To Soar with Wings of Desire in Visible Cities:

A Theory and Practice of Contemporary Public Art

Jesse Shapins

Contemporary Urban Problems

Professor Kimberley Johnson

2 May 2001

The Scope of my Project

In simplistic terms, this essay may be described as an exploration of public art in the city. That would be unfair and limiting. More than just a description of the history and contemporary status of public art and three particular artists in New York, Berlin, and Havana, this essay aspires to examine the city within an unconventional, expanded framework. My sources reflect a concerted attempt to view the city in the most interdisciplinary and international way possible: I have studied recent German films and Italian literature, personally interviewed contemporary artists in New York, visited sites in Berlin, Havana, and throughout New York, looked at the existing academic literature concerning public art, aesthetics, and community development, and read various important philosophical texts addressing a variety of topics, from general aesthetic theory to the abstract nature of the city to community empowerment to chaos theory to the qualities that define our everyday lives. This essay will attempt to incorporate all of these seemingly disparate resources into a coherent argument for a theory of urban analysis, aesthetics, and public art. While it may not seem overtly prescriptive from a public policy standpoint—I do not offer a simple solution or plan—, it is my hope that the arguments which I set forth will inspire a raised consciousness of the nature of the city itself and the possibilities for public art to enhance community cohesion and improve people's everyday lives. It is my belief that if the ideas I set forth are taken to heart and policy decisions are made under this new consciousness, the city may become a better place to live for everybody.

Let me voice the essence of my thesis immediately: the role of public art should be to excite passion in people for the present moment and raise awareness of themselves, their community, and the places where they live. This public art should be surprising, throwing viewers out of their normal routine and forcing them to participate in the artwork itself, and in

turn, their immediate physical , temporal, and sensual reality. It should emphasize the local and the personal, embracing and expressing the principal of difference to create fundamentally unique and engaging public spaces and urban experiences. It should ignite people's sense of curiosity and attempt to direct it in a positive way: towards relevant political issues, one's role in the community, one's ability to pursue his or her dreams. It should be organic, growing out of the distinct character of the individual artist, the place, or the intended audience and community. It should not be imposed from above and afar, but should be a grassroots project that focuses upon participation and recognizes the process of creation as often equally if not more important than the final product. It is a public art concerned with making people *think* and *care* about themselves and the world around them.

There is no single embodiment of this type of art: its very definition works against the idea of absoluteness and singularity. This ideal rests upon a recognition of the complexity of our modern world and cities, and instead of simplifying this reality, it embraces it, attempting to constantly add new layers of intimate uniqueness and distinction to our landscape. This is a public art that aims to *increase and raise awareness of* the complexity of our environment by expressing the infinite eccentricities that define us as humans.

What Public Art Should Strive For: An Introduction via Contemporary German Film

In this section I will analyze the two recent German films *Wings of Desire* (*Der Himmel über Berlin*) and *Run Lola Run* (*Lola Rennt*) to illustrate what public art should aim to inspire in its viewers—or hopefully, its *participants*. Better than any other work I have encountered, *Wings of Desire* shows the immense beauty that we must strive to appreciate in our everyday lives.

Based upon the mythical story of an angel choosing to give up his immortality for a human life on earth, the film brilliantly illuminates what it means to be human. The film argues that the qualities of life that most deeply embody the beauty of the human existence are a combination of those seemingly mundane moments of everyday life—for example, the feeling of warmth from rubbing one's hands together—and the unexpected, surprising encounters and experiences that constantly disrupt our everyday routine.

