



# What Does Public Mean?

Art as a Participant in the Public Arena

EDITED BY  
TONE HANSEN

TORPEDO<sup>PRESS</sup>

This anthology has been made on the basis of two seminars and one exhibition, as well as meetings with artists in connection with my employment as a Research Fellow at the Oslo National Academy of the Arts. These are the solo show *Come and Take It* with Gardar Eide Einarsson at the Young Artists Society (UKS) in 2003, the seminar similarly entitled, and the conference *What does Public Mean? Art as a Participant in the Public Arena* arranged for the National Museum, Oslo as part of my contribution to the group show *Kiss the Frog, The Art of Transformation* in 2005.

*Tone Hansen, 2006*

**WHAT DOES PUBLIC MEAN?  
ART AS A PARTICIPANT IN THE PUBLIC ARENA**

EDITED BY Tone Hansen  
Torpedo Press 2006

All copyrights between Torpedo Press, Tone Hansen,  
authors and the artists.

All rights reserved, no part of this publication may be  
reproduced in any form without permission of the publisher.

EDITING: Tone Hansen, Eivind Slettebø

GRAPHIC DESIGN: Claudia C. Sandor, Tone Hansen

TRANSLATION: Søl Kjøk (Tone Hansen), Georg Morgenstern (Stian Grøgaard)

LANGUAGE EDITING: Marit Paasche, Line Ulekleiv

COVER PHOTOGRAPH: Tone Hansen

INSIDE COVER: Excerpt from the website *hovedstaden.info*

PRINTING: Valdres Trykkeri

PAPER: Trucard Duo, 300 g/m<sup>2</sup>; Munken Lynx, 130 g/m<sup>2</sup>

TYPOGRAPHY: Gotham, Mercury

FIRST EDITION: 750

ISBN-13: 978-82-997365-0-3

ISBN-10: 82-997365-0-1

Torpedo Press would like to acknowledge financial support  
from the Freedom of Expression Foundation, Oslo



**TORPEDOPRESS**

PUBLISHED AND DISTRIBUTED BY  
Torpedo Press  
Hausmannsgate 62  
0182 Oslo, Norway  
[kontakt@torpedobok.no](mailto:kontakt@torpedobok.no)  
[www.torpedobok.com](http://www.torpedobok.com)



# Contents

Editor's note	5
Introduction	10
A Frame Around Reality MARIANNE HEIER	24
Publicness: The Site Specificity of a Concept STIAN GRØGAARD	36
Event list occurring at "Pro-test lab" or in relation to the Pro-test against privatization of Pylimo Street 17, cinema "Lietuva" GEDIMINAS AND NOMEDA URBONAS	46
A Problem of Style: Art vs. Subculture On the work of Gardar Eide Einarsson INA BLOM	56
On Alternating, Dynamics and Movement PEIO AGUIRRE AND LEIRE VERGARA	62

Walk_Through_the_City TONE HANSEN	68
Forward to the Past— The Concept of the Cultural Lighthouse In Hamburg's <i>HafenCity</i> CORNELIA SOLLFRANK	102
Peter Tamm Loves the Navy An interview with Cornelia Sollfrank TONE HANSEN	110
Untitled GARDAR EIDE EINARSSON	116
Biographies	144



# What Does Public Mean?

## Art as a Participant in the Public Arena

TONE HANSEN

This anthology focuses on two parallel issues in the field of art. On one hand, it discusses art and the artist's function as players in the public sphere, and the art world's function as a political arena for pragmatic perspectives on topics of conflict. On the other hand, it seeks to present a balance sheet of the ideal and fictive functions of the art sphere. These issues are examined in light of the New Economy and recent political developments where market mechanisms and corporate organizational forms dominate the restructuring of government-run cultural institutions.

