultural districts and the public art projects. Success of those early examples of the involvement of culture in the redevelopment projects led to the recognition of the impact that arts could have on city economy.⁵⁵

2.3. Post-war Years: The Western Europe

Urban development in the post-war Europe was in many ways different from the American, but still there was also one important similarity - in both cases, slum clearance has become determining factor for the urban growth and renewal.

In the first decades after the war prevailed the new modernistic approach of urban planning in Europe, greatly based on the postulates of the Le Corbusier's Athens's Charter. New towns and the city's suburbs constructed after the war, were designed in

⁵⁴ Gillian Whiteley, *Art for Social Spaces*,

<http://vads.ahds.ac.uk/learning/designingbritain/html/regeneration.html> , retrieved: April 12, 2008.

⁵⁵ Landry, Greene, Matarasso, Bianchini, *The Art of Regeneration*, Comedia, London 1996.

line with the modernist principles, however, very soon after its foundation a great range of criticism concerning the modernist approach to city's function separation and human scale of those new communities emerged.

Similarly, as in the US, in the Western Europe enthusiasm for the modern urbanism was largely decreased as a result of a dissatisfaction with outcomes of the modern urban planning and its failure to establish more community oriented housing. As a consequence, early in the 1960s and especially in the period after the international financial crisis of the 1972, a widespread romantic reaction to the modern urban planning and architecture appeared, which in a sense reanimated an interest in the traditional urban planning.

Compared to the United States, where the first post war decades were a period of a great urban and economical prosperity, in the devastated Europe those years were mostly period of the healing and reconstruction. Destruction and material damage of the cities during the War World II was even greater than casualties from the First World War. Great number of the European urban centers sustained serious bomb-damage and the crucial problem that emerged in post-war period was how to reconstruct ruined cities in order to provide accommodations for all people lost their homes. Years and sometimes even decades, passed in the clearance and reconstruction.

In Britain, country that had suffered heavy bombing in the first years of the war, 200 000 homes were ruined and 4 million more were damaged. In those circumstances one of the most disturbing national concerns was assuring the accommodation for all homeless population. To resolve this problem government established a special Parliamentary Commission headed by Sir Anthony Barlow. After the few months of the consultation the Commission proposed a project for the construction of the New Towns as the best solution for the existing accommodation problems. In order to assure success of the program the Commission also recommended a decentralization of the industry from London into newly constructed cities. With this project they wanted not only to construct new housing units for war's victims but in the same time to resolve an urging problem of the overpopulation of London and other large cities, and to avoid construction of new housing on their suburban fringes. The chosen path of the reconstruction in Britain was in line with the Howard's urban theory and his project for the Garden Cities

construction.

In 1946 the New Towns project was accepted by the government which passed the New Towns Act and proclaimed this project as a new national urban strategy for the resolving of housing problems. Soon Britain became a huge building site and the first results were shown before the beginning of the new decade, when the first generation of the New Towns emerged. The program was continued in the fifties with the construction of "second-generation" towns, and "third-generation" towns was finally launched in the late 1960s. All New Towns were constructed in accordance with the Howard's Garden cities as well as with, prevailing in that time, modernist urbanism postulates. They were independent and fairly self-sufficient towns with their own markets and shops, their own recreation centers, theaters, hospitals, and other public institutions, and what is the most important - with their own industries. Furthermore, each of these New Towns possessed, in addition to parks and playing fields, a wide encircling belt of a permanently agricultural land which primary function was to prevent further spreading of a town.⁵⁶

Nevertheless, the whole project of New Towns lasted only until the end of 70s when the Thatcher's government, established in 1979, saw the New Towns as a socialist experiment which needed to be discontinued.

From the start of the project, there was a lot of criticism concerning the nature of those cities. The earlier generation of towns, whose construction was often rushed and whose inhabitants were generally plucked out of their established communities with little ceremony, rapidly got a poor press reputation as a home of "new town blues" and were often labeled as lonely and anti-community places. In later towns these issues were systematically addressed, in second and especially in third generation substantial resources were devoted to cycle routes, public transport and community facilities, as well as to a social development work through the employment of special teams. In order to become more community oriented and the pleasant place for living some of the cities started to invest more in community projects and to develop different kinds of the cultural projects such as the public art projects. The results of those attempts were mixed, but still those were first efforts of incorporating public art into the urban redevelopment projects in Britain.

⁵⁶ This was the main Howard's idea – how to prevent overpopulation and spreading of the cities.

Like in Britain, other western European countries also suffered a great devastation during the war. In France many towns and villages, especially port cities on the west coast, endured a serious bombing damage and needed reconstruction. Reconstruction process begun after the liberation in 1944, with the foundation of the new ministry in charged for reconstruction and urbanism. Starting from the 1945, the French government begun with the reconstruction of the ruined cities but unlike British case there was no strict decision which kind of urban solutions to apply. Usually this decision was left to architects in charged for the projects, which resulted in a great diversity of approaches. Some cities were just reconstructed as they were before, yet for some other this situation offered opportunities to change, redesign and modernize the former appearance of city centers.⁵⁷

Important part of the French reconstruction program was a construction of a large number of the public housing units, initially intended to accommodate a war victims but over the time the program was broadened to accomodate all underprivileged population. Project lasted more then twenty years and it became known under the name of *Grandes Ensembles*.⁵⁸

Grandes Ensembles were not an autonomous and self-sufficient cities as the contemporary British New Towns, even if some of them were of the considerable size. They were just suburbs on the fringes of the cities, large apartment blocks and towers, planned mostly in accordance with the modern urbanism and Le Corbusier's Athena Charter. In the sixties when bad sides of the modern urbanism became obvious and suburbs centers of the social unrest, the government decided to follow the British example of the New Towns construction. However, a project of the *Grandes Ensembles* continued until 1974 when ministry finally drop out from it, and this type of urbanization in general. In the next period main emphasis was given to the traditional urbanism based on fragmentation of the buildings, creation of a different and complex public spaces and construction of the individual houses and small collective houses.⁵⁹

⁵⁷ Simon Texier, *France – Urbanisme au XXe siecle*. In: Internet Encyclopedia Universalis.

⁵⁸ Roger-Henri Gurrand, *Logement social en Europe et aux Etats-Unis*. In: Internet Encyclopedia Universalis.

⁵⁹ *ibid.*

This new approach to city planning was firstly implemented in the same *Grandes Ensembles* suburban estates and cities, which were almost all being totally demolished and rebuilt in a more traditional European urban style, with a mix of housing types, sizes, prices, and tenures, as well as a mix of other uses such as retail or commercial.

The New Towns project was a part of this change, or in French case, *Villes Nouvelles* project, which started in the 60s. Ten cities were founded under this program, five of them in Paris region and other five near to Lille, Marseille, Lyon, Toulouse and Rouen. All *Villes Nouvelles* were, regarding the spatial arrangement and demography, very similar to the suburbs but unlike them they had more facilities and were more community friendly.⁶⁰ For this reason they have succeeded to be a desired places for living and in that way denied supposed fatality of urban fringes. However, in spite of all changes the New Towns could not ever replace a traditional city and they were, and still are, depending on other cities in many ways.

New urban movements emerged as a reaction to the modern urbanism, together with the social and students riots from the 1968, were representing a symbol of a deep dissatisfaction with the urban and social development after the war and a reaction to the urban ruination and decay. Early criticism of modernism was based on the discontent with realizations of the housing projects, but in time it was enlarged to the modernistic theory also. All critics considered modernism as a totalitarian movement indifferent to the social problems caused by the modernism itself. They stigmatized its obsession for an order and physical hygiene on the account of the community needs and morality.⁶¹

New approach to the urban planning, based on planning for the new human scale, walkable communities, gradually replaced modernism during the sixties and seventies. Movements such as Aldo Rossi's *New Rationalism* and Leon Krier's *Renaissance of European City*, aimed to conserve an urban substance of the preindustrial city while retaining accomplishments of modernism. They were interested in a typology of the old, traditional city and wanted to abandon a collective monumental housing by replacing it with the traditional individual house. There was enormous public interest for a conservation of the old parts of cities, streets and buildings and those movements whose

⁶⁰ Leonardo Benevolo, *Urbanisme et architecture –ville*. In: Internet Encyclopedia Universalis.

⁶¹ Jane Jacobs, *The death and life of the great American cities*, Vintage Books, New York 1992.

main goal was a protection of physical and social of historical parts of the city as positive models for a collective life.⁶² Those approaches influenced a large number of city's reconstruction projects in Europe⁶³ and some of them became a starting point for the culture led redevelopment programs in the eighties.

As we can see, in contrast with the United States, the concentration of the public housing in the inner city was not typical for the European postwar reconstruction at all. In Europe, social housing projects were built on the land that was the least expensive, often in the suburbs and almost never in the central parts of the city, where usually upper class population was (and still is) living. In continental Europe the historical core of major cities remained relatively affluent, and it is generally the edge of town suburbs made up of single-class state subsidized housing, such as the French *cités* and the British *council estates* which suffered the worst decay and blight.

In the States situation was for a long time completely opposite⁶⁴ and subsidized housing was, all until the eighties, placed mostly in the downtown. The main reason for this was a federal law by which if city wanted to be qualified for the federal housing funds, there was a requirement that one slum unit will be eliminated only if city builds new public housing units on its place.

Although, the European New Towns were in some aspects similar to the contemporary American suburbs there was one principal difference. As opposed to the American suburbs which were filled with commuters working in the city and obliged to sacrifice an hour or more a day in traveling between home and office, the New Towns were largely self-sufficient and independent from the other cities as a result of the industry decentralization. They were conceived not only as a dormitories but as real towns with all needed facilities that one town had to have, such as public transports, factories, shops, cultural and recreational facilities and so on.

The main difference between the American and European urban development was that american method was leading more often to inner city decay and serious city crisis,

⁶² Aldo Rosi, *Arhitektura grada*, Beograd 1996.

⁶³ One of this reconstruction project was a huge reconstruction of the Paris historical buidings and quarters during the seventies, when many of the old cheep housing units were demolished and replaced by the new luxury apartments. Simon Texier, *France – Urbanisme au Xxe siecle*. In: Internet Encyclopedia Universalis.

⁶⁴ Until the 80s and 90s when it become popular for members of new creative class to life in new, reconstructed parts of the cities.

while in Europe social problems and urban decay were reserved for suburbs, as cities were continuing to be attractive places for living. Phenomenon of the inner city decay was almost unknown in Europe up to the beginning of the eighties and the change of the city's economy.⁶⁵

Throughout this period and especially with the emergence of new/traditional urban movements, the culture had enormous importance for the life of the European cities. Unlike the United States where economical objectives were the main reason for the introduction of cultural activities in redevelopment programs, in Europe, especially in the Mediterranean countries, cultural activities were more part of a social policy. Their use of the art festivals and architectural projects, often combining old and new was in service of restoring social public life. Since the 1970 many European cities, such as Stockholm, Copenhagen, Lyon, Grenoble, Vienna, Rome, had adopted strategies for encouraging local residences to “re-discover” their cities. The aim of those strategies was to make city center safer, more accessible, and attractive for all citizens. They developed policies encompassing cultural animation, festivals, pedestrazinzation, the creation of cultural centers, traffic calming, improvement of public transport. The primarily objectives of these policies were not only to regenerate local economy and bring back people to the city (as in the States) but also to counteract trends towards social isolation and home cultural consumption.⁶⁶ They wanted to bring back importance of the city center for the social interaction and development of local community and its identity.

In next chapter we will disscuss more detailed an urban situation emerged in the eghties as well as charasteristics of contemporary urban redevelopment programs.

2.4. City in Crises: Emergence of Culture led Urban Development Programs

In the second half of the 20th century, a number of the large industrial cities in the western countries, which once prospered on the economic base of the 19th and 20th

⁶⁵ Even then is ussualy connected with Britain and not so much with other European countries such as France.

⁶⁶ Landry, C, Greene, L, Matarasso, F, and Bianchini, F., *The Art of Regeneration. Urban Renewal Through Cultural Activity*, Comedia, London 1996, p.28.

centuries industry development, had started to experience a considerable economical difficulties. Traditional industry which was for a long time a foundation of the urban economy and prosperity become the fundamental source of the city's problems. The emphasis of the economic activity has shifted from the industry to the service and towards an emerging knowledge economy. This rapid slide of the traditional industries, was leading to the economic decline, massive job loses and accompanying social problems. Unemployment and low incomes were usually followed by the poor living and housing conditions and with the increasing crime rates and vandalism. Another issue connected with the weakening of a city economy base was a rapid decay and ruination of the central parts of the cities. In the United States this process started earlier in the 60s as a result of the suburbanization, and in Europe during the eighties with the deindustrialization. In both cases the most obvious indicator of the decay were old industrial buildings and warehouses, often of great architectural and social values, which became redundant and abandoned in the urban landscape at the edge of city centers and on river banks. Nevertheless, the physical state of the buildings was just underlining the effect which those economical changes and loss of the traditional employment had on the people and local communities.

One of the most noticeable trends concerning the contemporary city and its functional change in the post-industrial era was that they were becoming increasingly important as centers of a consumption, apart from the production. This was a consequence of a wider product differentiation which resulted in a greater content to the design of a wide range of products and services. Higher life standards brought the reduced working hours and a larger income for many people, which meant in the same time more time devoted to the leisure and increasing demand for a consumption.⁶⁷

With the raise of the consumer society cities have become more and more important as places to visit for shopping or eating out, to take part in social events, to have cultural experiences, at movie theaters, concert halls, and museums. Hence, in the post-industrial situation, one of the prerogatives for cities become change of local economies in order to meet those needs of contemporary life. Urban policy planners were

⁶⁷ Adams, Champion, Murray, *Developing Creative Cities: A perspective from UK*, Urban Studies Department, University of Glasgow.

faced with the challenge how to enhance the competitiveness of cities by achieving flexible and diverse local economic structure, which would better position their cities in the global competitions. This was done by widening the service sector and introduction of the new economical sectors such as cultural industries, and related knowledge sector of the electronic communication and higher education.

One of the key elements that determined city competitiveness become its ability to attract highly skilled and creative workforce and companies who are the driving force of the new service and knowledge based economies. Consistent with the new role and new imperative of the city development in postindustrial society, during the eighties several new methods for tackling the problem of the city attractiveness and the urban regeneration issues have emerged.

Some of the most appealing methods for the urban regeneration were related to restructuring of the local economies by introduction of the new economic sectors based primarily on the development of knowledge intensive activities in the service and cultural sector. One of the most popular and intriguing strategy of urban redevelopment today is based on these principles - the **Culture led Urban Redevelopment**. This strategy consider attractiveness and image of the city as the most important factor for its future development.

A city's attractiveness is usually defined as the ability to attract factors necessary for economic development and in that context, could be regarded as an important indicator of its potential for the future economic success.⁶⁸ Attractiveness can be determined by the wide range of elements. There are such basic factors as effectiveness of infrastructure, particularly public transport and road networks, availability and quality of housing stock, quality of education, availability of job opportunities, safety in the street. Nevertheless, there are also less tangible factors, and for our case more important, such as liveliness of local economies, prestige and city image. Their importance become much more obvious having in mind that in recent time the question how to attract highly skilled workforce and innovative entrepreneurs for the achieving urban economic restructuring and regeneration is of crucial significance. Increasing attention has been

⁶⁸ Background Note, *Enhancing City Attractiveness for the Future*, OECD International Symposium, Japan 2005. http://www.oecd.org/document/38/0,3343,en_2649_33735_34915110_1_1_1_1,00.html, retrieved: March 6 2007.

paid to the place image which often has a decisive influence on location decisions by the people, and policy planners have adopted diverse measures to enhance it. Among those measures, the physical renovation and the flagships city centre developments, city promotion through the cultural policy and events are the most common components and have often been combined together into a policy package.⁶⁹

The idea that culture can be employed as a driver for urban economic growth has become part of the new orthodoxy by which cities seek to enhance their competitive position. Although, as the UNCHS report⁷⁰ illustrates, its practice has become globalized, it is in cities in the economically advanced nations that the use of culture-driven strategies largely originated and its adoption has had the most dramatic consequences both physically - in transforming the urban landscape, and economically - in building their economic performance. During the period of a little more than two decades, the initiation of culture-driven urban regeneration projects has come to occupy a pivotal position in the new urban entrepreneurialism.⁷¹ Such developments reflect not only the rise of the cultural sphere in the contemporary (urban) economy, but how the meaning of the culture has been redefined to include new uses to which it can be put to meet social, economic and political objectives.⁷² In the context of urban regeneration under the term culture are meant primarily cultural resources, such as the arts, sport, food, visitor attractions and faith, which could shift patterns of behavior and mobilize potential in order to achieve economic, social and environmental goals.

Along these lines, many cities were, and are, choosing to use a culture to address urban redevelopment issues by implementing some type of the culture-led urban regeneration strategies. In regard to the popularity of culture in the urban policy today testifies the fact that *Culture-led Urban Regeneration projects* have grown from an interesting alternative to the traditional urban development policy in the eighties, into a core development strategy for a increasing number of cities and regions world-wide

⁶⁹ Ibid.

⁷⁰ The State of the World's Cities, UN-Habitat series, 2004. quoted in: Stiven Miles, Ronan Paddison, *Introduction: The Rise and Rise of Culture led Urban Regeneration*, Urban Studies, Vol.42, Nos 5/6, 833-839, Glasgow 2005.

⁷¹ Stiven Miles, Ronan Paddison, *Introduction: The Rise and Rise of Culture led Urban Regeneration*, Urban Studies, Vol.42, Nos 5/6, 833-839, Glasgow 2005.

⁷² Ibid.

during the nineties.

This contemporary emphasis on culture owes much to recent debates on the relationship between culture, creativity⁷³ and the city, and especially the work of Richard Florida which has had a significant role in underpinning the assertion that cultural inputs translate into social and economic outputs. In his book *Rise of the Creative Class*, Richard Florida is dealing with an emergence of understanding the indicative conditions favorable to the creation of urban economic growth. He connected the three areas: a creative class – a novel idea, the creative economy, and the questions concerning necessary conditions in order to city attract the new creative class. For him the future economic development is driven by the lifestyle factors, such as tolerance and diversity, urban structure and entertainment. Florida argues that cities and regions should focus on promoting creativity, and on attracting creative people through their creative ‘offer’. In short, for Florida, the clustering of human capital is the critical factor in regional economic growth and is the key to the successful regeneration of cities. The key focus here should therefore not be on whether cultural investment works, but on the degree to which it works for diverse social groups. *Culture led Regeneration* programs are in line with Florida understanding of the contemporary urban economy because those programs are having decisive role in enhancing the city image and an achieving economic deindustrialisation based on a widely shared assumption that cultural policy has a substantial impact on place image which, in turn, plays a crucial role in attracting talented people, entrepreneurs and investors. The underlying thinking is that attempts to persuade these highly-qualified people to target their location choices at certain cities will be aided if those cities are closely associated with arts, culture and entertainment and that cultural infrastructure, such as theaters, museums, galleries, acts as a powerful magnet for creative people by offering the attractive lifestyle opportunities. It is also expected to serve as an effective tool to tackle structural unemployment since it could contribute to the diversification of the local economic base by sowing the seeds of the new economic activities that are characterized as knowledge-based and which could eventually grow into

⁷³ Landry, Greene, Matarasso, Bianchini, *The Art of Regeneration*, Comedia, London 1996, and Charles Landry, *Creative City*, Earthscan Publications Ltd. 2000.

the major growth engines in the future. This recognition of the crucial role that cultural policy could play in urban regeneration drove many cities to create a new cultural infrastructure, including galleries, theaters and concert halls, as a tourist attraction and a community platform for culture-related economic activities to expand.

Anyway, as we could see the link between culture and urban regeneration is complex and subject to different interpretations. Still we can identify two main strands of arguments in favor of those plans: first, that it encourages economic diversification⁷⁴ and second, that it enchases the images of areas suffering from decline.⁷⁵

From the seventies, when the idea of introducing of culture in urban regeneration process appeared for a first time, several models, which incorporated cultural activity into the regeneration process, were developed. This subject and the main characteristics and differences of existing approaches of incorporation of culture in urban development plans were discussed by Graeme Evans in his text *Measure for Measure: Evaluating the Evidence of Culture's Contribution to Regeneration* published in 2005.⁷⁶ In this text Evans introduces three different approaches to the involvement of culture in urban development issues: *culture-led regeneration*, *cultural regeneration* and *culture and regeneration*. However, those approaches are not necessarily mutually exclusive, particularly if they are considered in the long run.

In the early eighties, marketing together with other mechanisms for a providing a better image of the city were recognized as the main aim for an introduction of cultural activities in the economical and physical urban regeneration plans. However, it was important that all cultural activities considered as a part of urban redevelopment plans have to have a high-public profile and be frequently cited as the sign or symbol of city

⁷⁴ Booth, P. and Boyle, R., *See Glasgow, See Culture*. In F. Bianchini and M Parkinson (Eds) *Cultural Policy and Urban Regeneration: the West European Experience*, Manchester University Press, Manchester 1993, pp 21-47; John McCarthy, *Encouraging Culture-led Regeneration*, Paper presented at the EURA Conference, Urban and Spatial European Policies: Levels of Territorial Government, Turin, 18-20 April 2002.

Bianchini, F. Culture, conflict and cities: issues and prospects for the 1990s. In F. Bianchini and M. Parkinson(Eds) *Cultural Policy and Urban Regeneration: the West European Experience*, Manchester University Press. Manchester 1993, pp. 193-213.

⁷⁵ Council for Cultural Co-operation, *Culture and Neighborhoods*, Vol. 1, Strasbourg, Council of Europe Publishing 1995.

⁷⁶ Graeme Evans, *Measure for Measure: Evaluating the Evidence of Culture's Contribution to Regeneration*, Urban Studies, Vol.42, Nos.5/6, Glasgow 2005, pp.1-25.

regeneration.

In these circumstances, in the early course of formulating the culture led redevelopment strategies in the eighties, the main attention, the same in the United States and in Europe, has been paid to the two objectives:

1. *Physical renovation of the city centers and an incorporation of different kind of flagships project (such as architectural or public art projects); and*
2. *Implementation of arts and cultural policy.*

As we already have seen, physical environment, particularly in city centers, has continuously been, and probably will continue to be an important feature for the urban policy planners to address a problem of alternation and enhancement of city's image, since it is the most fundamental and conspicuous factor of the urban environment. City centers have always served as a focal points of citizen's urban life as well as social and cultural heritage. For that reason, they have been chosen as the best strategic locations for policy planners to concentrate their limited public resources to enhance city attractiveness. This strategic thinking has led to the proliferation of a particular type of city centre redevelopment projects, called **flagship redevelopments**. This kind of projects are mainly of considerably large scale and as such they have high visibility and significant impact on city image. Under the flagship project we can consider a huge scale of different project from the public art installations to the contemporary architecture and elaborated restorations of whole historical quarters.

Nevertheless, most of the city's governments usually chose to commission a public art projects from prominent artist or to employ an internationally recognized architect to design new cultural facilities - museums, concert halls, galleries and other buildings for public or mixed use. In recent times it has also become very popular that city's governments develop programs for reclaiming the public space by designing a new well designed parks were events such as garden festivals could be organized, or to engage famous architect for reconstruction and transformation of the former industry buildings for cultural use.

For all these usually large and costly public works, private investment are eagerly

welcomed and sometimes even used as a form of leverage ratio, as a criterion to gauge the potential of the project. Project locations are carefully chosen so that economic potential can be materialized with a minimum of public investments in the infrastructure improvements. These prestigious projects, which often require a considerable amount of public and private investment, are expected to act as symbols of urban regeneration, as the “*flagships*” of modern and dynamic economies.

Apart from these physical renovation and flagships projects, cultural and art policy have also been considered from the beginning as the determining factor which can influence on making a city more attractive place to live in. Usually, cities would have started new programs as art festivals, diverse kinds of public events and public art schemes which main purpose was rebranding the place. Rich and interesting cultural programs, festivals and large scale cultural events were together with flagships projects considered as decisive factors for attracting investors and creative workers to the city.⁷⁷

All these cultural interventions have in common the claim for uniqueness which other non cultural regeneration interventions do not have. This special character of cultural interventions is usually presented as a good instrument for creating distinctiveness and for raising awareness and excitement in regeneration programs as a whole.⁷⁸

At the time of the first implementations of these programs there was a lot of criticism in the press and from the local officials concerning the redirection of public funds from social programs and public education to these grand scale programs which were considered by the most of the people unnecessary. The recognition of the value of the arts, brought about by different studies and analyses launched in the eighties, laid the foundation for more integrated urban regeneration strategies driven by cultural policy imperatives. However, in these times critical literature was rare and only promotional and celebratory reports existed, issued primarily by the agents and promoters of regeneration and followed by more dismissive critical responses in the academic literature.

⁷⁷ Background Note, *Enhancing City Attractiveness for the Future*, OECD International Symposium, Japan 2005. http://www.oecd.org/document/38/0,3343,en_2649_33735_34915110_1_1_1_1,00.html retrieved: 6 march 2007.

⁷⁸ Graeme Evans, *Measure for Measure: Evaluating the Evidence of Culture's Contribution to Regeneration*, Urban Studies, Vol42, Nos.5/6, Glasgow 2005, p.10.

Almost a decade later, the first real evaluations of the culture led regeneration programs and its social and economical impact appeared. Many of these texts posed the question how to define evaluation criteria and how to measure an impact and a real contribution of the culture on the economical development as well as on social regeneration. As we already stated earlier, the main reasons in favor of flagships projects were improvement of the city image and possibility for economic diversification. It was proved that flagships projects and culture in general contribute to the improvement of a city image but there is still no answer of whether it has a positive effect on diversification of the local economy. Analysis has shown that in many cases flagships city centre developments and culture led innovation policies have had a significant impact on enhancing of city image but on the other hand in this new situation some other issues becomes apparent.

In the nineties and with the appearance of great number of official and nonofficial reports concerning this subject the main conclusion of almost all these researches has been that flagships oriented programs are failed to bring significant long-term economical results as well as improvements in the domain of community regeneration. It was also argued that physical improvements and flagships project do not have at all a real regeneration value but only a symbolical one. Another problem appeared with the evaluation of the economical impact of these kind of programs. It was noticed that there is a rise in the domain of tourism and tourist related services but there is no evident effects on the local economy as a whole.⁷⁹ Some critics underlined that the culture led initiatives are primarily aimed for high spending inhabitants and visitors, and that place improvements are usually followed by some negative social processes such as process of gentrification and that local community do not benefit from these kind of programs.

The fact that the predominance of the property led renovation strategies usually leads to the reproduction of similar built environment which undermines expected effects, has also contributed to the negative image of these kinds of projects. In the nineties many western cities choose to introduce some kind of culture led regeneration strategies but instead to make plans in accordance with their particular situation many of them

⁷⁹ Background Note, *Enhancing City Attractiveness for the Future*, OECD International Symposium, Japan 2005. http://www.oecd.org/document/38/0,3343,en_2649_33735_34915110_1_1_1_1,00.html retrieved: 6 march 2007.

decided just to replicate existing successful examples. This goes as far as replicating of design schemes for cultural district or waterfront development and even existing public art installations.

However, majority of the criticism concerning flagships projects addressed its role in the regeneration of local communities. Inclusion of a local community is one of the main issues which culture led regeneration not only did not succeed to resolve but in some cases even facilitated this process. For a very long time, in some cities, even today, local communities were not involved at all in the process of planning and construction of the large scale projects. This led to a situation in which some local communities in self-styled cultural cities started to perceive new city centers and new cultural spaces as not intended for them. This imposes a conclusion that great majority of these projects are conceived having in mind not local residents at all but only tourists. Besides, it became obvious that economical impact of flagships oriented culture led programs are overstated. In these circumstances, proponents of these kind of project are shifted back towards smaller public, community art projects and concern for design quality of everyday environment.⁸⁰

The extent to which culture can positively contribute to the regeneration of the areas and neighborhoods which have been subject to economic and physical decline has become concern of the government officials. This is particularly obvious when one takes into account the duration of this phenomenon.⁸¹ Today cultural activities are no longer just part of the capital redevelopment projects but they are becoming more focused on supporting the community led regeneration which are participatory in nature, low cost and more flexible and responsive to the local needs. Regeneration has become more concerned with the quality of life in neighborhoods. That means that previously flagships oriented Culture led Regeneration approaches have broadened their focus from cultural events, large public art project and costly flagships project to the smaller, art based projects with social impacts, which are addressing the problems of inclusion and greater participation of city residents in the community life.⁸² This shift of emphasis is a product

⁸⁰ Ibid.

⁸¹ Graeme Evans, *Measure for Measure: Evaluating the Evidence of Culture's Contribution to Regeneration*, Urban Studies, Vol42, Nos.5/6, Glasgow 2005.

⁸² Ibid.

of changes in understanding of reconstruction process, from the support to big and costly urban design projects toward recognizing the local community as a principal asset in the reconstruction process.⁸³

Today the role of arts (within a broader category of the cultural and creative industries) has broadened and they became a key factor in strategies to deal with urban problems from the social exclusion to the rehabilitation of post-industrial sites. As a result of this change many city's officials are giving more attention to the implementation of different kinds of cultural policy measures aimed at developing the creative cities. There are three main cultural policy strands today: *Creative Industries, Public Art, Events and Festival programming*.

Having in mind all these changes passed in recent times, Evans in his text tries to separate these two approaches to culture and redevelopment projects. He introduces a distinction between **Culture led Regeneration** projects and **Cultural Regeneration**. He states that phrase the Culture led Regeneration is commonly used (or misused) for describing these particular type of high profile art facilities construction projects. He considers these kind of project as the most visible part of development schemes and investment programs, but for him they are still less significant and rarely lead to property and economical development.⁸⁴ Even in the case when flagships projects are dominating in the city landscape and are the main characteristic of city image such as in the case of the Museum Guggenheim in Bilbao, this kind of interventions are not enough if are not followed with the investments in land preparation and infrastructure and even in upgrading of existing cultural facilities. Having this in mind Evans cites Giddens remark: *“money and originality of design are not enough...You need many ingredients for a big, emblematic projects to work, and one of the keys is the active support of local communities.”*⁸⁵ In order to distinguish a new approach from the old one flagship based approach, Evans has named this new more **community oriented urban redevelopment** strategy as the **Cultural Regeneration**. In contrast to the Culture led Regeneration approach, in the new strategy cultural activities are more integrated with other

⁸³ Charles Landry, Lesley Greene, Francois Matarasso, Franco Bianchini, *The Art of Regeneration*, Comedia, London 1996.

⁸⁴ Graeme Evans, *Measure for Measure: Evaluating the Evidence of Culture's Contribution to Regeneration*, Urban Studies, Vol42, Nos.5/6, Glasgow 2005.

