

Christoph Schenker

ART AS CONDENSED KNOWLEDGE

Art Public Zürich: A Research Project

The following contribution presents an overview of the research project *Art Public Zürich* and also places it within a theoretical framework. After introducing the *mission statement* and the *Organisation Art in Public Space Zürich*, developed in cooperation with the city of Zürich, the methodological approach will be described that underlies the project, namely to determine factors that will open contextual fields of reference for public art, thereby strengthening its social relevance. One section of the contribution leads to the thesis that art in public space – similar to comparable phenomena in the sciences – can trigger a profound re-evaluation of the concept of art. The closing section examines artistic research and its significance in our knowledge society.

A sociological and art theoretical aspect

Helga Nowotny, specialised in the study of science and technology, has defined the spread of a new mode of producing knowledge, which is undermining traditional innovation based on specific disciplines and linear in form.¹ This change is linked to the rapid multiplication of knowledge production, and its causes and effects are manifold. The background of this new principle of organisation is formed, on one hand, by the globalisation of science and research, and, on the other, by the expansion of the level of education and, hence, the increasing distribution of knowledge within society. It also includes the increasing complexity of issues relevant to society, the steadily growing pressure of problems as well as the fact that, for primary research, concrete and extremely varied areas of application are beginning to play a greater role than generalised situations confined to the field of science.

This perspective reaches beyond the field of the sciences and can be applied to the system of art. The rapid multiplication of novelty in art is a consequence of the fact that ever more and ever different means of production and marketing can be activated within and outside the art system. It has become self-evident for art to encroach upon other fields of knowledge, competence and activities in a host of different ways, and the scope of action is no longer restricted to the post-industrial countries of the West. This expanded scope of action – in all its aspects – goes hand-in-hand with the steadily accelerating speed of ever new developments. Helga Nowotny speaks of the “knowledge explosion” that has been triggered by untold scientists scattered all over the world and mutually connected in a closely knit network of research institutes. Similarly, new work is created with greater and greater speed in the art system as well. This accelerating momentum increasingly curtails the half-life not only of the market value of artworks but also of their artistic and social relevance.

It is impossible for any single scientist or artist to take in, let alone master, the wealth of knowledge and innovation in art and science that is available in today’s highly developed civilisations. Specialised disciplines and organisations conventionally attempt to cope with the rapidly rising flood of knowledge and innovation and to define manageable fields of endeavour by introducing additional classifications and hierarchies. These correspond to the differentiation and specialisation that underlie modern civilisation’s social, economic and political achievements. Functional differentiation is illustrated, for example, by the institutional specialisation of universities, art academies and higher institutes of education, by distinguishing basic research, applied research and the development of marketable products, or by distinguishing scientists, artists, intellectuals,² appreciators³ and lay experts.⁴ Within the art system, such differentiation may involve the distinction between art *intra muros* and art *extra muros*⁵ as well as the classification of art by material, technique, medium, extension in space and time, function and context. But it may also be expressed in the “art world community”⁶ and the workings of its institutions through the social and cultural hierarchy’s education capital, information capital and economic capital. Within the context of the ideal whole of contemporary art, artists are becoming increasingly more specialised, working in the fashion of “micrologies”.⁷ On the other hand, however, they address a range of issues and concerns in the interests of making a successful contribution that goes beyond conventional borders and no longer defers to traditional classifications by media, discipline and discourse, nor by function, type of use, principle, subject matter or style.⁸ Between micro and macro in both art and academia, customary categories are eroding; their boundaries are becoming

blurred, soft and permeable. Even such firmly established social categories as state, market, culture and science have become fuzzy and unclear.

The new form of knowledge production, “mode 2” as it is called by Helga Nowotny in contrast to its conventional predecessor, “mode 1”, is characterised by elements that also largely apply to art projects in public space, namely: transdisciplinarity as a privileged form of knowledge production and the attendant site-specific production of knowledge, in other words, knowledge produced for a specific context. The new mode prevails primarily in non-hierarchical undertakings staffed by a heterogeneous combination of people. Research groups are frequently formed for a limited period of time and transcend established institutional boundaries in selecting their members. Moreover, the involvement of different agents and stakeholders increases the commitment to instituting a dialogue in the public sphere. One far-reaching consequence of this new form of knowledge production has been to extend the spectrum of traditional scientific criteria to include “context-sensitive” criteria, in other words to expand “reliable knowledge” through the addition of “socially robust knowledge”. The process of knowledge production has become more open and reflective. The diffusion of this mode has led Helga Nowotny to rethink the epistemological foundations of science. Similarly one might inquire whether art *extra muros*, which explicitly engages in dialogue with the public, forms a field within the system of art that could serve as a point of departure for rethinking the concept of art.