For far too long, we (in the Nordic countries) have taken it for granted that art's relatively free position in society (i.e. a social democracy) is protected against the restructuring taking place in the rest of society. Given the latest discussions, battles, and debates, we are now forced to re-evaluate our strategies, organizational forms, and framework for a critical artistic practice. We must once again discuss the terms and conditions for a practice that actively creates public arenas. This is a matter of assessing alliances, collective action forms, and the special function of the art sphere; of examining and learning from other disciplines such as critical journalism and philoso-

phy; and exploring how the current art education functions in relation to these mechanisms. Clearly, this book cannot encompass all of these aspects. *What Does "Public" Mean? Art as a Participant in the Public Arena* gives examples of various strategies and means of action, and opens up for a wider debate. In this context, it is a matter of ownership of the community, the right and opportunity to exercise an influence; and of who has access to the various societal forums, but also the ways in which a general development alters the particular situation of the art sphere.

These issues have been analyzed in a number of publications, perhaps most recently in the anthology *In the Place of the Public Sphere*?<sup>1</sup> edited by Simon Sheikh, where the issues surrounding the public sphere are primarily discussed in light of a historical continuum. *Documenta 11* dealt with the relationship between politics, society, and art through its many platforms across the globe.

The anthology uses Oslo as its point of departure, but also draws on lessons learned from projects and actions in various urban areas in Europe and the US, such as Vilnius, San Sebastián, Hamburg, and New York.

### Market Power

I here intend to establish the outlines of the current situation and point to some challenges artists and cultural workers—to varying degrees—will be facing. There will be a particular emphasis on three aspects that can be seen as concurrent: how the artist is perceived in society today; the consequences of neo-liberalism for society, and how art, culture, and design once again have become means of control and power over "public" urban spaces. The quotation marks are included because at present, one might say that we have gone from public arenas to private-public arenas. The dividing lines between private and public are no longer as clear as they used to be. Art and culture have become a significant part of the political power game, and we are part of that, whether we like it or not. The question is to what extent one may offer resistance, and whether a refusal to move away may sometimes represent greater progress than going with the tide of development.

The final stages of preparation of this anthology coincided with the publication of *Markedets makt over sinnene* (*The Market's Power over the Mind*)<sup>2</sup> by Bent Sofus Tranøy. This is a sharp and frank political-economic analysis of the same sets of issues I have long attempted to localize in the art field,

i.e. what is referred to as the hegemony of neo-liberalism over our language, over our prospects for the future, and over the apparatus of concepts that is allowed to shape our cultural institutions. While Tranøy does not explicitly address the cultural institutions, he does describe situations and conflicts in the corporate and public sector that are parallel to the battles of values that are now being waged in the cultural field.

In his introductory remarks, Tranøy calls into account precisely the concept of neo-liberalism, which he sees as a too positively connotated term for those who are pushing for the greatest possible degree of a so-called market-driven society. The term is too similar to classical liberalism, which has laid the groundwork for a part of our fundamental values. In its place, Tranøy proposes "market fundamentalism" as a more apt term for a literal faith in the mechanisms of the market, and thus a fundamental skepticism of government as an active entity establishing the premises for social development.<sup>3</sup> That is to say, a government that always reacts in retrospect through revisions, rather than an administration that establishes the terms and conditions prior to any movements. Market always implies a power struggle. Where there are markets, there are concentrations of power, and far too often, the people pushing for the privatization of public property and institutions have personal interests in the matter. In that regard, the oligarchs robbing property in Russia are not so far removed from the reform-friendly Scandinavian politicians who are diving in for the kill when public property is sectioned off and privatized. There is little doubt that market fundamentalism yields great influence. Tranøy goes as far as saying that we are living in a market fundamentalist era.

"Far too many, also highly educated and powerful people, show too little interest in thinking about and discussing the interplay between a constitutional state, bureaucracy, democracy, civilian society, family, and various forms of market organization. Instead, a simplified and idealized version of one single organizational and motivational system is held up as the standard for all things."<sup>4</sup>

This is perhaps also the consequence of viewing democracy as a completed project in terms of its form. Combined with a continual quest for consensus in the political center and an aversion to confrontations, the result is

that passion, enthusiasm, and temperament are banished from the political sphere for the ordinary citizen.