⁸⁵ Giddens, quoted in Evans.

development strategies for particular area, primarily with the activities in the environmental, social and economical sphere. As an example of Cultural Regeneration model Evans cites the case of Barcelona and Birmingham.

Barcelona⁸⁶ is commonly taken as one of the best examples of successfully implemented cultural activities into the urban regeneration strategies. The city of Barcelona has adopted an urban design, cultural planning and creative quarter approach and it is still recreating itself through the further expansion from the old city, to the former Olympic village site and declining Poblanou industrial district. This former manufacturing area on the city fringe is now targeted as a creative industries quarter, linking the old city to the expanding waterside commercial development. On the other side there is Birmingham example, which took Barcelona and North American cities such as Chicago for inspiration for its prestige city-centre redevelopment plans, by incorporating together major arts and events facilities, public art and landscaping schemes. Although, Birmingham redevelopment is based on the replication of existing successful examples, nevertheless culture has been incorporated into mainstream urban policy from the early stage, by planning and resourcing through the Council's joints Arts, Employment and Economic Development Committee.

Cultural regeneration model is in some aspects very similar to **Creative City** model of urban cultural policy and regeneration, proposed by Landry and Bianchini which focus on fostering of creative industries that have "*their origin in individual creativity and talent which have a potential for wealth and job creation through the generation and exploitation of intellectual property*".⁸⁷ This model is welcomed from the cities where cultural flagships projects have failed to sustain social and economic regeneration. Many former industrial and port cities are choosing this method of redevelopment. The assumed benefits of becoming the '*creative city*' intersect many aspects of public and urban policy, and evidence suggests that unlocking the creative potential may well improve the prospects for successful urban regeneration. Such activity

⁸⁶ Graeme Evans, *Measure for Measure: Evaluating the Evidence of Culture's Contribution to Regeneration*, Urban Studies, Vol.42, Nos.5/6,1-25, Glasgow 2005. As well as some other texts such as Mari Paz Balibrea, *Urbanism, Culture and the post-industrial city: challenging the "Barcelona model"*, Journal of Spanish Cultural Studies, Vol.2, No 2, Carfax Publishing 2001.

⁸⁷ Charles Landry, *Creative City*, Earthscan Publications Ltd. 2000.

may be cultivated to attract economic gain (in the form of investment, developing the creative industry sector, business start up locations, tourism spend and knowledge workers) and also social cohesion (strengthening identity, civic pride and accommodating cultural diversity). The Britain's Creative Task Force defined the notion of Creative Industries as “ *these activities which have their origin in creativity, skill and talent and which have a potential for wealth and job creation through the generation and exploitation of intellectual property.*”⁸⁸

Third model of involvement of culture in the regeneration plans which Evans specify in his text is **Culture and Regeneration**.⁸⁹ In this model culture is not integrated at the strategic development or master planning stage, often because the responsibilities for cultural provision and for regeneration sit within different departments. In these cases cultural interventions are often small and range from a occasional public art projects which are usually conceived as afterthought and rarely in design phase for the public space or building. Sometimes they can also involve larger projects such as setting of the art or local history museum on the reclaimed industrial site. In this model cultural activity largely depends on personal engagement of the local representatives and residents as well as a civil sector and different kind of cultural organisations, which respond to the existing vacuum and make their own interventions—organization of the cultural events, commissioning artists to make public art, signs or street furniture, recording the history of their area, and so on. Although in this case cultural interventions are introduced at the later stage, they can still make a considerable impact on the regeneration process, enhancing the facilities and services that were initially planned. What differentiates this approach from two former is that in this case there is still cultural activities which can help to urban regeneration but on official level is not recognized as an integral part of the process. The main reason for this lack of recognition for cultural activities is mainly in the non existence of leading organization of public services which are structured in the way which impede collaboration between these responsible for regeneration and these responsible for cultural activity.

⁸⁸ DCMS, Quoted in Adams, Champion, Murray, *Developing Creative Cities: A Perspective from the UK*.

⁸⁹ Graeme Evans, *Measure for Measure: Evaluating the Evidence of Culture's Contribution to Regeneration*, Urban Studies, Vol.42, Nos.5/6,1-25, Glasgow 2005.

On the other hand, the common reason is the lack of a leader with the knowledge about the process in which way cultural activity can contribute to the regenerative projects. Frequently in many cities, urban regeneration programs are developed without any reference to the culture, or inclusion of arts and cultural groups in the planning process.

Although, cultural regeneration approaches are shown as unsuccessful, in many cities today community consultation becomes a prerequisite and tool which developers and their designers now employ, but evidence of the impact of such consultation in the final built environment is less apparent. Still, it seems to be that flagships programs for the inner cities and waterfronts reconstructions are not producing sustained social and economical benefits, so situation and approach are changing on the behalf of more community oriented procedure.

One may conclude that there is no easy answer which model of cultural regeneration is the best. All three models which Evans describes in his text, have positive and negative effects. Decision, brought by the city's officials on which method to chose have to be based more on evaluation of the local economic and cultural situation and not on replication of the solution implemented in other cities.

CHAPTER III

CASE STUDY: THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

History of the contemporary public art in the United States begun at the end of the sixties, which were marked by the series of important events in the field of contemporary art as well as on political and social field. Some of these events were connected with the evolutions specific to the field of art, especially in the domain of sculpture, and the other depended on new approaches to city planning.

From the beginning the advocacy for the public art was based on its ability to correct urban design problems, and to animate public spaces and make them more appealing for a general population. It was recognized as a good way to revitalize decaying central parts of the cities, which were under the burden of poverty and increasing social problems.

In the reality besides these social reasons there were also important economical reasons. From the urban economy standpoint the public art was just one of the means for attracting capital investments and for bringing back upper and middle class population, living mostly in the suburbs, to live and spend money in the city. In a way this situation was similar to that one a century before when was also an introduction of the new urban plans and the city beautification considered as one of the solutions for economical and social crisis in the cities.

For the importance of the public art in that time speaks the fact that many corporations, due to an escalation of the prices on art market, also were showing an increasing interest for a commission of outdoors sculptures as means for identifying with prestige. Furthermore, major corporations such as Chase Manhattan and PepsiCo had committed themselves to acquiring modern art. One of the first examples of these kinds of commissions was sculpture of Picasso for Chicago, which had been commissioned with private funds for the Chicago civic center in 1967.

Nevertheless, since the late 1960s, works of the contemporary art and craft have increasingly been located in the city squares and government buildings, corporate plazas, parks, gardens, schools, hospitals, railway stations and on the external walls of houses. Most of the public art have been initiated and commissioned through public bodies and for that purpose some of them promoted a percent for arts policy. In time, the public art

has become a major area of the state patronage, but the way in which it conveys the state ideology was seldom overt, concealed more in matters of style and bureaucracies of art management than in the narrative content like in former monumental art.

3.1. Federal Programs

Real and intensive contemporary public art activity in the United States started in the sixties with a foundation of two federal programs aimed for support of public art. In 1963, the General Service Administration, GSA, the agency responsible for constructions and maintenance of the United States government property, initiated the *Art in Architecture* program with fine arts allowance of mandatory 0.5% of the estimated cost of all building constructions.⁹⁰ Only two years later (1965) it was created the National Endowment for Arts (NEA),⁹¹ including its special program *Art in Public Places* whose main goal was *to give the public access to the best art of our times outside museum walls*.

Formation of these two federal programs was preceded by the specific favorable political conditions. Prompted by the positive press that greeted poet Robert Frost's participation in the Kennedy's 1961 inaugural celebration, some presidential advisors began to advocate for arts policy. Federal support for art was developed gradually and was based on specially commissioned reports, which were stressing the importance of good design and the need for artistic freedom.⁹² For Kennedy arts were important as an expression of the American liberty and democracy, as opposed to the controlled arts of the Soviet Union.⁹³ His successor, Lyndon Johnson, continued with the policy of supporting the arts and in 1965 he signed the law that created the NEA. As a part of educational policy of his *Great Society program*,⁹⁴ Johnson defined the arts as an expression of "*the inner vision that guides us as a nation*".⁹⁵ But the real implementation

⁹⁰ Harriet Senie, *The Tilted Arc Controversy: Dangerous Precedent?*, University of Minnesota Press 2001.

⁹¹ The National Endowment for Arts (NEA) is a United States federally funded and donation assisted program that offers support and funding for projects exhibiting artistic excellence. It was created by act of the U.S. Congress in 1965, as an independent agency of the federal government. Its slogan is: "*Because a great country deserves great art*", www.nea.gov.

⁹² Harriet Senie, *The Tilted Arc Controversy: Dangerous Precedent?*, University of Minnesota Press 2001.

⁹³ Ibid.

⁹⁴ Great Society Speech, Lyndon B. Johnson, 1964.

<http://coursesa.matrix.msu.edu/~hst306/documents/great.html> retrieved : May 22, 2008.

⁹⁵ Harriet Senie, *The Tilted Arc Controversy: Dangerous Precedent?*, University of Minnesota Press 2001.

of a national arts policy began with Nixon administration. In that period NEA was formulating its work procedures and commissioned first great scale modernist sculpture such as Alexander Calder's sculpture for Grand Rapids, Michigan. Nevertheless, by the middle of the seventies many questions concerning the quality and type of art funded by the NEA occurred. The main concerns were whether money should be spent on advocacy as opposed to direct support, and the priority of geographical distribution. As a result of these debates (and war in the Asia) two years later, economic resources became more limited and arts institutions and programs were increasingly in competition with one another.⁹⁶

3.1.1. GSA - Art in Architecture Program

From its foundation GSA was in charge for all federal buildings decoration and it was not surprising that it become also the first federal department, which officially adopted the 1% policy. In 1963, GSA created specialized program for the public art commission - Art in Architecture. Inauguration of this program was last step in long chain of many governmental decisions in favor of better quality of governmental architecture and its decoration.

One of the first decisions which facilitated this process was made in the time of Kennedy's administration when was announced a set of recommendations from the President's Ad Hoc Committee concerning government office space.⁹⁷ The Committee gathered for a first time in autumn 1961 in order to explore solutions for the scarcity of administrative buildings in Washington and to what many perceived as the mediocre design of federal office buildings. Its final report confronted the absence of prior policy. In a special section named *Guiding Principles for Federal Architecture* it was explained a new, more quality-conscious federal attitude toward architecture, one that would lead directly to a mandate for fine art in public buildings. The Guiding Principles proposed revitalizing governmental architecture through a three-point architectural policy:

1. Distinguished building design should be acquired from the finest American architects;
2. No official governmental style should be allowed to develop;

⁹⁶ Ibid.

⁹⁷ Wetenhall, John, *A Brief History of Percent-for-Art in America*, Public Art Review, Fall/Winter, St. Paul 1993.

3. Attention should be paid to each building site for its location and beauty.⁹⁸

In effect, the Principles proposed to abolish the old system for federal commission that had presumed the Beaux Arts style and had degraded sculpture and mural painting to the ornament status. Originally, the Committee had drafted a fourth guiding principle, which would have required from the government to spend up to the one percent of all buildings construction costs on art. This fourth principle did not appear in the final report only because before publication, General Services Administrator Bernard Boutin (an Ad Hoc Committee member) had already instituted the policy.⁹⁹

In the background of the Guiding Principles lay a heightened awareness in the early 1960s among architectural critics, journalists, and policy makers that urban America had become exceedingly ugly and that federal architecture had set a leading example in that domain. Architectural Forum hailed the Committee for at last confronting the Beaux Arts clique that has banished good architecture from the capital city for many decades. Jane Jacobs book *The Death and Life of Great American Cities* (1961) had already turned a spotlight on the unsightliness of urban America.¹⁰⁰

The GSA activated its new policy in spring 1963, by continuing the commissioning procedures already in place. Suggestions for art still depended on each project architect and the new percent-for-art policy simply protected art from budgetary cut-backs. The architect normally provided a short list of potential artists, which the GSA would pass along to the Commission of Fine Arts¹⁰¹ for non-obligatory selection (normally based on artistic competence, not necessarily on creative ability). The Commission of Fine Arts might even approve the entire list, leaving the choice to the GSA. The selection process was not very rigorous. With the fact that GSA's role in artists selection was effectively subordinated to the architect, the commissioned art varied in type and artistic quality. However, by the 1966, the program was suspended due to the budgetary pressures of the war in Southeast Asia, existing public art controversy, and lack of public interest for art. In the selection process architects were still treating public

⁹⁸ Ibid.

⁹⁹ Ibid.

¹⁰⁰ Ibid.

¹⁰¹ Ibid.

art as simple decoration and public mostly ignored the artworks. Six more years have passed before the public art policy was introduced again but this time with the changed selection procedures.

In 1972, almost 10 years after the first introduction of GSA public art program, President Nixon decided to restore the program and to involve the NEA in the process of commissioning public art for federal buildings. New NEA role included involvement in selection process. GSA put back the percent-for-art policy and with the help of NEA representatives, they had framed a new procedure for artist's selection.¹⁰²

The first step in new procedure was a recommendation of the building's architect concerning location and the main characteristic of artworks proposed for building design. In the next step the NEA would appoint a selection panel consisted of the building's architect, two local residents knowledgeable in the arts and serving as community representatives, two local or regional art professionals, one nationally recognized art professional with experience in public art to serve as chair, and the GSA regional administrator. This panel had to make a list of artistes suitable for this specific GSA project and rank them in order of preference. The initial meeting took place at the project site where panel members discussed the nature of an appropriate art project, potential places for it, and possible artists. At the second meeting they would be selecting three to five artists and ranked them in order of preference for final selection by the GSA administrator. At the final meeting they reviewed the artistes' proposals. This new selection model essentially entrusted GSA selection process to the NEA independent expert panel. Nevertheless, the final decision on this and all agency matters was still on the GSA administrator.¹⁰³ About the type of the commissioned art the best testify a fact that one of the first GSA's commission approved under new procedure was monumental modern sculpture Flamingo from Alexander Calder, intended for the Federal Center in Chicago.

3.1.2. NEA – Art in Public Places Program

The second governmental program important for development of public art in United States had been the Art in Public Place organized and administered by the

¹⁰² Ibid.

¹⁰³ Harriet Senie, *The Tilted Arc Controversy: Dangerous Precedent?*, University of Minnesota Press 2001.

National Endowments for Art. At the time of the program inauguration its mission was to provide opportunity for the promotion of the democratic participation in the process of selecting and placing public art works in order to prevent prevalence of private interests in designing of public space.¹⁰⁴ From the start NEA APP (Art in Public Place) took part in the variety of different programs, from *the assistance in the acquiring the decoration for federal buildings, to the collaborative projects with cities and divers public organizations*, in order to commission a large scale abstract sculptures (Calder, Moore, Picasso or Dubuffet) usually for the central city's plazas and parks. In the majority of the cases the main NEA responsibility was that through APP program *provide communities and organizations professional consultancy and support in selection process as well as partial grants for the implementation of the project*. NEA selection panels in majority were consisted from experts, artists and curators, but also representatives of local communities. Normally, panel would propose list of artists and possible artworks to representatives of local community, which would make a final decision and be the legal owner of the artwork. The recurrent problem of legitimacy prompted the NEA to choose to intervene in commissions only as a partner in artistic initiatives developed on local level and to renounce both total sponsorship and ownership of the work.¹⁰⁵

One of the first NEA projects, which is commonly considered as a turning point in the contemporary public art history in the United States, is a sculpture of Alexander Calder for Grand Rapids, Michigan.

In the late sixties local government of Grande Rapids started with reconstruction of city's centre in order to make city more attractive for future investors. It was decided that in old downtown had to be constructed new businesses and cultural centre and that central city square have to be animated with the public art. Local officials turned to the NEA, which assisted in the selection process and helped them to apply for a federal grant.¹⁰⁶ City officials agreed with the NEA propositions and chose the sculpture of Calder, distinct modernist sculptor, to emblemize a central city plaza.

The sculpture was named *La Grande Vitesse* and was inaugurated in 1969. Public

¹⁰⁴ Ibid.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid.

¹⁰⁶ The total cost of the project was 127 900 dollars and most of that amount was raised locally. In: Cruikshank, Jeffrey L. and Korza, Pam, *Going Public: A field guide to developments in art in public places*, Arts Extension Service, Amherst 1988.

reactions were very bad in the start, even hostile, but eventually sculpture was accepted and today represents a symbol of the city. Its silhouette adorns mayor's stationery as well as city's sanitation trucks.

Even though La Grande Vitesse, but also all other commissioned sculptures in that period, was remarkable and, we may say, well-integrated artwork, it was still, in its essence, just magnified studio work placed in the public space and rarely intended for that particular place. Critics of this public art concept were describing these kinds of public sculptures as the *plop art* - sculpture just plopped in the central city plazas. This approach to the public sculpture was heavily criticized by the prominent modernistic artists like Henry Moore who even one time stated that these works looked like "*costume jewelry pinned on the building as an afterthought*".¹⁰⁷

Furthermore, NEA public art sculptures and collection were often accused of not having a public dimension. One of the most repeated commentaries was that NEA public art was more related to the art history than to the city and its cultural history. Nevertheless, this relation to the art history was in the spirit of declared NEA's main goal of that period "*to give the public access to the best art of our times outside museum walls*". In this way NEA was trying to honor America's greatest artists by giving them a chance to place their art in the public spaces. All these artworks were just monuments which represented only author's personal style and without any pretension to be symbols of the society. The only discourse in that time regarding the public art was centered mostly on the artistic style rather than on public values. In that sense, all public art projects from that time were just reflecting dominant modernistic concept of reality and art separation.

This approach and an understanding of public art were also reflected in original NEA commission procedure, consisted of three simple steps – selection, commission from artists and the placement of artwork in a public area. In this process NEA was in charged for the selection process and an appointment of the selection comity composed of experts and city representatives. The main criteria for awarding a grant were specific qualities of a proposed site as well as participation of various civic organizations in the arts initiative support. Sometimes, one of the NEA's responsibilities was also to assist

¹⁰⁷ Ibid.

local communities in application for federal funding.¹⁰⁸

While an inauguration of the Art in Public Places program signified that for the first time contemporary art left the museum in full force, in many aspects this program still had a limited conception of the public. In other words, audience was simply not addressed in the selection process of artworks for outside display. Expert panels made these decisions, which in most of the cases made obvious that public art was conceived along the same lines as modern museum art - as the creation of individual artists.¹⁰⁹ From today's distance, this early NEA's model of public art commission may be regarded artistically and politically naïve. In its essence it resembled more to the imperious model of museum curator than that of the public agency.

The seventies and an emergence of the new artistic movements brought some changes and adjustments in the definition of public art. As a consequence of these artistic experimentations, in 1974, the NEA added the stipulation that *public art should be appropriate to a given site*. Thus, public art began to move away from the monumental *plop art* that was often seen at odds with its context, and adopted any permanent medium including earthworks, environmental art, and non-traditional art like artificial lighting.¹¹⁰ Site-specific works appeared are poised to engage audiences through the more direct means in its increasing attention was focused on historical, ecological, and sociological aspects of sites. However, as Suzanne Lacy points out, the site-specific public art usually only addressed such issues metaphorically, and continued to replicate the museum experience.¹¹¹

However, all these adjustments didn't change the NEA selection process, which remained curatorial in its nature. One of the most common commentaries on the NEA Art in Public Place program is that its expert's panels have a problem how to make distinction between the public art and the gallery art. As Roland Lee Fleming in his text *Public Art for Public* comments until the end of the APP program existence the NEA

¹⁰⁸ Harriet Senie, *The Tilted Arc Controversy: Dangerous Precedent?*, University of Minnesota Press 2001.

¹⁰⁹ Alex Baker, *Public Art in Critical Perspective*, <http://astro.ocis.temple.edu/~ruby/aaa/alex.html>, retrieved: March 21, 2007.

¹¹⁰ Lacy, Suzanne, Cultural Pilgrimages and Metaphoric Journeys. In: *Mapping the Terrain : New Genre Public Art*, Ed. Suzanne Lacy, Bay Press, Seattle 1995, pp. 19-50.

¹¹¹ Ibid.

“pitted romantic notions of the independent artist against the desire of taxpayers to obtain understandable art for their tax dollars”.¹¹²

3.1.3. *The Tilted Arc*

Having in mind all previously stated, and especially that this system of federal patronage of art managed by the NEA expert’s panels was dominant almost until the middle of the eighties, it comes as no surprise that from the beginning many of the public art projects commissioned either by GSA or NEA were encountered with negative public response. In many cases local communities and different citizens groups were reacted very loudly against the public art projects commissioned on the base of the art experts recommendations, which usually favored abstraction and avant-garde art, and without any consultation with the local community or explanatory materials and educational programming. One of the most intriguing public art controversy for which were responsible both agencies¹¹³ is the removal of Richard Serra the **Tilted Arc**¹¹⁴ from the Federal Plaza, New York. The exemplary character of this controversy,¹¹⁵ which provoked a torrent of debate, was immediately recognized and went well beyond the limits of the United States where its outcome marked turning point in the contemporary public art development. It was nevertheless depending on the specificity of the place, time, proceedings, artist, work, reception, and a long chain of subsequent interactions, which must be examined in greater detail.

¹¹²Ronald Lee Fleming, Melissa Tapper Goldman, *Public Art for the Public*, Public Intrest, spring 2005, http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m0377/is_159/ai_n13779492, retrieved: June 12, 2008.

¹¹³ GSA commissioned work in collaboration with NEA, which selected and recommended artwork.

¹¹⁴ About this case more in: Harriet Senie, *The Tilted Arc Controversy: Dangerous Precedent?*, University of Minnesota Press 2001; Gregg M. Horowitz, *Public Art/Public Space: The Spectacle of the Tilted Arc Controversy*, *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, Vol. 54, No. 1. Winter, 1996, pp. 8-14.; Caroline Levine, *The Paradox of Public Art: democratic space, the avant-garde, and Richard Serra's "Tilted Arc"*, *Philosophy and Geography*, vol.5, No.1, Carfax Publishing 2002.

¹¹⁵ Tilted Arc was not the first GSA sculpture to get a negative press. In 1966 a mural by Robert Motherwell in Boston proved so controversial that the Art-in-Architecture program was halted for six years. Charles Ginnever's *Protagoras* (1974) in St. Paul was compared to "a potential machine-gun nest" and the "undercarriage of a UFO-type flying saucer;" Noguchi's *Time Landscape* (1975) in Seattle was related to the current pet rock craze; Claes Oldenburg's *Batcolumn* (1976) in Chicago received Senator William Proxmire's Golden Fleece Award for the most outrageous spending of tax dollars; and George Sugarman's *Baltimore Federal* (1978) was perceived as threatening because it "could be used to secrete bombs or other explosive objects. Harriet Senie, *The Tilted Arc Controversy: Dangerous Precedent?*, University of Minnesota Press 2001.

The Jacob Javits Building on Federal Plaza in Lower Manhattan was erected in 1968, at time when GSA Art in Architecture program had been suspended.¹¹⁶ The Javits building was at the time the second largest Federal office building after the Pentagon and housed among other federal agencies the regional offices of the GSA and the US court of International Trade. When the Art and Architecture program was reestablished in 1972, it was decided to commission an artwork to be installed on the Plaza in front of the main entrance. According to the established agency procedure, the commissioning process began with the building's architect recommendations to include a sculpture in the plaza. In the next phase NEA appointed three member selection panel. At the beginning of 1979, this panel decided to appoint Richard Serra to do a sculpture.

Richard Serra was already established artist who in that time made a transition in his work from an ephemeral installations in loft and no man lands on which he worked during the 60s, to the site-specific permanent installations exposed in urban sites in the 70s. The main characteristic of his art has been notion of the site-specificity, understood as a specific situation in which every artwork depend on the characteristics of the place for which it was created. However, Serra did *not understand this relation as one of the integration but as one of criticism and transformation on aesthetics and physical plane.*

Selection process was followed by two year evaluation period in which Serra addressed all GSA concerns about his design referring to lightening, placement, maintenance and so forth, until his proposition for the sculpture was accepted by the agency offices in New York and Washington. It is important to underline that officials gave its permission only after they were completely informed about sculpture's appearance and during that process Serra was following all their demands.

In 1981 the Tilted Arc, sculpture composed of tilted cylinder sections crossing the Plaza, was finally installed. Just as many other public art commissions, soon after the installation, the work met the immediate opposition. The GSA received a bulk of letters against the sculpture and there were organized even petitions for its removal.¹¹⁷

¹¹⁶ There is a controversy over one earlier commission for Boston, mural by Robert Motherwell named Elogy.

¹¹⁷ In contradiction to the guidelines for the installation of public sculpture under the Art for Architecture program no measures were taken to prepare and facilitate the local reception of the Arc.

Nevertheless, gradually, these initial negative reactions were died down.¹¹⁸ Critical receptions of the sculpture in the press as well as in the artistic circles were mixed. At one occasion in 1983, local employers were interviewed about sculpture and many of them were puzzled or even disturbed by the sculpture.

For understanding of the whole problem about the Tilted Arc it is important to consider the fact that in a period since the commission to the installment, political conditions were largely changed. In that period there was a change of public personnel as well as of the procedure in the GSA. In the same time *public art emphasis was also changed from art history to public and community issues*. Taking into the consideration this change of emphasis, the new procedure instituted more extensive community involvement, but still it could not be employed retroactively. In these circumstances, in 1984 William Diamond was appointed as the GSA regional administrator for the city New York. His appointment marked an opening of the public controversy concerning the Tilted Arc. From the start of his mandate he was trying, though, unsuccessfully to find alternative places, in and around New York, to dislocate the sculpture. However, whenever he was speaking about necessity for the sculpture's displacement he pointed out that he is not censoring art and he is not against the sculpture from aesthetic reasons. His main concern was destructive effect that sculpture had on social function of the Federal Plaza.¹¹⁹ Diamond initiative in promoting recall it was seen as consistent with the general policy of Reagan's administration of enhancing state and local control.

In March 1985 Diamond organized and presided at public hearing concerning the dislocation of the Tilted Arc. For the hearing he nominated a panel with two members from the GSA. This panel had to evaluate results of the testimony of 180 witnesses. From the 180 witnesses a 120 were against the sculpture relocation and only 60 were in favor, but in spite of fact that quantitative results of the hearing were against the removal, the panel recommendation was in favor of sculpture relocation, and its decision was confirmed by the GSA Washington general administrator. In the next phase Diamond superior, acting administrator in Washington, suggested that professional panel of the

¹¹⁸ Harriet Senie, *Richard Serra's "Tilted Arc": Art and Non Art Issues*, Art Journal Vol48, No.4, College Art Association 1989.

¹¹⁹ Still he placed in the lobby of both federal building on the Plaza petitions for relocation of the sculpture in which was stated that signatories "find no artistic merit in the Serra work". Ibid.

NEA had to determine whether a proposed alternative location will be appropriate place for the sculpture. In 1987, after a conversation with Serra and his explanations about site-specific nature of the sculpture, the NEA panel decided unanimously that sculpture could not be removed without destroying its artistic integrity and intent.

In the same time Serra with determination to protect his sculpture from removal and all kinds of distraction, began a legal battle against the GSA's decision. His main argument was that Tilted Arc as a site-specific work was commissioned and designed for this particular site and as such it can't be relocated. He asserted that removal impinged on his right to free expression (speech) as well as his right to his work be respected. Judges considered that "speech" represented by the Arc was commissioned by state and thus become property of the state. Considering his first amendment argument, court ruled that first amendment protects the freedom of individual to express his views but not a freedom to continue to speak forever. Serra's attempt at resorting to copyright as substitutes for moral right was counteracted by insistence of the copyright office on certain amount of the original artist material. His last attempt was to protect his work under the *Berne convention for the protection of Literally and Artistic Works* but unfortunately, the US Congress rejected the section of the convention regarding moral rights. Nevertheless, when it was finally accepted this convention provided very limited protection for works of art linked with architecture.

In 1989 court dismissed all Serra's claims and ruled in favor of the GSA and sculpture's removal. The same year in the night of march 19 and almost ten years after the commission, and eight after the installment, the Tilted Arc was dismantled from the Federal Plaza and stored in the warehouse in Brooklyn. Tilted Arc case endorse acknowledged conviction that public policy is often enforced by different process which are opened to manipulation by the people who know how system works.¹²⁰

3.1.4. GSA and NEA after the Tilted Arc Case

The Sera case become turning point for the future development of the public art in the United Sates. In the next period change of emphasis in public art as well as in art policy in general, become more then evident. Federal Government lost every interest in

¹²⁰ Ibid.

supporting the arts, and its new standpoint toward art was manifested through great budget cut-backs. The whole process caused by these financial problems and rising conservatism concerning art issues, started with a decrease of collaboration¹²¹ between the NEA and the GSA, until eventually collaboration was ended entirely. Until the end of the nineties from two public programs dedicated to the funding of public art only one succeeded to adapt to new circumstances (GSA, Art in Architecture) and the other has ceased to exist (NEA, Art in Public Spaces).

As we already mentioned erosion of the collaboration between the GSA and the NEA started in the early 80s, parallel with emergence of the Tilted Arc controversy. As a result of the Serra controversy GSA officials became aware that NEA's preference for a curatorial approach was increasingly at odds with the needs of the GSA. In the spring of 1988 the new GSA administration proposed a new set of guidelines, giving a greater control over the selection process to the GSA. Under these recommendations, the GSA appointed three of six panel members and of these three the regional administrator designated two. New panels obligatory had to include community representatives from an outside of arts world. The NEA was still appointing two local or regional art professionals and one nationally recognized art professional with experience in public art, but they had to be previously approved from the director of GSA Arts and Historic Preservation Department.¹²²

Within new procedure the GSA regional administrator had an obligation to chair first panel meeting, and to outline the criteria for the project. He had to provide directions to the panel "*indicating material, design, placement, and style of art to be considered,*" and to prepare the pre-site report. Final decision and complete control over the artist and artwork selection, regarding the commission under \$ 50 000, was on the regional GSA administrator, but before he make a decision all commissions proposals had to be also approved by the Public Building Service Commissioner. This new complicated and localized decision process reflected the Reagan administration's decentralization policies.

In these circumstances the acting director of the NEA Visual Art program observed that the GSA had been acting independently for some time and recommended

¹²¹ It started with Serra case.

¹²² Who now had jurisdiction over the Art-in-Architecture program. Harriet Senie, *The Tilted Arc Controversy: Dangerous Precedent?*, University of Minnesota Press 2001.

that the NEA not participate any more in the process as outlined. In 1989, time of the Tilted Arc decommission, NEA and GSA formally terminated its seventeen years long collaboration. From then on, GSA's Arts and Historic Preservation Department was appointing selection panel, prepared the report of the pre-site meeting led by the regional administrator, and, by matching artists' current selling prices to the art budget, identified appropriate individuals for consideration by the selection panel.¹²³ Under the GSA control selection panels usually included majority of non art professionals and public administrators have more power.