One of the most poignant scenes of the film comes at the beginning when the two angels, Damiel and Cassiel, sit together and watch the passing street-life of Berlin while comparing notes on what they have recently seen in the mortal world. Reciting his list of observations, Cassiel says, "Today on the Lilienthaler Chaussee, a man, walking, slowed down and looked over his shoulder into space…. At the Zoo U-Bahn [subway] station—instead of the station's name—the conductor suddenly shouted, 'Tierra del Fuego.'"[1] It is the oblique, sensual, ephemeral, unexpected, and out of the ordinary details of city life that Cassiel highlights as central to human existence. Damiel's response brings these themes to the fore:

> It's great to live only by the spirit, to testify day by day for eternity only to the spiritual side of people. But sometimes I get fed up with my spiritual existence. Instead of forever hovering above, I'd like to feel there's some weight to me, to end my eternity and bind myself to the earth. At each step, each gust of wind, I'd like to be able to say, "Now…And now and now" and no longer say, "Since always" and "forever." Not that I want to beget a child or plant a tree right away, it would be quite something to come home after a long day…and feed the cat, to have a fever, to have blackened fingers from reading the newspaper, to be excited not only by the mind, but, at last, by a meal, the curve of a neck, by an ear…. To feel your skeleton moving along as you walk. Finally to suspect, instead of forever knowing all. To be able to say, "Ah," and, "Oh" and "Hey," instead of "Yes" and "Amen."[2]

Damiel wants to give up his limiting spiritual existence to be able *to feel* the fluctuating physical sensations that only humans can experience. The experiences for which he is willing to

sacrifice his immortality are those details of everyday life whose value we often overlook: a combination of the events of our everyday routine—the feeding of our pets, the reading of the newspaper, the eating of our meals—and the eccentric and unexpected moments which we cannot predict that punctuate this routine. Damiel is aware that not all human sensations are positive: he longs "to have a fever" as well. He recognizes life as a mixture of both pleasure and pain, but is willing to take on this variety of both negative and positive sensations in order to achieve some degree of *feeling*. Alienated as an eternal, purely spiritual being, he longs to connect with the fragile reality of mortality, "to feel [his] skeleton moving along as [he] walks." Damiel longs to immerse himself in the unpredictable present moment that is only possible in a mortal existence.

Damiel eventually fulfills his desire to ground himself in the emotional and temporal vibrancy of mortal life. He decides to give up his status as an angel and assume the body of a living—and therefore eventually dying—man. Before his fall he says:

> I'm going to take the plunge. An old human expression, often heard, that I only understood today. Now or never, the moment of the ford. There is no other bank, there's only the river. Into the ford of time, the ford of death. Down from our look-out of the unborn! Observing from above is not like seeing at eye-level.[3]

After so many years of hovering above and around humans, Damiel realizes that there is no real meaning in his ethereal, detached eternal existence, and that what is most important is to "plunge" into the risks inherent in human life. Wenders' and co-author Peter Handke's message is an assault against the notion of eternity and stasis. They seek to inspire an approach to life that focuses upon the "now," realizing that if it is not embraced it will dissolve into the "never." Damiel's fall is a descent "into the ford of time, the ford of death," the ford of the present moment. Once again, it is important to recognize that Wenders and Handke do not idealize mortal life and the present moment: their symbol is the "ford" of a "river," a shallow crossing

point in a constantly flowing, fluctuating, and unpredictable body of water that always encounters rocks, branches, pollution—in human terms, impediments, pain. Ready for his plunge into mortality, Damiel realizes that "there is no other bank": the truth and beauty of human existence is an immersion in the *current* of its river.

Tom Tykwer's *Run Lola Run* will help us further understand the meaning and importance of the present moment in our lives. This film is also set in Berlin, but after the fall of the Wall and pulsates with the pace of the newly-reunified city. The film presents a rather simple story in order to highlight the interconnectedness of our lives and the impact that the seemingly most minute details have upon ourselves and others. Lola must acquire 100,000 Marks in twenty minutes to save her boyfriend's life. The film consists of three versions of her frantic pursuit of the money, each ending differently as a result of only a couple seconds. It is not only Lola's life that changes in each scenario: the film consciously shows that each character's life is affected by the small details of each moment. The film wonderfully illustrates the infinite interconnectedness of our lives and the importance of being attune to the reality of every second we are alive. [4]

The present moment is, of course, a highly abstract notion. When I refer to this concept, more than anything, I mean *awareness of and attentive focus upon* the immediate actions, thoughts, sensations, and emotions of one's reality. From *Run Lola Run*, we see that it is consciousness of the present moment that may give people the ability to connect with, understand, and in the end, achieve some degree of control over their lives. The present is therefore the totality of things existing in interconnectedness; it is the point of origin on an infinite horizon of possibility. The present is the seed of infinite futures among which we can *choose*.