The political theorist Chantal Mouffe explores a way out of the neo-liberalist grip on the development of democracy in her definition of the notion of "agonism." In her text *For an Agonistic Public Sphere*, she discusses the kind of public area on which a vibrant democracy depends:

"In order to defend and deepen the democratic project, what is urgently needed is an alternative to the dominant approach in democratic political theory, one that would help revitalize the democratic public sphere by stimulating awareness of the need for political forms of identification around clearly differentiated democratic positions and the possibility of choosing between real alternatives. This is why, against the existing models of democratic politics, the aggregative and the deliberative, I have argued for a model of "agonistic pluralism", which acknowledges the role of power relations in society and the ever present possibility of antagonism."<sup>5</sup>

Like many others, Mouffe emphasizes that a real democracy can never be completed, but must constantly be under discussion and revision.

In post-communist countries, the consequence of market fundamentalism is a transition from a government-run plan economy to a market economy dominated by oligarchs and multinational corporations that have no time or space to build a civilian society based on regional values. The Pro-test lab action in Vilnius came about as a direct response to the sale of public buildings to private parties without any form of regulations on use.

Public pools have been shut down to make room for office space, movie theaters have been converted into casinos and Benetton stores. Parks have been sold off to investors at a frenzied pace. The artists Gediminas and Nomeda Urbonas took the initiative for the occupation of the lobby of the movie theater with the symbolic name *Lietuva* (a controversial name during the Soviet occupation and a symbol of independence). The project gained wide local support and international attention, and brought together participants from many fields of society, ranging from political pressure groups, architects, activists, and intellectuals to artists. The instigators here present the entire list of activities that took place during the action. The list gives



insight into the broad range and impact of their action, which created possibilities to envision new collectives side by side with privatization. Thus, a collective memory of the possibility of protest took shape.

### Market Power and Design

The anthology is being put together at a time and in a country where ideas about public institutions, spaces and communal goods are developed in the wake of “Cool Britannia” (cultural industry at the national level) and New Public Management (the restructuring of governmental agencies and services according to corporate models).<sup>6</sup> It is no exaggeration to claim that there is very little difference between a center-left government and a center-right government when it comes to the introduction of NPM as a managerial and organizational model in the cultural sector. Big institutions are turned into private entities, which again finance their operations through earmarked allocations. In Lithuania, as in Norway, culture is also given a new role in national advertising. Oslo is dreaming of a giant museum at the Tullinløkka square. A new opera house on the waterfront is meant to boost development in the harbor area surrounding Oslo. Arturas Zuokas, Mayor of Vilnius, has plans for a Guggenheim Museum there by the year 2009, as part of the 1000 year anniversary of the city of Vilnius and of its application for status as a European Culture City. Everybody hopes for the Bilbao effect (effective as urban development, but dysfunctional as an exhibition space), controlled and programmed from USA, but financed locally, and drawing large crowds of visitors.

New Public Management has been an effective organizational approach for the past two decades. It has contributed to changing our language, the marketing of art institutions, the municipal governments, public agencies and services. Where diversity is desirable, company strategies and profiles are being bundled together to convey a “consistent” image—which makes the educational institutions, the museums, the public institutions and agencies appear increasingly more alike the same “consistent” product. The same mechanisms are at work in rural communities threatened by depopulation, as in government agencies that have been turned into independent entities. Hence, there is no essential difference between the logo and marketing of the MuseumsQuartier in Vienna and the logo of the tiny community of Os located in the outskirts of Bergen, or the government-owned company

Mesta.<sup>7</sup> All three are meeting points for innovation, creativity and development. The very same forms, colors and concepts are intended to turn a “museum cluster” in Austria, a government-owned company, and a village on the western coast of Norway into something truly different. Design is always “total design,” says Mark Wigley.<sup>8</sup> He examines architecture as design in light of two concepts of the Total Design theory, i.e. *Implosion and Explosion*, which contrast each other, but are nevertheless connected.

“Implosive design is usually understood as a form of resistance, if not the last stand. Architecture gathers all its resources in one sacred place where architects collaborate with other artists to produce an image of such intensity that it blocks out the increasingly industrialized world. In contrast, those who explode architecture out into every corner of the world embrace the new age of standardization.”

The consequence of an omnipresent design is that the people with the power to design our institutions, both visually and in terms of their content, all use the very same color palettes and organizational models. In this regard, globalization levels out the differences to the benefit of the advertising companies’ simple methodology. Their favorite colors are currently orange and deep blue.

