

FROM SPECIFICITY TO TRANSFERABILITY¹: DEBATING PLACE-SPECIFIC ART PRACTICES

A condensed version of this paper was presented at the Symposium: Locational Identities, which accompanied the opening of Dialogue, a series of interventions in the city of Bristol commissioned by IAN – Independent Artists Network in July 2003. Having been made for a short oral presentation, it has been reworked for written publication in this Boletim da Associação Portuguesa dos Historiadores de Arte.

Talking (or writing) about the experience of doing a project always leaves me with a double feeling. On the one hand, it is a great pleasure because, unlike talking about concepts and theoretical premises alone, the first hand experience of having produced a piece of work undoubtedly colours the communication with, shall I call it, a lively sense. But on the other hand, it leaves me with a feeling of dissatisfaction because words can never pay justice either to the making or to the outcome, let alone to experiencing it as it happens.

In this paper, under the pretext of talking about my participation in Dialogue, I will reflect upon some issues that have accompanied my practice for a very long time².

Dialogue was a project which took place in Bristol. It was organised by the Independent Artists Network which commissioned “(t)hirteen new artworks (...) from artists from the UK and from Bristol’s twin cities of Oporto and Hanover, that were responsive to the Bristol’s dockside either historically, philosophically, physically or conceptually.”³

The interventions were all temporary and dealt either with the threshold condition of the Bristol water front or with parallelisms found between Bristol and its sisters cities in the project. My project, *Solo*, subscribed the latter. Departing from the name of the project, I wanted to create a symbolic dialogue between the two cities by bringing an element from Porto street life into the streets of Bristol. I will further on describe the project in more detail, for now I would like to talk briefly about some premises embedded in my work, bearing in mind that I speak of these issues as an artist and not as an art theoretician or historian, and that, therefore, it is the transience of the experience of making art (and of living through the making) that mostly interests me.



Marion Bock: A Masterpiece/For Sale

A text work applied to the harbour wall using industrial stencils and brick-clay. The text made reference to the slave history of Bristol, quoted from a German woman's visit to Bristol in 1803.

Very much as with other cities' dock areas, as soon as the trades which occupied them died out (in Bristol's case the slave trade), Bristol's docks have been intensely neglected along the centuries. More recent economic booms have injected regeneration into these abandoned spaces rediscovering financial and cultural interest where for long periods of time there has been not more than echoes of by-gone forms of wealth. It is known that with regeneration come a new life, new crowds and new senses of place, although contrasts can only be accentuated if an inclusive approach is not taken.

In critical terms, these situations propel ways of thinking about urban space that indicate the possibility of several forms of space (Lefebvre) of which I will refer to two main options in this instance. I would like to make mention to the rigid and measured space that stems from hierarchical values, financially or even empirically considered, as a contrast to what Deleuze and Guattari call "smooth space" that which is occupied based on a multi-sensorial approach.

On one side, corporate investment and property development create new forms of living these areas, adding important and sometimes remarkable landmarks and possibilities for the identity and the movement of crowds. A combination of the unrepentant flow of money and the animated everyday lived experience of people, suddenly finds either ideal or impractical conditions

depending on how smooth or deep the rift of exclusion. And on the other, a layered and flexible succession of spaces, enables historical contrasts, the co-existence of simple stories and trivial moments with traces of sometimes cumbersome narratives.

It seems to me that the project Dialogue dealt with these multi-layered forms of approaching space, for the most part, in very effective ways and proposed varied alternatives to an understanding of the city dock area in several fronts, from historical to emotional perspectives (or a combination of these).

Urban regeneration, it is known, lifts the spirit of communities and improves something that politicians value enormously for their own political success: their community's self-image. I will obviously not disagree that any improvement of a community's self-image is beneficial for the communities themselves, however, as Graham Haworth says of architect's and urban planners' awareness of social sustainability, "... a simple moral commitment (...) to technology and social ideals, as prescribed by orthodox modernism, is just not complex enough to deal with all the junk of everyday reality."⁴ In the same manner, there are innumerable current trends within the artistic community that deal with social realities, that utilise social ideals as a matter of work, either with an activist slant or with the less utopian (though no less idealistic) purpose of what has been called in the past to *presentify* different levels of a reality in order to make it available for the public's critical consumption.

