

in the field (and they do indeed exist, as Ortega demonstrates with an extensive technical bibliography), there are only so many ways one can lay bricks to build a proper wall so that no bricks have to be cut in half in order to form right angles. Ortega figured out an as yet unforeseen way of doing this and he registered it in his name. He thus found a new solution to a non-existent problem. In fact, to something that no one had even considered as a problem. Did we actually need a new design? In a way, he reverts Duchamp's logic when the latter said that if there is no solution neither is there a problem.

The *Aparejo* Antonio Ortega has many possible readings. On the one hand, it treats the artist's role ironically and locates Ortega himself at the starting point of critical analysis. In fact, it is as gratuitous as Rogelio Lopez Cuenca's delimitation of a few square meters of urban space. The result is a piece that, playing with minimalist aesthetics, questions the "usefulness" of work in art.

As conclusions to the question proposed by the title of this conference (Policies for Public Art ?) I would like to put forth two ideas.

On the one hand, I believe we must have faith in art as an intellectual activity that generates discourse. We should resist the increasingly widespread temptation of the kind of art that simply illustrates other disciplines' discourse. This tendency posits art as a documentary activity - a machine that puts into images what philosophers, scientists and anthropologists think and say. We must claim a space for art and artists where they can generate their own discourse, or, better said, discourses.

On the other hand, I would like to venture an answer: this is not about marking work in the city but rather with the city. I believe we should not invade reality with urban sculptures or limit ourselves to documenting reality's processes. Art is an extraordinary

activity but means of which one can look at, analyze and alter the real. It should not be a passive spectator of the world in which it exists, but rather yet another actor on the broad political stage in which we live. Let us make art that deals with intensity. That studies the real, that reflects upon its reason for being and that emphasizes its contradictions.

PUBLIC SPACE IN JAPAN **Toshio Shimizu**

Introduction. Since the 1990s art is changing in Japan. Before that date, New York was the model young artists followed. Every month, art magazines reported the latest information on the most recent art from New York. However, since the 90s, New York has lost its preponderant position. Instead of art from New York we started seeing a larger range of art. The Japanese art scene opened up to works by young British artists from London or art from emerging Asian countries such as Korea and South East Asia.

Young Japanese artists started showing abroad. Tadashi Kawamata, Tatsuo IYAJIMA, Yasumasa Morimura, Hiroshi Sugimoto, Dum Type belong to the first generation of such artists. Foreign museums or international exhibitions presented these artists. They are artists who didn't follow the American model. They created an art based on Japanese traditional aesthetics but which showed new elements that could be appreciated in the international art world.

The most important change during the 1990s was that art started being shown outside of museums, mostly in cities, in what we call the -Public Space. It is curious that during the 1990 important museums of contemporary art opened in Japan in Hiroshima, Marugame, Mito and Tokyo.

They began to support contemporary artists and to open up possibilities for them. But at the same time people started to want to see art outside the museums. The Museum has lost its prestigious position in the art scene.

There are at least three types of new art activities during the 1990s

1) Art festivals organized by an artist or ordinary people in the city. The display

paintings and sculptures in streets, in parks in office buildings foyers, stations, or in shopping malls.

2) Public art programs in public or private building. In these programs, a curator is designated to make a project. Mayor international artists began to be invited to create art work for public places in Tokyo and other cities.

3) Artist in residence programs. Artists are invited by a community to stay for several weeks or months. TEY WORK AN SOMETIME PRESENT EXHIBITN OR EDUCATIONAL Programs for local people.

These new activities demonstrate that contact points between art and people increased and diversified.

In 1992, I organized a symposium. The title was "Places of Contemporary Art" In order to prepare for these new phenomena in Japan I invited French curators, artists, art critics and the Japanese architect, Arata Isozaki, a specialist in urban planning and art critic.