### Control over Urban Development

The same mechanisms apply to urban development. As opposed to urbanization, which is a matter of the major movements within the city, restoration of certain parts of town is now taking place on a grand scale; a death throe attempt at preserving the notion of the old merchant town. The recently completed *Hovedstadsaksjonen* (an architectural restoration program for the Norwegian capital branded as “actionist”) is an example of how nostalgic historicizing can serve as a cover for controlling the usage of the city and the circulation within it, where “private citizens” take it upon themselves to address problems and redesign the city according to their own desires—in this case, modeled after the historic city center of Paris.

A passive, conservative Town Council welcomes this development because its members have opted for paralysis. While “the action” is concluded, its principles still apply to the further renovation of the city. I will address



this in detail in "Walk\_through\_the\_City", which is a visual analysis of potential zones of conflict in Oslo and the consequences of passivity in the municipal administration.

In Hamburg, a group of artists, intellectuals, architects, and activists, including Cornelia Sollfrank, has initiated an action against a privately owned, but municipally funded marine museum, which in reality is a collection of objects from the Nazi era. The collection belongs to the old National Socialist Peter Tamm. Here, too, the consequence of privatizing or outsourcing public tasks is poor political control over the underlying interests of the private providers. The action is collectively organized, but addressed to the individuals behind the decision-making processes. In this book, Sollfrank describes the background situation in an interview entitled "Peter Tamm Loves the Navy," and conceptualizes the background for the action in her essay "Forward to the Past: The Concept of the Cultural Lighthouse in Hamburg's Hafen City."

### Some Changes in Our Understanding of the Art Sphere

To the extent to which art protests against the prevailing social development, challenges an expanding capitalism or examines bureaucratic structures, the art institution as a concept can serve as a protective framework for experimentation, but also as a refuge for debates that do not occur in other forums.

Artists enter into new alliances that break away from the traditional idea of the art institution. They use the institution more as a tool for critical investigations, rather than an old-fashioned, self-reflective institutional criticism. Gardar Eide Einarsson fits into this category with his advanced visual rhetoric that is partially based on the many spaces and backyards of the art field, where fragments of sites and situations succeed one another at a rapid pace. His photo series offers glimpses of strategies, opportunities crossing various types of spaces and potential zones of conflict, but it never presents the art sphere or the urban space as a site for the completed and perfect. Rather, he describes gaps and glitches, several ways out.

The art sphere has long been characterized as an asylum and a refuge by curators such as Charles Esche. This view presupposes that the art world offers a possibility for retreat to discuss and experiment, as a space with a distance to the major developments. This fictional aspect of the art sphere

has its place in the general public, too. As a parallel to "reality", the art world offers a possibility for a discussion of societal development. This is the very reason why the discussion of the art arena's function at many levels has evolved around the more indefinable functions of a publicly accessible space, as an asylum and meeting place, as a space for those transactions and transfers for which there is no room, or that cannot find any loopholes next to all the big, financial trades occurring in the administrative and private sectors. Not as the only alternative, but as one of many.

The question is whether the art field has become polarized as a consequence of the introduction of financial measures of success in the major and dominant art institutions. Are the small institutions able to fight for space in the public sphere without adopting the same rules, based on other networks than the major government-run and private museum conglomerates?<sup>9</sup> And if so, do they then have to be self-financed as well as self-organized so as not to succumb themselves to the drive for profit? The US-based *16 Beaver Group* explained its (lack of) organizational structure at a conference in Oslo earlier this year.<sup>10</sup> In fact, *non-profit* is just a step towards becoming for-profit. Incorporating an entity entails much more bureaucracy and a demand for transparency. By not incorporating, the entity can maneuver faster, but cannot apply for funding from foundations for non-profit organizations.

The art arenas in the plural form must be understood as several fragments of the public with many and conflicting interests within a larger web of diverse communities, interest groups, associations, and political factions. Representing a fragment of the public does not mean to be against the public in the sense of a negative withdrawal into separate cells. On the contrary, a fragment of the public means an element that enters into a larger and complex understanding of the public sphere.