In a short editorial Simona Vendrame asks "... are artists first and foremost people who are part of a social context and must they respond first to society even before their own creative spirit, or rather must they allow their demiurgic condition to predominate independently from any exigencies in the outside world?"⁵.

My most immediate answer to the first part of this question is yes, artists are obviously part of a social context in the same manner that art works are, and have forever been, part of everyday experience. But to the full implications of the question my answer is no, because neither social commitment can be the sole

trigger of artistic creation, nor, I believe, an artist's own personal reality can ever attain meaning withdrawn from a wider resonance which is, forcibly, also social.

Artists can contribute very validly to social sustainability, and this is what makes them so interesting for politicians, but their most valuable contribution is not to mask social exclusion or inequality with the veneer of progress (of which the endorsement of culture can be both a part and an instrument), but to uncover gaps, sometimes even very minute gaps, within the regeneration processes so that these can be moved forward. And this is what makes these artists sometimes so inconvenient for the political power.

Temporary public art, new genre public art, conceptual public art, any of these or akin forms of intervention in the public space, are often, for the political establishments, not so expensive to support, reason which obviously makes them so appealing for them.⁶

But these artists may also often become not so agreeable or even not so understood by the politicians whose departments might have lent support to their work, because, on the one hand they will not leave perennial signs or grand sculptures for the political power to reflect itself in, and on the other, they will fall short of the embellishment so dear to most of the so called art in the public space. Notwithstanding the fact that these forms of public art may even feel tempted to celebrate failure or the history of small things.

For the public at large, this sort of intervention will either amuse, enlighten or move⁷; they may also not do any of the above and simply go unnoticed; but, if their success is so hard to measure in terms of audience attendance and responses, they tend to be at least tolerated because either of their temporary or of their participative nature. Temporary works of art work for, and often with, memory, therefore it is on behalf of the trace more than the object that they tend to come to be.



Anna Oliver: dockstories (UK)

Anna created a website which invited anonymous contributions from the public of stories of their personal experiences of the Bristol docks. These stories were placed on a huge billboard on Redcliffe Wharf on a variety of scales, encouraging the audiences to come closer to read the more intimate details.

As it is widely known, art for the public space has existed, for centuries, in a two-way dependency with both the political power and the space in public. These two intrinsic links, particularly the latter, have made it prone to be thought in close connection with the idea of site-specificity. However, if the discourse on site-specificity has undoubtedly added to the production of art in public a number of new issues that applied arts had not contemplated before, and although it unveiled what Michael Fried has called “the political-specificity of the site”⁸, site-specificity has left the problems raised by such awareness to be addressed by future generations of more radical forms of art in public, ultimately, the so-called new genre public art.

Paradoxically, the very limitation of modernist ideals (such as a remoteness from ordinary life which they seemed to want to address) has been the short-fall of minimalism, particularly in its site-specific forms, precisely because, as we have seen, it failed to address those issues as well⁹.

I would like to use here Miwon Kwon’s words:

“Site specificity used to imply something grounded, bound to the laws of physics. Often playing with gravity, site-specific works used to be obstinate about “presence,” even if they were materially ephemeral, and adamant about

immobility, even in the face of disappearance or destruction.” Further on, Kwon refers to Barry and Serra’s affirmations of the destruction of their works should they be moved from the sites they had been created for¹⁰. Kwon says of these statements that they signal “a crisis point for site specificity – at least for a version that would prioritize the *physical* inseparability between a work and its site of installation.¹¹”

Still, the discourse on site specificity has maintained its link to the production of art for the public space, in spite and beyond that crisis it carried on to inform much of the public art produced during the last half of the last Century. On the other hand, I have encountered many practitioners who, dissatisfied with being called site-specific have, for lack of a better word nevertheless appended the term site-specific to their own practice.