In the nineties GSA Art and Architecture program was under extensive program review. After the review period, in 1997, it was announced the creation of the Historic Buildings and the Arts Center of Expertise, consolidating three existing programs: the Art in Architecture program commissioning public art, the Fine Arts Program managing GSA's entire collection of art, including the nineteenth century and the WPA works, and the Historic Buildings Program concerned with preservation policy, restoration and adaptive reuse issues.¹²⁴ The following year revised program guidelines provided a new focus with roots in the past *"particularly during the first four decades of this century when artists and architects collaborated in the creation of lighting fixtures, gates, elevator doors and surrounds, as well as murals and sculptures."*¹²⁵ Lamenting that *"such collaborations and architectural ornamentation were eliminated in the post-World War II architectural design"*¹²⁶ the new guidelines sought a return to this architecture based practice. This new Art in Architecture Program strives for a holistic integration of art and architecture. Through a collaboration - from initial concept through construction - among artist, architect, landscape architect, engineer lighting specialist, and practitioners of other disciplines can work as a team to create new expressions of the relationship between contemporary art and federal architecture.

The same as the GSA Art in Architecture program, NEA was also suffered a great number of changes in the nineties which eventually led to cancellation of the Art in

¹²³ Ibid.

¹²⁴ Ibid.

¹²⁵ Robert A. Peck, Commissioner, Memorandum for Regional Administrators, "Changes to the Art in Architecture Program," March 15, 1998, quoted in Harriet Senie, *The Tilted Arc Controversy: Dangerous Precedent?*, University of Minnesota Press 2001.

¹²⁶ Ibid.

Public Places program.

Although, there was no centralized public art policy in the United States, from its inception the NEA was perceived as a federal program providing an umbrella for arts. In the early eighties, before the Serra incident, NEA was a strong and powerful organization, but with the arrival of Reagan's administration and the change of political climate its power became to weaken.¹²⁷ In spite of the fact that NEA was threatened with budget cuts all throughout the 80s, for a long period funding remained unchanged but as a result of inflation the cuts started to increase. Officially campaign against the NEA started in 1985 (the year of Diamond's hearing), when three Republican Congressman criticized the NEA for supporting 'pornographic poetry' and accused its peer panels of 'cronyism' and a conflict of interests. By the 1989 (the year Tilted Arc was removed) the NEA was embroiled in the "culture wars" that appeared to have replaced the Cold War. It was sharply attacked by representatives of the religious right for supporting exhibitions that featured Andres Serrano's colored Cibachromes of Christian images soaked in urine and Robert Mapplethorpe's black and white photographs of homosexual acts. As result of these complains congressional scrutiny increased, and the NEA was asked for a formal review of its selection process.¹²⁸

In these circumstances the NEA was also took a revision of its main objectives in the domain of public art which resulted in change of accent from the site -specific projects to the projects focused on community participation and education through the public art. It is important to emphasize that this kind of revisions were not something unusual for the NEA, because from its beginnings the NEA was always trying to be in the line with shifting paradigms in the art world. Since the sixties the NEA changed its objectives in domain of public art at least three times. As we already mentioned, in the sixties the main objective was artistic merit, ten years later great importance got site-specificity which in the nineties was finally extended on projects addressing the social situation of the site and community involvement. New enlarged and community oriented NEA definition of public art paved the way to the canceling the Art in Public Places Program. In 1991 in response to the recent Congressional budget cuts and complaints

¹²⁷ Ibid.

¹²⁸ Ibid.

from selection panels the NEA proposed combining the Art in Public Spaces and the Visual Artists Forums categories of funding. By this decision NEA chose *to emphasize more on education and dialogue and started to support more community related projects dealing with social problems and multiculturalism*. In this way after over more than two decades, the NEA finally abandoned its support for the independent object sculpture in favor of a more inclusive and collaborative approach to the creation of public art.

Both the rise and decline of the public art support were products of the Republican administrations. Like most policy shifts, they were directly related to the economy. In the only campaign statement that he made on the arts, Reagan compared them to sports that he thought did just fine without government subsidies (although stadium construction and repairs are routinely supported by public money and their design is not matter of public participation).¹²⁹

3.2. Public Art on Local Level

In spite of all problems and restrictions of the federal support for the public art in recent time, public art continues to be one of the most developing fields of art patronage in the US. One of the main reasons for its continuing popularity is that large number of municipalities considers public art as a good mean to improve their urban identity and image, but also as a tool for economic revitalization of decaying areas, at time when businesses and inhabitants are leaving central city's areas for the suburbs.

Today, there are more than three hundred public art programs across the US using public money for supporting either occasional public art projects or ongoing public art programs. These programs are initiated by the different kind of governmental agencies at the municipal, county or at the state level, including also specific public agencies such as transportation or national and state park services. Majority of these programs are financed through the percent for art mechanisms. However, in recent time some

¹²⁹ Cynthia Koch, The Contest for American Culture: A Leadership Case Study on The NEA and NEH Funding Crisis, Online Journal of Discourse Leaderships, <http://www.upenn.edu/pnc/ptkoch.html>, retrieved : June 21, 2008.

municipalities actively encourage public-private partnerships and efforts of private and non-governmental agencies creating art in public places.

In next section we will examine some of the most interesting and innovative public art programs and funding mechanisms on local and regional level in the US, as well as some planning issues concerning public art.

3.2.1. Financing Mechanisms

Public funds are commonly designated for public art in one of the four ways:

- Appropriations on the project by project basis
- Appropriation in the form of line items in an administering budget
- Percent for art legislation or ordinances
- Funding public art through the redevelopment process (public-private partnerships)

In addition to these enlisted funding mechanisms some municipalities instituted their own specific funding mechanisms. These mechanisms include variety of innovative solutions such as: a motel/hotel tax, lottery and special industry taxes and bond issue.¹³⁰

3.2.1.1. Public Art as a budget item

This funding mechanism is not widespread in the United States and it is practiced only in special circumstances when no other source of funding is available. One of the situations in which this mechanism comes into play is when a local community or public agency is too small to implement the percent for art mechanism because it could not yield enough funds to create a reasonable public art program. One of these cities is Kent in Washington State, which tackled this issue in a very original way.

By the City Council's decision city of Kent is designating 2\$ per budget year for every city inhabitant for capital improvement projects from the city's general budget to be placed in the city art fund and used for commissioning of public art. By contrast to other budget funds, money from the Art Fund can be carried over from year-to-year and

¹³⁰ Cruikshank, Jeffrey L. and Korza, Pam, *Going Public: A field guide to developments in art in public places*, Arts Extension Service, Amherst 1988.

pooled for support of larger projects. One of the positive aspects of this regulation is that Art Commission can use these funds freely because funding is not tied with building constructions.¹³¹

3.2.1.2. Percent for art

One of the oldest and the most popular ways to finance public art programs on local and regional level is through the percent for art allocations. First percent for art ordinance in the United States on local level was passed by the city of Philadelphia in 1959 as a part of its scheme for the urban revitalization. The ordinance codified an existing policy of the Philadelphia Redevelopment Authority which, since the late 1950s, had included a clause in contracts for reconstruction projects that required 1 % of the construction budget to be allocated for the fine art. This contract allowed a broad interpretation of the fine arts. In addition to the traditional sculpture and murals, fine arts included such amenities as foundations, textured walls, mosaics, pools, tiled columns, patterned pavement, grillwork, and other ornamentation. According to its originator, Michael von Moschzisker, Chairman of the Redevelopment Authority, the program endowed public spaces with the particular identities. Von Moschziskers percent-for-art requirement was neither in service of supporting the work of artist nor a subsidy for the modern art, but just a program in public interest which main aim was to accentuate the distinctiveness of the downtown Philadelphia.¹³²

Local Artists Equity Association were lobbying for extension of this municipal ordinances on percent-for-art requirement for all structures as diverse as offices, bridges, and city gates. Besides traditional murals and sculpture this extension also included a sculptural decoration, stained glass, and fountains. Nevertheless, nothing in the legislation particularly advocated the modern art and, in fact, the most clamorous Artists Equity sponsors were old-school practitioners of academic art. As implemented, the ordinance produced a variety of sculptures in public places, many of them figurative, some abstract. Most were small-scale pieces by local artist that, however pleasant, could hardly have any national importance. In short, it was an urban enhancement measure

¹³¹ Barbara Goldstein, *Public art by the book*, University of Washington Press, Seattle and London 2005.

¹³² Wetenhall, John, *A Brief History of Percent-for-Art in America*, Public Art Review, Fall/Winter, St. Paul 1993.

which in the same time offered benefits to the local art community.¹³³

Baltimore followed Philadelphia example and in 1964 established a municipal percent for art policy. Few years later in 1967 the same did San Francisco and after that many other cities followed. Some of the States also supported percent-for-art measures, starting with Hawaii in 1967, Washington in 1974, and succeeded by many others during the late 1970s and 1980s.¹³⁴ Today, after the almost 50 years from the introduction of the first percent for art regulation there is more than 300 cities, counties, states, and other governmental bodies that have adopted the percent for art regulations. Some of them like Fort Lauderdale, Dallas, San Francisco and San Jose have even increased the requirements up to 1.5 or 2%.¹³⁵ Majority of these cities claimed that the main reason for an adoption of the percent for art legislation and ensuing policies is that percent for art ordinance enable creative approaches and solutions for citywide integration of arts in public space.

In the next section I will try to present what are the main parts and definitions that one typical percent for art ordinance document have to include. For that purpose it will be assessed the main characteristic of the percent for art regulations for the City of Seattle and the Washington State as well as some new and improved regulations adopted by the Miami Dade County and the City of Phoenix. Furthermore, special accent will be laid on improvements that these ordinances introduced to the traditional percent for art model.

As we already know, typical percent for art law stipulates that a certain percentage of the costs for the construction or renovation of public building or site (or a capital improvement project) will be set aside for an artwork. Until recent past, most of the percent for art legislation in the US has been aimed only at the commissioning function and all other considerations such as administration of the project and later maintenance issues were not defined in the text of the regulation. In brief, main elements and definitions that every percent for art ordinance have to include are:

1. Purpose of the ordinance (why public art);
2. Definitions of words that may cause confusion, such as commission, pooling, etc;

¹³³ Ibid.

¹³⁴ Ibid.

¹³⁵ Public Art Network of Americans for the Arts,
http://www.artsusa.org/networks/public_art_network/default_004.asp.

3. Definitions regarding the legal use of the percent for art funds;
4. Responsibilities of the Commission Authority;
5. Foundation of the special Municipal Arts Funds –where are deposited all funds collected through the percent for art program.

However, many difficulties and implementation problems that have troubled the percent for arts programs in the early years were just a result of the initial legislation limitations, characterized by the lack of goals and specificity, restrictions on the use of funds, and an inadequate consideration of the ramifications of the programs such as long-term care of the art, as well as community education, which ensure the collection vitality and value.¹³⁶ Specificity and the precise definitions regarding the legal use of the percent for art funds are desirable in defining the elements of the law such as: the creation of funds for the program, the eligible source of funds, the eligible use of funds, the actual percentage to be allocated, from what base costs the percent figure is derived and how art allocations will be reserved and carried over from year to year.¹³⁷

Besides that, it is also very important to well define where lies the fiscal and administrative responsibilities, what are the main responsibilities of the Art Commission Agency as well as what is its authority in administering the program.

In next pages I will tackle just some of the enlisted problems:

- Use of the funds
- Founding sources
- Administration, maintenance and educational cost; and
- Administrative authority

Use of the funds - pooling of funds

In practice it has been shown that sometimes unnecessary restrictions in the law, such as limiting the use of funds to the site that generates them, or just vague and imprecise definitions, might pose problems and limited use of the percent for art funds.

¹³⁶ Cruikshank, Jeffrey L. and Korza, Pam, *Going Public: A field guide to developments in art in public places*, Arts Extension Service, Amherst 1988.

¹³⁷ Ibid.

One of the recurrent problems is that many logical sites for the public art activity cannot be addressed because they do not have renovation or construction planned or they just cannot generate enough money for the public art project. In the same time some other places eligible for the capital construction project that could generate the percent for art funds are considered as an inappropriate for the public art. In recent times as the best way to eliminate these restrictions is considered adoption of the *pooling of the funds* measure¹³⁸. **Pooling** is a mechanism that eliminates the restriction by which work of art must be limited to the actual site generating the funds. It allows percent funds generated at one site to be expanded at one or more other sites (but usually limited to the department originating the funds) and allows the arts agency to begin to consider the city as a whole. Pooling as an original approach to collection funds for public art projects was an important concept which is for a first time incorporated in the 1983 revised public art ordinance for the Washington State Arts Commission.¹³⁹

As it is stated in the supplement text for this ordinance, adoption of this new measure will “*aggregate the funds eligible for use on any public building or land, enable Arts Commission to address sites and situations which had major public access and visibility, served a social or environmental need, or were responsive to artists’ concepts for new works of public art and to better develop a public art program which considered the public as critical criterion*”.¹⁴⁰ One of the first public art project realized on account of Washington’s new pooled public art fund were the four major projects developed due to funds collected through the Department of Correction’s percent for arts. One of the project provided the opportunity for Richard Turner to create a major work called Memory’s Vaults, in the state park, which could not be possible without pooled funds because state parks although often have excellent lands and high public visibility, rarely can generate significant art funds.

The Washington example revealed the immense possibilities of the pooling funds and many local authorities in the US (in the UK also) today chose to implement this mechanism instead of the old one by which the percent for art funds are tied for one

¹³⁸ Ibid.

¹³⁹ Washington State Ordinance, reprinted in Cruikshank, Jeffrey L. and Korza, Pam, *Going Public: A field guide to developments in art in public places*, Arts Extension Service, Amherst 1988.

¹⁴⁰ Ibid.

construction or department that generates them. However, some cities adopted only limited polling regulations. For example, in Seattle city officials decided that one fund may not benefit another, which means that while general percent for art funds can be pooled within one department, they cannot be used to benefit another department of fund source.¹⁴¹

Founding sources

One of the main restrictions of the early percent for art ordinances was a lack of the precise definitions and clarifications considering what sorts of public constructions and buildings could generate the art percent funds. At time when the first percent for art regulations appeared most of the programs restricted this type of allocations exclusively on the new buildings constructions. However, in recent time many local authorities enlarged existing percent for art regulations to include also renovation projects, often stipulating a certain minimum budget size, although most of the programs are still exclusive of land acquisition.¹⁴²

Seattle is the city that first adopted one of the most inclusive percent for art ordinance that made all cities' capital improvement projects subject to the percent for art requirement. This is not surprising because Seattle has a long tradition of the public art support and one of most innovative and exemplary public art program. Early beginnings of the Seattle public art program originate in the early 50s when was established specialized Seattle Design Commission to review both the public art and the capital projects. In 1968, the city passed the Forward Trust bond issue, which provided funding for the new parks, community centers, roads, bridges, and electrical infrastructures. Few years later in 1973 the City of Seattle established a percent for art program aimed to " *the city accepts a responsibility for expanding public experience with visual art. Such art has enabled people in all societies to better understand their communities and individual lives. A policy is therefore established to direct the inclusion of works of art in public*

¹⁴¹ Seattle Public Art Ordinance, <http://www.seattle.gov/arts/publicart/ordinance.asp>, retrieved: May 29, 2008.

¹⁴² Cruikshank, Jeffrey L. and Korza, Pam, *Going Public: A field guide to developments in art in public places*, Arts Extension Service, Amherst 1988.

works of the city".¹⁴³ As all the other early percent for art ordinances, text of the Seattle ordinance was very restrictive at some issues but in the same time not precise enough in defining the conditions of the program.¹⁴⁴ These limited regulations even prevented the implementation of some innovative project. For that reason during the eighties the Seattle Arts Commission started a campaign for adoption of the amendment on the original percent for art regulation in order to facilitate better use of the collected funds.

In 1992 city finally approved amendments by which exiting regulation was enlarged on all major capital improvements in the city. The main novelty brought by the amendments was that for the first time percent for art regulation encompassed not only city sponsored building constructions and renovations but also all capital improvement connected with the city utilities organizations. This was possible because the City of Seattle owns its own water and electrical utilities, which both construct a large amount of city's infrastructure. Besides the city utilities in the percent for art program were also included all city's mayor construction agencies such as the building and parks departments.¹⁴⁵ The inclusion of the utilities in the Seattle program has made enormous difference in its program. Not only has the Seattle City Lights percent revenues provided about 80% of that program's annual budget, but also some of the most successful collaborations and innovative works have resulted from projects within the utilities' jurisdiction. The utilities have funded many artworks that promoted a sense of community and neighborhood pride in areas where infrastructure was being built.¹⁴⁶

One more novelty brought by the amendments was decision that every artwork commissioned through the Seattle's public art program can either be created as an integral part of a construction project or located at any other city owned site.¹⁴⁷ In City Treasury is established a special fund designated the Municipal Arts Fund into which are deposited all funds collected via percentage for art, together with other funds which the City Council appropriate for works of art for a portable collection. The Office of Arts and

¹⁴³ Barbara Goldstein, *Public art by the book*, University of Washington Press, Seattle and London 2005.

¹⁴⁴ Cruikshank, Jeffrey L. and Korza, Pam, *Going Public: A field guide to developments in art in public places*, Arts Extension Service, Amherst 1988.

¹⁴⁵ Ibid.

¹⁴⁶ Seattle Arts Commission, <http://www.seattle.gov/arts/publicart/default.asp>, retrieved: My 29, 2008.

¹⁴⁷ Cruikshank, Jeffrey L. and Korza, Pam, *Going Public: A field guide to developments in art in public places*, Arts Extension Service, Amherst 1988.

Cultural Affairs manages money from this Fund for projects prescribed by the Municipal Art Plan and any unexpended funds would be carried over for three years.

Seattle Public Art program is considered today as one of the most advanced municipal programs opened for all types of artistic creativity. Program acquires artworks in several categories: major, permanently sited indoor or outdoor artworks, products of team collaborations on overall design of site or major planning project, art in residence program- temporary or media based projects. However, Seattle experience has also demonstrated the fragility of even a well-established public art program. In response to a ratepayer's generated lawsuit a court ruled recently that the program's percent for art funding from Seattle City Light and Seattle Public Utilities must be rescinded. At present the agency is building new relationships to develop artworks with a greater nexus to utilities construction and resource conservation.¹⁴⁸

Administration, maintenance and education costs

As we can see, amendments from the 1992 enabled greater flexibility in the expenditure of funds for the Seattle public art program and many cities tried to emulate its success. However, besides all modifications to the original Seattle percent for art ordinance, in some aspects this ordinance was still not precise enough, which in many cases restricted use of funds. The major problem with Seattle ordinance was a lack of precise specifications for what and in which circumstances a percent for art could be used.

Nevertheless, principal question that could be posed is: if funds are only allowed to be used for commission, how can costs of administration, maintenance, and education – all now recognized as essential to the success of the percent for art programs - be covered? Vagueness in this domain has had a negative effect on the use of the percent funds as well as on a restriction of the funds available for new artworks. In few occasions the Seattle Art Commission tried to interpret more freely regulations in order to retain funds only for the new artworks. In 1980, representatives of the Commission went to the city council to gain funds above and beyond its percent for art revenues for use in

¹⁴⁸ City, Light can't use ratepayers's money to pay for good deeds, Seattlepi.com, Friday, January 19, 2007, http://seattlepi.nwsourc.com/local/300406_citylight19.html, retrieved : May 23, 2008.

managing of the collection. This collection management activity would include administration and maintenance of both percent artworks and non-profit artworks – historic works, gifts, but also educational programs. By the City Council decision administration, maintenance and education were recognized, as the operational costs similar to the park and building maintenance and were prorated and charged to the departmental funding source as a basic expense. Seattle example has shown how much it is important that the text of ordinances is clearly defined especially the issue of for what purpose will be used percent for art funds if agency don't want to be at mercy on whoever interprets that ordinance, city, county or state law departments.

As opposed to this example some of the new percent for art ordinances precisely define for which purpose fund can be used and some of them are even received more than 1% from government-financed construction. these programs define precisely how much money can be spent for what purpose, and what are the allowable administrative expenses and expenses for the maintenance of artworks. In some cases arts commission is obliged to propose specifically how such administrative resources will be made available.

In recent time some percent for arts programs decided to demand that a portion of their percent for art revenues be specifically set for administrative costs. However, one of the major disadvantages of this approach is that the total art funds are diminished. Another possible problem could emerge if the pace of city or state sponsored construction slackens for an extended period, administrative costs will not necessarily decrease, since projects in progress will continue to demand attention. Meanwhile, city officials may have grown accustomed to percent for art paying its own way and conceivably the administrative costs could escalate in relation to the arts costs.

An appropriate solution is that these funds come from some sources outside the percent for art funds. In the case of the City of Phoenix, Arts Commission's administrative funds come from the general fund of the agency. The Commission was told that it could not use the percent for art money to operate the overall program, except on a certain large- budget projects and only with an authorized approval. In a sense, such a restriction on funds may catalyze the release of funds elsewhere in a municipal budget by officially recognized percent for art administrative costs as a part of the agency's base budget.

Washington State Arts Commission sought unsuccessfully (in 1983 revised legislation) to create what they saw as an ideal fiscal structure for the ensuring maintenance funds. A revolving fund would be established, into which all percent for art funds would be pooled and earn interest income, which could be used for the program administration, maintenance, and/or new provisions without dilution of the principal.

The Metro Dade, Art in Public Places ordinance, approached this problem differently. This ordinance put a spending priority on art provision, but also permitted the use of the funds for administrative costs, repair and maintenance. In the plan of Metro Dade it is precisely stated:

“ To extent the total appropriation is not used for the acquisition of works of art for said buildings, the remainder could be used for:

- *Program administration costs, insurance costs or for repair and maintenance of any works of art acquired under this section; or*
- *To supplement other appropriations for the acquisition of works of art under this section or to place work of art in, on, or near government facilities which have already been constructed.”*¹⁴⁹

Requests for such uses are made by the Metro Dade APP staff and must be approved by its governing board, the APP Trust.

A final alternative is to reserve some proportion of the percent for art revenues for maintenance – either on project-by-project or pooled basis. In the long run, the result of this approach is better maintained for smaller collection, unless the overall percent allocation is increased.

Although most of the public art programs are delivering funds for education directly from the percent for art revenues (same as for administration and maintenance), sometimes some of the cities’ administrations have a problem to justify education as element of capital construction. Paradoxically, however, community involvement and education are considered as essential to the administration of the public construction projects, as Director of Phoenix Arts Commission stated, *“education should be funded*

¹⁴⁹ Cruikshank, Jeffrey L. and Korza, Pam, *Going Public: A field guide to developments in art in public places*, Arts Extension Service, Amherst 1988, pp.34-35.

out of the agency's budget as a fundamental administrative cost".¹⁵⁰ For that reason some public art programs are undertaken considerable efforts to program provide special and constants revenues for this purpose.

Metropolitan Arts Commission of Portland amended the county ordinance to add 0.33 percent to the existing 1% allocation to be used for educational activities. The education funds are presently going toward the building the Metropolitan Center for Public Art to be housed within Portland Building. Center will exhibit models of public art projects in progress, murals of the past projects; and related interpretative materials. This centre is a first step in the acknowledging a responsibility for communication with the public.¹⁵¹

Administrative Authority

Given the multiplicity of the public agencies involved in some percent for art programs, one of the most important questions is what the most effective administrative structure is. This also entails the question how to minimize bureaucratic complication and simplify financial transactions as well.

The 1983 revised version of the Washington State Arts Commission's percent legislation addressed these questions by consolidating all administrative responsibilities of the program under the Arts Commission. It clearly establishes the Arts Commission as the agency with authority to implement the legislation, including:

- The right to ensure artistic advice for state collection
- The right to determine project and sites, including these affected by pooling of funds
- The right to contract directly with artists and with other agencies on an interagency agreement basis, to assure their compliance with the terms of contract between the artists and the Arts Commission.

¹⁵⁰ Ibid. pp.35-36.

¹⁵¹ Ibid.

These responsibilities are always executed by WSAC in consultation with other involved state agencies.

As we can see specificity is desirable in defining elements of the percent for art legislation, however procedures and guiding principles for administering the program are best left generally stated in ordinance to allow flexible approaches to site and artist selection.

3.2.1.3. Public-Private Partnerships

One of the new developments in the public art is a considerable growth of the public-private partnerships throughout the United States. While state and local agencies still provide a great impetus and muscle for public art projects, the percent for art funds cannot always be stretched to finance all innovative or ambitious projects. Public officials have begun to see that the responsibility for creating successful public spaces must be shared by both the public and the private sectors.

This new approach has allowed a broader spectrum of the public art projects. Various methods and incentives have been put forward for harnessing private development monies for public art programs. Most notable methods of the private-public cooperation in developing of public art projects are:

1. *Public –private programs based on collaboration between public development or redevelopment agencies and private developers usually in the framework of the private redevelopment programs; and*
2. *New models for support of public art through the application of zoning requirements and incentives.*

Public Art as a part of Redevelopment Projects

From the early 60s and an emergence of the urban crises, for the most of the US cities first step in dealing with urban problems has been to establish an agency dedicated to the redevelopment of the designated sites or areas. In 1960s these agencies tended to take a broad-brush approach to the decaying areas, often clearing the whole neighborhoods in the name of urban renewal. Since that time, and especially with the rise of more community oriented urbanism in the seventies and eighties, redevelopment

efforts have become increasingly focused and sophisticated and it was only a matter of time before innovative arts agencies and city administrations began to link municipal development and arts policies.

Philadelphia was the first city that connected redevelopment issues with the public art through the introduction of the percent for art policy by its Redevelopment agency. Philadelphia example was followed by the Los Angeles's Redevelopment agency, which in the early 60s started to support and organize public art projects, although a formal public art policy (and percent for art legislation) was not established until the middle of the eighties.

In 1979 the Sacramento Housing and Redevelopment agency enacted a series of resolutions designated "*to promote the aesthetic improvements of the city Sacramento to the fullest possible*". This resolution established an art in public space program and stipulated that at least 2 percent of total actual constructions costs of all agency directed building projects had to be expended on aesthetic improvements. Sacramento redevelopment agency for the program subcontracted the Sacramento Metropolitan Arts Commission for the management of its art in public spaces program. This program placed an emphasis on flexibility and early interactions between art administrators and potential developers.¹⁵²

Los Angeles – Downtown Art in Public Places Program

One of the most innovative and successful public art programs in the United States is the Downtown Art in Public Places Program, initiated by the Los Angeles Community Redevelopment Agency (CRA)¹⁵³ in 1985, for three downtown redevelopment project areas the Bunker Hill, Central Business District and Little Tokyo. Ten years later, with the adoption of the 1993 Public Art policy, the CRA/LA expanded this program to include the CRA/LA redevelopment areas throughout the city. The CRA public art program is a unique program that requires from developers to include arts and culture in their redevelopment projects and to fund cultural enhancement of their communities. The

¹⁵² Cruikshank, Jeffrey L. and Korza, Pam, *Going Public: A field guide to developments in art in public places*, Arts Extension Service, Amherst 1988, p.39.

¹⁵³ The Community Redevelopment Agency of City of Los Angeles is a public agency established to attract private investment into economically depressed communities, eliminate slums, abandoned or unsafe properties and blight throughout LA. <http://www.crala.net/>.

main mission of the CRA public art policy has been to promote LA downtown area as cultural center through the support and creation of programs, facilities, and public artworks across a range of different artistic expressions.

As it is stated in the policy document the main goals of the program are defined as:

- To revitalize neighborhoods;
- To provide public art well integrated into the city's fabric;
- To involve artists in planning efforts;
- To assure that artist from diverse cultural, ethnic, gender and regional backgrounds are engaged in public art activity.¹⁵⁴

The final approval of the Downtown Art in Public Places Program was preceded by the years of extensive preparation and research of public art programs across the US and consultancy with experts who helped to shape innovations of the CRA's public art policy. Two public art programs that influenced the final version of CRA's public art policy were public art programs of cities Seattle and Sacramento.¹⁵⁵

From the content of the LA policy it is obvious that CRA's consultants carefully studied the Seattle Arts Commission Study of Public Art for certain downtown districts which is still considered as one of the best models of a firm policy commitment and a clear statement of art program goals. Similar to the Seattle public art program, CRA's goals statement emphasizes its commitment to the high quality and diverse art in public spaces program, integrated in the city's fabric and daily lives of the inhabitants.¹⁵⁶ What is the most important, the Seattle public art policy is one of the first that actively encouraged collaborative efforts and participation of women and minority groups, which is stated as one of the main goals in the LA policy also. Finally, both polices encourage, a variety of art forms: temporary and permanent, object and event, single or dispersed locations.

¹⁵⁴ CRA / LA Agency, Art Program, http://www.crala.net/internet-site/Other/Art_Program/upload/Art%20Policy%202005%20-%20AMENDMENT%20-2007.pdf, retrieved: May 2008.

¹⁵⁵ Cruikshank, Jeffrey L. and Korza, Pam, *Going Public: A field guide to developments in art in public places*, Arts Extension Service, Amherst 1988, pp.40-43.

¹⁵⁶ Ibid.

Besides the obvious influence of the Seattle public art program CRA's policy also in many aspects drew upon the Sacramento model and experience. In one recent interview Anri Sicora, in that time senior policy planner for the central business district of LA, stated that *“of all reviewed municipal and redevelopment agency's programs, Sacramento model was the most carefully structured to really **accomplish early integration of the arts component** into potential redevelopment project”*.¹⁵⁷ For him unlike Philadelphia's, Sacramento's program recognized the reality of the project evolution from tentative to final developer selection and potential for the significant changes in both project scope and design. This aspect of the Sacramento plan is very important because it acknowledges that in reality although some developers remain flexible on design, program, and even on the selected architect well past execution of the Disposition and Development agreement, in the beginning many got stuck with concepts which narrow the range of options for integrating art. It is never too early for agency staff, even during the explanatory discussions, to introduce goals of the arts program, artist's selection options, and a clear, firm statement of developer's procedural and fiscal obligations in a project.¹⁵⁸

Today, the LA program is considered as one of the best ongoing redevelopment programs that accomplished to successfully integrate art into the earliest stages of the proposed private financed development project.

One of the main innovations introduced by the CRA Public Art policy is an enlarged definition of public art. Within the CRA policy it stated that there is a diverse set of possibilities in the way that public art can be manifested:

- On site art in public spaces;
- On site cultural programming;
- On site art spaces and cultural facilities.¹⁵⁹

¹⁵⁷ Ibid.

¹⁵⁸ Ibid.

¹⁵⁹ CRA / LA Agency, Art Program, http://www.crala.net/internet-site/Other/Art_Program/upload/Art%20Policy%202005%20-%20AMENDMENT%20-2007.pdf, retrieved: May 2008.