The theorist and curator Simon Sheikh writes in his essay "Representation, Contestation and Power: The Artist as a Public Intellectual" that counter-publics must be seen as equally relational as they are oppositional, and that counter-publics often mimic structures from normative or dominant publics in order to convey their message.<sup>11</sup> They form a grid interwoven into society's fabric, sometimes uncontained by national borders. Some counter-publics, or perhaps better referred to as societal groups, refuse to be pinned down to a definition by answering questions with more questions. This is a strategy to remain at all times one step removed from those who retain the



power to define. Because if you are identifiable, you are open to occupation. A group, a society, a collective, or a sub-culture also defines itself—more or less consciously—through the restrictions it sets, and through what it considers to be outside of its own community. Ina Blom describes these mechanisms in her text on Gardar Eide Einarsson's work, "A Problem of Style: Art vs. Subculture".<sup>12</sup>

In that case, how do these partially fragmented positions entail possibilities for new self-referential statements—experiential and interpretative contexts within the art field?

Today, numerous organizations operate without permanent exhibition spaces, using various locations as their field of operation in collaboration with the artists. They occupy/make visible certain spaces to create temporary meeting points. The San Sebastián-based curators collective D.A.E Foundation (*Donostiako Arte Ekinbideak*) serves as an example of the creation of narratives in public spaces and the adaptation of strategies for the specific events or sites, while simultaneously avoiding the major mechanisms at work in the cultural field of their region. D.A.E consists of Peio Aquirre and Leire Vergara, who are currently active in different positions in the same region. The presentation of Aquirre's and Vergara's text, "Alternating, Dynamics and Movement", is consistent with their curatorial principle: their contribution to this anthology is as much a site-specific text as it is a description of a project.

### The Occupation of the Third Space

There is something about how words tie us to the times we live in, limit our field of action and set traps for the understanding of potential changes. That may be the reason why the above-mentioned Tranøy's calling to account of the market fundamentalism seems so welcome. Some linguistic and mental mechanisms work so effectively because we have had no guard up against neo-liberalism's most effective tool of change, namely our understanding of how the future can be shaped, and what is actually possible. Thus, communication is banalized. We end up kicking around the same old terms, and those in possession of the greatest capital win the hegemony over notions such as *events*, *avant-garde*, *meeting points*, *flexibility*, and, not to forget, the definition of *radicality*. Those who adapt to and master the reorganization game and the novel usage of the terms are our new, professional restructur-

ing managers; who tend to consider themselves the progressive, reform-minded radicals of our times. Tranøy writes:

"This layer consists of people with a corporate background, or of government employees who have themselves become reorganized and learned a new language and a new way of thinking."<sup>13</sup>

The third space is the term used for the space between home and work, which is the space everybody is fighting to occupy for each individual; this is the space in which we meet during our leisure time. It fits just as well with the neo-liberals or the reform-eager managers as with those who are trying to form a counter-balance. The minor institutions easily end up in the shadow of the central institutions, without the means to assert their presence. This is a threat to all forms of small publics that cannot afford to purchase the same amount of space as the big ones. Or, it leads to a marginalization of the pressure groups, which never obtain normative power. This represents a threatening aspect of market fundamentalism, especially in smaller countries where the dominant public arena is limited. Everybody knows that competing is about winning, whether the prize is market power or medals. Competition means the opposite of an agonistic pluralism; competition is about securing market shares. That is why the minor institutions are now perceived as a threat to the hegemony of the major ones. This is a new scenario for the Nordic art scene, which was previously, to a certain extent, founded on mutual respect, collaboration and exchanges. (Naturally, with their own political and financial hegemonies and problems that fall outside the scope of this publication).

The production, the thought processes, and the experiences that are happening within the large notion of art are not neutral, but already controlled and informed by interests that tend to present themselves as neutral. Nevertheless, the art sphere is both subject to and an object of constant change, which perhaps lends the minor institutions a potential upper hand in the exchange with other groups or fragments of the public.

There are many ways to challenge and benefit from this; financially, site-specifically, as well as politically. Without succumbing to political partisanship or local patriotism. But that requires time, and a willingness to examine and identify the mechanisms that are shaping the art institutions in the same



way as corporations and society at large. 'Acting locally, thinking globally' may also apply to art, if you are aiming for political effect. *Tamm Tamm Künstler informieren Politiker* and *Pro-test lab* are both examples of this. They also exemplify a type of protest actions that make effective use of the privileged position of a strong collective, where the artist's identity has effectively been pushed aside and knowledge is shared across diverse fields of experience.