Much has been discussed around the idea of place, sense of place, space becoming place¹², and I will not further that discussion here. It suffices to say, perhaps, that those discourses have contributed to the definite separation between the concepts of *site* and *place* as the theoretical ground for surpassing (at least as I see it being surpassed) the very concept of site specificity.

The triad of site, work and observer has been a major breakthrough brought about by minimalist practices and thinking. As Michael Fried puts it:

“It is, I think, worth remarking that ‘the entire situation’ means exactly that: *all* of it — including, it seems, the beholder’s *body*. There is nothing within his field of vision — nothing that he takes note of in any way — that declares its irrelevance to the situation, and therefore to the experience, in question. On the contrary, for something to be perceived at all is for it to be perceived as part of that situation. Everything counts — not as part of the object, but as part of the situation in which its objecthood is established and on which that objecthood at least partly depends.¹³”

There is no doubt that the work was questioning itself by asserting its relationship with observer and site, as well as, by repositioning the indispensability of the latter to the existence of the former. But modernist idealism was still tinting minimalist thought albeit in a covert manner. As I have written

before on this matter, "...two other rather important questions were not (not yet) brought into consideration: who is this observer and what is this place? If the viewer was now part of the equation and "... in effect, the subject of the work..." who this viewer could be was not yet questioned.¹⁴"

In the guise of a footnote, I have added that the fact that this problematic was not being taken into consideration could be detected for example in the way Michael Fried always referred to this beholder, naming it in relation to *his* gender. We would have to wait for the feminist and post-feminist discourses to revise this approach.

I, for my part, propose two other major revisions to help us follow the journey from site-specificity to forms of working which propel a more dynamic reaction to the relationship between work and its siting and audience.

Firstly we need to revise the idea of "(...) site by taking on board the dimension of space as socially produced (Lefebvre)" and secondly, we need to revise the "(...) consideration of the observer no longer as an abstract entity but as a multiple subject mirroring the multiplicity of the "identity of places" (Massey)¹⁵", so that *the site* becomes a *place*, and *the observer* becomes a *multiple subject*.

Site-specificity does not contemplate forms of working which are mostly temporary, fluid and geographically transferable. I have in the past tried to define this way of working with the term *place-specific*. At the time, I used the distinction between *site* and *place* as the basis for my reasoning, *site* being the geometrical and abstract location of the site-specific work of art, and *place* being the new location of the work of art which refers and utilises the levels of experience and temporality that the site-specific work did not contemplate.

However, today I am also not entirely sure that the idea of a place-specific way of working has not already become in itself non-specific. The idea of transference seems to me to contain a much more interesting potential than the idea of specificity¹⁶.

So the operations that the work carries out by virtue of successive dislocations (and the successive changes it goes through as it is dislocated) are,

in effect, what mostly interests me, as opposed to the differences between each one of the locations where the work happens to take place¹⁷.

To quote Miwon Kwon again:

“It is perhaps no surprise, then, that the efforts to retrieve lost differences, or to curtail the waning of them, become heavily invested in reconnecting to “uniqueness of place” – or more precisely, in establishing authenticity of meaning, memory, histories, and identities as a *differential function* of places. It is this differential function associated with places, which earlier forms of site-specific art tried to exploit and the current incarnations of site-oriented works seek to re-imagine, that is the hidden attractor in the term site-specificity.¹⁸”

However, it was precisely earlier forms of site-specificity that, by over-looking certain levels of difference in the functions of places, brought about their own crisis, and it is precisely more recent forms of such practices, undoubtedly coupled with the advent of globalisation, that have furthered the debate of truthfulness and authenticity in culture (and therefore in places), in the process proposing something a lot more dynamic than specificity, which, I suggest in this paper, may be called *transference*. Moreover, in a truly tentative manner, I am naming this form of working as *place-oriented*¹⁹.