Art projects in the public sphere are currently caught up in an extremely complex situation. This situation is determined not only by spatial, architectural and aesthetic concerns but equally by social and economic, political, cultural and historical factors. In fact, the relations are so complex and the demands of the situation so exacting that they cannot be resolved by the artist alone. Artists must therefore rely on the expertise of other specialists in order to take appropriate action.⁹ And since there is no longer any consensus on generally binding knowledge and basic values in our pluralistic, fragmented world, knowledge has to be tailor-made from case to case and artistic projects have to be developed for the specific local context. In addition, artists no longer treat context as a framework to which they respond in creating their works of art; it has become the very medium of their work. They intervene in the situation and interact directly with the stakeholders. Art in dialogue with the public sphere has a working tradition of its own, whose objective is not only to be artistically right but also socially relevant. Context, society and public obviously play a role in all art, even art *intra*

muros, functioning as a stronger or weaker factor, as a more or less reflecting background phenomenon or as the implicit or explicit subject matter. This applies especially to long-term art projects that tie in with living experience. Here, all of these mutually interacting relations to context, society and public become more explicit, complex and conflict-prone. Exposed as a problem, they form an integral part of the artwork's concept. The laboratory of art is its context; its partner is the public.¹⁰

Mission Statement and Workgroup “Art in Public Space”

In May 2004, the Institute for Contemporary Arts Research at the Zurich University of the Arts launched a two year research project devoted to art in the public sphere in the city of Zürich.¹¹ One of the two main goals of the project was to develop a strategy for public art along with a corresponding structure in the city government. The other goal consisted of working out a few artistic pilot projects that fulfil specific functions for the city of Zürich. Theoretical basics and public discourse would be enlisted to establish a framework for the long-term development of public art in Zürich. The main practical partner in this project was the city of Zürich or, specifically, various departments and offices within the administration. Other partners included H. Hüsey, the Georg and Bertha Schwyzer-Winiker Foundation, the Walter A. Bechtler Foundation, Swiss Re (Schweizerische Rückversicherungs-Gesellschaft), Mai 36 Galerie and Homburger Solicitors. The SNF chair for the History of Contemporary Art (Prof. Dr. Philip Ursprung) of the Swiss Federal Institute of Technology joined the project as a research partner. The project itself was substantially supported by the Swiss Confederation's Innovation Promotion Agency CTI. The project group consisted of artists, theoreticians and historians in the fields of art, architecture, urban planning, economics and social history. The research project concludes with the present publication and the execution of the pilot projects.

The notion of public art has received little attention in the city of Zürich. In comparison to other international cities of similar size and significance, public art in Zürich is minimal, anachronistic and random. Its cultivation and quantity do not do justice to the economic and cultural role of the city, especially since Zürich has becoming a flourishing city of the arts, a development that dates back to the 1980s.¹² So far there have been neither structures nor a mission statement to coordinate, initiate and carry out suitably contemporary projects in

public space, to define core issues and to encourage lively debate, which would include existing works as well. On the other hand, over the past 15 years, the quality of the architectural fabric of Zürich has reached an all-time high, as demonstrated by the development of Zürich West and Neu-Oerlikon (Zürich Nord) and also by two new master plans, one for the illumination of the city, the *Plan Lumière*,¹³ and the other for the design of public spaces, *Stadträume 2010*.¹⁴ This has gone hand-in-hand with a growing appreciation of public spaces and a substantial increase in public life, all of which will undoubtedly also foster attention to and interest in contemporary art in public space.

The goals of this research project were divided into four main work areas. The first involved research into the underlying trends that characterise the city's urban development, its public spaces and the art placed in them and, additionally, the study of specific aspects of the city's economic and social history. Some of this basic research, conducted to determine the substantive and qualitative placement of artistic pilot projects, can provide an important framework for future art projects. It is discussed in the contributions to this publication by Bernadette Fülcher and Ulrich Vonrufs. Another work area addressed the city administration's management of art in public space. In several workshops and meetings – in close cooperation with heads of municipal departments – the current approach to art in public space was analysed, a mission statement was drafted and a municipal organisation for art in public space was developed. In addition, individual works of art were implemented in close cooperation with the city of Zürich. The third area involved working out and executing pilot projects submitted upon invitation and according to precise specifications by both local and international artists. The artists' research dealt not only with the development of their own work but also its contextualisation within the public sphere of Zürich and ultimately the concept and function of public art today. The present publication includes commentaries and original contributions by the artists themselves alongside reproductions of their executed works or sketches of those not yet executed. The fourth and last work area dealt with communication and publicity. Information on the status of the research project and other material relevant to its content was and still is available at www.stadtkunst.ch. In addition, in the course of the first 1 ½ years, two e-mail newsletters were sent out with in-depth articles on the latest developments. Several public events with the participating artists, most of them related to the projects in the Hardau district, were followed up in November 2005 by a two-day conference with international experts in the arts, the sciences, economy and politics. The first part of the conference was devoted to the "public sphere as conflict management" in the

supranational context and to the political potential of contemporary art in a democracy, while the second part focused specifically on the pragmatic requirements of the city of Zürich in relation to public art. The most important contributions have been printed in this publication. Work proceeded in all four areas at once although, at the very beginning of the undertaking, emphasis was placed on the project in the Hardau district, which consisted of several parts requiring special studies and a separate approach. In addition, wide-ranging research was involved in finding and selecting artists and, prior to that, external experts were brought in to discuss and define the relevant factors that would serve as a basis for the pilot projects.