Now, we may return to *Wings of Desire* and round out our introduction via contemporary German film. The central element that Wenders portrays as the energizing force behind Damiel's enlightenment is the eye. That is, it is visual aesthetics that inspire Damiel "to take the plunge." This is illustrated in many different ways. From the beginning, Wenders introduces the theme of vision and aesthetics into the film. After the introductory credits, the first image is a close-up, full-screen shot of an eye. It is an eye that embodies Wenders' insistence that we focus upon our vision and the present moment: this eye, with its visibly strained nerves, fluttering eyelashes, and piercing pupils is bursting with intensity. To further establish the film's focus upon aesthetics, the first word after the credits is "Look!", uttered by a child to his friend as he points at the still-half-bombed tower of the Gedächtnis Kirche, the symbol of postwar Berlin.[5]

The importance of the visual in *Wings of Desire* is particularly evident in Wenders' mixing of both black and white and color. The scenes seen through the angels' eyes are in black and white; those seen through the eyes of the living are in color. This is important for our later and more direct discussion of public art: Wenders shows us that color is essential to humans' perceptions in the city. His use of color and black and white adds one more layer to his portrait of the richness of human life and the powerful force of aesthetics upon our lives.

The centrality of aesthetics to Wenders' discourse is best captured in this quote from Marian, the trapeze artist for whom Damiel falls in love: "I'm here, I'm free, and I can imagine anything. Everything is possible. *I only need to raise my eyes* and once again, I become the world. Now…In this very place a feeling of happiness that I could have forever" (italics mine).[6] Wenders argues it is possible through vision, and therefore aesthetics, to engage in a search for enlightenment and awareness of the present moment, a goal which may ultimately lead to *happiness*. It is through her eyes that Marian is able to be present, "here"—"free."

The City and the Present Moment

That *Wings of Desire* and *Run Lola Run* are set within the city is obviously no mistake on their creators' parts: the city itself functions as a central element in the discourses of the films. In the beginning scenes of both films there are swooping overhead shots of Berlin, establishing the immense area of the city as the locus of action. In *Run Lola Run*, the viewer falls with the camera from the sky into Lola's apartment: we are immediately grounded in Berlin. Wenders is even more explicit in drawing attention to the setting of the city: after the aforementioned shot of the eye, we follow the camera above Berlin, dipping into and out of apartments. Throughout the film, Wenders continuously draws attention to Berlin as the background of his story: coupled with the constant integration of overhead pictures, there are frequent references to the Wall, both verbal and visual, and other recognizable sites in Berlin. The point of these two directors is clear: their discourses must be understood as specifically *urban*. And while undoubtedly they both have many elements directed towards Berlin in particular, the essence of their urban discourse may be expanded to include all cities.

Wenders ultimately synthesizes the themes of everyday life, the present moment, and the city in the final dialogue between Damiel and Marian. In this climactic encounter, she says:

> I don't know if destiny exists. But decision does exist. Decide! Now, WE are the times. Not only the whole city, but the whole world is taking part in our decision. We two are more than just two.… We are sitting in the people's plaza and the whole plaza is filled with people who all wish for what we wish for. We are deciding everyone's game! I am ready. Now it's your turn. You're holding the game in your hand. Now…or never![7]

This is Wenders final message: we have the power to control our lives—we can "decide"—and these decisions do not only affect ourselves, but "we are deciding

everyone's game!" In the present moment and in the "people's plaza" we may act with a knowledge and appreciation of our interconnectedness. Translated into the language of traditional urban discourse, Wenders' message is that in public spaces people may come together to realize their intimate relations as *community* and grasp the power inherent in themselves as *active, decision-making individuals*. The universalizing here is not one of total commonality: it is the universality of the individual, the local, the eccentric, and the infinite connections that exist between us as *different people*.