For the Symposium I was asked to talk about the experience of working in Bristol or perhaps about the experience of working in different places and different moments. So, we arrive at, or perhaps depart from, geography. However, the issue of geography to me has become rather more than an issue of location and context. It is actually, one way or the other, a matter of work, a substance such as clay or stone are for a sculptor. And because of this, paradoxically, it ceases to be strictly contextual. It becomes something that the work transports around, rather than a specific set of characteristics that the work responds to in each different place, although undoubtedly these characteristics might propel the work itself.

A great number of my projects have been “moved” between more than one place, others have tried to reflect upon a condition of dislocation or a state of in-

betweenness, others have attempted to find symbolic links between different locations.



Gabriela Vaz-Pinheiro: *Solo* (Portugal)

Gabriela showed a back-projection in the window of Watershed of a busker from Porto, silently playing his accordion. The audio was available for a small donation, which was sent back to the performer in Porto to complete the circle of collaboration.

Solo was one of them. *Solo* started as a video piece. Over a certain period of time I have gathered video footage of street musicians in several cities without, at the time, a very clear idea of what I would do with the footage. I was vaguely thinking of, some day, creating projections of buskers playing for elusive audiences across different cities and countries. An exchange of lines with the Porto accordionist, one of the first musicians I filmed, had triggered a crucial thought at those first stages of the project. He said: - "I have played in many places, miss, but never abroad." - "And would you like to play abroad?" I asked. - "I would, miss, I would, but I don't it will ever happen." Dialogue finally enabled me to give him that opportunity.

The video is footage gathered in a street corner, features an accordionist, a well known busker in town. But *Solo* it is not a video piece only. I wanted to bridge between the two cities in a way that would express a double direction, although the obvious approach of symmetric or simultaneous projections did not really interest me because the pun on communication technologies would not

work. Instead, I was wanted to create a form of return that would take the work full circle to the streets of Porto.

I decided to make a *pirate* CD with one of the tracks he played for my camera. The video was projected, mute, onto the shop window of a well known cinema by the canal in Bristol. The sound lives in the CDs which were exhibited in purpose made cardboard stands for the public to make a contribution, thus leaving a coin or two to have access to the sound. The proceeds of these contributions were given in full to the Portuguese busker, thus fulfilling the return of the work to city of Porto. The ultimate (and simple) objective was that the player would be presented to a far away audience and that the audience's recognition would be returned to him.

The trajectory of the work is thus established at the same time that it is its occurrence in connection with the specificity of the project Dialogue (one which called upon itself a site-specific program). I have said before that a place-specific art practice is one which will reflect upon the generic as a counterpoint to the singular (and vice-versa), so that the generic space will not be ahistorical and the singular will not be acritical.

But the differences between a strictly site-specific art practice and one which I have called here *place-oriented* need to be clarified.

In essence, I have been interested in working in ways in which the work and its making would incorporate change (and becoming). This type of work allows itself to be moved and removed, to be re-worked from varied locations and varied contexts, but it allows these determinants to exist in an intrinsic manner to its very production. Transferability is not an added value to this work, it is part of the conceptual matter it is composed from.

So that "(...)in the process of being removed, [the work contemplates] within its own creative process, the possibility of its very disappearance; and in the process of being moved, [it allows] its conceptual premises to be remade by the determinants of the new space, the new context of place." Temporary interventions need to contemplate the possibility of their own disappearance from within their conceptual premises (fact that has been so far reserved to forms of art practice akin to

performance or happening); because they incorporate “the importance of trace, of memory, of the residual”, they are directed toward the document (fact that has been the territory of history or documentary).

There is also another very important point to make on this matter. This form of working opens up a territory of fluidity which is not compliant with fixed prescriptions or unchangeable forms. This work will very gladly enable itself to be re-made time and time again, proposing that every specificity of place is only valid if set in motion through the work, the artist, the audience and ... geography, in order to “reinstate the original questions into new outcomes.”