Three one-day workshops took place between July 2004 and January 2005, and in September 2005 a final meeting, attended by the six project staff as well as over 20 heads and directors from five of Zürich's nine municipal departments. From the Department of the Mayor, these included representatives from the Offices for Cultural Affairs and Urban Development; external members of the city's Fine Arts Commission; in the Structural Engineering Department, representatives from the City Planning Office, the Building Surveyor's Office, the Art and Building Committee and Property Management (administrator of the municipal art collection); in the Civil Engineering and Waste Management Department, representatives from the Civil Engineering Office and from the Office of Parks and Open Spaces; in the Department of Public Utilities and Transport, representatives from the Electricity Service and the Water Supply Service; and finally representatives from the Department of Social Welfare.¹⁵ Those taking part in the discussion had already played a central role in organising and administering art projects in public space, or would be expected to make a significant contribution in the future. In the workshops it was the first time that various administrative departments had collaborated on the subject of public art; further, it seemed advisable in future to cut across offices and departments in dealing with art in public space. Sessions in which people, in both strategic as well as operating positions, participated were headed up by Franz Eberhard, Head of the City Planning Office, Mirjam Schlup Villaverde of the Departmental Secretariat of the Civil Engineering and Waste Management Department, and Christoph Schenker, head of the research project. Substantial contributions were also made especially by Christine Bräm, executive member of the City Planning Office, and Peter Ess, Head of the Building Surveyor's Office.

The first workshop was geared primarily towards in-depth evaluation of the planning, implementation and outcome of art projects in public spaces over the past 15 years, which

would serve as a basis for defining future needs and guidelines. One consequence of this critical analysis was the *Organisation Art in Public Space in the City of Zürich*, conceived and planned in the third workshop and in separate sessions. This organisation specifies the accountability and competencies in public art projects with the proposal to create a new *Workgroup Art in Public Space*. Criticism was also voiced regarding the lack of a model for a process organisation that would determine quality standards for public art projects, and finally the need was expressed for a mission statement on art in public space in the city of Zürich. Other aspects discussed in this first workshop – for example, overarching goals, public dialogue and public-private partnership – were incorporated in the subsequent draft of a mission statement, which shows the brevity, precision and generalisation that is characteristic of such statements. In addition, there was debate on the fields and areas of artistic intervention that would be of particular significance for Zürich, the meaning and relevance of art in public space in general, the function and possible substance of such art and finally the criteria that might apply to decision-making processes in connection with art and public.

The second workshop commenced with a detailed treatment of the terms *public*, *public sphere* and *public space* and continued with an inquiry, based on concrete examples,¹⁶ into a contemporary understanding of *art in public space* or *art in the public sphere*. Pursuing the discussion begun in the first workshop on fields and areas of artistic intervention that would be relevant in Zürich, the project team worked out a list of categories for the factors that characterise a city and urban society in general.¹⁷ The list became the point of departure in determining those factors that apply especially to Zürich. In conclusion the discussion focused on which factors – from which perspective and according to which criteria – should be given priority in fostering public art at present and in the near future. Underlying these parameters is the thesis that it is meaningful for art projects in urban space to address economic, social, cultural and historical issues, which can, in fact, heighten their relevance. The debate on which factors are of particular significance in Zürich led participants to formulate their own point of view as well as their vision in reference to public art. Some of the concerns, guiding principles and basic orientation of public art as expressed in the workshop were incorporated in the mission statement.

At the beginning of the third workshop, the research group presented the selection of factors that play a role in the pilot projects launched within the framework of the research project. (*Art projects and relevant factors*, see below.) However, the key issue in this session was to

work out an ideal operational structure for planning and implementing artistic projects in public space and, in conjunction with that, a model for the official scope of action and assignment of competencies. To this end, the procedures followed so far in the various offices and departments as well as in specific cases (such as neighbourhood planning, design of plazas and parks, art and buildings, endowments, etc.) were analysed and led to a synthesis. The project team also proposed a number of basic guidelines as premises and for orientation, which were later incorporated in the mission statement. The most important outcome of the third workshop was a draft for the structure of *Art in Public Space in the City of Zürich*. The *Munich model*, in particular, served as a reference in working out the organisational structure.¹⁸

The project team additionally detailed the organisation's structure on the basis of feedback from executive city staff so that it was possible to present the proposed structure and the mission statement drafted by the project team at the plenary meeting in the fourth workshop. (See *Mission Statement* and draft for the *Organisation Art in Public Space in the City of Zürich*.) Prior to their presentation, the two documents had also been discussed in depth with the Fine Arts Commission. The mission statement and the organisational structure both included written comments and recommendations made by the research group. The most important element of the structure is the creation of a new permanent *Workgroup Art in Public Space*, which is to be manned half by city staff from various departments and half by external experts. The group will be chaired by an external member and – according to the recommendation of the research team – should be under the jurisdiction of the Office for Cultural Affairs (Department of the Mayor).¹⁹ The workgroup is primarily responsible for strategic concerns and is to pursue an active policy regarding public art in metropolitan Zürich.²⁰ In April 2006 the City Council passed a resolution to establish the Workgroup for Art in Public Space,²¹ thereby paving the way for the decisive and proactive advancement of contemporary art in urban space as a significant component of active public life. Hence, one important goal of the project was achieved.