In the policy, on site art projects are defined as broadly as possible from sculpture, to media art such as film, sound, to fixtures such as gates, streetlights. Within on-site cultural programming different types of programs are included: performances, literature, art education, special events (festivals) and even certain type artist in residence program. Maybe the most interesting is that cultural facilities as gallery, exhibitions space, arts education facilities, are also included in the public art definition.¹⁶⁰ In the case of facilities construction these places are available to the nonprofit institutions either through equity ownerships or a long term lease as in the case of the LA Museum of Contemporary Art. As we can see, unlike the publicly funded percent for art programs, which often legally restricts the use of funds to the creation of the artworks with specified life (e.g. 40 years), such privately funded projects are exempt from such restrictions and may contract to more ephemeral projects and events. The CRA recognized that public art need not always to be material or permanent.

The CRA Art in Public Places program included also some improvements in traditional percent for art policy. CRA percent for art policy requires that at least 1% of private development costs (total project costs exclusive of land acquisition) for new commercial and multi family developments be allocated by the developer to support such creation of cultural programs, public art projects and cultural facilities in LA Downtown area. By this policy it is funded special Cultural Trust Fund in which all funds collected through the 1% are deposited. However, specificity brought by this program is that each private developer has the option of choosing to implement its percent for art obligation through two different types of public art projects: *developer initiated projects* (public art project or cultural facilities within private developments) and the *Cultural Trust projects*. In the case that developers chose option to conduct public art project by themselves with the CRA participation, they must obligate at least 1% of development cost to developing a project art plan. Very low, low, moderate income-housing units, and historic rehabilitation projects are exempted from this rule. Policy states that at least 40 percent of the developer obligation must go into the corresponding redevelopment project area Cultural Trust Fund and other 60 percent must be used for on site programming or up to 100% in the case of cultural facility construction. The second option that developer can

¹⁶⁰ Ibid.

choose is to make an exclusive 0,8 percent Trust Fund donation (and thereby eliminate on-site artwork).¹⁶¹

The Trust Fund, one of the innovations of the CRA policy, is funding mechanism which aggregates portions of the individual private, site-specific percent for art requirements and redistributes these funds to finance cultural programs and art projects in downtown locations beyond these new private projects which generate the art funds. The Trust Fund is a means of financing and sitting artworks or programs that otherwise are infeasible, such as in neighborhoods without private investments or where development projects are too small or exempt from the DAPPP. Controversial or technically innovative artist initiated proposals usually avoided by developers are specifically encouraged. Art project funded by the Trust Fund are administered by the CRA and may occur anywhere within the redevelopment zone.¹⁶²

As we already stated, in the case that private developer chooses to conduct a public art project on the redevelopment site he is obliged to make a public art plan together with the CRA public art consultant in order to assure quality of the project. As one of the main goal stated in the CRA public art policy is *inclusion of artist from early stage of the project*. CRA emphasizes that the art component of project have to be planned before the construction of the overall project begins. The preliminary art budget is based on the estimated project costs. However, final project costs is higher then the costs figure used for preliminary art budget, an art budget must be increased to equal 1% of actual total costs. Early estimates of an art budget allow serious consideration of program options.¹⁶³ This facilitates the early selection and involvement of the artists in the design process.

Additional considerations for developers given through the CRA/Art in public space program guidelines define public art selection process, which would ensure that projects would both respond to the needs of a given site and community as well as to the high artistic standards of the Art in Public Spaces Program. The Trust Fund enables flexibility and experimentation in CRA's own public art efforts, for example in allowing the initiation of project by artists and community members.

¹⁶¹ Ibid.

¹⁶² Cruikshank, Jeffrey L. and Korza, Pam, *Going Public: A field guide to developments in art in public places*, Arts Extension Service, Amherst 1988, pp.40-43.

¹⁶³ Ibid.

Since the project inception in 1985 more than 30 projects have moved through the Downtown Art in Public Spaces process, although one third of these were initiated before adoption of the policy. This public art program has brought an impressive number of physical artworks and cultural programs in addition to the construction of cultural facilities throughout development areas in Los Angeles.

However, besides the accomplished success CRA consultants met up with two major procedural constraints especially in the implementation phase of the projects: lack of guarantee for early artists' involvement in design phase and problems concerning the organization of technical assistance for artists inexperienced in public art.¹⁶⁴

As it was shown in practice, developers are resistant to deal with art in the early stages of the project because in contrast with architecture, art does not necessarily secure the funding. However, bad communication between public art administrator and developer in early phase is as Anri Sicora underline a consequence of the developer's hope to leverage minimum expenses to secure a maximum agency commitment, a project design is rarely finalized until extensive discussions have been taken between developer and agency staff.¹⁶⁵ However, in many cases problems with developers were provoked by artist' lack of expertise and familiarity with the large scale or complex design processes. This problem especially become evident with the new policy goals of encouraging a variety of art forms, participation of women and minorities, and using artist as design team members, which has inevitably led to the introduction of players new to the process and unfamiliar with the agency procedure, architectural and engineering terminology, issues of permanence, liability city codes and so on. While one intention of the Trust Fund has been to provide a budget line for technical assistance limited staff resources have not realized the potential of these services.¹⁶⁶

Zoning

Use of the specific zoning regulation for support of public art projects is a new development emerged no more than twenty years ago. Zoning as regulatory tool in the

¹⁶⁴ Ibid.

¹⁶⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶⁶ Cruikshank, Jeffrey L. and Korza, Pam, *Going Public: A field guide to developments in art in public places*, Arts Extension Service, Amherst 1988, pp. 44-49.

city planning appeared together with the modern urbanism. It is used to regulate the use, scale, and form of buildings and land, the density of the development, the height and various other features of the buildings, and the percentage of a given lot that legally can be developed. This percentage is expressed in terms of floor area ratio (F.A.R), which is ratio of the building's floor area to the lot size. Zoning sets limits on the negative consequence of individual development decisions – for example, to minimize the impact of commercial and industrial areas on residential areas. The fundamental difference between redevelopment plans and zoning codes is that redevelopment is based on contractual relationship. Development project carried out under the auspices of a redevelopment program are the result of a consensus reached between developers and public officials. Like redevelopment, zoning encourages people to think about their communities on a large scale and over the long run. But in part because it doesn't provide interaction, zoning has traditionally been a relatively inflexible tool of public money. However in recent time, revisions and applications of the zoning concept have emerged, some of which, appear to be promising as means of supporting public art.

Conventional zoning regulations have been used explicitly to support public art, for example in San Francisco, where the zoning ordinance stipulates that developer must provide for publicly accessible art, just as he must observe setback guidelines, design parameters, and so on as a necessary factor of development.

Another zoning method that is used frequently to encourage public art is *incentive or bonus zoning*. This is a technique whereby a community secures certain amenities (such as public space, space for retail shops) in a development by granting extra income – generating benefits for developer – most often by adjusting the FAR to the developer's advantage. For example, a developer may be permitted to add floors to a structure in exchange for extra open space of community facilities on the property.¹⁶⁷

Recently, a number of communities have used incentive zoning to promote public art. The city of Mountain View, California, encourages public art in development projects in one areas of the city by offering the bonus of an additional 1 000 square feet per acre of floor area.¹⁶⁸ In the same time, Department of Construction and Land Use of city Seattle

¹⁶⁷ Ibid.

¹⁶⁸ Ibid.

requires public art when certain public amenities are incorporated into development project. It is the inclusion of these amenities with the art, which enables a F.A.R. bonus.¹⁶⁹

Portland, Oregon's Metropolitan Arts Commissions has drafted guidelines, which would encourage public art through awarding the bonus FAR. Within Portland's guidelines is requirement for at least 25% of the public art budget associated with the bonus FAR to be contributed to a Public Art Fund for reallocation on behalf of artworks elsewhere in Portland. The Art Commission would administer the public art program and Public Art Fund.¹⁷⁰

However, the most ambitious incentive zoning experiment is underway in Bethesda, Maryland.¹⁷¹ In 1982, the Montgomery County Planning Board approved an amendment to the Bethesda Master Plan designated to support a number of public amenities, including the public art. The zoning code from the 1970s permitted an increase of density in return for community benefits, which were to be negotiated between the Maryland National Capital Park and Planning Commission and developers. A key departure in the new county plan was a concept of the design competition. Numerous developers applied for permission to build in metropolitan area, under the old zoning rules, each proposed development would be considered in isolation. Under the new cooperative zoning application procedure, developers had to enter in competition, and their proposals were judged according to four criteria:

- Uses of residents;
- Enhancement of pedestrian environment;
- Visual and functional effectiveness;
- Provision of management and maintenance organization.

The goal of these zoning tools is to look on the process collectively and not only on isolated cases.

¹⁶⁹ Ibid.

¹⁷⁰ Ibid.

¹⁷¹ Ibid.

3.2.2. Planning Mechanisms

In past three decades many municipalities and local art agencies, inspired by the accomplishments and results of the individual public art projects and programs established by cities such as Seattle and Philadelphia, decided to pass public art ordinance and to start their own programs. However, since a majority of these programs were started without a clear mission and any previous research on public art in local context, it was not surprising that many of them encountered on problems of local community reception, which in the long run impeded further development of the project. In order for public art to receive a higher level of visibility and acceptance it is necessary that it becomes a part of the city's overall planning process. Opportunities for public art can be identified and planned as part of city's overall development rather than on site-by-site basis. Plans for public art should be incorporated into city's long-term capital and economic master plans, community plans and redevelopment initiatives.

By planning early on, the public art program can seed ideas that may require more creative funding and enable early incorporation of public art projects into all new developments programs. One of the first cities that led the way in the practical integration of public art within municipal planning and budgeting process is Seattle.

Seattle has a long history of including the artists and designers in local planning comities. In 1968 city established the Design Commission as consulting body for all urban design issues. In 1984 the Seattle Arts Commission carried out a study with the objective of developing rationale for making site recommendations for the public art project within a network of primary public spaces, in particular the downtown areas. It was the philosophy of the arts commission that it could *“support the city's sense of identity by supporting artworks at these places of social commerce or significant public meaning. Art was commissioned and created in relation to these areas will contribute to the vitality of the city, reach a wider audience and further define a place's significance”*.¹⁷² The research process assessed present and projected landscapes of the Downtown Seattle, as dictated by such factors as transportation patterns, population trends. Specific prospective sites for the public art were also evaluated in terms of these

¹⁷² Cruikshank, Jeffrey L. and Korza, Pam, *Going Public: A field guide to developments in art in public places*, Arts Extension Service, Amherst 1988, p.52.

character and use. Study recognized a changing use of city, the public's expectations about public art, and the vast and changing scope of artistic forms that would force unique solutions to art in public spaces.

During the eighties many cities made similar studies and produced general master plans for public art in order to articulate a broader vision of the public art for specific city's areas but also to integrate public art into the process of the municipal governance. The main purpose of the public art master plan is to define what is the role of art in community and which are community's cultural needs in addition to its physical identity. Comprehensive planning encourages interdisciplinary discussion and collaboration between art commission and other cities agencies, first of all city's development agency. Reasons for undertaking of the planning process can be diverse and largely depend on the local situation but three the most often repeated reasons are:

- To establish public art program itself;
- To provide a comprehensive means of implementing the program mandate;
- To refine an existing program.¹⁷³

However, whatever is the reason for developing the plan, process of producing master plan is based on comprehensive research of local context and finding the answers on questions how public art program have to be structured in order to reflect the unique character of a given area. Because the development and implementation of public art master plan affects a number of interest groups it is important that in planning process are involved all from elected officials, community representatives, key municipal agencies to art community. Based on the review of several master public art plans we can conclude that every plan has to include:

- Goals and community priorities;
- Key locations and opportunities for public art;
- Funding sources and projections;
- Implementation guidelines.

¹⁷³ Barbara Goldstein, *Public art by the book*, University of Washington Press, Seattle and London 2005.

Goals and community priorities

Based on the extensive research of the local history, demography and local master plans, public art agency consultants have to define the main priorities for the local public art development. In the reviewed master plans of the City of Seattle, the Washington State, the Metro-Dade County, CRA and the city of San Diego,¹⁷⁴ as the main goals most often are cited:

- Increase of the public access to the work of art;
- Contribute to the civic pride of the community;
- Ensure early involvement of the artists in the redevelopment project and especially in the urban design project;
- Enhance and preserve local artistic heritage;¹⁷⁵
- Enrich the public environment for both residents and visitors;¹⁷⁶
- Extensive public participation in the public art projects;¹⁷⁷
- Establishment of the new funding mechanism;
- Neighborhood revitalization;¹⁷⁸
- Economic revitalization of specific area such as waterfronts, beaches,¹⁷⁹ airport and etc;
- Enhance city urban design and use public art to promote economic and cultural tourism;
- Providing a new identity for community through the urban redevelopment;
- Providing the artworks reviving the local culture and heritage, etc.

¹⁷⁴Seattle Public Art Municipal Plan, http://www.seattle.gov/arts/publicart/municipal_art_plan.asp; Metro Dade Art in Public Spaces Master Plan and Washington State Public Art Plan. Reprinted in: Cruikshank, Jeffrey L. and Korza, Pam, *Going Public: A field guide to developments in art in public places*, Arts Extension Service, Amherst 1988; San Diego, Public Art Master Plan, <http://www.sandiego.gov/arts-culture/pdf/pampmarch2004.pdf>; CRA/LA Art Program, http://www.crala.net/internet-site/Other/Art_Program/index.cfm.

¹⁷⁵ This is the main goal of the Metro Dade public art program.

¹⁷⁶ Metro – Dade Art in Public Spaces Master Plan, reprinted in : Cruikshank, Jeffrey L. and Korza, Pam, *Going Public: A field guide to developments in art in public places*, Arts Extension Service, Amherst 1988.

¹⁷⁷ City of Bellevue, Washington, fact sheet in: Barbara Goldstein, *Public art by the book*, University of Washington Press, Seattle and London 2005.

¹⁷⁸ San Diego, fact sheet, *ibid*.

¹⁷⁹ Metro – Dade Art in Public Spaces Master Plan, reprinted in : Cruikshank, Jeffrey L. and Korza, Pam, *Going Public: A field guide to developments in art in public places*, Arts Extension Service, Amherst 1988.

Key locations and opportunities for the public art

This part represents a central and most elaborated segment of the plan. Here are given suggestions and recommendations for the current and future sites for permanent and temporary art project. Depending of their characteristics locations are defined as priority, future, and temporary sites.

Funding sources and projections

It is important that public art master plan include all relevant information about existing mechanism for financing public art projects and administrative structure responsible for the fund allocations. Additionally, this section may include also precise definitions in which situations could be used the Public Art Funds and when not. In the case that city have the percent for art ordinances it is important to define which categories of projects are considered as eligible to generate percent for art as well as is there a possibility for the pooling of funds.

Implementation guidelines

In this part are given specifications of the project management process. Implementation guidelines outline standard operating procedures, which govern how people working within a given program will carry a public art project from the conception to the completion. Usually guidelines have to be approved from an appropriate official body. They describe basic and key procedures such as:

- Methods and responsible agencies for determining eligible and appropriate sites;
- Methods and criteria for the artist selection, including which comities are included and their composition;
- How project are implemented, including the development of public information and educational opportunities, contract preparation and approval policies and fiscal procedures;
- How projects are documented and artwork maintained.

However, it is important to remember that no set of universal guidelines exists and that all procedures must be relevant to how local agencies and community operate if they are to be effective.

Public art master plan is usually created for municipalities but in some cases plan may also be focused only on one facility¹⁸⁰ (a library or an airport) or a government agency (a transportation agency for example). Although, these kinds of plans in their overall form have much in common with the municipal master plan they generally revolve around ways in which art can support the programmatic goals of an individual facility of agency.

Most of the municipalities in addition to the long term overall master plan produce also the annual public art plan as a necessary planning and management tool. The main aim of annual plan is to identify capital improvement project appropriate for the public artwork and a source of percent for art monies, itemizes each city department and agency public art commitment in fiscal terms, monitors carry over funds for projects in progress and documents the status of each public art project in terms of schedule and funds appropriated and expended.¹⁸¹ In a way the Annual Municipal Plan represents real working plan whereby the city makes evident its commitment to the public art activities on annual basis.

¹⁸⁰ Metro Dade public art plan for airport.

¹⁸¹ Seattle Annual Public Art Plan, http://www.seattle.gov/arts/_downloads/art_plans/MAP2006.pdf, retrieved: May 2008.

CHAPTER IV CASE STUDY: FRANCE

4.1. The Early Period

France is a country with a long tradition of cultural policy and the state patronage in Arts. Although it is usually considered that a development of cultural policy in France begun in 1959 with Andre Malraux and the creation of the first Ministry of Culture, one can trace its beginnings as far back as to the French Revolution period, or even earlier in the 16th century and the reign of Francois I.¹⁸²

Since the French Revolution, art and historical heritage as well as language, literature and education were appraised as a crucial constituent of the French national identity. Having that in mind, preservation and open access to the heritage was considered as an important mean of establishing unified nation of citizens. Nevertheless, an administrative infrastructure that would become a core of the later ministry of culture was built up throughout the 19th century. In that period,¹⁸³ the state was focused mostly on a preservation of the French historical heritage and a provision of specialist training in the fine art domain. As David Looseley once stated “*with the rise of the Third Republic the culture become even more explicitly enlisted in a double-edged ‘civilizing mission’: to consolidate the French empire abroad and to unify a fractious population at home*”.¹⁸⁴

At that time, the state subsidized only artworks - monuments and public sculpture, representing the national ideology and values and previously approved from the Academies and the High Council for Fine Arts created just for that reason, in 1875. Function of these artworks had been to commemorate distinguished individuals, events and ideals that reflected national systems of beliefs. They were inspiring the collective memory and served to construct the national identity. In these conditions all new and non-representational art hardly could find its way to the public space.

This state's policy was guided by the principle that the production and

¹⁸² Francois I, was a great patron of art but for our subject is more important that he founded College de France first educational institution opened to general public.

¹⁸³ Period of the Third Republic from 1870 to 1940.

¹⁸⁴ David Looseley, *Cultural Policy in France since 1959: arm's length, or 'up close and personal?* Nordisk Kultur Institut 2001.

consumption of the new works of art, was seen as an essentially private activity, in which state intervention was undesirable. As David Looseley argues, the main disadvantage with this approach, was that “*liberalism simply meant neglect: neglect of the contemporary arts (particularly in their more challenging forms, which were often sacrificed to academicism), and neglect of the entire problematic of cultural inequality*”.¹⁸⁵

With the formation of the Popular Front¹⁸⁶ government’s national objectives in the domain of culture slowly started to change in favor of the contemporary art practice. Responsible for all these changes was Jean Zay, newly appointed minister for education¹⁸⁷ in the National Front government, who showed a great interest for the culture and especially for the contemporary art creation. During his period in a ministry Jean Zay had assumed a responsibility for fostering, promoting and maintaining the contemporary art and its incorporation into the public space. Decisive to make some changes in the domain of art commission and to enable larger presence of the contemporary art in the urban environment Zay surrounded himself, in the ministry, with the people knowledgeable and experienced in the domain of contemporary art.

One of his first decisions as minister was the abolishment of the old practice of assigning all public commissions exclusively to the artists educated on the Academies and working in the Beaux Art traditions of monumental and allegorical sculpture. By this decision state commissions were for the first time opened to the contemporary creativity and to art that was not openly representative and ideological.

First results of the new public art policy become evident during the 1937 International Exposition held in Paris. Within the framework of this project government commissioned 900 artworks for the pavilions' decoration mostly from contemporary artists such as Leger, Herbin, Lipchitz, Laurens, Courbusier.¹⁸⁸

Nevertheless, Zay’s most important contribution in the domain of public art was

¹⁸⁵ David Looseley, David Looseley, French Cultural Policy and Exclusion, 1993-2003, [http://neumann.hec.ca/iccpr/PDF texts/Looseley David.pdf](http://neumann.hec.ca/iccpr/PDF%20texts/Looseley%20David.pdf), retrieved: April 8, 2008.

¹⁸⁶ *Front populaire* – an alliance of left-wing movements, which won the may 1936 legislative elections, leading to the formation of the first socialist government in France.

¹⁸⁷ In that time ministry of culture didn't exist and ministry of education was in charged for the culture.

¹⁸⁸ La commande publique, mode d' emploi, http://www.culture.gouv.fr/culture/dap/commande_publicue/cp/historique.htm, retrieved: May 27, 2008.

the initiative for an endorsement of the new regulation concerning the public building decoration. In the year 1937 Jean Zay elaborated for the first time premises of the percentage for art regulation, regulation that is even today central component of every public art policy. By this proposed measure the 1.5% of the all cost intended for the construction of schools and universities would be spent on decoration. The main goal of this regulation had been a collaboration of artists and architects in the creation of new and more human urban space. In the regulation draft was stated that the percentage for art program would not be restricted only to the Beaux Art monumental tradition but that it would be equally open to all quality art. Furthermore, in the draft it was proposed that an advantage should be given to unemployed artists, if it was possible. In this way ministry openly encouraged break with dominating monumental tradition and for the first time modern artists got their chance to work in the public space. In only few years in the framework of this initiative were realized murals in the *Conservatoire de Arts and Metiers (Andre Lhote)* and in the amphitheater of the Ecole de Pharmacie (*Charles Dufresne*).¹⁸⁹

Unfortunately and in spite of all Zay's efforts percentage for art was rarely applied in practice. Even in the situation when regulation was applied, architects in charged for selection mostly decided in favor of the traditional Beaux Art decoration. It would be needed more then three decades before all changes introduced by Jean Zay become accepted in entirety.

4.2. Post war period

In the first decades after the Second World War, the public art commission and the French cultural policy in general, was marked by a decisive role of the central government and gradual creation of new administrative structures and budget funds. Complicated administrative procedures and high centralism in many ways restricted development of the public art projects. Nevertheless, in the eighties as a result of long-standing trend toward a decentralization and greater shift of decision-making process from the central government to the local authorities, a situation was gradually started to

¹⁸⁹ Ibid.

change in favor of public art.

First step in the process of the public art policy institutionalization, in the post-war period, was the decision of the national education minister Pierre-Olivier Lapie from the 1951. Lapie decided to resume the percentage for arts policy from the 1937, and to pass a law by which this policy was made mandatory for all construction projects in the domain of education. The same as before the main aim of this regulation was an incorporation of art into architecture in order to enrich student's surroundings and urban spaces in general. However, the process of application of the percentage for arts regulation was remained the same and an architect still had decisive role in the selection process.

In the next period cultural policy issues would become of great importance for the central government, which resulted in an institution of the first ministry for culture. This happened in 1959 when De Gaulle set up a full government department for the arts, under one of France's the most famous novelists and intellectuals, André Malraux. Mission of the new ministry was defined by the founding decree in which Malraux stated that *"the ministry in charge of cultural affairs has the role of making available capital works from humanity, and initially from France, to the greatest possible number of French people, of ensuring the largest audience for our cultural heritage, and of supporting the creation of the spirit and works of art which enrich it."*¹⁹⁰

Institution of the ministry of culture represented a beginning of the new age for the central-government voluntarism in the domain of culture which was also reflected in the domain of public art. Two new duties of the state were added to the original ones of the preservation and training from the 19th century:

- Encouragement to contemporary 'creation'- the production and dissemination of new works; and
- Democratization - putting an end to cultural inequalities by taking arts to everyone.¹⁹¹

¹⁹⁰ Decree n° 59-889, known as the "founding decree", of 24 July 1959. France. Historical perspective: cultural policies and instruments, Compendium, Cultural Policies and Trends in Europe, <http://www.culturalpolicies.net/web/france.php?aid=1>, retrieved : May 18, 2008.

¹⁹¹ David Looseley, Cultural Policy in France since 1959: arm's length, or 'up close and personal? Nordisk

The new administration's primary aims were to promote contemporary creation in all artistic disciplines and a broader participation in cultural activities, especially in the areas of theatre, music and heritage. André Malraux wanted to set up the Arts Centers (Maisons de la Culture) in each French department in order to stimulate contemporary artistic creation and disseminate culture on a broad scale.¹⁹²

In the domain of public art policy in that period there were no significant changes, public art projects were still rare and percentage for art regulation was restricted only to the constructions in the domain of education. Nevertheless, in 1962 Malraux created the Department for Artistic Creation headed by Bernard Anthonioz, and three years later also special Office for Public Buildings Decoration and the Comity for Artistic Creation.¹⁹³ The main aim of all these new departments had been to foster contemporary creativity in all domains and to propose to a ministry which artwork to acquire or to commission. Within this framework the first significant public art commissions were made, such as a decoration for Opera Garnier made by Chagal, decoration for Theatre Odeon by Masson, and placing the Maillol's sculptures in the Tuileries Gardens in the vicinity of Louvre Carrousel.¹⁹⁴

About the significance of culture in that period testify the fact that during Malreaux's mandate culture for the first time was integrated into economical development plans.¹⁹⁵ Cultural issues were largely connected with the process of urbanization and the question of how to provide 'sociocultural animation' (arts, sports and leisure activities, youth clubs, and so on) in the new residential estates. In view of the specific local circumstances some French cities were giving the great importance and considerations to the high quality urban space design in which public art had an important role. One of the first urban renovation projects, in which the public art had significant role, was an

Kultur Institut 2001.

¹⁹² France. Historical perspective: cultural policies and instruments, Compendium, Cultural Policies and Trends in Europe, <http://www.culturalpolicies.net/web/france.php?aid=1>, retrieved : May 18, 2008.

¹⁹³ La commande publique, mode d' emploi, http://www.culture.gouv.fr/culture/dap/commande_publique/cp/historique.htm, retrieved: May 27, 2008.

¹⁹⁴ Milena Dragičević-Šešić, Institutional system of French cultural policy, MA Thesis, Faculty of Dramatic Arts, Belgrade 1981.

¹⁹⁵ David Looseley, French Cultural Policy and Exclusion, 1993-2003, <http://neumann.hec.ca/iccpr/PDF/texts/Looseley David.pdf>

arrangement project for the Floral Park in the Vincennes. In the framework of this project Bernard Anthonioz developed an innovative public commission policy based on the creativity of young artists. In the period between 1969 and 1971 within this initiative a significant number of temporary public art projects were realized.¹⁹⁶

Bernard Anthonioz was also responsible for the development of the special network of regional art consultants assigned in the Office of Artistic Creation. Through this network he was supporting the local authorities in their public art projects.

This was the case with the city of Grenoble, which during the process of preparation for the 1967 Olympic games put a strong emphasis on the city's decoration and quality of urban design. For financing the city decoration Grenoble used mostly funds collected by the percentage for art scheme, which was extended much beyond educational projects, especially for this purpose. Besides that, in the 1967 city of Grenoble organized the first French symposium on monumental art, during which many artists had an opportunity to realize the public art project in the city. This example of extended use of 1% for art funds, in the next period was followed by some other cities such as Vitry and the cities that were part of the Villes Nouvelles project.¹⁹⁷

Early development of the public art in France during the 1960s and the 1970s can be defined by two main characteristics, which to certain extent obstructed its greater expansion. The first and the most important characteristic is a strong state's involvement in the domain of culture, especially in the domain of public commission as opposed to practically nonexistent regional and private patronage in the domain of public art in that time. The same strong and centralized state's control was in the domain of production and the management of public space.

This centralistic system was largely criticized during the student demonstrations in 1968. Consequently, since the Malraux departure in 1969, the cultural dimension of the social and political unrest from the year 1968 largely marked French cultural policy. One of the main characteristic of the new- left ideology of May 1968, was rejecting the state centralism in France in political domain as well as in the cultural. For the leftists, the

¹⁹⁶ La commande publique, mode d'emploi,
http://www.culture.gouv.fr/culture/dap/commande_publicue/cp/historique.htm, retrieved: May 27, 2008.

¹⁹⁷ Gilbert Smadja, *Art et espace : le point sur une démarche urbaine*, rapport no. 2001-0091-01, Conseil General des ponts et chaussées, mars 2003.

state centralism was a political expression of universalism. By rejecting centralism they were rejecting universalism too, in the name of a rediscovered particularism, which in France had previously been associated with the Right. Hence, there was an explosion of demands for the right to difference, to regional or ethnic identities, and to popular creativity. Malraux notion of cultural democracy was attacked as centralist and hegemonic for imposing of commodified bourgeois conception of art. True cultural democracy was seen as a transformation of public from the consumers to the participants by mobilizing their autonomy and inventiveness. In the next period, and until the early eighties, the cultural democracy movement was embracing the campaigns of regional and other social and human right movements.¹⁹⁸

After Malraux's departure and a short interim period, in 1971 the Centrist leader Jacques Duhamel became Minister for Culture. Today, the Duhamel's interlude is looked on as a period of a relative liberalism in cultural affairs, largely because Duhamel's policies began to reflect at least some of these post-1968 concerns. He carried out a simultaneously interdisciplinary and interdepartmental policy aimed at integrating culture into society. To do this, he drew heavily on ideas concerning cultural development which had recently been voiced in the reports of the cultural commission of the Sixth Plan.¹⁹⁹

The Sixth Plan acted as a reasonably independent think-tank, formulating an alternative discourse to the Ministry's. In its first ten years, the Ministry under the Malraux had largely turned itself into a department for the professional arts. But the Sixth Plan Commission was more concerned with the creative activities of ordinary people. *Today's French citizens, it argued, have become alienated and powerless in the era of urbanization and of mass production, mass leisure and mass communications, all of which have turned them into passive spectators of their own lives.*²⁰⁰

As Minister, Duhamel took a cultural development on board in a number of ways. His guiding principle was the need for a government-wide responsibility for culture. Since cultural development is about ordinary people being creative and fulfilled in all aspects of their lives, all ministries, and all other tiers of government, have a part to play

¹⁹⁸ David Looseley, *Cultural Policy in France since 1959: arm's length, or 'up close and personal'?* Nordisk Kultur Institut 2001.

¹⁹⁹ The sixth economic plan from 1971 to 1975, attempted to deal not only with consequences but also with the causes of the may 1968. Ibid.

²⁰⁰ Ibid.

in it. His best known initiative in this regard was the setting up of an inter ministerial structure, the Cultural Intervention Fund (FIC), which for over a decade provided pump-priming for experimental projects which could elicit complementary funding from other ministries, local authorities or other bodies. But the most significant among Duhamel's policies was his contribution to decentralization.²⁰¹

At this stage, the general devolution of funds and powers to local and regional authorities in France was still some years off. However, Duhamel further assisted this process by developing the network of regional offices of the Ministry known as DRACs (Regional Directorates of Cultural Affairs) with 'de-concentrated' funds and powers from Paris, had the task of advising and encouraging local authorities and acting as intermediaries in negotiating and implementing the contracts.²⁰²

In the domain of public art the main contribution of Duhamel's ministry was extension of the 1% system to include all existing public buildings. In the period from the 1972 to 1981 beside the ministry of education, system was gradually outstretched on almost all the other ministries such as International Relations, Agriculture, Cooperation, Culture, Economy and Finances, Environment, Industry, Sports and Young, Post and Communication, Transport, Work, Defense. On top of this extension, law from 1972 also adjusted the requirements to aim the integration of buildings into their surroundings, which meant that the *law allowed 1% not only to be used for building decoration but also to plan spaces in the near proximity* of the building by employing the artists.²⁰³

Period of Duhamel ministry coincided with planning and construction of new great urban entities such as business quarter of Paris - *La Defense, Beaubourg* and Bercy and the most important urban project of that time in France *Villes Nouvelles*.