Two themes were examined during the symposium. The first one was. -Contemporary Art in the Museum - It was about the new roles of museums in the creation of new art. Why were French people invited? Because I wanted to introduce French examples of -Grand Projectl inaugurated by the President Mitterand. The discussion was very fruitful. Seeing what happened during the past ten years in Japan, I am convinced the theme of the symposium was right on track.

Since then, I have done three different projects in the city and outside of the museum.

1) Temporary intervention in the City, displaying art works by Daniel Buren, House Wa

2) Curator for public art programs This means the long term placing of art works. Two projects are now beginning.

3) Enlarge the notion of public space into virtual space. I have organized an exhibition of videos that were distributed through internet.

I would like to share my notion of Public Space in Japan.

History. To provide a historical perspective of what is happening in Japan today. I would like to give an overview of the history of "Art and City" in Japan. History. To provide a historical perspective of what is happening in Japan today. I would like to give an overview of the history of -Art an City - in Japan.

Throughout the 300 years of the Edo period the notion of art was very different from the West. Art was everywhere in every day life. The doors of houses were painted. People wore beautiful kimono and paintings hung in the tokonoma, a small niche in houses for art and flowers. Art was a very personal and secular affaire. This was before the introduction of museum in Japan Art was not et in museums, but in everyday life.

The age of the Monument. During the late 19th Century and after the meji Restoration of 1868, Japan started becoming a modern country by importing the Western civilization. The New Meji Government modernized art and cultural policies. The government started to build museums in the city and also monuments.

They are mostly statues of heroes of the Meji Restoration or some legendary samurai generals who helped the emperor in the

past. The government tried, through these statutes, to strengthen the political system. The new government's system was very fragile. Many people didn't even know who the emperor was.

During World War II, many statues of war heroes were constructed as propaganda. When the war was over, the government started to build monuments to the war sacrifice and for peace. I think these sculptures continued the idea of monuments from the Meiji Restoration, i. e. the purpose of art is to convey a message from the government to people.

The Age of Modern Art. In early 1950s, the two first modern art museums were founded in Japan. These museums began to introduce modern art to a large public. Curators and art critics who participated in these museums organized an outdoor sculpture exhibition, suggested by the people of Ube. Its purpose was to improve environment of a city that had been devastated by war and later rushed into industrial development, it was the first time that modern art was displayed in a Japanese city. Artists were invited to display their large sculptures in a park and when the exhibition was over, they were installed in different places of the city of Ube. They continued this exhibition every year and in the 1970s a total of 60 sculptures had been placed

272

In 1970s, many other cities started to follow the example of Ube. To have sculptures in the city became a condition of a modern and cultural city. Today you can see a large variety of sculptures streets or parks of big or small cities. These works are strictly modern art. They don't convey any message from the government or any group. Artists were free to do anything that art critics recognized as having artistic value.

As early as the 1970s when these sculptures started to invade many cities, some people

Didn't respect these works because most of time they had nothing to do with local community or city. People couldn't share the very personal artistic expression of these sculptures. People started to speak of "Sculpture Pollution".

The age of Public Art. As said at the beginning since the 1990s, three new movements began. These movements were reactions against museums and modern art sculptures in the city. People were really tired of the "Sculpture Pollution". The first important movement emerged in Fukuoka, in the early 1990s in Fukuoka, artists, museum curators, and ordinary people formed a curatorial group to start an exhibition in streets, in shopping malls, in front of office buildings, etc.

It was called "Museum City Project". The group decided upon the theme of the exhibition, selected artists found places to place the art works, and did fundraising. They were site specific art works it was very successful as a result of the strong direction of the curatorial group. They controlled the quality of the art works and gave them meaning.

In the nineties, curators started to organize public art programs in the city. They selected artists and art works which would integrate to the space.

Curators had to consider physical conditions such as size, proportion and material in order to obtain harmony between art and space. In Tokyo, Shinjuku I – Land Building (1994), Fumihiko Tachikawa (1995), International Forum (1997), and a lot of other buildings allowed the public the possibility of seeing nice sculptures and paintings in public spaces.