Art projects and relevant factors

Working out detailed proposals for artistic projects and their implementation was another important part of the research project. Since they were to act as pilot projects, they had to

satisfy several requirements at the same time. For one thing, they were to set contemporary standards that would function as a model for the future development of public art in Zürich. In addition, they were to make an innovative contribution to the international debate on public art. Finally, as a research project, they were to offer new perspectives for the work of the participating artists. Two aspects are of fundamental importance in this context. Indispensable to the tactics of art in urban space is the cultivation of the dialogue with the public which, in turn, means cultivating a specific approach. On the other hand, the situation of art in public space is of a complexity that necessarily requires artists to work with specialists from other disciplines. Public art – regardless of the form it takes – is by definition a dialogic and interdisciplinary undertaking. The express interests of the city, of the project group and of the participating artists can be interwoven through reference to relevant factors.

As a research project, Art Public Zürich differs from the practice of conventional art programs in public space with regard to fundamental decisions on procedure. Before inviting artists to work out specific projects, the research team first explored which factors were of particular significance for the city of Zürich and which factors might also be of relevance with respect to public art. There are factors that characterise a city, a district or a neighbourhood, because they have an exceptional atmosphere or because they are especially problematic, and the impact of these factors is decisive if they become powerful enough. These may be economic, ecological, social, cultural and even historical factors. In the city of Zürich, such factors consisted, in the late 1980s, of the drug problem, for example, and in the second half of the 1990s, of unclaimed assets held by banks.²² In the 1990s, to name another example, the art scene burgeoned and became a significant cultural, social and economic factor in Zürich. Other factors may seem less significant but there may be efforts to draw more attention to them or to optimise them in the long term: for example, the prevention of social conflicts through socio-cultural measures and intelligent urban planning as well as reinforcing culture as a local factor, as other metropolitan areas have done, or the in-depth cultivation of controversial public discourse which is indispensable to the intellectual climate of a city that is home to several universities and prides itself in being an open society. For art works in the public sphere, such conspicuous and influential factors, but also those that are hidden and should be fostered, can be of decisive significance. This does not, of course, mean that a work of art or a project must explicitly address such issues. Nor does it mean that the relevant factors also have to be the areas addressed by artistic intervention. From the point of view of art, not all of the factors are of equivalent interest as a frame of reference, a field of

intervention or a substantive issue. Nonetheless, factors do provide important reference points for artistic work in the public sphere and their contextual exploration can be of great advantage to a project.

The research project *Art Public Zürich* does not presuppose any factors as given. This means that, unlike most projects in the public arena, the city's built public space is not taken to be the *a priori* frame of reference. By inquiring into relevant factors, the project incorporates fundamental issues into its research, which – as hidden and undefined background phenomena – have largely escaped attention in current supranational artistic and curatorial practice. The different facets of a context rarely undergo explicit and thorough investigation for which reason extremely basic questions were posed. Should public art function as a component of a city's marketing to enhance its international competitive edge? Should it contribute to the cultural re-evaluation of underprivileged urban districts or help to give developing areas an identity? Should it stimulate critical urban cultural and political discourse? How does art itself define its functions in the urban context? How can the invisible be made visible, how can the voiceless be given a voice?

The research team conducted wide-ranging investigations to determine the relevant factors applicable to the city and the pilot projects. They reviewed the findings of the workshops and the studies in progress within the research project on the history of urban planning in Zürich as well as its economic and social history. In addition, they consulted the writings of architects, cultural theoreticians, economists, philosophers, political scientists, publicists, literary writers, sociologists, urban historians and futurologists. Members of the project team also engaged in official and informal conversations with artists, curators, critics and other experts from the fields of art, culture and higher education. Finally, the analysis of the Hardau district²³ not unsurprisingly revealed the importance of factors within the categories of *social space*, *urban space/architecture* and *atmosphere*.²⁴ The following factors proved significant for the whole of Zürich as interesting and meaningful referential frameworks for artistic projects: *global city*, *the larger context of social spaces*, *media and public*, *politics and direct democracy* and the *Zürich mentality*. Further considerations in determining these factors included how fruitful they promised to be within the parameters of a research project; which aspects would make sense in launching a new politics of public art in Zürich; and, finally, which ones are indispensable as experiments in a research project since they have no chance of being promoted within the context of a city-funded programme.²⁵