And it is ultimately from the audience that some form of movement is requested in order to experience an outdoor intervention or series of interventions. Questions of the measurable character of this audience have been often posed in terms of the *accidental attender* versus the *purposeful treader* armed with the projects' guide²⁰.

The report made for Dialogue reads: “It is almost impossible to measure exactly how many people saw or attended **dialogue**. As it had an open access policy, with no charge, spread over a large geographical area, and with invigilators present for only certain works at certain times, obtaining attender numbers has proved problematic. There are numbers for those who attended ticketed events such as ferry journeys and the symposium but none for the amount of people who saw the work. There is also the problem as to how you define ‘attender’ or ‘audience’. Is it a person who has set out purposefully to see the work or do you include those who pass through the exhibition on their way to somewhere else? Do we include all the footfall for the docks area as everyone who passed through would have seen some of the work?²¹”

However, it is perhaps interesting to consider that the way in which these works communicate with the everyday must somehow evade the terms in which audiences have been experiencing works of art within the traditional institutions of exhibition. Therefore the impossibility of quantifying their experience is perhaps intrinsic to the works themselves and not in any way a limitation. This is perhaps how the work embeds itself in everyday experience.

For artists and curators this creates several problems. How can one distinguish between the work and the surrounding environment if the work is so embedded in it? How can one evaluate the work's impact within a given community (artistic community included) if the audience in the circumstance is such a fleeting entity? I would like to reiterate some thoughts on this matter. It might be said that the object distinguishes itself from the surrounding environment by a dislocation of meaning but it communicates with that same environment by being attached to it first in matter and then in trace. The experience of the work may be incorporated within the experience of everyday life, namely in the urban environment, but the object, event or the two combined, insinuate some form of disruption in order to provoke a re-evaluation of our position in the flow of the everyday. This instigated disruption is the key for that distinction. The fleeting experience of the object, if the set-up of the gallery space is not there to protect it, risks being absorbed precisely by everyday experience. Ultimately, however, these risks may be incorporated in the work, as component and drive.



Eve Dent: Anchor Series (UK)

Performance artist Eve Dent secreted herself in small spaces around the harbour during ferry journeys. This work responded to the notion of the medieval practice of walling-up women as anchoresses.

But these works still have to rely on some form of staging in order to be distinguished from the everyday and in order to declare themselves as works of art. I have called the strategies for the staging of such works *spaces of display*.

These are not necessarily taken in the spatial sense of a room, or an architectural setting, but refer to strategies of *isolating* the event or object from a surrounding everyday. Place-specific or place-oriented works of art rely, as with every other form of art work, on press releases and magazine articles, on labelling and photographing, on cataloguing and documenting, they rely perhaps even more on these strategies due to their evanescent character. The interesting aspect to consider here is that, more importantly than warranting that the life of the work resonates beyond its experiencing, (an echo of W. Benjamin?), these strategies also constitute themselves, as intrinsic to the work itself. They are not only the guardians of the work's survival, but, unlike with work produced for the gallery space alone, these strategies are often part of the place-specific/oriented outcome.

How does this work overcome the contradiction in terms present in the problem of bridging between experience and art, everyday and document, mundane and registered (or fabricated) memory. So, the problem might be put as follows: that the continuity of the work, (relative to its endurance beyond completion), does not entirely express the transience of experience (from making it to having lived through the making) but that its future life will ultimately determine how well it manages to incorporate this problematic and become something entirely else: i.e. a collector's item, a weather washed poster, or the faint memory of a passer-by.²²

London, July-November 2003

The following thirteen artists were commissioned by IAN to produce work for **dialogue**.

Marion Bock: A Masterpiece/For Sale (Germany)

A text work applied to the harbour wall using industrial stencils and brick-clay. The text made reference to the slave history of Bristol, quoted from a German woman's visit to Bristol in 1803.

Adam Dade: Stock (UK)

Stock was an interactive work whereby attendees were invited to fold and fly paper planes through the building.