Today, Paris' business quarter *La Defense* represents one of the best examples of the French approach to design and construction of new urban entities in which great importance was given to the public art projects. Thanks to director of L'EPAD Jean Milles, who actively supported the placement of contemporary artworks in public space, streets and plazas of La Defense were enliven by the contemporary sculptures of Miro,

²⁰¹ Ibid.

²⁰² Ibid.

²⁰³ Gilbert Smadja, Art et espace : le point sur une démarche urbaine, rapport no. 2001-0091-01, Conseil General des ponts et chaussées, mars 2003.

Calder, Venet, and Cesar. In some cases public art design was integrated in the project from the planning stage. Furthermore, La Defense represents one of the first state founded examples of integration environmental artworks in the public space in France. The main responsibility for this project was on Germain Viatte, great supporter of the land and environmental artworks, who was responsible (in 1974) for determining of the conditions for public commission for La Defense. In his call for applications he proposed to artists to apply not only with sculptural projects as before, but also to consider some environmental and site-specific solutions for the site.²⁰⁴ The results of his initiative were two artworks: Fontaine de Yaacov Agam realised in 1977 and Basin from Takis realized only in 1985-1988.²⁰⁵

The same approach to public art is present in the case of *Villes Nouvelles* project. From 1974 when Monique Faux was nominated for the visual art consultant for the Villes Nouvelles, great attention was given to the quality of the built environment. For that purpose she developed ambitious program of the public commission for the *Villes Nouvelles* in *Ile de France* region.

New measures for supporting these extensive public art programs were diverse: from the broadening of the percentage for art scheme to the special commissions from the regional authorities or from the central government. For the project Monique Faux invited artists like Marta Pan, Dani Karavan and Piotr Kowalski, to make propositions not only for public sculpture but also for different kind of space and site specific interventions. Importance of this project lays also in the fact that in this case *artists were involved from the beginning in the design phase*.²⁰⁶

Although there were a lot of positive changes in the domain of public art during the Duhamel's mandate unfortunately the administration of the scheme was impeded by the numerous bureaucratic constraints. One of the main problems was existing selection procedure. Besides all changes architect continued to be the only one responsible for all decisions concerning public art, from the choice of the place, type and scope of artworks, to the artist selection. Second problem that even more obstructed public art installment was that Perfect of the Department had a veto, what resulted that in many cases decisions

²⁰⁴ Ibid.

²⁰⁵ Ibid.

²⁰⁶ Ibid.

and recommendations from the National Advisory board and regional arts officers could not be implemented. In these conditions a large sum of the money intended for the public art rested unused. Besides, there has been strong criticisms by artists because the lack of response to this whole initiative from regional and local authorities.

Nevertheless, besides all constraints this period was marked with steady return of the modern sculpture in public space in the city and in the park. This return was accompanied by an emergence of considerable number of the temporary expositions of sculpture in the open space. One of the first was “*Space, Architecture, Form, Color*” organized by artistic group the Space in Biot in 1954.

Public art was also becoming more and more present in the scientific discourse. In only few years there were organized two large symposiums on the subject of monumental art: one in the Grenoble, and the one in Pavillon Baltard in Paris. During Paris symposium on the exhibition *Art in the city, Art in the Life*, were represented all project realized in the 1% for art framework. In the same time it was published first publication representing the Villes Nouvelles project, with an introductory essay on relations between contemporary art and public space.

In the domain of more experimental art, the seventies were marked by emergence of new artistic movements such as land art and earth art, minimal and conceptual art, which entered in the public space and claimed the inscription of the artwork in the landscape or urban space. With these new artistic movements it became obvious that it is necessary to make changes in the domain of public art policy in order to incorporate all these artistic practice in the public space. Artist like Dubuffet, Jean Tinguely and Jean Pierre Raynaud contributed to the evolution of the notion and understanding of the public art and public commission in France.²⁰⁷ Without any help from the government they undertook constructions of different kinds of utopian artistic projects that raised questions about importance of the public sculpture, its relations with architecture and its role in the defining of public space.

²⁰⁷ In the beginning experimental artist were rarely supported by the state. In 1969 thanks to financial help of the De Menil family which gave on disposal a terrain in Milly, in the Fontainebleau forest, Jean Tinguely begun to cut large construction of the Cyclop while Dubuffet on his private land constructed artwork named Closerie Falbala. Ibid.

4.3. New developments in the eighties

Since the eighties, interest for art in public space in France has increased in the great extent. Affirmation of the new art commission policy facilitated an emergence of a great diversity of public art projects and changed the nature and significance of the public art interventions in France. New public art projects were ranging from a simple architectural decoration, through the different kinds of open-air museums and exhibitions of artworks installed on the street or in gardens and parks in museum manner (Defense example), to the complex site-specific urban projects, and more recently - the community and socially engaged projects.

Nevertheless, the diversity of public art projects would not be possible without the adequate administrative substructure and the foundation of the new public commission programs. In this period the majority of projects continued to be realized under the existing percentage for arts program but also many projects were realized due to these newly established public commission initiatives. Besides these two programs, public art project were subsidized also within the framework of different kinds of special governmental urban construction and reconstruction projects such as the Mitterrand's *Grandes Travaux* initiative.²⁰⁸

Turning point for the development of new public art policy represents the year 1983 and the installment of Jack Lang for the new ministry of culture. Jack Lang was personally very interested in public art and the state patronage in art in general. One of his first engagements in the domain of public art was a visit to Dubuffet 1983, in order to commission from him one monumental artwork for Paris. Artist proposed artwork *Tour aux Figures*, which was designed in 1970, and placed in the island of *Saint Germain in Issy les Moulineaux*. This artwork is one of the first financed within the new public commission program.

Nevertheless Lang's most important contribution to the public art development was an implantation of the new institutional models for financing public art projects.

²⁰⁸ The Grands Travaux: Its legacies and Lessons- Are There Lessons here for the World Trade Center Design?, Conference at Architecture Research Institute, NY 2002, <http://www.architect.org/gt/gt.html>, retrieved: May 2008.

Newly installed policy enabled changes in the commission process by establishing and defining the new initiatives and actors and their specific relations in the commission process.

Process of political and administrative decentralization which took place in France in the eighties, has contributed to a great extent to the development of new public art policy. Nevertheless, first moves toward decentralization in culture were stepped up with the completion of the regional cultural affairs directorates (DRAC) network, even before the official decentralization law was passed in 1983. From its creation the main aim of regional DRAC offices has been to enable collaboration between ministry of culture and the local authorities.

Decentralization law from the 1983 expanded even more this type of collaboration by enabling the transfer of authority and responsibilities for public functions from central government to regional and local authorities. The main aim of decentralization process was to allow citizens and their elected representatives more power in public decision-making process. New system enabled also redistribution of the authority and financial resources for providing public services among different levels of governance. Although, in practice majority of projects was still initiated by the ministry of culture or by central government, new regional cultural departments and their consultants succeeded to assure better participation of the local community in the process. In these circumstances some of the regions and local authorities even decided to develop their own public art commission policy. However beside the decentralization process and new founding sources public art was not widely spread in all French regions, but only in two the most developed ones: Ile de France with Paris and Rhone-Alpes region.

Paris has had a privileged positions among other cities. In the eighties central and city government initiated in Paris a great number of different public art projects mostly as a part of extensive public works. Among the most interesting public art project from that period are: Tinguely and Niki de Saint Phalles Pool near Pompidou Centre (1985-86), le Canyon australe de Gérard Singer (1988) etc. Here we also have to mention Mitterrand Grandes Travaux initiative whose important part was also public art.²⁰⁹ The *Grandes*

²⁰⁹ There is many successful examples from the Louvre pyramid to extensive decoration intended of

Travaux, large public construction project started in the same year when Mitterrand was for the first time elected as a president - 1981, and was entirely financed from the central government. This initiative was a part of the global strategy that aimed at getting Paris ready for world fair and bi-centenary of the Revolution 1789.

Alongside with Paris and Ile de France, Rhone Alpes region have the longest tradition of the public art projects in France. Since the sixties this region established itself as one of the most productive in the development of the different kind of public art projects. This is especially the case with the Grenoble district, its project of decoration for the Saint Martin d' Heres campus as well as already mentioned city beautification project for the 1968 Olympic Games. The city of Lyon also devoted great attention to the integration of public art into the urban renovation projects as in case of metro and central part of city renovations. If we look on the website of DRAC Rhone Alpes we can find extensive list of all public art project realized since the 1985.²¹⁰ From the 54 projects realized in the framework of public commission initiative there were 26 public art projects. Some of them are monumental sculptures in Roanne (Arman,1992), Grenoble (Caro1995), Valence (Di Suvero, Buren) and Vienne (Buren) etc.

There is not enough information about the public art projects in other French regions. Although, there were only few cities with established public art policy there is many examples that public art was an integral part of the urban reconstruction and construction projects.

4.4. Public Art Policy Instruments

As we already mentioned public art boom in France was facilitated by the new funds and measures introduced during the Jack Lang mandate. By these new policy measures were instituted two different types of public commissions, depending from nature of the commissioner and funds:

1. Commissions within percentage for art scheme;

Ministry of finance in Bercy. In: Gilbert Smadja, Art et espace : le point sur une demarche urbaine, rapport no. 2001-0091-01, Conseil General des ponts et chaussées, mars 2003.

²¹⁰ www.culture.gouv.fr/rhone-alpes/

2. “Commande publique”- public commission program;
3. Special governmental commissions initiated from both central and local governments.

In the next section it will be given the main characteristic of all three programs and their inherent procedures.

4.4.1. Percentage for art regulation²¹¹

As we already stated, in the period from the 1974 to the 1980- 81 the majority of ministries accepted the percentage for art scheme. However, one unified procedure regulating the application of the percentage for art directive for all ministries did not exist. Every ministry had to adopt their own application directives. In most of the cases architect was still in charge for selection process. He would choose artists and artwork but the final decisions were made by the representatives of the commissioner (in this case ministry's administration). However, besides all procedural and administrative constraints, percentage for art regulation has shown itself as the best means for the contemporary art promotion and its integration in the urban settings.

In 1983 the French National Assembly passed a decentralization law by which central government transferred certain competences to regional and local governments such as its jurisdiction in the domain of architecture and urbanism, including the construction of public buildings as: kindergartens, primarily school, secondary schools, community sport centers, local libraries and so on.²¹² In the article 59 of decentralization law it was specified that local communities are obliged to dedicate the 1% for art from all construction costs for the buildings which in its description have *obligation to receive the public*. By this decision, it has been instituted coexistence of two separate percentages for art initiatives: the old one centralized and administered by ministries and the new one, so called *decentralized percentage for art*, administered by the regional and local

²¹¹ Le 1% artistique, Presentation, <http://www.culture.gouv.fr/culture/politique-culturelle/index-dossiers.htm>, retrieved: May 2008.

²¹² Gilbert Smadja, Art et espace : le point sur une démarche urbaine, rapport no. 2001-0091-01, Conseil General des ponts et chaussées, mars 2003.

governments.²¹³

Article 59 which instituted decentralized percentage for art, contained no clarification considering its application. In the absence of the proscribed procedure local communities developed their own procedures. Usually in practice all responsibility for organization and implementation of the project was on the project commissioner. As selection procedure was not specified it was continued with the old ministry's practice that architect has to propose artist and artwork, which would usually be bought from the art gallery or directly from the artist. Local secretary responsible for culture was in charged to make all decisions considering public art project, in the case that its costs were less than 50 000f.

Besides these decisions, percentage for art scheme was rarely applied on regional and local levels. In three regions Ile de France, Rhone -Alpes, Haute-Normandie²¹⁴ research on the application of the 1% for art scheme was conducted. Results showed that from 218 interrogated local communities only 40% was applying 1%. From that percent 29% were applying it regularly and systematically, 11% from time to time, and 63% only in special situations or in the case of the initiative of the elected.²¹⁵

In the light of these results one of the objectives of the Ministry of Culture during the nineties was popularization of the percentage for art scheme as well as an establishing of the application procedure, which was shown as the main constraint for the scheme implementation.

During the nineties there were many attempts to harmonize and improve the procedures for the 1% for art regulations. However, the first official attempt was made in 1993. In the march of 1993 ministry of education issued two amendments to exiting 1% regulation²¹⁶ (one decree from 23 march 1993 and its supplement from 23 march 1993) which were putting forward new rules for the organization of all scholar and university constructions in the future. For the first time it was organized special artistic comity in charged for the selection process. By this decree it become obligatory that all public commissions initiated by the ministry have to be approved from the regional art comity

²¹⁴ Research department of the MP council. Ibid.

²¹⁵ Ibid.

²¹⁶ Ibid.

chaired by the regional chief administrator. It was introduced policy of remuneration of the sketches from the selected artist.

Decrees from the 1993 inspired debate on the importance of the reconciliation of application procedures for all percentage for art programs, which consequently lead to new decree from april 2002,²¹⁷ which redefined and harmonized obligations of all ministries and public institutions in the domain of public buildings decoration as well as the main conditions of that obligation. By this decree for the first time percentage for art become mandatory for all public constructions.²¹⁸ It is stated that percentage for art scheme have *to be applied to all constructions and enlargements of public building as well for reconstruction works resulted in the change of use or appearance of the building.*²¹⁹ However, there is no precise definition what can be considered as public construction, which caused vast possibility of interpretation and sometimes even confusion. Decree defined also scope of artwork financed by the percentage for art scheme. It included all type of art from design, painting, sculpture, new media, site specific, urban interventions, urban mobilier. It contained also an article which reaffirmed possibility that percentage for art should be used not only for decoration of specific buildings, but also that fund could be used to enliven public spaces in near proximity of the building.²²⁰ There was only one constraint and that was that by this program could be founded only permanent art projects.

Although, decree from 2002 to some degree facilitated application process, the implementation procedure was not entirely defined. For that purpose in 2005 new decree was issued, and it defined precise instructions for the project implementation.²²¹ It made more precise conditions for the selection process and precisely defined implementation procedure for all ministries and other public institutions.

By this decree whole procedure was made easier for all project participants -

²¹⁷ Le décret n°2002-677 du 29 avril 2002

http://www.culture.gouv.fr/culture/dap/dap/unpourcent/uFiles/doc/7_fichier.pdf, retrieved: May 2008.

²¹⁸ There are just few exceptions such as military constructions, hospitals and commercial.

²¹⁹ This does not include maintenance.

²²⁰ It was also part of the 1993 decree.

²²¹ Décret no 2005-90 du 4 février 2005 modifiant le décret no 2002-677 du 29 avril 2002 relatif à l'obligation de décoration des constructions publiques et précisant les conditions de passation des marchés ayant pour objet de satisfaire à cette obligation;
<http://admi.net/jo/20050206/MCCB0400926D.html>, retrieved: May 2008.

artists, architects, commissioners and general public. It has established an artistic comity in charged for the selection process and consisted from members arriving from different domains: representative of the investor (commissioner) as president of the comity, architect, DRAC representative, representative of the future building users and two art professionals. Alongside with this comity, there is also regional artistic comity and a national artistic comity which has a consultative role.

The main advantage of 2002 and 2005 decree was the harmonization of the existing different application procedures as well as a institution of artistic comity in charged for the selection process. The main problem with this newly established selection procedure was that institution of three different artistic comities made whole process overtly complicated.

In the september 2006 the new circular for application of the 1% for art was issued.²²² This circular made by the ministry of culture and communication offered to all commissioners (ministries, central government, local and regional authorities, public institutions) further clarification and simplification of the 1% for art procedure.

The main contribution of the 2006 decree was a simplification of the artists selection procedure by the suppression of the regional artistic comities. By this decision only one art comity established by the commissioner should exist, and it is supposed to have an authority during the selection process. The Artistic Comity had consultative role and the main decision was made by the commissioner. The Artistic Comity is consisted from seven members and headed by representatives of the commissioner. Members of the comity are:

- Four persons representing the commissioner (comity president, project manager, representative, of the future users and art professional appointed by commissioner);
- Three other members – regional secretary of culture and two art professionals, one proposed by professional art organizations and the other by regional secretary of culture.

²²² Circulaire du 16 août 2006 relative à l'application du décret no 2002-677 du 29 avril 2002 relatif à l'obligation de décoration des constructions publiques, modifié par le décret no 2005-90 du 4 février 2005; http://www.culture.gouv.fr/culture/dap/dap/unpourcent/uFiles/doc/8_fichier.pdf, retrieved: May 2008.

The work of the artistic comity consists of two phase. In first phase comity had to gather all informations about the project. Based on these informations they have to clarify and define conditions for the project having in mind social and urban context. On the basis of the gathered informations they make a program for the commission. Commission program include their decisions considering the place of the intervention, the nature of the intervention, selection of the one artist or multidisciplinary team and all other necessary decisions concerning the project. This program have to be approved from the commissioner and then it could be communicated to the interested artists.

In the next phase comity is responsible for the conduction of the selection process. Selection process is also organized in two phases. In the first phase every member of the comity has to propose an artist for the project. During this phase comity members can consult existing database with all relevant informations in the domain of public art. In the next phase comity will call proposed artists to an interview to present their ideas and sketches, and after that they will make a decision. To all artists invited to the interview fees will be payed and sketches compensated. In that case the commissioner will be the owner of the sketches.

Circular recommend to the artistic comity to make their decision as soon as possible in order for artists to be involved in building construction from the design phase. In this way it *encouraged early involvement of artists and collaboration between architect and artists.*

There are few exceptions from this procedure. In some cases, when the amount for art project is less then 30 000 euro the commissioner can chose to buy an artwork instead to commission it. In that situation the decision is made jointly by the representatives of the future users, regional secretary of culture and representative of commissioner.

If the cost of the project is less then 100 000 euro the project is examined only by the art comity but if it costs more, the project manager have to present all propositions to regional art comity consisted from the six representatives of administration: prefect of the region, university dean (for the universities), prefect of the department, regional secretary for culture, consultant for the visual arts, president of the institution, representative of the

community; and the sixth external members which are selected for the five years period. In front of the comity, a project is presented by the project manager and artist with the help of the visual art consultant. Comity have to give its response during the period of no more than three months.

Besides the detailed description of the selection procedure, in the circular from 2006 special attention is given to the maintenance of artworks installed within the framework of the percentage for art scheme. Moreover, the circular adapt conditions and procedures of the scheme to the other law regulations, such as the Public Procurement law which defines conditions for all public procurements. This law defines equality of all candidates and transparency of the selection procedures for all public commissions. By this law all public commissions have to be publicly announced. Commissioner is obligated to present all information considering the percentage for art programs on its internet site as well as on internet sites of the professional organizations, in professional magazines, press etc. In the same time the Ministry of Culture have to create a website with all relevant information concerning the 1% regulations, procedures, call for artists, and presentation of finished projects.²²³

4.4.2. Public Commission /Commande publique program

In 1983, in the same time when decentralized percentage for art scheme was established, the central government decided to initiate new public commission program administered by the National Centre for Visual Art.²²⁴ Within the National Centre for Visual Art it was created a special comity, named the Inspection for Artistic Creation, responsible for artists selection as well as for the project implementation. Members of the Inspection were usually representatives of the commissioner, appointed visual art consultants and professional artists.

From the beginning public commission program has had a substantial and constant budget²²⁵ and variety of the public art projects were supported in this way. For example, the Villes Nouvelles art in urban spaces project was financed by this program as

²²³ <http://www.culture.gouv.fr/culture/politique-culturelle/index-dossiers.htm>

²²⁴ Centre national des artes `plastiques; <http://www.cnap.fr/>.

²²⁵ Depending on year - between 20 and 23 million francs.

well as some other interesting projects intended for socially endangered communities. Although, first years were characterized by the excitement and great number of realized projects, the government still didn't define the commission objectives and program procedures.

In 1987 these early years of the program were critically evaluated in the report made by Dominique Bozo,²²⁶ responsible for visual arts in the government of Francois Leotard. This report contributed to the program reorientation. In the next period precise program's objectives were defined in the line with the newly proclaimed policy of the enhancing of national heritage by the contemporary art. As a result of new policy through the program were largely supported projects that contributed *to urban spaces animation, promotion of contemporary art in urban spaces, and artistic production*, especially realization of the ambitious art projects, which could not be possible without a help of public commissions funds. Special importance was given to the projects of *incorporation of contemporary artworks into historical monuments and public spaces*.²²⁷ Among these kind of projects belong the *Deux Plateaux* from Buren and installations of the contemporary sculpture at *Tuileries Garden*. Both projects witness about the capacity of contemporary art to improve historical public space. At the end we have to mention that important part of this new policy was also commitment to maintenance and conservation of public art.

New policy was accompanied with the process of decentralization, and many local communities for a first time got a possibility to use these funds for an integration of public art in their urban development projects. All these projects were realized having in mind their special geographical, architectural and social contexts. Furthermore, one of the new program objectives was initiation of the dialogue and *joint programs between central government and local communities* in order to make the general public more sensible to contemporary art.

The regional DRAC were in charged for the selection and implementation of the project. For every commission it was organized special the Expert's Comity whose main

²²⁶ Gilbert Smadja, Art et espace: le point sur une demarche urbaine, rapport no. 2001-0091-01, Conseil General des ponts et chaussées, mars 2003.

²²⁷ Emergence of this kind of project provoked a great debate in France, Ibid.

role was to prepare and define conditions of the project. Mission of the Expert Comity was to analyze all conditions of the project, to consult local historians, sociologists, and architects and based on all collected data define a program of commission. Comity was presided by the representative of the commissioner and lead by a project manager (usually architect). Other members of the comity were DRAC and DAP (Architecture and Heritage Directorate) representatives and local art experts ranging from professional artist, designers, landscape artist, historians, sociologist, and philosophers. All experts were appointed because of their specialist knowledge necessary for defining of project's context. After this extensive research comity would be make their decisions considering:

- Place for art intervention
- Type and nature of the artworks (site specific, urban furniture, change of the designation of the historic monument etc)
- Selection of the artist or multidisciplinary team;

and all other recommendations important for the project implementation.

In the next phases the experts comity presents their program and propositions to the executive comity presided by the city mayor. Their program also has to be approved from the DRAC office. When program of the commission is approved, regional DRAC office appoints visual art consultant to be responsible for the administration of the project as well as for the selection issues. Selection is usually organized by invitation - few artists are invited to present their works. After the project is chosen artist sign a contract with DRAC. In next phase special DAP and CNAP (Nation center for plastic arts) working group have to make decision whether that project can be realized in participation with the central government.²²⁸

After the project realization project commissioner is obliged to explain and present a project to the general public. Usually experts' comities in their program propose which kind of action is to be organized. Actions can be diverse as the exposition representing the project, publication of the texts representing the project, organization of debates, representing the project in the tourist guides and maps etc.

²²⁸ La commande publique, mode d'emploi, Methode et procedure,
http://www.culture.gouv.fr/culture/dap/commande_publicue/cp/methode.htm, retrieved: May 2008.

Considering the type of commissioned artworks and projects there is a great diversity -from murals, works on the windows, furniture, to the classical paintings and sculptures, video, installations. If we observe the statistical data of the DAP public commission in the period between 1983 and 1991 we can see that in that period 276 projects in public space were realized, which represents 46,5% of the total number of projects. On the other side, in the same period only 12,5 % from that number was funded by public commission program.²²⁹ These numbers reveal that beside the general impression, in the first years of program its policy on national level was not oriented towards art interventions related to the urbanism and architecture. In the nineties, with the policy revision situation was changed. From that period support for art in urban spaces become one of the main program's objectives. This new orientation is evident from DAP policy paper from the year 2000, where is stated that "*urban territory is one of the most important domain for the implementation of art in public space*". One of the explanations for this enormous interest for art in urban spaces was probably that in this period architecture came under the authority of the ministry of culture.²³⁰

4.4.3. Other financial sources

Percentage for art scheme and the public commission program have been main engines of the public art development in France but they are not the only ones. In the eighties and nineties old tradition of granting the special funds for public art from different public institutions, communities or the government, also continued. As we know project for Villes Nouvelles in the seventies was financed in this way.²³¹ One of these kinds of funding sources are special conventions of the ministry of culture. In the nineties conventions of the ministry of culture were intended mostly for collaborative projects of the central government and local communities.

First city's conventions are introduced in 1992 by Francois Barre²³² which was consultant for visual arts responsible for Amiens, Nimes, Niort and Strasburg. His aim

²²⁹ Gilbert Smadja, Art et espace : le point sur une démarche urbaine, rapport no. 2001-0091-01, Conseil General des ponts et chaussées, mars 2003.

²³⁰ Ibid.

²³¹ Ibid.

²³² Ibid.

was to reshape the existing ministry of culture system for art support. When a few years later, he became director of the DAP (Department for Architecture and Heritage) one of his first decisions was to introduce new conventions for supporting projects on city-architecture relations for six cities (Grenoble, Athis-Mons, Lorient, Port-St- Louise du Rhone, Annecy and Chambéry). This project was conceived as some kind of a laboratory for new policy in which an important role had architecture and heritage. This program was similar to a special program introduced in 1970 for the Villes Nouvelles whose conventions were accompanied by procedural solutions as establishment of the interdisciplinary organizational committees.

Some other institutions and especially local governments like Lyon, Brest, have also dedicated special funds and conventions to artistic projects in urban spaces, especially in the special occasions of urban reconstruction projects.²³³

In the last twenty years or so, the public art in France is still dominated by the State intervention besides the many attempts of decentralization and in some cases even insistence on larger community participation in the project. Both public art programs – the percentage for art and the public commission are exclusively initiated, financed and administered by the Ministry of culture and/or the DRAC. When a local authority decides to organize a public art project it tends to contact the regional arts office - DRAC. The commission is then managed under the Public Commission or the percentage for art scheme, and other possibilities of realization are very rare. Only a small amount of public art projects has been initiated and realized by third sector or independent public art agencies, as is usually the case in the United States and Great Britain.

Besides a great number and diversity of the initiated and realized projects the downside of this state sponsorship approach to art sometimes can result in the lack of a critical debate about art in the public realm and especially its role in social production of the space.

During the last two decades of 20th century a tremendous amount of energy and

²³³ This is the case with the largely popular projects of public art accompanying the introduction of the new tramway lines.

funding was invested in public commissions in France. There is currently a lull, which is due to the rethinking of the method and its efficacy. It would now appear that many national commissions were short lived. They fell prey to the usual maintenance difficulties, and never properly appropriated.

In the circumstances of the large state domination in the public art domain there is still one important exception - the New Patrons and Artist's initiative programs supported by the Foundation de France. New Patrons scheme²³⁴ is developed as an alternative method for commissioning of the new artworks for the public space, and although some projects are co-financed by the Ministry of Culture, the working method is completely different. The program enables anyone confronted with the issues about the society or the local development to commission an artwork directly from an artist. As is stated in the New Patrons protocol,²³⁵ the main aim of the program is to give a chance to citizens to become art patrons and to hear their voices.

The second program Artist's initiative gives opportunity to all artists to ask for help in taking the initiative in society' interest. The originality of this program lies in its procedure and the combination of different players: the patron, the mediator-producer and the artist, working together on the project which is produced by public and/or private partners. Role of mediator is to facilitate implementation of the project and to create links between different protagonists. He is in position to draw up a contract and to harmonize and manage the different sources of public and private funding devoted to culture. He also knows the practical and administrative constraints bound up with commissioning. Mediator on the basis of the cultural and technical conditions selects an artist, but his choice have to be approved from the patron. Finished artwork will become property of the community and it will be registered in the inventory in order to insure later maintenance.²³⁶

Foundation de France was the first institution involved in the program and with its help the first New Patrons commission in Burgundy 1992 was organized. From that period, under this initiative more than one hundred of artworks all over France have been

²³⁴ <http://www.nouveauxcommanditaires.com/>

²³⁵ New Patrons Protocol <http://www.nouveauxcommanditaires.com/>, retrieved: May 2008.

²³⁶ Ibid.

produced.

In past three decades two distinct perspectives concerning importance of the public art project are crystallized. From one perspective, which is closer to local authorities, importance of public art is regarded through its relation to the city and process of urban redevelopment and its role in production of more humane urban environment. On the other hand from the perspectives of ministry of culture and professional artistic circles public art is more often considered as one more way for supporting artistic creativity and contemporary art in general.

CHAPTER V

CASE STUDY: UNITED KINGDOM

5.1. The Post-War Period

Soon after the implementation of the first post war urban reconstruction plans in the United Kingdom, it became obvious that serial, dull, anonymous built environments were not capable to fulfill the needs of the new inhabitants. In most of the cases they were the companions to the social disadvantage, which led to the urban decay. In these circumstances a consensus emerged that a presence or an absence of art can improve built environment and had a measurable effect on local economies. It was argued that some of today's social problems are linked to the community's relationship with their environments and that every improvement will encourage the location of new businesses and thus improves local economies. Increasing urban decay during the seventies and especially in the eighties reinforced the provision of public art in the United Kingdom as a matter of morality.²³⁷

However, this discourse around a public art and its relation with the built environment was preceded by the change of attitude towards arts in Britain. After a long period of an absence from a public realm,²³⁸ in the post-war Britain arts were recognized again as a part of public domain. At that time the specific international political climate influenced debate in the UK whether there is a place for a government in funding the arts as an expression of a free and democratic society. Renewed interest in democracy prompted to an increasing demand to democratization of arts and a wider access to arts and culture in general. As is stated in the British Policy for Arts from 1965: *“Arts enjoyment should not be regarded as something remote from everyday life. The promotion and appreciation of high standards in architecture, in industrial design, in town planning are all part of it...There is an immense amount that could be done to*

²³⁷ Juliet Hamilton, Leslie Forsyth & Daniel De Iongh, *Public Art: A Local Authority Perspective*, Journal of Urban Design, vol.6, issue 3, Routledge 2001, pages 283-296.