Moreover, it made sense to condense the five factors into thematic clusters to both pinpoint and expand their potential as referential fields for artistic interventions. Economic considerations and social space in connection with the traffic network and public transport are of particular interest regarding the factor *global city*. The *global linkage of social spaces* (globalisation, North-South divide, etc.) is principally of interest in the context of ethics and migration, including historical aspects as well as issues of memory, not forgetting and commemoration. The factors *media and public* are of interest in Zürich particularly in connection with public entertainment and events, *politics and direct democracy* in connection with urban planning and areas of development and, lastly, the *Zürich mentality* (religion, work ethic) especially in connection with public spaces and media. Clusters and intersecting sets provided useful means of determining focal points in order to be flexible in reflecting on connections between factors and allowing for themed cross-references. Many facets of these factors involve abstract subject matter while the decisive critical potential of the art work lies in its sensual positioning in the public sphere. For this reason the physically tangible intersecting sets of the factors are crucial to the studies and the artistic projects. It also seemed useful to designate a concrete force field based on the additional links and locations of the factors, which offers a certain amount of leeway and implicitly formulates a problem for artistic interventions.

The research team then looked into finding international artists who had already produced or were likely to produce high quality projects in comparable areas. Monica Bonvicini, Matthew Buckingham, Harun Farocki and the artist group Knowbotic Research expressed an interest, upon inquiry, in a collaborative venture. Lawrence Weiner was invited to develop a project independently of the background factors.²⁶ After briefing the artists on the local issues, the factors were re-evaluated and rearranged on the basis of additional research and analysis by the artists themselves as well as their own particular research interests. Factors in the categories of *politics and democracy* and *architecture* are relevant to Monica Bonvicini's proposal, *Fassade (Façade)*, while Matthew Buckingham's project *Film To Be Projected Every Year* addresses the factors *history*, *politics* and *public space*. Harun Farocki's *Denkmal (Memorial)* involves clusters of factors in the categories of the *discourse on memorials*, the *media* and the *global context*. Knowbotic Research worked out their proposal *BlackBenz Race* against the background of factors in the categories of *media and public* and *migration* in view of the *large-scale linkage of social spaces*. Finally, Lawrence Weiner's work *Kugellager oder*

runde Steine (Ball Bearings or Round Stones) relates to the factors *use of public space, social space and identity*.²⁷

The Aspect of Research and Development

Contributions to the pilot projects in the present publication variously circumscribe the artists' areas of special interest while also, implicitly, referring to the current status of art relevant in that specific respect, outlining their central concerns, the specific targets of their research, their achievements and their relevance. The concluding presentation of certain aspects of artistic research is therefore brief and fundamental. It addresses types of research in the field of art, the subject areas of artistic research and the cognitive experience intrinsic to art.²⁸

Four research categories are distinguished in the field of contemporary art: research *for* the arts, research *in* the arts, research *through* the arts and research *on* the arts.²⁹ *Research for the arts* refers, generally speaking, to studies and developments *in the service* of artistic practice and artistic research. *Research in the arts* refers to research *as* artistic practice which investigates issues assigned to the discipline of art and may therefore address the object of research, the method or the cognitive approach. This category is the quintessence of artistic research.³⁰ *Research through the arts* refers to research using artistic techniques or the discipline of art in order to arrive at findings in fields that are not of primary artistic relevance. In this case, art functions as a means. And, finally, *research on the arts* refers to research conducted by other disciplines (such as art theory), the subject matter of which is art. Within the framework of the research project *Art Public Zürich*, all four of these research categories were involved to varying degrees, with the main emphasis on artistic research.

Cooperation with the administration and the government of the city of Zürich is not research in the narrow sense of the term; it is *development*, and has led to a mission statement as well as new structures for art in public space. Although they are independent research projects, the scholarly studies belong to the category of *research for the arts*. However, the contributions in the symposium as well as the special research and analyses of the project team, the city administration and external experts were also conducted as research for the artistic projects. Finally, public relations as part of the dialogue tactics of public art also fulfilled a constitutive and informative function. Crucial to this category were the development and testing of

methods for determining, by means of evaluating factors, the core areas of the problems involved. Not only curatorial concepts were derived from this; it was also possible to establish a basis for promoting the social function and relevance of artistic projects beyond being artistically right. The category *research through the arts* comes into play when the artistic projects and interventions help to acquire an insight into shifts in identity, to develop practical life skills or to change societal conditions. This is achieved, in part, by deploying the means and methods of art to modulate various facets of public space. The public sphere is studied, problematised and renegotiated through the discipline of art. The effects may be considered relevant in such areas as socioculture, urban planning and migration policy but they may also be of interest in demography, human geography, the media sciences and sociology. Within the context of this research project, *research on the arts* has been specifically addressed in the articles on the art projects and the papers from the symposium, both published in this book. Explicitly reflecting, exploring and explicating texts by artists and their accomplices are constitutive of artistic research. They are the first step in establishing a system of artists' theories as a link between artistic and theoretical research.³¹ Finally, *research in the arts* is the core of this entire project as well as every individual art project. Research as artistic practice is a micrological undertaking regardless of the specific area to which it applies.