The city is the form of settlement most conducive to allowing this diversity to flourish and our interconnectedness to be utilized in the best possible ways. It is the perfect crucible for spontaneous interplays to take place. As I wrote before, the present moment is the time when we have the ability to decide our futures. A highly concentrated population creates a wider and more diverse spectrum of possible futures. The constant interaction of different people that is possible in the city allows us the opportunity to explore our interconnectedness, giving us the chance to be constantly *engaged* in our infinite complexity of connections. This possibility, though, is only accessible when different people *interact in the present moment*. That is, just because a lot of different people live near each other does necessarily mean that there will be interaction between them. A city, neighborhood, street that is statistically diverse is not enough: there must be *communication and interaction* between different people. Public art can be a powerful force in facilitating this interaction.

Current Condition of Public Space, Public Art, Urban Aesthetics

For public art to be *public*, it first must exist in public space. Here, I will give a brief overview of the definition of public space, its recent history in American cities, and current developments affecting its present condition. Public space can be defined as a place where 1) economic activity is not necessary; 2) the inherent plurality and diversity of society is accepted and encouraged in its expression; 3) spontaneous interaction is possible. Of course this is quite a restricting definition and excludes many places that form an integral part of our public culture (e.g. cafés, bars, most museums, etc.), but for the purpose of discussing the public art projects specific to this paper, this definition will suffice.

Today, the public spaces that meet these criteria are being threatened. In these times of seemingly constant privatization, public places where we are not forced to purchase anything and people from all spectrums of society are encouraged to interact are few. The danger of a city without such spaces is that the unique qualities of the city are lost: the chances for our interconnectedness to be explored are severely limited and the possibility for us to decide our futures is inhibited.

Intimately linked with this growth in privatization is a homogenization of public aesthetics. Instead of design that emphasizes difference and attempts to distinguish places as distinct, much contemporary urban design tries to make things *the same*. The implications of such design are tragic. The effect is what I would call *numbing.* Instead of design whose distinct character inspires interest and engagement in the place—and in turn, the people—, the homogenization of space and public aesthetics allows people to detach themselves from their environment and ignore their place in society. Whereas design that surprises and engages people in the present moment may raise awareness and encourages people to explore humanity's interconnectedness and take an *active* role in humanity's infinite web, so much contemporary

urban design produces fragmentation, isolation, and disconnection in urban communities. The examples of such design are endless, but most of all this can be seen in shopping malls, sprawling suburban development, and the proliferation of chain stores—all symbols of *sameness*.

Much of the recent history of public art must be identified with this type of numbing design. In the 1967 a program called Art in Public Places began under the National Endowment of the Arts to promote the placement of art in public spaces. These projects were often directly linked with urban renewal projects and the construction of large corporate skyscrapers. Along with increased funding for public art in these spaces, developers were allowed to make their buildings larger if they included public space and art at the street level. What these programs produced is what is now often referred to as private public spaces, and within that, private public art. In other words, these "public spaces" do not have the same qualities that such traditionally successful public places (e.g. Central Park, the old plazas of Europe, etc.) had: they are often highly regulated spaces created specifically for a wealthy, business elite, excluding much of the urban population. They do not promote the expression of difference and serve as forums for challenging people to recognize and engage themselves in the complex reality of society. Moreover, the design aesthetic of most of these private public spaces embraced the ideals of Modernism, which is intimately linked with the intellectual and financial elite. Skyscrapers, the central business districts in which they rose (minus public housing projects), and the streets that they loomed over were never intended to be places where diverse populations should interact or where challenging social issues should be explored. Enmeshed in the ideology of urban renewal, they were not projects that sought to create diverse, mixed-use neighborhoods where the traditional intimacy and tight-knit community structure that once defined urban relations could flourish. They were projects whose clear goal was to meet the business needs of the elite

corporations whose offices they were building, needs which theoretically had to be opposed to social changes.