Eve Dent: Anchor Series (UK)

Performance artist Eve Dent secreted herself in small spaces around the harbour wall during ferry journeys. This work responded to the notion of the medieval practice of walling-up women as anchoresses.

Natalie Deseke: What's Up? (Germany)

Natalie created an audio work which was installed in the huge cranes outside the Industrial Museum which animated the cranes so they appeared to 'talk' to one another.

Here nor There: Where R U? (UK)

HNT hosted a evening ferry journey, which offered a wide range of works including poetry, performance and live music.

Ana Medeira: Oportos Route in Bristol (Portugal)

Ana proposed a mapping of a parallel route in Oporto with Bristol. The route was anchored at each end by cafes – Watershed and Brunel Buttery. Both venues agreed to serve 'francesinha', a dish specifically associated with Oporto. A video film of the journey in Oporto was also shown in the Watershed on monitors.

Anna Oliver: dockstories (UK)

Anna created a website which invited anonymous contributions from the public of stories of their personal experiences of the Bristol docks. These stories were placed on a huge billboard on Redcliffe Wharf on a variety of scales, encouraging the audiences to come closer to read the more intimate details.

Otiose: Popular Territory (UK)

Otiose (aka John Dummett) created a public consultation space in the commercial area of Temple Place. By engaging visitors in conversations about the space, John set out to create a dialogue between himself, the site and the attendees.

John Pym: Interconnector (UK)

John created an alternative space within a derelict Electricity Generating Station.

Paul Rooney: Blush (UK)

Paul created a text piece on floristry paper which was wrapped around flowers sold in a florist on Prince Street Bridge. The narrative was created from a conversation with a local resident who told of her childhood apprenticeship to a florist.

Louise Short: The Shock of the Old (UK)

Louise worked with volunteer engineers and technicians to re-animate a bridge signal on Redcliffe Wharf which had been static for nearly fifty years.

Seamus Staunton: Shoal (UK)

Seamus responded to the familiar sight of buoys in the water by creating huge, amorphous forms in bright yellow Polypropelene.

Gabriela Vaz-Pinheiro: Solo (Portugal)

Gabriela showed a back-projection in the window of Watershed of a busker from Oporto, silently playing his accordion. The audio was available for a small donation, which was sent back to the performer in Oporto to complete the circle of collaboration.

¹ I take some linguistic license by pushing the noun *transferability* from the idea of transference. The word is intended to introduce a sense of movable meaning to the work of art produced for a particular location.

² Naturally, I do not aim to speak for any of the other participants or the commissioning body. Dialogue enabled me to produce a piece of work that I considered successful in terms of the trajectory of my practice and, therefore, it made sense that the opportunity to talk about my work in the context of Dialogue would bring these thoughts together.

³ From "Dialogue-Evaluation Report" available at <http://www.hybrideyes.com/evaluation/evaluation.html>

⁴ Graham Haworth, "Doing More With Less..... working in the margins" *Scroope* Cambridge Architecture Journal, 13, 2001, pp.136-142.

⁵ Simona Vendrame, "The Independence of the Artist", *Tema Celeste – Contemporaryart* 99, September/October 2003, p.9.

⁶ I should say here that, although some forms of temporary public art may want to avoid the contamination of policy making processes, it is undeniable that they cannot take place without the co-operation of the political power, even if they want to make a comment on its flaws. Moreover, spontaneous interventions become increasingly less common due to very regeneration which by rendering public space better for the people may also work at masking its social and marginal problems. These spaces obviously also become more surveyed and therefore less prone to subversive intervention. I believe artists working in the public space need to bring these contradictions into their critical premises, because what Vendrame calls "a renunciation of the visibility of the artistic work" does not mean the abdication of asserting their "intellectual independence" (ibidem).