Regarding the subject matter, artistic research in the project *Art Public Zürich* embraces problems and issues raised in at least three fields. For one thing, the subject matter of research is devoted to the themes and conditions circumscribed by the relevant factors that apply to the city of Zürich. On the other hand, research is focused on exploring and developing new functions (forms of intervention) of art and experimenting with them as a contribution to the current discourse on public art in general.³² Finally, in view of an individual artist's ongoing work biography, one can sum up three types of subject matter that determine the mode of research: the first type includes subjects of research that are concrete, material and aesthetic in nature and are physically embodied in the work itself. The second type of subject matter is less tangible; it is about the content of artistic work: inquiry into the value and meaning of existence, both its parts and its wholes, is considered a true field of artistic endeavour. The third type is reflective, its subject matter being one's own artistic activity in relation to the art system, the system of knowledge and the system of society. The three types are closely interrelated and often play a crucial role in artistic endeavour at the same time and in concert.³³

Regarding the ultimate goal and achievement of artistic research, the uncritical and indiscriminate transfer of the terms cognition and knowledge production, as used in the context of the sciences, to the realm of art would be problematic and misleading. Let us suggest a few guidelines: Robert Musil writes about the writer's "specific attitude toward and experience of knowledge, as well as of the corresponding object world". In contrast to the systemisable material world of the natural sciences, this is the "nonratioid" world of imponderable facts, "the realm of values and valuations, of ethical and aesthetic relationships, the realm of the idea". The artist does not "apply any different kind or capacity of perception than the rational person", but his task is poetic: "to invent the inner person".³⁴ This productive, performative and practice oriented aspect of knowledge also plays a crucial role in John Dewey's analysis of the function and role of research. Dewey distinguishes between inquiry that has scientific knowledge as its goal from common sense inquiry, which solves problems in a "mode of inquiry dealing with situations of use and enjoyment". The latter mode enlists "good sound practical sense" to explore the "ordinary affairs of life" in the broadest sense of the word 'life' and in an environment in which people are *directly* involved.³⁵ Similarly, Jean-François Lyotard distinguishes between scientific knowledge and knowledge as "training and culture".³⁶ Knowledge [*savoir*] is not the same as science and cannot be reduced to learning [*connaissance*]. Knowledge as culture is knowledge characterised by a tightly woven web of many different competencies. These competencies are speech (writing, painting, etc.) and action characterised not only by the criterion of truth but also by the criteria of justice and happiness (ethical wisdom), of correctness (beauty, interestingness) and efficiency. This approach to knowledge, these "modalities of knowledge [are] other than the book".³⁷ Research in art, as basic inquiry into the fields of aesthetics and ethics, is located within this fabric of diverse competencies. Art can be understood as a form of this "condensed knowledge".³⁸ The material, the instruments, the form, the language game, the content and the tactics of art are fundamentally distinct from those of the humanities and social sciences but in terms of substance, art clearly shows a kinship with these disciplines; art is part of the "social knowledge" that, according to Helga Nowotny, complements the knowledge of the natural and technological sciences and is the precondition of "socially robust knowledge".³⁹

First published in Christoph Schenker and Michael Hiltbrunner (eds.), *Kunst und Öffentlichkeit. Kritische Praxis der Kunst im Stadtraum Zürich* (Zürich: JRP Ringier, 2007), 29–48.

Translation: Catherine Schelbert

¹ Helga Nowotny, “Transdisziplinäre Wissensproduktion – eine Antwort auf die Wissensexplosion?” in: Friedrich Stadler (ed.), *Wissenschaft als Kultur. Österreichs Beitrag zur Moderne* (Vienna: Springer, 1997), 177–195; –, “Grenzen und Grenzenlosigkeit: Kreativität und Wissensdistribution” in: Jörg Huber and Martin Heller (eds.), *Konturen des Unentschiedenen* (Basel: Stroemfeld, 1997), 151–172; –, et. al., *Wissenschaft neu denken. Wissen und Gesellschaft in einem Zeitalter der Ungewissheit* (Weilerswist: Velbrück Wissenschaft, 2004); –, “Wissenschaft neu denken. Vom verlässlichen Wissen zum gesellschaftlich robusten Wissen” in: Heinrich-Böll-Stiftung (ed.), *Die Verfasstheit der Wissensgesellschaft* (Münster: Westfälisches Dampfboot, 2006), 24–42.

² On the concept of the intellectual, see Jean-François Lyotard, “Tomb of the Intellectual” (French 1983) in: *Political Writings* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1993).

³ On appreciation and appreciators, see Ludwig Wittgenstein, “Lectures on Aesthetics” (1938) in: *Lectures and Conversations on Aesthetics, Psychology and Religious Belief* (California: University of California Press, 1966), 1–40.

⁴ On the relationship of science and public, see Priska Gisler, Michael Guggenheim, et. al., *Imaginierte Laien. Die Macht der Vorstellung in wissenschaftlichen Expertisen* (Weilerswist: Velbrück Wissenschaft, 2004).