The public art that was placed in such spaces had the same agenda. The pieces that were included in these public art projects were almost exclusively Modernist work by established artists who had found success in the international art world. It was simply a way of moving the bourgeois aesthetics of traditional museum collections into the public sphere. The discourse in which the pieces were engaged was not that of public values and contemporary social issues, but the debates within the isolated and upper-class world of art history. The aim of these works was not to provoke self-consciousness and public dialogue, but to educate people in an appreciation of the high art aesthetic established by an elite sector of society. The public for whom this "public art" was created was not a diverse population, and in most cases, not the public of the particular neighborhood (e.g. the sculpture at the intersection of 125th and St. Nicholas Ave.). At the beginning, the often abstract sculptures were not even chosen with any pretension to site-specificity or development through an engaging community process. It was artwork that was imposed upon places, without any real connection to the unique history and spirit of those places and with no ambition to include the community in the process of creation.[8]

In the 1980s certain public artists began to criticize the traditional modes of Modernist public art and sought to create public art that functioned as a means of promoting social change, raising public awareness, and strengthening communities. These artists began to understand that art in the public sphere should not merely be an opening of the traditional museum to the street: public art as a medium should be fundamentally different. This new group of artists titles their movement "new genre public art." Suzanne Lacy describes this movement as:

> Unlike much of what has heretofore been called public art, new genre public art—visual art that uses both traditional and nontraditional media to communicate

> and interact with a broad and diversified audience about issues directly relevant to their lives—is based on engagement.[9]

For these artists, two points are particularly important: 1) the process of creation becomes as central to the art as the final product itself; 2) the work has social relevancy, expresses a diverse public, and attempts to motivate people to enact social change.

These artists work against the Modernist relationship between the audience and the artist: a relationship that had virtually been erased. In the Modernist ideal, artists had no obligation to consider their audience, only themselves. This ideology is clear in Georg Baselitz's statement along with his 1983 exhibition at Whitechapel Art Gallery in London:

> The artist is not responsible to anyone. His social role is asocial; his only responsibility consists in an attitude to the work he does. There is no communication with any public whatsoever. The artist can ask no question, and he makes no statement; he offers no information, and his work cannot be used. It is the end product which counts, in my case, the picture.[10]

Baselitz, embodying the Modernist ideal of the artist, severs the tie between the artist and society. His work has "no information" and "cannot be used." Art, in this sense, has stopped functioning as Ezra Pound once described it: "As the antennae of the human race."[11] Instead of both perceiving and transmitting the reality of society, Baselitz as the quintessential Modern artist removes himself from the social realm and explores the singular world of his ego. Rejecting this isolated vacuum, the new genre public artists choose to do their work in the public sphere in order to rejuvenate the role of the artist as an essential *communicator* in society. The relationship between the new genre public artist and his or her audience is *dynamic*. The artist seeks to convey an important message, and on the other hand, the audience's reaction itself is a part of the message. "Engagement"—which Lacy defines as the primary aim of the new genre public art—is the making of the viewer into a participant in the present moment.