²³⁸ First half of 20th century as a result of prevalence of modernism.

improve the quality of contemporary life."²³⁹

Arts Council of Great Britain was founded in 1946, and it is considered as the first arts agency in the world to distribute government funds at the "arm's-length" model. The arm's length principle essentially represents a "convention" between the government and the various arts and cultural agencies, and the terms of these relationships are set down in management standards.²⁴⁰ The role of the Arts Council was primarily reactive - allocating the funds for arts organizations and artists and providing help and encouragement.²⁴¹

New attitude towards arts in the UK was manifested in 1951 during the Festival of Britain, when for the first time issues of art were entangled with that of individual rights and democracy. Festival of Britain was organized within the social program of reform implemented by the new Labor government and conceived as a celebration of Britain's history and culture, an event that would help Britons to forget traumas of war. Festival celebrated various aspect of reconstruction and introduced a modern town planning through exhibitions. Visual arts were also important part of the festival.²⁴² The London County Council and Arts Council of Great Britain especially for this occasion commissioned public art, sculptures and murals, for various locations in the city, in order to enliven the city during the festival. The main exhibition of public sculpture was organized on the West Bank and many of the exhibited works remained on the site after the end of festival.

In the following period, on account of government legislation from the 1948 that had given local councils a legal authority (although only permissive) to support arts and entertainment,²⁴³ some of the local authorities began to expand their support for public art. This support was mostly manifested through the organization of the open air exhibitions, art project for schools, installment of contemporary public sculpture on city's precincts, public parks, shopping areas in new built environments, which all gave

²³⁹ Quoted in: Juliet Hamilton, Leslie Forsyth & Daniel De Iongh, *Public Art: A Local Authority Perspective*, Journal of Urban Design, vol.6, issue 3, Routledge 2001, pages 283-296.

²⁴⁰ United Kingdom, Country Profile, Compendium, Cultural Policies and trend in Europe, <http://www.culturalpolicies.net/web/unitedkingdom.php>, retrieved: April 2008.

²⁴¹ Ibid.

²⁴² Designing Britain 1945- 1975, The visual experience of post-war society, <http://vads.ahds.ac.uk/learning/designingbritain/index.html>, retrieved: May 2008.

²⁴³ United Kingdom, Country Profile, Compendium, Cultural Policies and trend in Europe, <http://www.culturalpolicies.net/web/unitedkingdom.php>, retrieved: April 2008.

ordinary citizens opportunity to experience contemporary art.

During this period the London City Council adopted the first official policy for promotion of public art in the built environment. City of London started to finance decoration of schools and housing estates with sculptures and murals. Although there were earlier examples of sculpture being sited on housing estates, it was in mid 50s that the London County Council made a decisive commitment to commission contemporary sculpture for specific sites.²⁴⁴ The main aim of this program was an improvement and enhancement of the quality of everyday life of ordinary people. This practice is considered as the first example of the cultural strategies employment in urban regeneration in Britain. London City Council policy was a precedent for many other cities in the UK, and especially for the towns and cities part of the New Towns project. One of the best examples of this new practice was Harlow, city which from its foundation had a policy of incorporating public sculpture in the housing estates as well as in the city precincts. Harlow eventually acquired public sculpture collection larger than any other British town of that size, whose number counted 27 by the end of 1973.²⁴⁵

However, besides all of these early attempts made by the city of London and the New Towns officials, UK acceptance of the public art policy has been hesitant. In spite of the urgent political will to foster a cultured environment and bring 'art' to the widest audience possible, the official public art policy had to wait until the 1980s.

However, as Sara Selwood stated in her report "*Benefits of Public Art*",²⁴⁶ interest for Public Art in Britain was constant and the first wave of the official public art advocacy has arisen in 1970s. She highlighted the importance of the first government's initiatives in that domain, from the Labor party report *Arts and People* made in 1977, through to the Conservative administration support to Garden Festivals. Furthermore, from that period originates also the Arts Council of Great Britain first initiative in this domain - project the *Art into Landscape*. At the same time together with these official programs, the artists themselves initiated a great number of the public art projects. One of the most influential projects of this kind was the community murals movement, spreading

²⁴⁴ Designing Britain 1945- 1975, The visual experience of post-war society,
<http://vads.ahds.ac.uk/learning/designingbritain/index.html>, retrieved: May 2008.

²⁴⁵ <http://www.harlow.gov.uk/Default.aspx?sID=726> , retrieved: May 2008.

²⁴⁶ Tim Hall, Ian Robertson, *Public Art and Urban Regeneration: advocacy, claims and critical debate*, Landscape Research, Vol.26, No.1, Carfax Publishing, 2001.

all over the UK in seventies and typically led by art school graduates using depriving urban landscapes for the artistic interventions.

All these new manifestations and an increase of public advocacy in favor of the public art prompted also many industrial and commercial sponsors to start to commission the public art. In the most of the cases corporate interest for public art was manifested only in the form of placing the contemporary public sculpture in front of their headquarters as a depiction of their corporative strength. However, some corporations chose to initiate community-oriented projects also. One of the early examples of this practice originates from the 1972 when the Peter Stuyvesant Foundation financed a project to site public sculpture in eight city-centers in Britain.

5.2. New Developments in the Eighties

Nevertheless, all these initiatives in the seventies were still just isolated cases, and until the mid 1980s there was no special governmental interest for public art and thereby neither the funding possibilities. Decisive stimulus for an expansion of public art projects in the eighties came not, as we may think, from the domain of culture, and existing governmental aspirations for democratization of art, but rather from an urban policy domain and a widely spread acknowledgment during the eighties, that arts, and especially public art, could to certain degree contribute to the urban redevelopment process and the growth of the city's economy.

This unexpected turn of events in favor of public art, was determined by the special social and economical situation of that period. During the eighties, central and local authorities in the United Kingdom faced with the large urban crisis, result of the process of suburbanization and decline of city's economy. In that situation, one of the main government's concerns become how to reverse process of rapid inner city decay and to bring back to life city's economy, through the implementation of the specific economical and social policy measures. For that reason the British government abandoned the New Towns project²⁴⁷ and adopted a new urban policy - *Action for Cities*,

²⁴⁷ Which is sometimes considered also as one of the reason for the process of decentralization and related crisis of great Britain cities.

based on the property led redevelopment strategies for inner cities areas, which were already employed in the US for more than a decade. This new urban policy was based mostly on measures for the lowering of the governmental control in the domain of urban redevelopment and a stimulation of the privately financed reconstruction projects, directed towards more effective use of buildings and land, in order to attract new businesses, encourage city's economy diversification and thus enable new jobs openings. Important factor in these strategies had a provision of the new housing and business facilities as well as a general enchantment of urban environment in order to give possibility of better way of life to urban residents.²⁴⁸

Important part of the new urban redevelopment programs was an attempt to decorate a city. Most of the local authorities adopted new urban policies based on the move towards remodeling the image of the city centers in order to market themselves as attractive places for investment and tourism. It was considered that even minor developments or simple placing of public art should improve cities environment. A new duty for local authorities rapidly developed: to at least encourage features that could enhance the identity of any built-up area.²⁴⁹ In all these developments public art got a considerable role and almost all redevelopment project included some kind of public art project. Many local authorities and developers were investing large sums of moneys into the emblematic and expensive public art projects realized by the most distinguished contemporary artists.

Alongside with the new interest for a public art and its presence within social and urban policy, the 80s were also a time when political and economic pressures led to a fundamental reappraisal of the funding and management system for the arts and culture in Britain. As a result of the recognition that art does not occupy only aesthetic realm but that they are also part of an economic relations in the society, the Arts Council for the first time expanded its policy objectives beyond the mere promotion of the interests of artists. In the same time, while declaredly remained committed to the principle of public sector support, the government made a decision to decrease expenditures for culture, and required from the arts and culture organizations to look for the new sources of revenue to

²⁴⁸ Juliet Hamilton, Leslie Forsyth & Daniel De Iongh, *Public Art: A Local Authority Perspective*, Journal of Urban Design, vol.6, issue 3, Routledge 2001, pages 283-296.

²⁴⁹ Ibid.

supplement their income.²⁵⁰ From that period all arts funding, including public art, have been frequently justified in economic terms. This new attitude towards arts the best illustrates the Arts Council policy and its main goals:

- Encouragement of private sector funding the arts;
- Regular evaluation of projects and acknowledgment of the interests of the market;
- Need to expand audiences for the arts;
- Support for non-traditional art forms;
- Creation of greater parity between the art provision in London and the regions.²⁵¹

Evidence of this new more proactive Arts Council cultural policy, was an extensive pro arts campaign started in order to facilitate private funding of arts and an incorporation of the public art in urban development projects. During the second half of the eighties the Council financed several researches on the subject - how and which kind of direct economic benefits could derive from the provision of cultural and artistic facilities. Results of these analyses were widely promoted, and public arts funding bodies in the most of the cases assumed the roles of its advocates.²⁵² In 1984 as part of these efforts it was established the Business Sponsorship Incentive Scheme, which for the first time matched funds from business with a government grant, and was administered by the Arts & Business organization in order to encourage new sponsorship.²⁵³

First results of the new public arts advocacy become evident early in 1982 during the Art and Architecture conference at the Institute of Cultural Affairs (ICA). This conference has shown that there had been an enormous growth of local authority policies aimed to encourage collaborative efforts between artists, architects and other interested actors to work on the improvement of the built environment.²⁵⁴

²⁵⁰ United Kingdom, Country Profile, Compendium, Cultural Policies and trend in Europe, <http://www.culturalpolicies.net/web/unitedkingdom.php>, retrieved: April 2008.

²⁵¹ Juliet Hamilton, Leslie Forsyth & Daniel De Iongh, *Public Art: A Local Authority Perspective*, Journal of Urban Design, vol.6, issue 3, Routledge 2001, pages 283-296.

²⁵² Tim Hall, Ian Robertson, *Public Art and Urban Regeneration: advocacy, claims and critical debate*, Landscape Research, Vol.26, No.1, Carfax Publishing, 2001.

²⁵³ United Kingdom, Country Profile, Compendium, Cultural Policies and trend in Europe, <http://www.culturalpolicies.net/web/unitedkingdom.php>, retrieved: April 2008.

²⁵⁴ Henry Lydiate, *Public Patrons. Percentage for art*, 1982, <http://www.artquest.org.uk/artlaw/patrons/28615.htm>, retrieved : 6.february 2007.

Few years later in 1987 the Department for Environment published the *Art for Architecture* handbook, the first handbook in the UK with all practical information how to commission public art. Published in the climate of decreasing public expenditure for arts, its main goal was a construction of a business case for art.²⁵⁵ With the same intention in 1988 the Public Policy Institute commissioned from John Myerscough, an extensive study named *The Economic Importance of the Arts in Britain*. The basic premise of this study was that arts are an important source of jobs and economic regeneration and that they are capable to regenerate a local economy. Study demonstrated that in cities Glasgow, Merseyside and Ipswich 128 000 new jobs were directly attributable to the arts. The conclusion of the author was that the arts can act as magnet to draw people to live in particular regions and localities. Arts attractions and events contribute to the quality of the inner-city life and to the appreciation of property values. In this way arts also can influence on economic vitality of their immediate localities. They are a potent force for environmental improvement, as well as a tool for the regional and urban development. By bringing to life city centers, they assist public safety and provide a foundation for social reconstruction.²⁵⁶

Although this study was more concerned with the art as process and cultural industries (mostly performative arts) and not so much with the acquisition of contemporary public art (sculpture), enthusiastic and strong visual art lobby used this and some other studies to make a good case for public art as a part of the urban redevelopments plans.²⁵⁷

In the same context one year later the Council of Arts issued a study *Urban Renaissance* in order to popularize public art projects. In its foreword Luke Rittner, acting Secretary General of Arts Council, stated that “*Urban renewal continues to be high on national agenda. Architecture and quality of life in cities are subject of debate throughout history... The Arts are making a substantial contribution to the revitalization of our cities*”.²⁵⁸ This publication presented 16 art projects developed all over the UK which were saw as the important contributors to the economical revival of the cities and

²⁵⁵ Juliet Hamilton, Leslie Forsyth & Daniel De Iongh, *Public Art: A Local Authority Perspective*, Journal of Urban Design, vol.6, issue 3, Routledge 2001, pages 283-296.

²⁵⁶ Quoted in : Ibid.

²⁵⁷ Miles Malcom, *Art, Space, and the City*, Routledge, London 2006, pp.104-132.

²⁵⁸ Ibid.

community participation in cultural activities. Illustrated project diverse from the multi arts venues, performances arts projects, media projects and visual arts projects. Among all of these projects only one was really relevant for public art. As Miles argues, in the end of eighties visual artist and arts managers lobby was very strong and succeeded to appropriate the case of arts in redevelopment and to ascribe all its positive effects to the permanent public art projects. Nevertheless, regardless an extensive advocacy of the Arts Council and a strong visual arts lobby, making the case for the public art and a campaign for incorporation of public art into urban redevelopment projects was shown as more successful with the public bodies (including the different Development Corporations) than with the private property developers.

However, in the nineties some concern were arisen about property led up-down approaches to urban regeneration which further led to the re-evaluation of its accomplished results and especially their social and economical impacts. Evaluations clearly demonstrated that redevelopment projects succeeded to accomplish only environmental improvements but social and community issues rested unsolved or in some cases they even aggravated.²⁵⁹ So, it was proposed that existing urban policy framework be reshaped in order to include more holistic and locally sensitive strategies. This new urban policy was leaning toward integration of the social, economic, physical ad cultural strategies all in one. In economic terms an emphasis was not any more on private investments but more on private - public partnerships, and once again public funding reached a similar level to that of private sector.²⁶⁰ For accomplishing these new objectives, regional developments agencies (RDA) were established, with the main mission to reduce regional inequalities, through the coordination of economic regeneration and development.

The same as in the domain of urban and social policy, the nineties brought fundamental policy and structural changes in the cultural sector as well. The most important structural change occurred in 1992, when a re-elected Conservative

²⁵⁹ New redevelopment project in many UK cities facilitated gentrification processes.

²⁶⁰ Carol-Ann Beswick, Sasha Tsenkova, *Overview of Urban Regeneration Policies*, http://www.ucalgary.ca/EV/designresearch/projects/2001/Urban_Regeneration/chapter2.pdf, retrieved: May 2008.

government²⁶¹ established for the first time a co-ordinated Ministry to deal with arts, museums, libraries, heritage, media, sport and tourism called the Department of National Heritage.²⁶² Few years later in 1997, with the election of the new labour administration, the Department of National Heritage was renamed to the Department for Culture, Media and Sport. With the foundation of the new ministry important changes occurred in the domain of public founding of arts. New Labour administration increased once again an investment in a culture and in that way ended years of "standstill" funding. They conducted a structural reform of the existing system in culture and consequently reduced the number of arm's length cultural agencies through a series of mergers.²⁶³

Central question of cultural policy in second half of nineties was not any more only the economical importance of culture but also the issues in which way cultural sector in the UK can contribute to the achievement of the wider government objectives such as promoting of social inclusion and neighborhood renewal, as well as its increasing commitment to investment in cultural capital in general. In the mission statement of the newly founded the Department of National Heritage from 1993, arts are regarded as a means to “*deal with the problems of unemployment and alienation in the country’s inner cities, as well as contributing to the creation of a classless and tolerant society*”.²⁶⁴ Few years later labour Ministry for Culture (DCMS) as their main mission declared “*to improve the quality of life for all through cultural (and sporting) activities*”.²⁶⁵ Subsequently, both ministries have made widespread provision for the arts in a range of urban (and rural) regeneration budgets.

²⁶¹ For a Prime Minister was elected John Major.

²⁶² In 1994, a fundamental decision was taken to devolve the Arts Council of Great Britain's responsibilities and functions to three new separate bodies: the Arts Council of England, the Scottish Arts Council and the Arts Council of Wales. Each nation therefore runs its own affairs in relation to arts funding. In: United Kingdom, Country Profile, Compendium, Cultural Policies and trend in Europe, <http://www.culturalpolicies.net/web/unitedkingdom.php>, retrieved: April 2008.

²⁶³ Ibid.

²⁶⁴ Ibid.

²⁶⁵ Department for Culture Media and Sport, <http://www.culture.gov.uk/>.

5.3. Public Art Policy Instruments

5.3.1. Intersectorial Cooperation

In order to achieve proclaimed goals, the Ministry of Culture, Media and Sport encouraged inter-sectorial cooperation and organization of the joint projects among cultural, social and urban sector. Within this framework new ministry advised local authorities to develop local cultural strategies, or to incorporate them into their Sustainable Communities Strategies. Ministry has also established a Regional Cultural Consortium in each of the eight English planning regions outside London to develop integrated cultural strategies across England and ensure that culture has a strong voice in regional development.²⁶⁶ This period sought also an initiation of large number of specialized and publicly founded organizations and projects connecting the social, urban and cultural issues. Many of these organizations were supporting different kinds of public art projects dealing with community regeneration issues.

One of these newly established organizations interested in the support of public art was the Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE), government's official expert body with the main task to promote better quality building and urban design. In 2004, CABE has organized and supported three years national public art funding scheme *Project*, together with non profit organization *Arts and Businesses*, whose main mission was to enable cooperation between art and commercial sector. The main aim of this project, managed by specialized public art agency *Public Art South West*, has been engaging artists, public agencies and private sector in public art project within built environments. *Project* was not only project of this type in the UK, while in the last two decades many governmental development agencies were also started to finance different kinds of public art projects. Besides the already mentioned CABE, a significant role for the promotion of this kind of projects have the national regeneration agency *English Partnerships*. This non departmental public organization is supported by the Ministry of Communities and Local Government with the main objectives such as a development of well designed sustainable public places for community. The EP works

²⁶⁶ United Kingdom, Country Profile, Compendium, Cultural Policies and trend in Europe, <http://www.culturalpolicies.net/web/unitedkingdom.php>, retrieved: April 2008.

together with CABE and other developmental organizations on collaborative projects in public spaces.²⁶⁷

Among organizations that were (and are) actively supporting and granting public art projects we can also include regional development agencies responsible for the sustainable economic development and regeneration of the specific region. RDAs are considered to be the ‘driving force’ of the UK’s economy today. Although, RDA's does not have a strategic responsibility for the culture development, they understand that cultural development contributes significantly to the sustainable economic and social development. In 2003 one of the regional RDA agency, the South East England Development Agency (SEEDA) together with Arts Council England has started public art granting scheme called *Art Plus*. Art Plus is conceived as a competitive award scheme which seeks to improve built environment in England- whether streets, schools or other public spaces – by including the creativity of artists in their design. It is an award scheme for ideas for innovative public art projects that could take place in the south east region of England.

Here I mentioned only a few the most important organizations and cooperative granting schemes for public art in the UK. Besides these inter sectorial cooperative public art projects, Ministry of Culture, DMCS, through the Art Council allocation support many of the specialized public art organizations and their projects. Some of the most successful of them are IXIA, PASW, ArtPoint. All these organizations are primarily charity organizations founded by the Arts Council (IXIA) or just supported by it through the grant allocation (PASW, ARTSLINK). The main aim of these organizations is to advocate, carry research and consultation on public art for public and private organizations, provide guidance on the role of art in public space and organize training for artist and commissioners. All public art organizations carries a pro-active approach in the intiation of the projects and their way of working is underpinned by being able to offer financial support to a range of strategically important projects and partners in the region.

²⁶⁷ English Partnerships, <http://www.englishpartnerships.co.uk>, retrieved: May 2008.

5.3.2. National Lottery Program

Nevertheless, a significant development in the public art domain during the two past decades in the UK has been mainly a result of the introduction of the National Lottery²⁶⁸ program for *good causes* in November 1994, which brought a major new income stream for the cultural sector in the United Kingdom. The National Lottery in the UK is centrally administered and controlled through the Parliament via the DCMS by an appointed Lottery Commission. The main task of the DCMS is to set policy and financial framework within which the distributing bodies for National Lottery grants could operate. All lottery grants intended for culture are allocated through the following distributing bodies: Arts Council England, Northern Ireland, Wales, Scottish Arts Council, Heritage Lottery fund, Big Lottery Fund (a merger of The Community Fund and New Opportunities Fund).

In the initial years of lottery funding program, Arts Councils' focus was very much on capital and flagships projects, for example the refurbishment of museums and galleries as well as the new buildings and mayor public art projects. In that period the Lottery has funded projects ranging from the *Angel of the North*, *Tate Modern* and equipment for village halls. Subsequently, with the new New Lottery Act from 2006 the funds has been allocated in the more flexible ways, for example for small community projects, public art commissions or feature films, as well as to individuals.²⁶⁹ This new legislation aims to make the Lottery more responsive to people's priorities and to ensure that Lottery money goes efficiently to good causes.

Besides the Lottery funds, grants from the Arts Council and different development and regeneration agencies, the main financial resources for public art projects in the UK are the means gained on the local level, through *the percentage for arts policy* and so called *Section 106 Planning Agreements*.

5.3.3. The Percent for Art Policy

The Arts Council's attempts to develop the 'percent for art' policies amongst British local authorities started on at the end of the eighties, and were drawn on the wide-

²⁶⁸ About this, www.lotterygoodcauses.org.uk

²⁶⁹ In November 2004, revealed that GBP 2 billion had been allocated through Arts Council England.

spread American public-sector models. In 1988 the Arts Council of England, the Scottish Arts Council, the Welsh Arts Council and the regional arts associations confirmed in principle their support to the introduction of the Percent for Art Policy. They organized special steering group headed by prominent architect Richard Burton to investigate viability of the percentage for arts policy in UK conditions. The main task of the steering group was to work out a program for the implementation of percentage for art ordinances as well as possible ways of its application. Initially in 1988, when the Arts Council for the first time came up with a idea, it was considered as the best solution for propagation of public art would be passing the national legislation, requiring a percentage of all publicly funded buildings and maintenance schemes to include funding for artists' and architects' collaboration. However, the 1980s²⁷⁰ were not the best time for the percent for art policy introduction because the Thatchers' government saw this kind of regulations as a restriction on the freedom of capital, or as an increased burden on the public budget.²⁷¹ In these circumstances, in 1991 the Arts Council issued steering group report "*Percent for art: a review*" in the form of an handbook which main aim was to persuade local authorities as well as private developers to adopt a policy. In the report steering group made 10 recommendations how to implement percentage for arts policy, which included also legal advise that *percent for art policy could not be mandatory under the English planning law*.²⁷² The demand for legislation was, to all intents and purposes, shelved in favor of publication of information, education, and the persuasion of bodies responsible for both the environment and the arts and crafts - a strategy that has proved successful. Nevertheless, Steering Group gave also other more positive recommendations and urged public bodies to include the Percent for art policy in their own development scheme. It was stated that adoption of the percent for art policy can in different ways contribute to the city development. Here we will cite some of the stated benefits:

- To make a place more interesting and attractive;
- To make contemporary arts and crafts more accessible to the public;

²⁷⁰ During the Thatcher's government urban policy in Britain was including and accentuating private sector involvement in urban revitalization project.

²⁷¹ Henry Lydiate, *Public Patrons. Percentage for art*, 1982, <http://www.artquest.org.uk/artlaw/patrons/28615.htm> , retrieved : 6.february 2007.

²⁷² Ibid.

- To highlight the identity of different parts of a building or community;
- To increase a city's/country's/or company's investment in the arts;
- To improve the conditions for economic regeneration by creating richer visual environment;
- To create employment for artists, craftspeople, fabricators, suppliers, and manufactures of materials, and transporters;
- To encourage closer links between artists and craftspeople and the profession that shape environment: architecture, landscaping, engineering and design.²⁷³

First evaluations made in the nineties demonstrated that from the beginning of the Arts Council campaign approximately three times as many public art commissions stemmed from the public sector compared to the private sector.²⁷⁴ One of the first survey on this subject, done by the Policy Studies Institute in 1994 has shown that the vast majority of local authorities were aware of the percent for art, with 48% of all local authorities and 70% of urban local authorities having such policies.²⁷⁵ Survey also demonstrated that local authorities who have commissioned works have felt public art able to address a number of their strategic priorities concerning:

*“the quality of the built environment ... , public access and awareness of visual arts ... the need to stimulate economic regeneration and to develop positive identities for particular areas ... and to foster civic pride”.*²⁷⁶

An another survey made by the Public Art Forum revealed that between 1984 and 1988, 124 UK local authorities (24% of all local authorities and 43.5% of these responding to the survey) commissioned some 333 pieces of public art. This included a range of artworks (although sculpture and murals dominated) costing some £3.5 million. The percentage of local authorities commissioning public art rose to 53% between 1988 and 1994.²⁷⁷

²⁷³ Arts Council, 1991. In: Miles Malcolm, *Art, Space and the City*, Routledge, London 2006, pp.104-132.

²⁷⁴ Tim Hall, Ian Robertson, *Public Art and Urban Regeneration: advocacy, claims and critical debate*, Landscape Research, Vol.26, No.1, Carfax Publishing, 2001.

²⁷⁵ Ibid.

²⁷⁶ Ibid.

²⁷⁷ Public Art Forum Study, *ibid.*

This survey also revealed some interesting facts considering the implementation process. For project management usually were in charged local authorities but also great number of them (21%) decided to employ a specialist public art officer or agency.²⁷⁸ In this way it was acknowledged that a large number of independent commissioning agencies, largely established during the 1980s and playing a liaison role between commissioners and artists, have also become key agents in the development of public art in the UK, often acting as a regional catalysts to its development.²⁷⁹

As we can see, in spite of the fact that percentage for arts policy in Britain is still mainly vague, voluntary and ad hoc, its implementation has become the norm in city development and, as cited surveys demonstrates, in only 10 years has succeeded to foster a new climate favorable for the public art projects.²⁸⁰ Nevertheless, the main problem considering the percentage for arts policy is that its application at ground level is far from universal. All surveys show that public art project are usually concentrated in high-visibility areas, central parts of the cities and new parts of cities but they are rarely present in the poor neighborhoods and in the rural areas. Its absence from deprived areas often accompanies a low opinion about its effectiveness in the process of urban regeneration.²⁸¹ In recent period as a solution for this problem some researchers proposed a minimum Percent for Art to be energetically enforced as a national strategy, for addressing these anxieties and ensure a continuation of provision which might see public art spread beyond densely populated city centers to distant and underprivileged districts. Although nationally applicable, ideally this procedure would be mediated at the local level.²⁸²

5.3.4. Section 106 Planning Agreements

Alongside the percentage for arts policy many of local authorities have decided to adopt the so called *Section 106 Planning Agreements* as the best way to finance public art projects. Section 106 Planning Agreement is a voluntary, but legally binding agreement

²⁷⁸ Policy Studies Institute, 1994, *ibid.*

²⁷⁹ *Ibid.*

²⁸⁰ Juliet Hamilton, Leslie Forsyth & Daniel De Iongh, *Public Art: A Local Authority Perspective*, Journal of Urban Design, vol.6, issue 3, Routledge 2001, pages 283-296.

²⁸¹ *Ibid.*

²⁸² *Ibid.*

between a developer and local planning authority, whereby the developer agrees to make financial contributions that minimize the impact of the development on community infrastructure and provide community benefits. The terms of each individual agreement set out the scale of the contribution and the areas of community benefit to be addressed. The local authority itemizes these areas and Public Art is one of the potential benefits able to be secured through this route. A positive outcome for the developers would be add value to their developments through the integrating public art into their plans rather than add them on as an obligation. A developer may consider adding to existing budgets to incorporate a creative approach, for example an artist's involvement in the design of key elements such as glass, paving, door, furniture etc.²⁸³

5.4. Planning Mechanisms

As we can see, a significant and growing amount of public art projects in the UK in large measure is result of developments that require planning permission or have a connection to the planing system and process. From the early nineties, with the emphasis on the integrated treatment of urban policy, many UK cities decided to develop a public art strategy in order to place public art within the planning and development process. In this way local authorities were trying to encourage commissioning of public art as a part of high quality building and urban design, integral within the new development schemes as well as part of social investment in the new housing units.

Under the british law, promotion of art is not a proper function of planning control, and so public authorities and developers could not be obliged to provide public art but only encouraged.²⁸⁴ Due to this legal restraints, there is no specific national guidelines regarding public art and its inclusion in the planning system and process in United Kingdom. However, there is a support for public art commissioning in statutory and strategic documents concerned with planning, design and the built environment at national, regional and local levels.

At the national level, the Government's Planning Policy Guidance Notes (PPG)

²⁸³ Miltion Kenys Public Art Plan

²⁸⁴ Henry Lydiate, *Public Patrons. Percentage for art*, 1982,
<http://www.artquest.org.uk/artlaw/patrons/28615.htm> , retrieved : 6.february 2007.

and their recent replacement Planning Policy Statements (PPS)²⁸⁵ are the main documents which set out policies on different aspects of planning and advise the Local Authorities during the preparation of their Local Developments Frameworks. these documents do not make specific references to the public art but they do state that sustainable development have to include good design and community engagement, aspects that artist can influence.²⁸⁶ To illustrate this we will cite some of the paragraphs which clearly emphasize the possible contribution of artists to high quality urban design.

PPS paragraph on sustainable development says: *'Planning policies should promote high-quality inclusive design in the layout of new developments and individual buildings in terms of function and impact, not just for the short term but over the lifetime of the development. Design which fails to take the opportunities available for improving the character and quality of an area should not be accepted.'*²⁸⁷

The similar idea is emphasized in the PPS for planning for town centers : *"Policies for the design of development for main town centre uses, regardless location, and for development in town centers, should promote high quality and inclusive design, in order to improve the character and quality of the area in which such development is located and the way it functions."*²⁸⁸; as well as in in the following paragraph of the PPG planning for open space: *"[Local plans and policies should be aimed at] creating places, streets and spaces which meet the needs of people; which are attractive, have their own distinctive identity, and positively improve local character."*²⁸⁹

Corresponding paragraphs exist also in the PPS for Housing, Local Development Frameworks, Transport, Planning and the Historic Environment, and they all, although not implicitly indicating public art, suggest to local authorities to consider inclusion of the some kind of urban design and public art policy into their development plans.

On the regional level, similar observations and advices are presented in the Spatial Strategies that provide a regional level planning framework as well as in the Regional

²⁸⁵ Department for Communities and Local Government's website, www.communities.gov.uk

²⁸⁶ *ibid.*

²⁸⁷ www.publicartonline.com

²⁸⁸ Department for Communities and Local Government's website, www.communities.gov.uk.

²⁸⁹ *Ibid.*

Economic Strategies developed by Regional Assemblies (RA) and Regional Development Agencies (RDA). These public agencies are recognized a role of the built environment and public realm in the process of social and economic development of the regions.²⁹⁰ Both agencies have developed intensive collaboration with the specialized national agencies such as CABA²⁹¹ or the Arts Council of England supporting different kind of public art initiatives. Arts Council and its regional offices also participate and have leading role in the process of defining the public art strategy within policies and initiatives of RA's and RDA's. They exercise their mission either directly or through the support of different kind public art organizations and agencies.