⁵ Daniel Buren, “Kann die Kunst die Strasse erobern?” in: Klaus Bussmann, et. al. (eds.), *Skulptur. Projekte in Münster 1997* (Ostfildern-Ruit: Gerd Hatje, 1997), 482–507.

⁶ Ulf Wuggenig, “Soziale und kulturelle Differenz. Die Segmentierung des Publikums der Kunst” in: Heinz Schütz (ed.), *Stadt Kunst* (Regensburg: Lindinger + Schmid, 2001), 33–59.

⁷ Jean-François Lyotard, *The Sublime and the Avant-Garde* (French 1985) in: –, *The Inhuman* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 2004), 89–107.

⁸ Cf. Rosalind Krauss, “Sculpture in the Expanded Field” (1979) in: –, *The Originality of the Avant-Garde and Other Modernist Myths* (Massachusetts: The MIT Press, 1986), 276–290. Krauss introduces new concepts for postmodern art forms to which the term sculpture no longer applies.

⁹ Buren 1997 (see note 5).

¹⁰ Max Frisch, “Öffentlichkeit als Partner” (1958) in: –, *Öffentlichkeit als Partner* (Frankfurt a. M.: Suhrkamp, 1967), 56–67.

¹¹ For further information on this and the following chapters, see Christoph Schenker and Roberta Weiss-Mariani, “Welche Funktionen nimmt Kunst heute im urbanen Umfeld für sich in Anspruch?” URL: <http://www.stadtkunst.ch/0/5/22/43/>. A slightly revised version of the interview was published as “Ein Masterplan für die öffentliche Kunst” in: *Schweizer Kunst / Art Suisse / Arte Svizzera / Swiss Art*, (Zürich: Zeitschrift des Berufsverbands Visuelle Kunst), vol.2, 2004, 63–67.

¹² Since the mid 1980s, establishment and redefinition of exhibiting institutions, art journals and art publishers as well as the transition of the School of Applied Arts into a University of the Arts, in 1985 the introduction of artist training at the former School of Design, in the 1990s the establishment of an art market and an art scene with internationally renowned galleries and artists; see Christoph Schenker, “The Fine Arts Studies’ Course – its Development and Central Ideas” in: Kunsthalle Zürich u.a. (ed.): *Bekanntmachungen. 20 Jahre Studiengang Bildende Kunst* (Zürich: JRP | Ringier, 2006), 218–219; Christoph Weckerle and Michael Söndermann, *Kreativwirtschaft Zürich. Studie I: Der privatwirtschaftliche Teil des kulturellen Sektors im Kanton Zürich* (Zürich: Hochschule für Gestaltung und Kunst, 2005); Tom Held et. al., *Kreativwirtschaft Zürich. Synthesebericht* (Zürich: Hochschule für Gestaltung und Kunst, 2005). URL: <http://www.kulturwirtschaft.ch>

¹³ *Plan Lumière*, masterplan, Zürich 2004. URL: <http://www.plan-lumiere.ch>

¹⁴ *Stadträume 2010*. Strategy for the design of public space in the city of Zürich, Zürich 2006. URL: <http://www.stadt-zuerich.ch/internet/stadtraeume/home.html>

¹⁵ Not present were representatives of the Public Transport Service and Business Development (local marketing). Names and functions of the departments and people here and in the following date from 2004/2005.

¹⁶ Specifically: Franziska Koch: *Trinkwasser*, 2003 (fountain sculpture), Rue de Romont, Fribourg; Bruce Nauman: *Model for Outdoor Piece: Depression*, 1976 (experienced architecture), planned location: Centre of the Natural Sciences, University of Münster; San Keller: *San Keller Sleeps at Your Place of Work*, since 2000 (performance), commission no. 3, in the news program *10 vor 10*, Swiss Television SF DRS, 14 July 2000, 2 p.m. to 10:30 p.m. And in other connections: Ken Lum: *Il Museum Buolf Mus-chin*, 2003, La Punt Chamues-ch, Engadine; Sofie Thorsen: *Village fig.4/ Some Publicly Accessible Information and 20 Events That Could Have Taken Place around the Year 2002 in the Plaiv*, 2002, Madulain, Engadine; *Wochenklausur: Intervention zur Drogenproblematik*, 1994, Zürich; Pipilotti Rist: *Open My Glade*, 2000 (video screen), Times Square, New York City.

¹⁷ The categories for factors (parameters) are: a) topography, urban space/architecture, traffic and transport, uses, public space; b) social space, government/administration, religion, ethics, politics, public life, history, language, recreation; c) media, communication, other relevant themes; d) culture, arts, art scene, art in public space; e) economy, education and research/cultural capital; f) atmosphere, time, nature.