The theory behind new genre public art recognizes humans' relationship to their environment and each other as one defined most of all by *memory and personal connection*. Working from the premise that people will care more about a place and community where they have a stake in its appearance and identity—where they are able to *see* themselves because of the memories of their experiences—the new genre public artists seek to incorporate as many people into their projects as possible. Their model for development draws its inspiration from grassroots politics, an approach that works for community-based activism.[12] It is the inverse of the model of top-to-bottom creative development that the Modernist public art utilized. It is within this grassroots development model that the principle of difference is expressed and individualism and eccentricity come to function as a means of uniting people. Instead of encouraging people to come together and express themselves solely as a group bound in common ground according to broad and problematic categories (e.g. race), the new genre public artists seek to bring people together by the binding force of their idiosyncrasies.[13]

This process rests upon the principles of acceptance and self-expression. This self-expression, though, is antithetical to the self-expression of Baselitz. Whereas Baselitz sees his personal "picture" as "asocial," the new genre public artists promote self-expression that understands people's "pictures" as shaped by their cultural milieu. They see self-expression as a promising force for motivating people to critically examine themselves and their communities and formulate personal interpretations and dreams. Coming from the self—growing *organically*—these ambitions and impressions will be grounded not in impersonal teachings prescribed from above, but in the distinct experiences and beliefs of the individual.

This philosophy is selfish, but not in the traditionally negative sense of the word. It is selfish in that it recognizes the trajectory of the world as the product of constant decisions made

by *individuals* in the present moment. It is selfish because it encourages self-confidence and motivation and encourages people to recognize the power intrinsic in themselves. It is *not* selfish in that the decisions that it promotes are ones that aim to make society better as a whole and not just improve the circumstances of the single individual. It is a philosophy of *action*, encouraging people "to take the plunge" and maintaining that once people have launched into the present moment, realized their ability to determine their own futures, and become enmeshed in the interconnected web of society—beginning at the local level—they will *care* about making life the best it possibly can be for the most possible people. The reality of modern life, particularly in the city, is that the greatest commonality between us is our distinctions and idiosyncrasies. This commonality via difference must be the means by which we strengthen the bonds within our communities, from the single family to the "global village." One of the most powerful ways to express this commonality in difference and use it to improve our social standards and bring us closer together is through art in public places.

The public art that I am proposing embraces all of these ideals of new genre public art. However, I believe that the realm of successful and inspiring public art must be expanded to include certain forms of work whose content is not so overtly political. These works I will call "ephemeral details." Often by anonymous artists, these works function as a powerful force in stimulating people's awareness of their environment. Their message focuses upon the present moment and highlights the ever-changing nature of the city. They are usually uncommissioned, and thus may be removed quickly or altered by both the forces of nature or other artists. Embracing life in the city as ephemeral, they seek to challenge the idea of permanence and focus viewer's attention upon the immediacy of the present moment. These works try to surprise the viewer. Often, they are small, and thus require close attention to see them. Their greatest

importance is that they promote a new form of seeing, one that encourages people to carefully look at all of the details—both large and small—of their environment. In the end, this effect in itself eventually becomes political, in that it is part of a process of *engagement, caring, and awareness*, three of the central tenets of *active* citizenship.

Now, I believe the theoretical foundation of this essay has been established. We have looked at *Wings of Desire* and *Run Lola Run* to see the importance of everyday life and the present moment. We have provided a context for this project by examining the history of public art since the 1960s and analyzed the problems of the Modernist ideal of the artist. And we have looked at the recent developments in public art, specifically the innovations of artists of the new genre public art, whose work reconnected the public artist with society, interjected political issues into their message, emphasized the failings of a dichotomy between process and product, and worked to express the principle of difference. Lastly, I introduced the notion of a public art of "ephemeral details," whose merits I believe must be connected with the positive ideals of the new genre public artists. In the following sections, I will describe the work of three contemporary public artists—James de la Vega, Ellen Harvey, and Salvador González—and a recent collaborative project in Berlin, all of which I believe represent inspiring examples of successful contemporary public art.

James de la Vega: Community Muralist and Sidewalk Poet

James de la Vega is a public artist currently working in New York City. Originally from Spanish Harlem, de la Vega's first began to work in his home neighborhood and since has expanded into the entire city. There are two components of his work: murals which are

concentrated in Spanish Harlem and his short, poetic phrases written in chalk on sidewalks throughout the city. The first will serve as an example of work within the model of new genre public art, while his chalk poems also fit into the category I established as "ephemeral details."