Art in the City. An overview of the history of the relationship between art and city in Japan shows that, as of the sixties, there

has been a demand for art in city . Even if the modern art movement in the city. Why did people want to see art in the city? People s demand was spontaneous. I think in Japan it was a movement to recover art in every day life. Museums had separated art from life. People were forced to go to museum to see art works.

If we consider Japanese art history, it is quite reasonable for people expect to see art outside of museum and in everyday life. But what is the place of art in city? What is public space?
I would like to answer this by sharing my experiences.

For the past 10 years, I have been involved in three different art programs in the City. an art exhibition in streets, a public art program, and a virtual exhibition.

1) The Tachikawa International Art Festival
The Tachikawa International Art Festival (1999) was a large outdoor art exhibition.

The national culture agency, which is the equivalent of a culture ministry provided a budget in order to support and encourage the development of the local community through art. People of Tachikawa formed a committee to organize an outdoor art festival in collaboration with the city government. L was nominated as artistic director.

My strategy was to stimulate everyday life through art in the city. In a public art program, art should not stimulate every day life too much. However, art is not always peaceful and hammiest Sometime is toxic, it criticizes society or tries to make people aware.

Apart from some beautiful sculptures, in Tachikawa I decided to display some provocative art in streets and to present performances in public space in some cases art works caused problems I think these problems are welcomed. They give people a chance to think of art and life. And that was what I expected.

My idea was to use many urban sites to display the art works. However, it was not easy to get permission in private spaces I asked the owners. In private spaces I went to see city s administrators and the police it seemed normal to ask the private owners for their private space but the city spaces, which I understood were public, were treated by the persons in charge of them as through they were private. There was no idea of public space Cities are composed of private territory. The City is a kind of mosaics of private areas. Even the streets and parks belong to the Ministry of Land and Transportation. They are private. In fact, there is no public space that belongs to the public.

Public space is just a place where people can enter without any restriction, but it is under control of a section of the city office. As a result, in Japan it is very difficult to organize a large urban project. The government started the construction of the airport without the consensus of the local people.

So the decision about the use of a space depends on the good will of the private owner or city officer in charge. The destiny of a place depends on an individual s will So if you want to organize a project. You have to get everyone s consensus, on by one. This is one of the reasons why Japan is unable to organize a large art project as France did in 1980s Japan is traditionally a country of consensus. -Yamato - Japan s old name, means "Great Harmony"

If you want to organize an exhibition in the city, you have to go to the private owners to the city office and police. If you are lucky to find a nice person, you will obtain permission to use the space belonging to the city and will be able to organize an interesting project to simulate the city. But you need a lot of energy. So today, there is less activity than before in this field. It is same for public art projects I am currently doing two public art project started

as a good will initiative by important people in different organizations that commissioned artworks. In a project promoted by the local government of Iwate, North of Japan, an architect suggested to the governor he should spend one percent on art and he accepted.

2) Public Art Program

I would like to tell you about how to get consensus within the government for an art project.

In cases where an important use of the land or space belonging to city or public organization is involved, it is necessary to justify why that a public space will be used for art and also to reach an agreement about the proposed project, its theme, artist list, artworks etc. In fact, agreement is reached through negotiations with government people.

I would like to exemplify this through one of my projects.

In Morioka, north of Japan, I am now doing a public art project for cultural complex building which includes a library, art gallery, meeting rooms, etc. The best way to reach an agreement is to form a committee of specialists and government representative. The curator presents his projects with its theme artist list, and budget. The committee examines the project and approves its take off.

But in Morioka, they preferred not to form committee of specialists. Instead, they formed a committee within the government. The president was the governor and directors. We had several meetings in order to arrive at the final proposal of the project that satisfied all members.

In fact, the committee of specialists didn't work as well as we did. During the modern art period, many sculptures were chaotically displayed in city. This happened because of

the specialists committee. They come from outside of community and had no idea of the local history, nor did they understand the local mentality.