⁷ One quote from Dialogue's report section on audience survey reads: "*I didn't have any expectations I think. Some of it was good, some of it was tosh. Maybe I expected that it would all be rubbish. But I was surprised that I found things I liked. Some things even made me smile. Which I wasn't expecting.* (Non-art gallery attender)." (ibidem, p.13). And another: "*It's also educational isn't it? Gives young people a chance to see art where they don't have to pay and they don't have to go to a stuffy gallery, which can be quite frightening. They should do this sort of thing much more often. I came down didn't I? I've never set foot in a gallery in my life. I'd come again too.*" (ibidem, p.17).

⁸ Michael Fried, *Art and Objecthood*, London and Chicago: Chicago University Press, 1998.

⁹ Curiously, these short-falls have also informed politically aware forms of art production, although not without a certain disenchantment after the 70's artistic activism proved fruitless.

Contemporaneously, what comes into question within art addressing social contexts seems to be less idealistic objectives in favour of either participation (sometimes informing the art work, sometimes with educational purposes as well) or commentary. Within this context of working, site becomes less the solid territory for the work to root itself physically, and politics more the enablers fiercely kept at arms length by the artists' desire of independence.

¹⁰ Kwon quotes both these artists from: Robert Barry in Arthur R. Rose (pseudonym), "Four interviews with Barry, Huebler, Kosuth, Weiner" *Arts Magazine* (February 1969), p.22; and Richard Serra, both from his letter to Donald Thalacker, January 1, 1985, published in *The Destruction of Tilted Arc: Documents*, ed. Clara Weyergraf-Serra and Martha Buskirk (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1991), p.38, and from Richard Serra, "Tilted Arc destroyed," *Art in America* 77, no5 (May 1989), pp.34-47.

¹¹ All quotes from Miwon Kwon "One Place After Another: Notes on Site Specificity" October, Volume 80/ Spring 1997, pp. 85-110. Also refer to Miwon Kwon, *One Place After Another, Site-specific Art and Locational Identity* (Cloth, June 2002).

¹² As examples I could mention, Lucy Lippard, *The Lure of the Local: Sense of Place in a Multicentred Society*, New York: The New Press, 1997; Erica Carter et al (eds), *Space and Place: Theories of Identity and Location*, London: Lawrence and Wishart, 1993; the list however could be enormous.

¹³ Michael Fried (ibidem) p.155.

¹⁴ Gabriela Vaz-Pinheiro, *Art from Place: The Expression of Cultural Memory in the Urban Environment and in Place-specific Art Interventions*, PhD Thesis, 2001, p.185.

¹⁵ Gabriela Vaz-Pinheiro (ibidem) p.186.

¹⁶ There is a methodological note I need to include at this point. It has been my artistic work that allowed me to further these thoughts. The fact that I have not, to my satisfaction, formulated the thinking into words, enables me to affirm that artistic practice may actually precede its cognate theoretical discourse, so, with the due parenthesis for the incomplete reflection, I would like to reassure the reader that I am still working on how to phrase this process.

¹⁷ An indication of this could perhaps already be detected, albeit in the form of embryo, when, referring to the movement of art and of audiences, I said: "As far as my practice and research are concerned, the problem is interesting, from the questioning of the nature of the work itself as a work of art, reinstating the trajectory of the subject (artist and viewers) and of the work, through different kinds of spaces." (ibidem), p.189. The idea of the trajectory as a form of knowledge has been introduced by Virilio. See Inke Arns, "Flux Diagrams and Maps of the Trajectory", lecture at *Parallel Spaces*, ICA, London, July 5, 1997 referring to Virilio's *Revolution of Velocity*, Berlin: Merve, 1993.

¹⁸ Miwon Kwon (ibidem), p.108.

¹⁹ As we have seen, Miwon Kwon has used the term site-oriented, however, I have been defending that the word *site* lacks the flexibility of meaning needed for the definition in question.

²⁰ Familiar sight in Kassel during Documenta, for example.

²¹ "Dialogue-Evaluation Report" (ibidem) p.10.

²² For the last paragraphs of this text I have quoted loosely from previous texts on the matter namely *Beyond Site* and my PhD Thesis *Art from Place*.