De la Vega first began painting on the walls of his neighborhood because he wanted to improve the way the area looked. Recognizing that the landlords in the community were not doing anything to improve the conditions of the streets, de la Vega took it upon himself to bring color, humor, and important local issues to the public's eyes. One of the central motives of his work is to try and encourage the members of his community to recognize their conditions and then to understand the power they have to change them. Some of these murals are entirely personal works, while others were done in collaboration, most of all with youth from the area. Many of his personal paintings incorporate traditional subjects of art history, but he finds ways to personalize the paintings for the community. For example, he painted a homage to Picasso as a unique version of the famous mural *Guernica*. Picasso's *Guernica* highlights the destruction of the Northern Spanish city during its bombing in the Spanish Civil War. De la Vega's rendering of the famous piece reinterprets the scene for a specific inner-city audience. The bull is replaced by a pitbull, a fire-hydrant is placed in the middle, and the man in a business suit is seen as an oppressive evil. De la Vega thus critiques the imposition of high art values as exemplified by Modernist public art and creates an entirely unique and locally meaningful work.

Many of the murals that de la Vega has done also embrace the new genre public art philosophy of direct participation in the creative process and the importance of that process itself. He has done many murals with kids in the community, engaging them in the actual creation of the pieces, hoping to give them an experience that they would not typically encounter. After graduating college, de la Vega worked as a teacher in the public school system

and he is deeply aware of the education that most of the neighborhood's children receive. Regarding the experience of painting with kids from the neighborhood he says,

> The kids come away with an experience that public schools aren't giving them. It's just a different kind of experience. It's a heart-opener. I think that the process is as important as the product. Art should build bonds. It should connect people together in a society where we are divided by classes. It should be a way of connecting with other worlds.[14]

The "other worlds" are not just those of art: it is more broadly those of personal expression. De la Vega understands his collaborative projects with the community as a way of *directly* giving people the opportunity to witness and experience their own unique, personal powers. He says, "It begins to show these kids on these streets that they can be special too. I'm not from heaven. I'm very much like them. I come from these streets. I have interests in fighting against the machine that crushes a lot of these kids and throws them into the cracks they often end up in."[15]

De la Vega's chalk work can be understood both in the context of the new genre public art and as "ephemeral details." The phrases that he often writes are both humorous and challenging. They are not overtly political in regards to specific topics, but attempt to be universal in their critique of human life. All of them attempt to raise the consciousness of viewers by making them question certain aspects of their life, the environment around them, and to inspire people to positive action. The message might be to appreciate the often overlooked qualities of lives, like Wenders in *Wings of Desire*. An example of such a phrase is: "Your thumbs are more important than you think." Other phrases might encourage increased self-awareness and action: "We already spend a 1/3 of our days sleeping. Wake up." "The rich control the de$tiny of the poor, but an intelligent man controls his own." "Become your dream."[16] These phrases can clearly be seen in the same vein as *Wings of Desire*, encouraging

people to realize their ability to control their own lives and take an active role in both understanding the world and improving it.

Central to de la Vega's work is an attempt to reconnect the artist to society. His ambition is completely antithetical to Georg Baselitz's "asocial" view of the artist. De la Vega works like Pound's "antennae," moving into the streets, tuning into the issues that he sees in people's lives, and producing work that attempts to not only express these tensions but inspire people to confront them and attempt to improve their lives. He sees the technical qualities of his work as secondary to the effect that his work might have. Regarding his aims in stirring emotions within people, he says,

> There are thousands of artists a lot better than me. But I'm in the streets and I'm saving lives. I'm improving lives. And to me, that's the ultimate. It's not just about making a pretty painting. Anybody can do that….It's good that you get upset, you need to be upset, you can't be complacent. But you also have to be constructive. And that's the next step. Teaching people not only how to be upset, but how to direct their energies to doing something positive with their lives.[17]

Clearly, central to de la Vega's work is an intimate relationship with the audience.