But our committee was not opened to the public. They knew that when a project is completely open to the public. It is impossible to reach a consensus. Art is so much about personal taste that if the public examines the project, reaching a final proposal would be difficult. However, each member sought the opinion of the public and reported it at the meetings.

These observations about public space and the ways to obtain consensus seem very specific. Japanese examples. But would like to say that there is no universal way of solving the problems of art in the city. If they want to place art in city, each cultural entity will have to find its own solutions.

The Future. However, we cannot wait for somebody to come up with the idea of art in the city someday. Artwork is necessary for life. We have to activate situations ourselves.

My idea is to propagate the "One percent" concept in Japan. If the government spends one percent of their construction budget when they build schools or hospitals, the situation will change. The budget should be invested on art projects developed by a curator or an artist after discussions with people, so that public space becomes really public. Today, there are people in different cities organizing artistic and cultural events if we can make a network of these people. The approval of the "One percent" law will not be impossible.

3) Virtual Exhibition. I would like to mention the virtual space in 1988, I organized an exhibition of video works in Tokyo through the internet. Video works were stocked in

the hard discs of a server. Using the internet and the MPEG2 system of codification,

people could get the video works and see them on small monitors or on a large LED screen in a coffee shop. I saw the possibility of using the virtual space as public space. Today many artists share using internet to show their works and the commercial distribution of video has begun would like to develop the virtual space as a public space in which to show art works it will be interesting to use internet through mobile phone as a public space.

ART AND THE CITY. POLITICS FOR PUBLIC ART
Alejandro Hernandez.

Evidently, the various roundtable discussions in this symposium have dealt with the issue of the relation or relations that exist between the City. Today we have listened to panelists speak of politics for public art in a first instance, of politics in first instance. Of politics in the strict, perhaps narrow sense of the word as management and administration as the strategies that allow for and foster art practice as something "public".

But maybe we should take a step backwards and ask ourselves rather whether or not every relationship from the outset. And also ask ourselves whether the relationship between art and the city is not a political relationship from the outset. And also ask ourselves whether the relationship itself between artists and their art and we must underscore the possessive their art is not also inevitably a political one.

The topic at hand is indeed art and the city rather than the artist and the city. But if it had needed the later, it would be impossible to overlook. Plato's exclusion of artists (of poets that is to say the creators of works from the city banned both from civic. Space and from the urban real (which are not necessarily one and the same).

In a series of essays whose title happens to be The Artist and the City. philosopher

Eugenio Trias explains the need for this ban in a space (civic space) where everyone is interdependent and governed by pre-established rules that transcend individuality established rules that transcend individuality -and where each thing is what it is says Trias-, there is one individual (the artist being aware of all the terms implications) who rises above the rest and shows us or gives us a "work" that is the result of his or her poetic- erotic impulse- a work that, now following Heidegger, creates a world for itself and is a self - sufficient entity . This action s disruptive nature and the confusion generated by the artists actions in the eyes of the philosopher- politician justifies his or her expulsion.

At least since the dawn of modernity- the modernity that began, shall we say, around the time of the Renaissance and especially since the outset of Romanticism- the artist has been viewed as someone who distances him or herself from his or her own cultural milieu (in a dialectic gesture that negates tradition in order to achieve a new synthesis that reaches beyond it) As Deleuze states concerning the writer an artist becomes what he or she is by becoming a stranger to his or her own language and culture. The artist today is a critic a dissident a radical and thus sows dissolutions in any pre-established social or cultural order.

Here over the last few days, we have talked about the issue of consensus, of *sensus communis*: common sense. This leads us to many questions has consensus, outside of literary works ever been the result of an agreement among free willed equals? Are not culture and tradition- necessarily public- ways of assuring consensus a hence, political forms of control (which does not imply that they are evil perse)? Should a breakdown in consensus be seen as a loss? Is modern art- like modern thinking- a cause or effect of this breakdown in consensus, of common sense?