This is a matter of interaction among a number of small and active players/identities, rather than an undifferentiated grey mass streaming past the counting meters on its way into "the third space" as passive consumers.

### The Artist and the Creative Class

If a relational or agonistic public sphere does not offer stable or homogeneous notions of art, what are the new roles and representation models for the artist? Today's new directions emphasize the education of moderators, agents, and intermediaries meant to serve as messengers between the art and its audience. An army of intermediaries passing material and messages down a long line of hands. A common characteristic among these new educational programs (in Norway) is that they are "neutral". It is all a matter of dissemination logistics, and the statements announcing the new educational programs make no mentioning of critical reflection, whether in the role of educator or curator. These new go-betweens may in reality constitute a very moldable and useful link for the management—an efficient communication tool in new strategies for encountering and molding the audience. Is it the role of the educator, curator, intermediary, or cultural manager to spark some friction and challenge the system, or is she/he seamlessly integrated into the institutions' extended apparatus without any resistance?

This increased focus on "the creative class" has not engendered a corresponding debate about the artist's role in this "class", or how the artist's or the art institution's critical role can be shaped, or simply practiced. From another perspective, one might claim that market fundamentalism cannibalizes all opposition, and that any attempt to place oneself on the outside is effectively adopted and made normative in a perverted form. Thus, the nineties notion of crossover has become the norm for a new total art movement in the major art institutions, where differences between cultures and art forms are successfully dissolved to the benefit of a centralized management.

In her text "A Frame Around Reality", Marianne Heier sheds light on this issue by showing how the artist, as a carrier of cultural capital, is useful to the corporate world where there is a need to build an attractive image of a construction site, as is the case with Bjørvika AS. But the artist is not only a carrier of cultural values as an interest-generating tool for the development of new urban regions. The artist can also apply for project funding from foundations to which the corporation, as a for-profit entity, does not have access. One can point to many questionable cases where a corporate desire for cultural status is financed with public funding, despite the fact that the developers and real estate investors have budgets and revenues that far surpass the public funds for art. But is the notion of art and the artist's role being watered-down as a critical practice when the artist gets involved in such scenarios? Or does this simply represent the establishment of new arenas from which the artist benefits? And can all critical art, in fact, be incorporated into market strategies, where the more critical the art, the more attention it garners, and thereby also credibility for the company, which is seen as self-critical? Heier's analysis of her own project identifies some zones of conflict in the encounter between the artist and the commissioner of artwork in venues outside of the classical art institution, not to forget the institutions' lack of knowledge in dealing with temporal art works. But Heier's main focal point is another conflict zone: by re-opening the Sagene Bad Public Pool for one day, she brought attention to the municipal authorities' neglect of maintenance of public buildings (in anticipation of a buyer), and the poor swimming education offered by a city that takes pride in calling itself a "Fjord Town".

### The Discussion of the Public Sphere

Artists have a privileged position with access to a very peculiar space, but do not possess the power to alter the underlying structures. A critical position that is tied to the use of a public space defined and financed by others, must define its own independence. We have inherited from Modernism notions such as autonomy, authenticity, and representation, notions that have a simultaneously repressive and liberating effect. When are they serving as a necessary filter against external interests and their desire to rule? Can we envision a power perspective for art? Ina Blom writes the following in her text "A Problem of Style: Art vs. Subculture":



"It could even be the case that the stylistic practices of the system of visual art are particularly capable of processing or marking out such stylistic instances in the sense that they may even invent for them an ethics, a positive social reason that would remain impossible or invisible from a different point of observation".<sup>14</sup>

There is a need to put ideals and utopias to the proof, and find out whether we can actually learn something from the old debate on the public sphere and the fantasy of the bourgeois public sphere. This is a subject treated for many years by the theorist Miwon Kwon:

"As many have said before, the public sphere is always necessarily an ideal, an idealized construction (fantasy), insofar as it imagines a possibility and potential of overcoming social differences to debate issues of common concern".<sup>15</sup>

Kwon also calls for attention to a need for the discussion of a revised version of the "Habermasian ideal."