However, beside all efforts, on the national and regional level the recommendations could only be made in favor of public art, but in most of the cases local authorities are responsible to define conditions for its placing as well as for the preparation of the public art policy and its implementation. For that reason the Arts Council and the public art agencies are giving special attention and advocating to the Local Authorities how to develop and implement public art policies, within a local authority context.

Considering the local authorities planning obligation a provision of public art is usually defined within the Local Plan Policy. First step towards development of special public art strategies has been made in the beginning of the nineties when a significant number of local authorities decided to include the Percent for Art Policy in their Local Plan. Besides, a public art policies can be further developed within the Community Plans and Supplementary Planning Guidance such as the Planning Briefs for individual sites. Many of the objectives, contained within these documents on the environment, community development, employment and so on, relate to quality of life issues and the public art has an important role within the delivery of these objectives.²⁹² However, in recent time as it is greatly acknowledged that planing has a strong influence on nature and process of public art commissioning, a large number of local authorities decided to adopt the supplementary Planning Document on public art as a part of the Local or Unitary Development Plan. One of the main purposes of this document is to enable

²⁹⁰ Public Art and the Planning System and Process in England, IXIA Report, 2007.

²⁹¹ CABA- The Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment, www.cabe.org.uk

²⁹² Public Art and the Planning System and Process in England, IXIA Report, 2007, and others public art policy documents.

developers to prepare public art statements for inclusion within planning applications that are secured within the Section 106 planning obligations and planning conditions, or to secure financial contributions within the Section 106 planning obligations to support place-wide public art initiatives promoted and adopted by a Local Authority.²⁹³

Recent survey²⁹⁴ from 2007 has shown that approximately 61% of the Local Authorities in England have either public art policy documents, or some kind of strategies and statements linked to the local planning system and process. The majority of these policies are part of the urban authorities development plans. Usually the local authorities base their policies on an advice given by the Arts Council of Great Britain, which states that local authorities can adopt special policies to encourage public art in their development plans and provide incentive schemes to prompt private property developers to include public art in their development schemes requiring planning permission.

The main aim of the public art policy document (strategy or statement) is to define how Local Authority will apply the public art policies to its own capital developments and the development brief strategies, via the planning system and process. This document identifies policies and guidelines that local authorities can adopt to facilitate the commission and implementation of the public art projects in city's public spaces. Policy document usually contains public art plan specifying opportunities and possible sites for new projects, different kinds of art initiatives integrated within place-wide public realm as well as all other plans on this subject adopted and promoted by the Local Authority. The content of some current public art policy documents issued by city's councils of Derby, Cambridge, Bristol, Cardiff, Salisbury and especially IXIA's guidance on a supplementary planning document for public art (2007) provides us with details about local authorities visions, policies and strategies for public art as well as a guidance on the key stages for the production of the document and all other considerations that good public art policy document have or may include.

An overview of these documents has shown that majority of these cities have adopted some kind of public art policy early in the nineties.²⁹⁵ However, the main reason for their decision to produce public art policy document was a recognition that

²⁹³ Ibid.

²⁹⁴ Ibid.

²⁹⁵ Cambridge, Salisbury and Bristol.

percent for art policy was not effectively and consistently implemented and opportunities had been missed. Two third of the local authorities²⁹⁶ did not adopt the exact wording of the 1% policy but chose to interpret it more flexibly. They sought policy to “encourage public art” and they are chose not to specifically mention *percent for art*. The main way for the public art encouragement is through the implementation of the 106 planning agreements and conditions within planning applications. Some cities such as Cambridge are even decides to adopt both the percentage for arts and the 106 planning agreement measures.

In order to prepare the public art policy paper, the City Council appoints a local public art officer usually located within the cultural or planning department. Increasingly, it is located within the latter,²⁹⁷ as this fosters greater understanding of the relationship between public art and planning policies, strategies and processes that guide the social and physical development of places. Some policy documents also noted a need for a coordination across and within departments.²⁹⁸ In other cases there is still no public art expert or administrator in local administration and in these circumstances city's officials usually appoint external specialist public art agency²⁹⁹ to conduct research and to prepare strategy together with a local art officer.³⁰⁰ In many cases one of the main objectives of the public art policy document is to establish new posts for public art officer, responsible for planning process as well as a management of the projects.³⁰¹

First step in the development of the public art plan is to assess current situation in order to establish what has already taken place and what is planned and, when possible, an evaluation of the impact of realized projects. Based on these findings public art officer or public art agency made recommendations how to improve process of the commissioning and implementation of the public art project in the future. Based on the

²⁹⁶ Public Art and the Planning System and Process in England, IXIA Report, 2007.

²⁹⁷ Ibid.

²⁹⁸ In almost all policy documents is accentuated a need for a beter inter sectorial cooperation: Salisbury, Cardiff, Derby.

²⁹⁹ In UK there is a large number of specialistic Commissioning (Public Art) Agencies – which tend to be charities and have educational purpose as well as commercial one.

³⁰⁰ Public art strategy for Derby was developed by the Public Arts agency in consultation with local arts administrator.

³⁰¹ In association with Public Art South West, Bristol City Council has established two new posts to assist the development and delivery of the Public Art Policy: a Senior Public Art Officer within the Arts Development Unit of Cultural Services; and an Art Project Manager within City Projects and Urban Design, Planning Services.

IXIA report and analysis of case studies we can conclude that every public art policy document (or strategy or plan) have to include informations on:

- The Local Authority's vision for public art, its policy and strategy;
- The wider policy context;
- Definition of public art;
- The benefits of public art;
- The principles of good practice;
- The rationale for the use of public art expertise;
- How the public art policy will be applied to specific regeneration areas and development sites;
- Descriptions of public art statements for the provision of public art by developers;
- Description of the process for the provision of public art by a Local Authority that is by developers.

The Local Authority's vision for public art, its policy and strategy

A vision represents the most important part of the policy document and it explains why the Local Authority chose to promote public art through the planning process. It defines Local Authority's understanding and approach to public art phenomenon and a summary of its policies and strategies. In the Salisbury public art policy document is stated that their vision is *“To create a sense of unique local identity through commissioning of artworks which will create individual and distinctive design features bringing character and showing creativity in public spaces and buildings.”*³⁰²In this introductory part of document are also defined central strategies and policies for the public art commission, maintenance and de-commissioning process and clarified Local Authorities' responsibilities in that process. An overview of the policy documents has shown that almost all City's Council choose to implement following strategies:

- Integration of the artist in the process from the earliest stage;
- Establishment of a percent for art policy;

³⁰² Salisbury District Council's Public Art Policy, 2003, www.salisbury.gov.uk/public-art-policy.pdf

- Employment of the vast range of educational approaches for better understanding and enjoyment in public art;
- Artist working with local community, project managers, officials to make integrated program for public art;
- Development of cross departmental liaison and links with other city's strategies;
- Open commissioning process to encourage locally based artists;
- Improvement of the management and maintenance of existing and future public works;³⁰³
- Establishment of the Public Art Initiatives Fund for commuted sums - used for a program of commissions not linked to individual developments, for ongoing marketing and promotion, and for care and maintenance.³⁰⁴

Almost all listed strategies are recommended from the Arts Council as the good practice and widely popularized over the past 15 years all over the UK through conferences and specialized reports.

The wider policy context

In this part of the policy document the national, regional and local policy context for the public art policy and are explained. This section summarizes all relevant existing policies, planning guidance and advice in relation to the public art development.

Definition of public art

This section is one of the most important part of every policy document. As we have already observed public art is widely diverse phenomenon which is hard to define. Inclusion of the definition of public art ensures that developers would not limit scope of public art when considering the possibilities for working with an artist. However, many local authorities in their public art policies are using restrictive definitions and place emphasis on the product and not so much on the process. In recent time this approach is

³⁰³ Cardiff Public Art Strategy, <http://www.publicartonline.org.uk/current/policies/strategies/documents/CardiffPublicArtStrategyEnglish.pdf>.

³⁰⁴ Cambridge Public Art Plan, <http://www.publicartonline.org.uk/current/policies/planning/cambridge.html>

starting to change and some communities are using different definitions of public art. For example in the Public Art strategy of City Council of Derby the main focus is on the understanding of public art as a process and a way of engaging with art, artist's communities and public space. It is stated that public art is *“the work of fine artists or craftsperson's which is physically and/or visually accessible to the public outside the traditional arenas for visual art.”*³⁰⁵ In the policy for public art of the city of Cardiff this definition is even broader and it encompass not only public sculpture but also festivals, performances and other temporary art forms.³⁰⁶ Bristol City Council in their strategy define public art as *“in whatever form, public art has one consistent quality: it is site-specific and relates to the context of that site”*.

The benefits of public art

Public art policy document have to clearly define which are the perceived benefits of public art in order to encourage individuals and organizations and especially private developers to get involved in public art. Public art benefits could be related with the physical quality of the site as well as social. Most of the public art policy papers as the main benefits states:

- Generate pride in an area;
- Increase sense of ownership;
- Develop cultural identity;
- Change an image;
- Engage with local communities;
- Create distinction, character and identity;
- Contribute to the quality of life, through good design and high quality surroundings;
- Promotion of the city as a good place to live, work and investment;
- Increases tourism;

³⁰⁵ Public Art Strategy City of Derby,
http://www.publicartonline.org.uk/current/policies/strategies/documents/derbypublicartstrategy_mk3.pdf.

³⁰⁶ Public Art Strategy City of Cardiff,
<http://www.publicartonline.org.uk/current/policies/strategies/documents/CardiffPublicArtStrategyEnglish.pdf>.

- Economical regeneration;
- Education and employment opportunities for artists, local community.

The principles of good practice

Principles of good practice for public art is a review of public art practice and presentation of the recognized standards. Usually in this part of the document extensive material is given concerning all practice principles for sourcing, appointing and working with public art.

The rationale for the use of public art expertise

In this section is defined who is responsible for management of the project. Sometimes it is a special public art officer, within cultural or planning department, responsible for management of the project, development of public art strategies, advocacy, education, marketing, founding or fundraising and encouraging public art commissions in new developments. In other cases when this kind of post does not exist within local administration or in cases when project is too big, the City Council chose to employ services of specialistic public art agencies and organizations.

How the public art policy will be applied to specific regeneration areas and development site

In this part Local Authorities summarize where will be public art policy and strategies applied. Most of the local authorities are choosing to support incorporation of the public art projects as part of development sites and place-wide public art initiatives integrated within public realm, but there are also some other possibilities. An overview of the existing practice is shown that policy could be applied on the project such as:

- Capital projects undertaken by the Local Authority;
- Regeneration areas;
- Area action plans;
- Public and private sector development sites;
- Public and private initiatives.

Descriptions of public art statements for the provision of public art by developers

Public art policies often includes an advices for the developers how to develop public art proposal. In this part guidelines for private developers are given on how to prepare public art statements which will enable that public art experts and artist be included in development project from the beginning. It is intended to highlight the issues that should be taken into consideration during the implementation of the project.

Description of the process for the provision of public art by a Local Authority that is funded by developers

Here are given all the relevant information how Local Authorities should enable developers to either appoint public art expertise or directly agree financial contributions secured within the Section 106 planning obligations to support place-wide public art initiatives as part of the public realm and other plans adopted and promoted by the Local Authorities.

This is just brief description what public art policy document represents and what have to define and include. It is important to emphasize that these are just general principles which can be applied by any organization or public body wishing to incorporate public art activity as a part of their key aims and objectives.

As we can see during the eighties and nineties it has been noticed steadily growth of public art projects in Britain. In the report *Benefits of public art*, Sara Sellwood estimated, in numbers, that in the period between the end of WW2 and 1984, 550 works of contemporary public art were placed in whole Britain. Nevertheless, in the next 10 years this number is largely exceeded and some calculations have shown that 750 public art installations have been created only in the period between 1984 and 1993.³⁰⁷ However, concept and aims of public art is changed in the last two decades. It evolved from the perception of public art as public sculpture or large flagships projects, to the public art as process and community art. Instead of large flagships public art project so preferred in the eighties, new policy encouraged the development of a larger number of

³⁰⁷ Quoted in Josie Appleton, The return of “statuemanía”, Spiked Essays, 22. September 2004, <http://www.spiked-online.com/Articles/0000000CA6F6.htm>, retrieved: May 2008.

small and community related programs based on collaboration. The role of public art was not any more restricted to the decoration and marketing of the place but it was considered that public art based on the collaboration and community participation have possibility to enhance civic pride of the inhabitants, to foster social cohesion and self confidence. In favor of this new, broader definition and understanding of public art (new genre public art) it was asserted that public art had to act as a symbol for rebirth, renewed confidence and dynamism for the people who live and work in a place. As a part of the community regeneration projects public art can promote a sense of community as well as an awareness of local or civic identity, promote social network development and sense of place, educate, and provoke social change.

Today, more than 50 city's and district authorities have adopted some kind of public art policy, either the percentage for art ordinances or they are implemented public art schemes as a part of environmental and planning programs. Public art has been successfully used both from the public and the private sector, separately or in partnerships. However, there is still many obstacles for the development of public art programs, and funding and motivation are the principle ones. Local authorities experience increasing financial pressure. Thus other statutory provisions, e.g. health, education and social welfare, many of which have escalating costs, have tended to relegate arts, even in the wider sense, to a financial wilderness.³⁰⁸ In a climate that does not stress the relationship between wealth creation and the quality of property development, most local authorities are reluctant to impose the Percent for Art on private developers. This situation is further worsened by the worry that such a requirement of the private sector, itself not celebrated for its sensitivity, might lead to a rash of banalities commissioned by developers who resented their new responsibilities rather than welcoming them.³⁰⁹ However, the main difficulties with the Arts Council and local authorities public art policy is that it is still applied in the same time to the whole spectrum of different public art projects from community regeneration to the mega corporate developments and without any differentiation between public good and corporate greed.

³⁰⁸ Juliet Hamilton, Leslie Forsyth & Daniel De Iongh, *Public Art: A Local Authority Perspective*, Journal of Urban Design, vol.6, issue 3, Routledge 2001, pages 283-296.

³⁰⁹ Ibid.

CONCLUSION

The contemporary public art is a phenomenon that is hard to define. It covers a broad range of media and it is opened to the multitude of the interpretations. In its forty years of existence the contemporary public art practice has undergone significant shifts, from the primarily aesthetic considerations to the recent collaborative and socially engaged practice.

There are a lot of different definitions of public art but one of the all encompassing is a cumulative definition given by the Public Art agency Forecast, according to which public art is: *“a work created by artists for the places accessible to and used by public. Ranging from the temporary installations to the permanent objects and the creation of entire public places, public art also includes performances and events. Artists who create public art may take cues from the work's physical environment; involve other professional disciplines or the community in a collaborative process; or pursue independent forms of creative expression. Public art often reveals its meaning gradually over time. Public art may shape public places; serve a function; engage a community; send a message; or confront the status quo”*.³¹⁰

Taking into account the complexity of the public art phenomenon, one might find it very difficult to encompass in one place all of its characteristics. Therefore, instead of trying to treat all its intrinsic features, I decided to explore only issues related to the public art projects in the built environment, implemented in authorization and collaboration of the central or local governments that own or administer public (urban) spaces, in order to articulate more comprehensive and meaningful analysis of the phenomenon. The first building block of the conceptual analysis assumed in this research might be articulated by the following pragmatic and narrow definition of public art given

³¹⁰ Public Art Agency, Forecast, <http://forecastpublicart.org/>.

by Hilde Heine: “*public art is art installed by public agencies in public places and at public expense.*”³¹¹

As it was emphasized in the introduction of the thesis, I conducted this research in a form of the case studies analyses through which I tried to analyze how the public art policy and its legal and financial instruments are developed and implemented in three countries, the United States, France, the United Kingdom. They are taken also as the main representatives of three different types of cultural policy models: the US as a representative of the liberal (facilitator) cultural policy model, France as the architect model and the UK’s as the arm’s length model. My research has shown that although all three countries approached and organized cultural policy in different ways their legal and financial policy instruments in the domain of the public art remained very similar.

Through case studies analyses I have demonstrated that governments of all three countries actively encourage the creation of public art by introducing the **percentage for art policy**, a regulation that requires that 1% of all public buildings constructions costs should be spent on public art. France and the US introduced and maintained this policy on the national level as early as the thirties; France introduced it as a part of the special program of Ministry of education and the US through the WPA³¹² Federal Art Project. However, in recent time this support in both countries has shifted from national to local and regional level. In the UK this regulation was introduced only recently, during the eighties and only at the local level.

The United States of America

After the early beginnings with the WPA Public Art program, in 1963 two special governmental public art programs were founded in the US, GSA Art in Architecture and NEA – Art in Public Spaces program. Through these two programs in the next three decades the public art had come into the central focus of the US government’s patronage in art. However, due to changed political circumstances and decentralization of the

³¹¹ Similar definition of public art gives Michel according to whom the Public Art is art “*commissioned, paid and owned by the state*”. In: Mitchell W.J. T. (ed.), *Art and the Public Sphere*, University of Chicago Press Journals, Chicago 1993.

³¹² Works Progress Administration.

decision making process within the federal government institutions, as well as growing resistance towards governments patronage in art during the Reagan mandate, one of these two existing public art programs has ceased to exist (NEA- Art in Public Spaces), and the other one changed its goals in the public art domain and has turned towards the architectural decoration (GSA- Art in Architecture).

During more than thirty years of federal patronage in public art the main reasons behind the provision of public art have changed drastically. From its foundation the NEA changed its objectives from early aspirations to " *give the public access to the best art of our times outside museum walls*" towards using the public art in the process of the social integration. On the other side, the GSA Public Art program, except for some minor changes, during the whole period remained faithful to its original objective that through art and well-designed architecture represents the power of the federal government.

However, besides this annulment of the state patronage in the domain of the public art, this type of projects continued to grow more than ever, but this time at the local and the regional level. The first local percent for art regulations in the US were introduced in the early seventies, and in the next period, especially during the eighties, most of the progressive public art projects as well as some new mechanisms of the public art policies were usually developed at the local level. Emergence of the local public art policies is connected mostly with the beginning of the urban regeneration programs in the seventies, whose main goal was to resolve existing economical and social problems of the cities and the urban crisis. At the beginning, for most of the cities, the public art was only a mean to enliven city centers and the newly redeveloped areas in order to attract new businesses and wealthy residents, but in a long run, this approach could not bring expected economic changes, and furthermore these urban regeneration programs simultaneously generated new social problems. Hence, in the nineties, some cities have started to develop new kind of public art programs, whose main goal was community revitalization. In contrast with the prestige flagships public art programs, which were mostly object based, the new socially engaged programs have become more process based.

We can summarize the main drives behind the development of public art programs at the local level in the US as:

- To enliven and enrich the decaying urban spaces;
- To market new local identity;
- To revitalize economy of former industrial cities;
- Integration of local community.

France

Although the first percent for art regulation in France was introduced in 1937, only after the WW2 the ministry of education made it mandatory. In the next period and especially after the foundation of the first Ministry of Culture in France, the public art becomes important field of the state patronage. Some of the first public art projects such as placing of Aristide Maillol's sculptures in the Tuileries Gardens in the vicinity of Louvre Carrousel, was realized on the initiative of the Minister of Culture Andre Malraux, as a part of the new cultural policy objectives to bring great works of art to the general public.³¹³

During the seventies, the development of the public art projects was also connected with the construction of the Villes Nouvelles, wherein public art was from the beginning considered as an integral part of the new urban spaces. At the same time the seventies are a period during which the percentage for art regulation becomes mandatory for most of the French ministries. The eighties and the appointment of Jack Lang as Minister of Culture represented a turning point in the development of the contemporary public art in France. During his mandate the new program of the *Commande Publique* (with two commissioning procedures - national and decentralized) and the new decentralized law of 1% for art were introduced, which for the first time empowered local authorities to make decisions in this domain.

Finally, we can summarize that in France, public art patronage was developed within the larger cultural policy objectives such as:

- To accentuate national cultural identity and French cultural dominance and prestige;
- The democratization of culture;

³¹³ Milena Dragičević-Šešić, Institutional system of French cultural policy, MA Thesis, Faculty of Dramatic Arts, Belgrade 1981.

- Employment opportunities for artists;
- Dissemination of contemporary art;
- Enrichment of heritage with contemporary art;
- To enliven the urban environments (Villes Nouvelles).

The United Kingdom

In contrast to the American and French cases, the public art in the UK is a younger phenomenon. The first large public art programs and projects emerged in the UK during the eighties, as a part of the urban regeneration programs developed according to the similar US initiatives from the seventies and the early eighties. The main reason for a sudden and growing interest for the public art in the UK was an attempt of Brittan's urban planners to solve the enormous economical and social problems emerged due to urban crisis. The Percent for Art schemes are introduced in the UK during the late eighties and in the early nineties through the "Art and Architecture" movement.

However, due to the specific legal system in the UK, which does not enable the percent for art and similar regulations to become mandatory, the public art policies in the UK are not considered as the legal requirements but informal and voluntary. In that situation the Ministry of Culture and Media and Arts Council have invested a lot of efforts in the public art advocacy, which in the very short period led to the introduction of a large number of public art programs and agencies. This, of course, also resulted in an enormous number of the new public art projects. Most of the established public art programs were operated by the public authorities responsible for spending, or authorizing the spending of the public (sometimes private) money on the construction, refurbishment, or regeneration of the built environment.

However, besides all attempts that have been undertaken during this short period, the UK falls far behind France and the US in terms of provision and policy mechanisms. In the recent literature, the UK's public art policy (and the cultural policy in general) has received strong criticism for its merely instrumental features because, it was argued, behind the extensive advocacy for the public art was the explicit economic rationale. However, like in the US, in the UK it became obvious that public art as a part of the urban regeneration programs did not bring the results as it was expected so the end of the

nineties in the UK represents a period during which a shift towards more process based and community directed project in the domain of public art has occurred.

During this short period of public art development in the UK, the main reasons that directed this development are claimed to be:

- Promotion of the city as a good place to live, work and invest;
- Economical regeneration;
- Education and employment opportunities for artists, local community;
- Community integration.

Some characteristics of legal and financial public art policy instruments

During this long period all three countries developed specific legal and financial cultural policy instruments for the provision of public art. Although all three countries introduced the same principle of the 1% for art, each country developed its specific ways for its implementation, which were explored in this thesis.

In the thesis are presented modifications of the typical percent for art regulation introduced by some of the most progressive public art programs in the US, in particular: Seattle and Washington State Public Art Program. The introduced improvements have resolved some of the issues concerning flexibility of funding sources and the use of funds. In order to achieve better integration of the public art into the public spaces, the Washington State Art Commission introduced the so called **polling the funds model**, which enabled *funds that are generated by one site can be used on the other site which could not generate sufficient funds*. On the other hand, City of Seattle, in order to expend funds for the public art projects, adopted one of the most inclusive percent for art ordinances, by which *percent for art regulations were enlarged to all public renovation projects as well as to all capital improvements connected with the city utilities organizations*.

Improvement of the typical percent for art model was also one of the dominating issues in France during the last couple of years. Although, the first mandatory percent for art regulation in France was passed as early in 1957, all until the nineties there was no clear application procedure, which has been proven to be the main constraint for the scheme application. In 2002 special decree to the 1% policy regulation was issued, which

for the first time redefined obligation of all ministries and other public institutions. By this decree, for the first time, the percent for art included not only decoration for buildings, which generates the funds, but it was declared that *funds could also be used for artworks in a near proximity of the building.*

Two years later, the new decree was issued (and 2006 one application circular), which defined precise instructions for implementation procedure – decision-making process, selection of the artists, as well as the management of the project and later maintenance issues. By the new regulation special attention has been given to *the collaboration with the local community* during the planning process and the selection of the artists; as well as to *the involvement of the artists in the construction process from the early stages.*

Apart from the 1% for art regulation, during the years a number of other ways for the realization and financing of the public art projects have been introduced, from the simple local authority (or central government) commissions to the incorporation of the public art in the urban development projects.

Other ways of financing of public art projects and programs can be classified in two ways:

1. ***Projects supported through the public funds;***
2. ***Projects supported through the public-private partnerships.***

Projects supported through the public funds

As it was already mentioned, the US government almost for twenty years supported public art through the NEA and GSA special public art programs. However, today in the US this kind of projects could be publicly supported only as a part of GSA – Art in Architecture program, or in some cases through the new NEA Community program.

In France from the 1981 and the appointment of Jack Lang as Minister of Culture, some administrative modifications and new financial instruments to the *Commande Publique* program (which in some form existed from the end of the 19th century) have been introduced. In the next period, some of the most interesting and prestigious public art projects were realized within this scheme. In the period between 1983- 1995, as a part

of this initiative in France, 718 public art projects were realized (either through national or decentralized *Commande Publique* procedure). Although the *Commande Publique* funds have diminished from the nineties, this is still a dominant framework for the realization of the public art projects.

In Britain, a large number of the public art projects are financed through the *National Lottery program for Good Causes*, administered by the Art Councils, which is the British equivalent of the *Commande Publique* program. From the very beginning of this initiative's implementation, most of the realized projects were large flagships (prestige) projects, such as Antony Gromley *Angel of the North*. However in the recent time, support for this kind of projects diminished. Public art projects in the UK are also often supported through *the collaborative programs* and the initiatives between *the public art and developmental agencies* as a part of new national strategy for better quality of built environment (CABE, RDA- Regional Development Agency projects).

Projects supported through the public-private partnerships

In recent time in the US, there is a number of public art projects realized through the public-private partnerships and as a part of the urban development projects. One of the most advanced programs of this type was developed in LA by the local development agency. The novelty introduced by the CRA/LA³¹⁴ public art policy is that the private developer is obliged to set aside the 1% of his construction costs, either for the public art project for that specific site or to deposit that amount in the Cultural Trust Fund. Through this fund are supported *public art projects, cultural programming as well as construction of the cultural facilities in the LA area*. Another novelty introduced by the CRA/LA public art policy is the stipulation that *developers have to integrate art in their redevelopment projects even during the planning phase* of the project.

Similar model of the public-private partnerships is developed in the UK. Based on the American experience, in the UK the **Section 106 Planning Agreement** is developed, and many local authorities in the UK are adopting it, as one of the ways for financing the public art projects. The Section 106 Planning Agreement is voluntary and legally binding agreement between a developer and a local planning authority. By this

³¹⁴ The Community Redevelopment Agency of the City of Los Angeles (CRA/LA).

agreement local authority may enter into an agreement with a developer to secure financial contributions towards a range of infrastructure including provision of the Percent for art.

In France as a consequence of different system of public space management, this type of the private-public collaboration is not developed. However, in recent time there are some attempts towards establishing the public-private partnerships in the domain of public art in France as well, whose best example is the *Nouveaux commanditaire*, an initiative supported mostly by the Foundation of France.

However, securing the financial support for public art, although as one of the main conditions for the implementation of public art projects would not suffice, as there are some other conditions that have to be fulfilled in order for a public art program to function successfully. To achieve that, it is important to clearly define the aim of the program and the ways in which public art would be included in the overall city planning process. It is also necessary to secure the support for the public art commission in statutory and strategic documents concerned with the planning and the design of the built environment at national, regional and local levels. It should be emphasized that the opportunities for public art have to be identified and planned as a part of the city's overall development, rather than on site-by-site basis. The plans for the public art should be incorporated into the city's long-term capital and economic master plans, the community plans and the redevelopment initiatives. As my exploration of the local Public Art plans in US and UK demonstrated, planning within the domain of public art has to be based on the extensive exploration of the local cultural and economical situation, and on the ground of these collected information, the future public art program goals ought to be defined. It is also essential *to identify the key locations* for the public art placement and to define the necessary *implantation guidelines*. Only by planning early on, the public art program can seed ideas that may require more creative funding and enable good integration of the public art projects into the public spaces and their acceptance by the community.

RESUME

Étant donné la complexité du phénomène de l'art dans l'espace public, il pourrait être difficile d'en définir toutes les caractéristiques. Par conséquent, au lieu d'essayer de traiter toutes les particularités de ce phénomène, j'ai décidé d'explorer uniquement la problématique relative aux projets de l'art dans l'espace public dans un environnement urbain, qui sont réalisés avec l'autorisation et la collaboration du gouvernement central ou local qui gère l'espace public (urbain).

J'ai réalisé cette recherche sous la forme d'études de cas, à travers lesquelles j'ai essayé d'analyser comment la politique de l'art public et ses instruments judiciaires et financiers sont développés et appliqués dans ces trois pays : les Etats-Unis, la France et le Royaume-Uni, qui sont représentants de trois modèles différents de politique culturelle: l'approche des Etats-Unis comme représentant du modèle libéral (celui de facilitateur), le modèle de la France comme un modèle 'd'architecte' et celui du Royaume-Uni comme le modèle qu'on appelle '*arm's length*'.

Ma recherche a démontré que les gouvernements de ces trois pays encouragent activement la création de l'art dans l'espace public en introduisant 1% artistique procédure, un règlement qui exige que 1% de tous les frais de construction des bâtiments publics, soit investi dans l'art pour l'espace public.

Les Etats-Unis

Après le lancement d'un programme innovateur de l'art dans l'espace public, WPA, deux programmes spéciaux ont été créés par le gouvernement des Etats-Unis en 1963: GSA Art dans l'architecture et le programme NEA –Art dans l'espace public. À travers ces deux programmes dans les trente années qui suivent, l'art public est devenu le point central du parrainage du gouvernement dans le domaine de l'art. Cependant, en raison des changements des circonstances politiques et de la résistance vis-à-vis du parrainage du gouvernement pendant la présidence de Regan, un de ces deux

programmes intéressants a cessé d'exister (NEA³¹⁵ – Art dans l'espace public), et l'autre a changé ses objectifs dans le domaine de l'art dans l'espace public et s'est tourné vers la décoration d'architecture (GSA³¹⁶ – Art dans l'architecture). Pendant plus de trente ans du parrainage fédéral dans le domaine de l'art public, les raisons principales du financement de l'art public ont changé radicalement. Depuis sa création NEA a changé ses objectifs en partant des aspirations à “donner l'accès au public au meilleur art de nos jours en dehors des murs des musées” vers l'usage de l'art public dans le processus d'intégration sociale. De l'autre côté, GSA programme de l'art public, à l'exception de quelques changements mineurs, est resté fidèle durant cette période à son objectif principal, celui de représenter le pouvoir du gouvernement fédéral à travers l'art et l'architecture élaborée.