¹⁸ Baureferat der Landeshauptstadt München (ed.), *Kunst für München* (Munich 2000); Lisa Gritzmann, “Im Auftrag der Stadt München. Kommissionen, Richtlinien, Wettbewerbe” in: Heinz Schütz (ed.), *Stadt Kunst* (Regensburg: Lindinger + Schmid, 2001), 283–294; Heinz Schütz, “QUIVID – im öffentlichen Auftrag” in: Baureferat der Landeshauptstadt München (ed.), *QUIVID*, (Nürnberg: Verlag für moderne Kunst, 2003), 10–23; Monika Pemler, “Die Kommission für Kunst am Bau und im öffentlichen Raum: Richtlinien” in: *Ibid.*, 24–27. URL: <http://www.quivid.com>; <http://www.ortstermine-muenchen.de>

¹⁹ The City Council assigned the group to the office of *Art and Buildings / Public Space* in the Structural Engineering Department. See note 21.

²⁰ This is a departure from the activities of the previous workgroup *Art and Public Space*, which was a subgroup of the Fine Arts Commission and could therefore not function proactively but largely provided recommendations and appraisals of bequests, inquiries and proposals coming from the private sector.

²¹ StRB No. 387 of 5 April 2006.

²² In 1994 the artists group Wochenklausur devoted a project to the drug issue. Shedhalle and Wochenklausur (eds.), *Künstler & Künstlerinnen zur Drogenproblematik. Eine konkrete Intervention* (Benteli Werd, Zürich, 1994).

²³ See Tim Zulauf's contribution in this publication: "Eerbte Widersprüche – Überlegungen zu den Kunstprojekten in der Hardau".

²⁴ For the meaning of the term *atmosphere*, as used here, see Olaf Nicolai, "Die Kunst, der öffentliche Raum, das Geniessen und die Kritik" in: Florian Matzner (ed.), *Public Art. Kunst im öffentlichen Raum* (Ostfildern-Ruit: Hatje Cantz, 2001), 263–267.

²⁵ In practical terms, however, the situation was complicated by the fact that only 140,000 to 170,000 Swiss francs were available for designing and implementing artistic pilot projects, in other words three to seven times less than the minimum amount ordinarily required for outdoor artistic projects.

²⁶ Regarding selection procedures and the projects in the Hardau district, see the following contributions in this publication: San Keller, "Freinacht in der Hardau und Best of Hardau"; Claudia and Julia Müller, "Glocke*Hardau*BimBam*2006"; Michael Hiltbrunner, "Plakate als Bilder".

²⁷ The projects are introduced in the following contributions to this publication: Monica Bonvicini, "Fassade"; Matthew Buckingham, "Film To Be Projected Every Year"; Harun Farocki, "Denkmal"; Knowbotic Research, "BlackBenz Race"; Lawrence Weiner, "Kugellager oder runde Steine".

²⁸ This chapter is based on: Christoph Schenker, "Künstlerische Forschung" in: Hans-Peter Schwarz (ed.), *Zeichen nach vorn. 125 Jahre Hochschule für Gestaltung und Kunst Zürich* (Zürich 2003), 176–181. Also published in: Präsidium der Hochschule der bildenden Künste Hamburg (ed.), *querdurch. Kunst + Wissenschaft* (Hamburg 2006), 147–156.

²⁹ Henk Borgdorff, *The Debate on Research in the Arts* (Bergen: Bergen National Academy of the Arts, 2006).

³⁰ Schenker 2003 and 2006 (see note 28); Borgdorff 2006 (see note 29); Mika Hannula, et. al., *Artistic Research. Theories, Methods and Practices* (Helsinki: Academy of Fine Arts, 2005); Florian Dombois, "Kunst als Forschung" in: Hochschule der Künste Bern HKB (ed.), *2006* (Bern, 2006), 21–29.

³¹ On artists' theories, see Michael Lingner, "Reflections on/as Artists' Theories" in: Kunsthalle Zürich u.a. (ed.): *Bekanntmachungen. 20 Jahre Studiengang Bildende Kunst* (Zürich: JRP | Ringier, 2006), 231–238.

³² As a real experiment, research in the field of art always also queries and really defines the function of art per se. Inquiry into what art contributes to a specific place within the context of knowledge production and what insights and competencies it generates, is closely related to inquiry into its function. In artistic research, the medium and the tactics refer to the respective substance and function of the work. A crucial factor is testing and changing how functions relate within art. Artistic work not only involves work on products but also work on the means, the tactics and the contexts of production. This is work that addresses the very basis of culture and art and that includes our forms of life.

³³ For a more detailed account, see Schenker 2003 und 2006 (see note 28).

³⁴ Robert Musil, "Sketch of What the Writer Knows" (German 1918), *Precision and Soul*, ed. and trans. by Buerton Pike and David S. Luft (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1990), 61–65.

³⁵ John Dewey, *Logic - The Theory of Inquiry* (Henry Holt and Company, Inc., 1938), 60ff.

³⁶ Jean-François Lyotard, *The Postmodern Condition: A Report on Knowledge* (French 1979), trans. G. Bennington and B. Massumi (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1984), 18ff.

³⁷ Bernard Blistène, "A Conversation with Jean-François Lyotard" (French 1984) in: *Flash Art* 121, 1985, 32–35.

³⁸ Lyotard 1984 (see note 36).

³⁹ Nowotny 2006 (see note 1).