22

"The fantasy of a public sphere, where one might bracket temporarily one's private, personal interest to imagine a collective identification, a different sort of intimacy—not for affirmation, consensus, or unification (not a self same identification)—seems more important than ever. Such an effort to imagine a democratic public sphere anew is necessarily an exercise in abstraction, and the (art) work to be done seems to be located in the space of a coming together of this different sort of intimacy and publicity."<sup>16</sup>

Stian Grøgaard's text for this anthology, "Publicness: The Site-Specificity of a Concept", operates within this field, where the relationship between publicity and publicness is discussed on the basis of Hannah Arendt's notion of the public, and whether we currently misread publicness as publicity.

The very point of a critical position is not to let oneself be ruled so much. To take a position on the sideline in order to analyze and to make one's views visible in a broad public sphere. If we do not want to be ruled in the way we are today, we have to ask ourselves how to find ways to be ruled differently, or avoid being ruled so much?

#### NOTES

1. Sheikh, Simon (ed) (2005): *In the Place of the Public Sphere?*: B\_Books, Berlin.
2. Tranøy, Bent Sofus (2006): *Markedets makt over sinnene*, Aschehoug & Co, Oslo.
3. Ibid, p. 10.
4. Ibid, p. 17.
5. Mouffe, Chantal (2002): *For an Agonistic Public Sphere, Democracy Unrealized*, Dokumental1\_Plattform 1. Hatje Cantz Publishers.
6. New Public Management is a set of theories for a restructuring of the public sector that is closely linked to the neo-liberal market theory. NPM has its origin in New Zealand's financial crisis in the 1980s, but is perhaps more often associated with Margaret Thatcher in Great Britain and Ronald Reagan in the USA. The ideological goal of NPM is to create a minimal government through applying the managerial principles, organizational structures, and management ideals of private corporations to the public sector. Tom Christensen, Professor of Political Science, describes NPM as "a shopping basket of various reform elements that are not particularly consistent." This means that NPM is not a holistic set of reform programs, but rather that the introduction of reforms yields different consequences, depending on sector, area, and institution. The result of New Public Management is a fragmented government. As agencies and government bodies become independent entities, cultural institutions are turned into self-governing foundations and public educational institutions become autonomous in name—partially through the new Norwegian Act on Higher Education—power is situated at arm's length from the government of the institutions.
7. See brands and presentations at [www.mesta.no](http://www.mesta.no), [www.mqw.at/fset\\_de](http://www.mqw.at/fset_de), [www.os.hordaland.no](http://www.os.hordaland.no).
8. Wigley, Mark (1998): *Whatever Happened to Total Design?*, Harvard Design Magazine, Number 5.
9. Maria Lind compares the major museum developments with media conglomerates in her text "rsvp, or What Rhythm, Scale and Format Can Do with Art", *nu* 1-2, 2002.
10. Ayreen Anastas and Rene Gabri in their talk at the conference *The New Administration of Aesthetics*, Kunstnerens Hus, Oslo, April 20-21, 2006. Organized by Trude Iversen, Tone Hansen, and Stian Grøgaard.
11. Sheikh, Simon: [www.republicart.net/disc/aap/sheikh02\\_en.htm](http://www.republicart.net/disc/aap/sheikh02_en.htm)
12. Blom, Ina (2004): "A Problem of Style: Art vs. Subculture. On the Work of Gardar Eide Einarsson." The essay was originally written for the exhibition *Come and Take It* at Unge Kunstneres Samfund (Young Artists Society) in 2004. Previously published at [www.kunstkritikk.no](http://www.kunstkritikk.no).
13. Tranøy, Bent Sofus (2006): *Markedets makt over sinnene*, Aschehoug & Co, Oslo, p. 156.
14. Blom, Ina (2004): "A Problem of Style: Art vs. Subculture. On the Work of Gardar Eide Einarsson."
15. Kwon, Miwon (2005): "Public Art as Publicity", *In the Place of the Public Sphere?*: B\_Books, Berlin.
16. Ibid.