Pourtant, à part la suppression du parrainage de l'état dans le domaine de l'art dans l'espace public, ce type de projet a continué à se répandre de plus en plus, mais, cette fois-ci, aussi bien au niveau local que régional. Le premier 1% artistique local a été introduit au début des années soixante-dix et dans la période qui suit la plupart des projets artistiques progressifs, ainsi que certains nouveaux mécanismes de la politique pour l'art public ont été développés au niveau local. L'émergence de ces politiques est généralement liée à la naissance des programmes de la régénération urbaine dont l'objectif principal était de résoudre les problèmes économiques et sociaux des grandes villes et les crises urbaines. Au départ, pour la plupart des villes, l'art public n'était qu'un moyen d'animer les centres des villes et les zones en développement dans le but d'attirer de riches habitants et d'encourager le développement économique. Néanmoins, sur le long terme, ces programmes de la régénération urbaine ont créé de nouveaux problèmes sociaux. Par conséquent, dans les années quatre-vingt-dix, certaines villes ont commencé à développer une différente sorte de programmes d'art dans l'espace public dont l'objectif principal était la revitalisation de la communauté.

Nous pourrions ainsi résumer les motifs principaux qui sont à l'origine du développement des programmes de l'art public au niveau local aux Etats-Unis:

- Animer et enrichir l'espace urbain qui était en train de se délabrer;
- Marketing la nouvelle identité locale;

³¹⁵ National Endowments for Arts.

³¹⁶ General System Administration.

- Revitaliser l'économie des villes auparavant industrielles
- Intégrer la communauté locale

La France

Même si le premier pourcentage pour la réglementation de l'art en France avait été introduit en 1937, ce n'est qu'après la Seconde Guerre Mondiale qu'il est devenu obligatoire. Dans la période qui suit, notamment après la création du premier Ministère de la Culture en France, l'art dans l'espace public est devenu la partie incontournable des nouveaux objectifs de la politique culturelle française, qui visent à faciliter l'accès des chefs d'oeuvre d'art au public. Durant les années soixante-dix, le développement des projets dans l'espace public a été également lié à la construction de Villes Nouvelles, où dès le départ, l'art dans l'espace public a été considéré comme une partie intégrale des nouveaux espaces urbains. Les années quatre-vingt-dix et la nomination de Jack Lang au poste du ministre de la culture ont représenté le point de tournure dans le développement de l'art contemporain dans l'espace public en France. Pendant son mandat, le nouveau programme de la *Commande Publique* (avec deux démarches de commande -l'une nationale et l'autre décentralisée) et la nouvelle loi décentralisée sur 1% artistique ont été introduits, ce qui a donné, pour la première fois, des moyens aux autorités locales pour la prise des décisions dans ce domaine.

Finalement, nous pourrions résumer la situation en France en disant que le parrainage de l'art dans l'espace public a été développé dans le cadre des objectifs d'une politique culturelle plus large, comme:

- Mettre l'accent sur l'identité nationale culturelle et la dominance culturelle française et le prestige;
- La démocratisation de la culture;
- La création des emplois pour les artistes;
- La diffusion de l'art contemporain;
- Accroître l'héritage avec l'art contemporain;
- Animer l'environnement urbain (Villes Nouvelles).

Le Royaume-Uni

Contrairement aux cas des Etats-Unis et de la France, l'art dans l'espace public au Royaume-Uni est un phénomène plus récent. Les premiers grands programmes et projets de l'art dans l'espace public ont vu jour durant les années quatre-vingt-dix, comme partie des programmes de la régénération urbaine qui ont été développés selon les initiatives similaires aux Etats-Unis dans les années soixante-dix et au début des années quatre-vingt-dix. La raison principale de cet intérêt soudain et croissant pour l'art dans l'espace public au Royaume Uni, a été un essai des urbanistes pour résoudre les énormes problèmes économiques et sociaux dus aux crises urbaines.

Pourtant, en raison d'un système législatif spécifique qui ne permet pas d'introduire comme obligatoire un pourcentage artistique et les réglementations similaires, la politique de l'art dans l'espace public n'est pas considérée comme législative mais plutôt comme informelle et volontaire. Dans cette situation, le Ministère de la Culture et des Médias et le Conseil des Arts ont investi beaucoup d'efforts dans la promotion de l'art dans l'espace public, ce qui a donné lieu à l'introduction d'un grand nombre d'agences et de programmes de l'art dans l'espace public en très peu de temps. Néanmoins, malgré tous ces efforts, le Royaume-Uni se trouve loin derrière la France et les Etats-Unis concernant la provision et les mécanismes de politique culturelle. Dans la littérature récente, la politique culturelle du Royaume-Uni dans le domaine de l'art dans l'espace public a été sérieusement critiquée, jugée trop instrumentale. L'argumentation soulève que derrière la promotion extensive de l'art, il existe des raisons économiques explicites. Pourtant, ainsi comme aux Etats-Unis, au Royaume-Uni, il est devenu évident que l'art dans l'espace public en tant que partie des programmes de la régénération urbaine n'a pas fourni les résultats attendus et pour ces raisons durant la fin des années quatre-vingt-dix, une tournure vers des projets basés sur le processus et orientés vers la communauté s'est produite.

Pendant cette brève période du développement de l'art dans l'espace public au Royaume-Uni, les raisons principales qui ont déterminé ce développement sont :

- La promotion de la ville en tant que bon endroit pour vivre, travailler et investir ;
- La régénération économique ;

- La formation et possibilités d'emploi pour les artistes et communauté locale ;
- L'intégration de la communauté.

Quelques caractéristiques des instruments financiers et législatifs de la politique culturelle dans le domaine de l'art de l'espace public

Pendant cette longue période, ces trois pays ont développé des instruments financiers et législatifs spécifiques pour la politique culturelle concernant la provision de l'art dans l'espace public. Bien que tous les trois pays aient introduit le même principe de 1% artistique, chaque pays a développé ses propres moyens d'implémentation, qui ont été élaborés dans ce mémoire.

Dans ce dernier, j'ai présenté les modifications du pourcentage artistique procédure typique introduite par quelques-uns des programmes les plus progressifs de l'art dans l'espace public, particulièrement : *Seattle* et *Washington State Public Art Program*. Les améliorations introduites ont résolu quelques questions concernant la flexibilité des sources de financement et l'usage des fonds. Dans le but d'atteindre une meilleure intégration de l'art dans les espaces publics, Washington State Art Commission (Commission pour les arts) a introduit le modèle nommé '*polling the funds model*' qui permettait que les fonds générés par un site soient utilisés pour un autre site qui n'avait pas pu rassembler assez de fonds. De son côté, la ville de Seattle essayant d'élargir les fonds pour les projets de l'art dans l'espace public, a adopté une réglementation très inclusive pour l'art, qui a permis que les pourcentages pour l'art soient élargis à tous les projets de rénovation publique ainsi qu'à tous les aménagements capitaux liés à l'organisation des services publics.

L'amélioration du procédure typique de 1% artistique a été également un des sujets dominants en France pendant ces dernières années. Même si la première procédure de pourcentage artistique a été introduite assez tôt, en 1957, jusqu'à aujourd'hui, il n'y avait pas de procédure d'application claire, ce qui s'est avéré la principale contrainte pour l'application de cette procédure législative. En 2002, une arrêtee particulière concernant

procédure de 1% artistique a été faite, ce qui a redéfini pour la première fois les obligations de tous les ministères et des autres institutions publiques. Par cet arrêté, le pourcentage artistique qui comprenait non pas seulement la décoration des bâtiments qui ont généré les fonds, mais aussi il a été déclaré que les fonds pourraient être utilisés pour les oeuvres d'art dans la proximité des bâtiments. Deux ans plus tard, un nouvel arrêté a été fait, définissant les instructions précises pour la procédure d'implémentation. Selon la nouvelle réglementation, une attention spéciale a été accordée aux collaborations avec la communauté locale ainsi qu'à la participation des artistes aux processus de construction dès les premières phases.

**

À part les procédures de 1% artistique au fil des années un grand nombre de moyens différents pour la réalisation et le financement des projets de l'art dans l'espace public ont été introduites. Ils pourraient être classifiés comme :

- 1. Les projets soutenus par les fonds publics**
- 2. Les projets soutenus grâce aux partenariats des secteurs public et privé**

Les projets soutenus par les fonds publics

Comme nous l'avons déjà mentionné, le gouvernement des Etats-Unis a soutenu pendant près de vingt ans l'art dans l'espace public à travers des programmes spéciaux : NEA et GSA. Pourtant, aujourd'hui, aux Etats-Unis, ce type de projet ne pourrait être soutenu qu'en tant que partie intégrale du programme GSA –Art dans l'architecture, ou dans certains cas à travers le nouveau NEA programme de communauté.

En France, à partir de 1981 et la nomination de Jack Lang au poste de Ministre de la Culture, quelques modifications administratives et de nouveaux instruments financiers ont été apportés au programme de la Commande Publique (qui existait d'une certaine manière depuis la fin du 19^{ème} siècle). Dans la période qui suit, certains des projets les plus intéressants et prestigieux concernant l'art dans l'espace public, ont été réalisés selon ce procédé. Malgré la diminution des fonds de la Commande Publique depuis les années

quatre-vingt-dix, ce cadre reste considérablement important pour la réalisation des projets de l'art dans l'espace public.

En Royaume-Uni, un grand nombre des projets d'art dans l'espace public ont été financés à travers le *National Lottery program for Good Causes* –programme de la loterie nationale, géré par les *Art Councils*. Néanmoins, tout comme en France ces derniers temps, l'appui à ce type de projet a diminué. Au Royaume-Uni, les projets d'art dans l'espace public sont souvent soutenus à travers les programmes de collaboration et les initiatives entre les organisations artistiques et les agences de développement, faisant partie de la nouvelle stratégie nationale pour améliorer la qualité de l'environnement urbain.

Les projets soutenus grâce aux partenariats des secteurs public et privé

Récemment, aux Etats-Unis, il y a un nombre important de projets d'art dans l'espace public qui ont été réalisés grâce aux partenariats des secteurs public et privé et comme partie des projets de développement urbain. Un des programmes les plus avancés de ce type a été développé à Los Angeles par l'agence locale de développement. La nouveauté introduite par la politique culturelle de CRA/LA est que le partenaire privé, c'est-à-dire promoteur de la construction soit obligé de mettre de côté 1% des coûts de construction, soit pour le projet d'art dans l'espace public pour ce site, soit de déposer ce montant au *Cultural Trust Fund*. À travers ces fonds, les projets d'art dans l'espace public sont soutenus, ainsi que la programmation culturelle et la construction des équipements culturels à Los Angeles.

Un modèle similaire du partenariat public- privé a été développé au Royaume-Uni. Basé sur l'expérience de Etats-Unis, dans la Section 106, l'accord de plan a été développé et bien des autorités locales l'ont adopté comme un moyen pour financer les projets de l'art dans l'espace public. Cet accord engage par des obligations volontaires et légales, le promoteur de construction et l'autorité locale.

En France, en raison d'un différent système du management de l'espace public (urbain), ce type de collaboration public- privé n'est pas développé. Toutefois, récemment, il y a des efforts pour établir ce type de partenariats dans le domaine de l'art dans l'espace public dont un des meilleurs exemples est le Nouveau commanditaire, une

initiative soutenu notamment par la Fondation de France.

Le soutien financier pour l'art dans l'espace public, même si étant une des conditions essentielles pour l'implémentation des projets de l'art dans l'espace public, ne suffira pas parce que d'autres conditions doivent être assurées pour un bon fonctionnement des programmes de l'art dans l'espace public. Dans l'objectif de développer avec du succès ce type de programme, il est important de définir clairement sa mission et les moyens d'inclure l'art dans le processus de planification des villes. Ce n'est que s'il est planifié bien en avance dont le programme de l'art dans l'espace public peut engendrer des idées qui puissent exiger un financement plus créatif et créer la possibilité d'intégration de ces projets dans les espaces publics ainsi que leur acceptation par la communauté.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books:

- Brandes Gratz Roberta, *The Living City*, Simon and Schuster, New York 1989.
- Cruikshank, Jeffrey L. and Korza, Pam, *Going Public: A field guide to developments in art in public places*, Arts Extension Service, Amherst 1988.
- Curtis Penelope, *Sculpture 1900-1945*, Oxford University Press 1999.
- Deutsche Rosalyne, *Evictions: Art and Spatial Politics*, MIT Press, Cambridge Massachusetts and London 1996.
- Dragičević-Šešić Milena, Stojković Branimir, *Kultura – marketing, animacija, menadžment*, CLIO, Beograd 2003.
- Dragičević-Šešić Milena (ed.), *Javna i kulturna politika: socio-kulturološki aspekti*, Magna agenda, Beograd 2002.
- Dragičević-Šešić Milena, *Institutional system of French cultural policy*, MA Thesis, Faculty of Dramatic Arts, Belgrade 1981.
- Dubois Vincent, *La politique culturelle*, Belin, Paris 1999.
- Florida Richard, *Rise of Creative Class: And How It's Transforming Work, Leisure, Community and Everyday Life*, Basic Books, New York 2002.
- Finkelpearl Tom, *Dialogues in Public Art*, The MIT Press, Cambridge 2001.
- Gamboni Dario, *The Destruction of Art, Iconoclasm and Vandalism since the French Revolution*, Yale University Press, New Haven and London 1997.
- Goldstein Barbara, *Public art by the book*, University of Washington Press, Seattle and London 2005.
- Jacobs Jane, *The death and life of the great American cities*, Vintage Books, New York 1992.
- Lacy Suzanne (ed), *Mapping the Terrain – New Genre Public Art*, Bay Press, Seattle 1996.
- Landry Charles, Bianchini Franco, *The Creative City*, Demos, London 1998.
- Landry Charles, *Lineages of the Creative City, Creativity and the City*, Netherlands

Architecture Institute, 2005.

Landry, Greene, Matarasso, Bianchini, *The Art of Regeneration*, Comedia, London 1996.

Le Corbusier, *Ka pravoj arhitekturi*, Beograd 1999.

Loos Adolph, *Ornament i zlocin*. In: *Izabrani eseji*, Beograd 2000.

Miles Malcolm, *Art, Space and the City*, Routledge, London & New York 2006.

Mitchell W.J. T. (ed.), *Art and the Public Sphere*, University of Chicago Press Journals, Chicago 1993.

Mollenkopf John, *Contested City*, Princeton University Press, New Jersey 1983.

Mumford Lewis, *Grad u historiji*, Zagreb 1988.

Remesar A., *Urban Regeneration, a challenge for public art*, University of Barcelona, 2005.

Rosi Aldo, *Arhitektura grada*, Beograd 1996.

Senie Harriet, *The Tilted Arc Controversy: Dangerous Precedent?*, University of Minnesota Press 2001.

Senie Harriet, Webster Sally, *Critical Issues in Public Art: Content, Context, and Controversy*, Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington 1998.

Šentevska Irena (ed.), *Grad, spektakl, identitet*, Zbornik radova sa simpozijuma, YUSTAT, Beograd 1996.

Urfalino Philippe, *L'invention de la politique culturelle*, Hachette, Paris 2004.

Zukin Sharon, *The Cultures of cities*, Blackwell, Malden, MA, 2006.

Williams David, *The Anxious City: British Urbanism in the late 20th Century*, Routledge, Oxford 2004.

Articles:

Adams, Champion, Murray, *Developing Creative Cities: A perspective from UK*, Urban Studies Department, University of Glasgow.

Balibrea Mari Paz, *Urbanism, Culture and the post-industrial city: challenging the "Barcelona model"*, Journal of Spanish Cultural Studies, Vol.2, No 2, Carfax

Publishing 2001.

Baker Alexander J., *The Schuylkill River Park Public Art Process: An Ethnographic Focus On A Philadelphia Urban Park's Development*, A Dissertation, The Temple University 2002.

Bailey Christopher, Miles Steven, Stark Peter, *Culture-Led Urban Regeneration And The Revitalization Of Identities In Newcastle, Gateshead And The North East of England*, International Journal of Cultural Policy, Vol. 10, No. 1, Routledge 2004.

Benevolo Leonardo, *Urbanisme et architecture –ville*. In: Internet Encyclopedia Universalis.

Booth, P. and Boyle, R., *See Glasgow, See Culture*. In F. Bianchini and M Parkinson (Eds) *Cultural Policy and Urban Regeneration: the West European Experience*, Manchester University Press, Manchester 1993, pp 21-47.

Bianchini, F. *Culture, conflict and cities: issues and prospects for the 1990s*. In: F. Bianchini and M. Parkinson (Eds) *Cultural Policy and Urban Regeneration: the West European Experience*, Manchester University Press. Manchester 1993, pp. 193-213.

Council for Cultural Co-operation, *Culture and Neighborhoods, Vol. 1*, Strasbourg, Council of Europe Publishing 1995.

Dragičević-Šešić Milena, *Art, Public Spaces, Identity*, Presentation held in Berlin, February 2006.

Evans Graeme, *Measure for Measure: Evaluating the Evidence of Culture's Contribution to Regeneration*, Urban Studies, Vol 42, Nos. 5/6, Glasgow 2005.

Garcia Beatriz, *Deconstructing the City of Culture: The Long-term Cultural Legacies of Glasgow 1990*, Urban Studies, Vol. 42, No. 5/6, Routledge 2005.

Gibson Lisanne, Stevenson Deborah, *Urban Space and the uses of Culture*, International Journal of Cultural Policy, Vol. 10, No. 1, Routledge 2004.

Gurrand Roger-Henri, *Logement social en Europe et aux Etats-Unis*. In: Internet Encyclopedia Universalis.

Hall Tim, Robertson Ian, *Public Art and Urban Regeneration: advocacy, claims and critical debate*, Landscape Research, Vol. 26, No. 1, Carfax Publishing, 2001.

Hamilton Juliet, Forsyth Leslie & De Iongh Daniel, *Public Art: A Local Authority Perspective*, Journal of Urban Design, vol. 6, issue 3, Routledge 2001, pages 283-296.

Hein Hilde, *What is Public Art?: Time, Place and Meaning*, The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism, Vol. 54, No. 1, Blackwell Publishing 1996.

Horowitz Gregg M., *Public Art/Public Space: The Spectacle of the Tilted Art Controversy*, The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism, Vol. 54, No. 1. Winter, 1996, pp. 8-14.

Hunting Daniel, *Public Art Policy, Examining an Emerging Discipline*, Perspectives in Public Affairs, vol. 2, Phoenix 2005.

Jauhiainen, Jussi S., *Waterfront redevelopment and urban policy: The case of Barcelona, Cardiff and Genoa*. By: European Planning Studies, Vol. 3, Issue 1, 1995.

Levine Caroline, *The Paradox of Public Art: democratic space, the avant-garde, and Richard Serra's "Tilted Arc"*, Philosophy and Geography, vol.5, No.1, Carfax Publishing 2002.

Looseley David, *Cultural Policy in France since 1959: arm's length, or 'up close and personal'?* Nordisk Kultur Institut 2001.

Madanipour Ali, *Roles and Challenges of Urban Design*, Journal of Urban Design, Vol. 11. No. 2, Routledge 2006.

Miles Malcolm, *Interruptions: Testing the Rhetoric of Culturally Led Urban Development*, Urban Studies, Vol. 42, Nos 5/6, Routledge 2005.

Miles Steven, Paddison Ronan, *Introduction: The Rise and Rise of Culture led Urban Regeneration*, Urban Studies, Vol.42, Nos 5/6, 833-839, Glasgow 2005.

McCarthy John, *Encouraging Culture-led Regeneration*, Paper presented at the EURA Conference, Urban and Spatial European Policies: Levels of Territorial Government, Turin, 18-20 April 2002.

Pavlos M. Delladetsima, *What prospects for urban policy in Europe?* City, Vol. 7, No. 2, Carfax Publishing 2003.

Sandle Doug, *Millennium Square Leeds, Civic Space, Public Arts and Social Facilitation*, Presentation given to the international conference, Waterfronts of Art II -The Arts in Urban Development, Universitat de Barcelona, October 2001.

Senie Harriet, *Richard Serra's "Tilted Arc": Art and Non Art Issues*, Art Journal Vol48, No.4, College Art Association 1989.

Smadja Gilbert, *Art et espace: le point sur une demarche urbaine*, rapport no. 2001-0091-01, Conseil General des ponts et chaussées, mars 2003.

Texier Simon, *France – Urbanisme au XXe siecle*. In : Internet Encyclopedia Universalis.

Zukin Sharon, *Urban lifestyles: Diversity and standardization in spaces of consumption*, Urban studies, Vol.35, Iss. 5/6, Edinburgh 1998.

Wetenhall, John, *A Brief History of Percent-for-Art in America*, Public Art Review, Fall/Winter, St. Paul 1993.

Web sources:

Appleton, Josie, *The return of “statuemanía”*, Spiked Essays, 22. September 2004, <http://www.spiked-online.com/Articles/0000000CA6F6.htm>, retrieved: May 2008.

Backett Andy, *Can Culture save us?*, the Guardian, Monday June 2, 2003. <http://www.guardian.co.uk/artanddesign/2003/jun/02/architecture.artsfeatures>

Baker Alex, *Public Art in Critical Perspective*, <http://astro.ocis.temple.edu/~ruby/aaa/alex.html>, retrieved: March 21, 2007.

Background Note, *Enhancing City Attractiveness for the Future*, OECD International Symposium, Japan 2005.

http://www.oecd.org/document/38/0,3343,en_2649_33735_34915110_1_1_1_1,00.html, retrieved: March 6 2007.

Beswick Carol-Ann, Tsenkova Sasha, *Overview of Urban Regeneration Policies*, http://www.ucalgary.ca/EV/designresearch/projects/2001/Urban_Regeneration/chapter2.pdf, retrieved: May 2008.

Binns, Luke, *Capitalizing on culture: An evaluation of culture-led urban regeneration policy*. The Futures Academy, Faculty of the Built Environment, DIT, Ireland 2005, <http://www.dit.ie/DIT/built/futuresacademy/publications/docs/CAPITALISING-ON-2005.doc>, retrieved: February 2008.

City, Light can't use ratepayer's money to pay for good deeds, Seattlepi.com, Friday, January 19, 2007, http://seattlepi.nwsource.com/local/300406_citylight19.html, retrieved: May 23, 2008.

Designing Britain 1945- 1975, the visual experience of post-war society, <http://vads.ahds.ac.uk/learning/designingbritain/index.html>, retrieved: May 2008.

Fleming Ronald Lee, Tapper Goldman Melissa, *Public Art for the Public*, Public Interest, spring 2005, http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m0377/is_159/ai_n13779492, retrieved: June 12, 2008.

France. Historical perspective: cultural policies and instruments, Compendium, Cultural Policies and Trends in Europe, <http://www.culturalpolicies.net/web/france.php?aid=1>,

retrieved: May 18, 2008.

Johnson Lyndon B., *Great Society Speech*, 1964.

<http://coursesa.matrix.msu.edu/~hst306/documents/great.html>, retrieved : May 22, 2008.

Koch Cynthia, *The Contest for American Culture: A Leadership Case Study on The NEA and NEH Funding Crisis*, Online Journal of Discourse Leaderships,

<http://www.upenn.edu/pnc/ptkoch.html>, retrieved: June 21, 2008.

Looseley David, *French Cultural Policy and Exclusion*, 1993-2003,

[http://neumann.hec.ca/iccpr/PDF texts/Looseley David.pdf](http://neumann.hec.ca/iccpr/PDF%20texts/Looseley%20David.pdf), retrieved: April 8, 2008.

Lydiate Henry, *Public Patrons. Percentage for art*, 1982,

<http://www.artquest.org.uk/artlaw/patrons/28615.htm> , retrieved : February 6, 2007.

La commande publique, mode d' emploi,

http://www.culture.gouv.fr/culture/dap/commande_publicue/cp/historique.htm, retrieved: May 27, 2008.

Miles Malcolm, *Reclaiming the public sphere*,

<http://www.malcolmmiles.org.uk/Reclaiming.html>, retrieved: May 2007.

Remesar (ed) *Public Art & Urban Design, Interdisciplinary and Social Perspectives*, Public Art and Urban Design Observatory, Barcelona University,

<http://www.ub.es/escult/1.htm>, retrieved: June 2007.

The Grands Travaux: Its legacies and Lessons- Are There Lessons here for the World Trade Center Design?, Conference at Architecture Research Institute, NY 2002,

<http://www.architect.org/gt/gt.html>, retrieved: May 2008.

United Kingdom, Country Profile, Compendium, Cultural Policies and trend in Europe, <http://www.culturalpolicies.net/web/unitedkingdom.php>, retrieved: April 2008.

Whiteley Gillian, *Art for Social Spaces*,

<http://vads.ahds.ac.uk/learning/designingbritain/html/regeneration.html> , retrieved: April 12, 2008.

Artplus - the Award Scheme for Art in Public Places

<http://www.artscouncil.org.uk/artplusawards>

Arts and Business, <http://www.aandb.org.uk/>

Arts Council England, <http://www.artscouncil.org.uk/>

CABE, The Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment, www.cabe.org.uk

Centre national des artes `plastiques, www.cnap.fr

City of Harlow web, www.harlow.gov.uk/Default.aspx?sID=726

City of Philadelphia Public Art Program, <http://www.phila.gov/publicart/index.html>

Communities and Local Government, www.communities.gov.uk

CRA/LA Art Program, http://www.crala.net/internet-site/Other/Art_Program/index.cfm

Department for Culture Media and Sport, <http://www.culture.gov.uk/>

English Partnerships, <http://www.englishpartnerships.co.uk>,

Forecast public art agency, <http://forecastpublicart.org/>

GSA, Art in Architecture Program, www.gsa.gov

IXIA, Public Art Think Thank, <http://www.ixia-info.com/>

National Endowment for the Arts, www.nea.gov

National Lottery Good Causes, www.lotterygoodcauses.org.uk

New Patrons Protocol, www.nouveauxcommanditaires.com/

Miami Dade County, Art in Public Spaces, <http://www.miamidade.gov/publicart/>

Ministere de culture et communication, www.culture.gouv.fr

Phoenix Office of Arts and Culture, <http://www.ci.phoenix.az.us/ARTS/artprogr.html>

Public Art Network of Americans for the Arts,
www.artsusa.org/networks/public_art_network/default_004.asp

Public Art Online, www.publicartonline.com

Public Art South West, www.publicartonline.org.uk/

Public Art Agency, Art Point, www.artpointtrust.org.uk/

Public Art Research Archive, Sheffield Hallam University, <http://public-art.shu.ac.uk/>

Seattle Arts Commission Public Art Programme,
<http://www.seattle.gov/Arts/WhatWeDo/PublicArt/default.asp>

The Washington State Arts Commission Art in Public Places Program,
<http://www.arts.wa.gov/public-art/index.shtml>

Legal and policy documents:

Bristol Public Art Strategy,

www.publicartonline.org.uk/current/policies/strategies/BristolPublicArtStrategy.r

Cardiff Public Art Strategy,

<http://www.publicartonline.org.uk/current/policies/strategies/documents/CardiffPublicArtStrategyEnglish.pdf>

Cambridge Public Art Strategy,

<http://www.publicartonline.org.uk/current/policies/strategies/cambridge.html>
<http://www.publicartonline.org.uk/current/policies/planning/cambridge.html>

Circulaire du 16 août 2006 relative à l'application du décret no 2002-677 du 29 avril 2002 relatif à l'obligation de décoration des constructions publiques, modifié par le décret no 2005-90 du 4 février 2005;

http://www.culture.gouv.fr/culture/dap/dap/unpourcent/uFiles/doc/8_fichier.pdf, retrieved: May 2008.

CRA / LA Agency, Art Program, [http://www.crala.net/internet-](http://www.crala.net/internet-site/Other/Art_Program/upload/Art%20Policy%202005%20-%20AMENDMENT%20-2007.pdf)

[site/Other/Art_Program/upload/Art%20Policy%202005%20-%20AMENDMENT%20-2007.pdf](http://www.crala.net/internet-site/Other/Art_Program/upload/Art%20Policy%202005%20-%20AMENDMENT%20-2007.pdf),
retrieved: May 2008.

CRA/LA Art Policy, [http://www.crala.net/internet-](http://www.crala.net/internet-site/Other/Art_Program/upload/Art%20Policy%202005%20-%20AMENDMENT%20-2007.pdf)

[site/Other/Art_Program/upload/Art%20Policy%202005%20-%20AMENDMENT%20-2007.pdf](http://www.crala.net/internet-site/Other/Art_Program/upload/Art%20Policy%202005%20-%20AMENDMENT%20-2007.pdf)

CRA/LA Art Program, [http://www.crala.net/internet-](http://www.crala.net/internet-site/Other/Art_Program/Art_Program_Guide.cfm)

[site/Other/Art_Program/Art_Program_Guide.cfm](http://www.crala.net/internet-site/Other/Art_Program/Art_Program_Guide.cfm)

Derby Public Art Strategy,

http://www.publicartonline.org.uk/current/policies/strategies/documents/derbypublicartstrategy_mk3.pdf

Derby Guide for Developers,

<http://www.publicartonline.org.uk/current/policies/strategies/documents/DerbyAguidefordevelopers.pdf>

La commande publique, mode d'emploi, Methode et procedure,

http://www.culture.gouv.fr/culture/dap/commande_publicue/cp/methode.htm, retrieved: May 2008.

Le décret no 2005-90 du 4 février 2005 modifiant le décret no 2002-677 du 29 avril 2002 relatif à l'obligation de décoration des constructions publiques et précisant les conditions de passation des marchés ayant pour objet de satisfaire à cette obligation;

<http://admi.net/jo/20050206/MCCB0400926D.html>, retrieved: May 2008.

Le décret n°2002-677 du 29 avril 2002

http://www.culture.gouv.fr/culture/dap/dap/unpourcent/uFiles/doc/7_fichier.pdf, retrieved: May 2008.

Le 1% artistique, Presentation, <http://www.culture.gouv.fr/culture/politique-culturelle/index-dossiers.htm>, retrieved: May 2008.

Public Art and the Planning System and Process in England, IXIA Report, 2007,
<http://www.ixia-info.com/pdfs/ixiaspdguidancejuly07.pdf>

Seattle Public Art Ordinance, <http://www.seattle.gov/arts/publicart/ordinance.asp>

Seattle Public Art Municipal Plan, http://www.seattle.gov/arts/publicart/municipal_art_plan.asp

Salisbury Public Art Policy, www.salisbury.gov.uk/public-art-policy.pdf

San Diego, Public Art Master Plan, <http://www.sandiego.gov/arts-culture/pdf/pampmarch2004.pdf>

Short Biography

Slavica Radišić graduated from the Art History Department at the Faculty of Philosophy, Belgrade University, on the subject *American Sculpture of High Modernism and Minimalism* (supervisor prof. Lydia Merenik).

She finished the School for History and Theory of Images of the Center for Contemporary Art, Belgrade.

In 2004, she started MA studies of Cultural Management and Cultural Policy in the Balkans, Joint Program of the University of Arts in Belgrade and University Lyon 2.

As a fellow of the French Government in 2005/2006 she did her internship at the Cube, Center for Digital Arts, Issy-les-Moulineaux, under the guidance of Florent Aziosmanoff, head of Creative Department.

From the year 2000 she has been involved in the various arts, culture and education programs.