One of the main reasons de la Vega chooses to work in public is the diversity of people that will encounter his work and the sheer number of potential viewers in the city's audience. He says,

> My interest is about reaching as many people as I can with this message, because I think we are all victims of this machine. So if I can reach as many people as possible along the way, I think that's my main purpose. I don't think that I would be as effective doing it the traditional route having shows in a museum or a gallery. Not that that doesn't interest me, but most people aren't going there.[18]

More than just sheer numbers, though, by working with an audience on the street, de la Vega allows people to react in whatever way they like to his work. Unlike in a museum or gallery where a piece is sacred, one can do anything they please to a message and drawing in chalk on a sidewalk. He says,

> It lives on the person's interaction with it. If not it's just writing on the ground. It's just a thought on the ground. It will come and go with the rain. But the fact that people are interacting with these things, in some cases it plants seeds in these people, whether of hope or anger. My stuff you can react to. You can spit on it. You can get water and erase it. You can curse the shit out of me if you don't like it.[19]

By being given the opportunity to react in their own personal way, he hopes people may realize the power inherent within themselves. "It builds a sense of like, 'You've got power.' You can react you don't have to stay still, caged in. You know you have the ability to make something happen. You can make change. You can improve the world."[20]

This moment of *reaction and interaction is engagement on a personal level in the present*. This experience is enhanced by the surprise and temporality of the work. The medium of chalk allows de la Vega to make his phrases appear and disappear suddenly from the city's streets. Unusual details among the mass network of undecorated sidewalks, they immediately catch people's attention as elements out of the ordinary and command attention.

> I think that the main goal of the artist is to sweep the carpet from underneath the comfortable person. That's what I think. That's what I try to do. When people are in the streets, jog 'em a little bit. Get them to see life through another set of eyes. I think that's the step toward freedom. If we can teach our young people to see life like that, then they can learn to be free and learn to be their own bosses one day.[21]

Furthermore, since they are only written in chalk, they may disappear at any time, forcing people to appreciate them for the moment, embracing their ephemeral character. He says, "I like the fact that the chalk stuff is temporary because it keeps the whole magic and surprise alive. One day there's a message, the next day there's nothing, the next day there's something else."[22] However, this emphasis upon the passing moment does not mean that de la Vega's work is not *lasting*. Like all powerful experiences *it lives beyond the absolute moment* and becomes a new element integrated into one's consciousness. De la Vega buys "real estate in your mind."[23]

The East Side Gallery: Spontaneous Public Art of Memory

Whereas we looked at de la Vega's work as an example of a public artist engaged in challenging people morally and working to give people motivation to pursue their dreams, we will look at the East Side Gallery in Berlin as an example of public art that focuses more upon important political and historical issues. The East Side Gallery is a 1.3 kilometer stretch of the Berlin Wall that was painted by artists from all over the world directly after the fall of the Wall in late 1989 and early 1990 with murals relating to significant local and international issues of politics and history.

The title of the gallery is derived from the location of the murals: they are on what was formerly the east side of the Wall, completely gray and inaccessible to artists since its construction in 1961, guarded imperviously by the guards of the former East German state. Murals and other forms of wall art had existed on the western side of the Wall almost since its beginning. First, it was merely scrawled names, then there came more political slogans, and eventually thoughtful murals. These works had served as an important medium of expression for the many politically minded citizens of West Berlin and West Germany. After the opening of the Wall, the artists that had already been working on the west side of the Wall, saw the opportunity to increase the political significance of their work by painting on the eastern side. Artists from all over the world heard about the project being undertaken and flocked to Berlin to contribute to this spontaneous monument to the hectic, emotion-filled, idealistic time. Adopting a grassroots model, the artists worked together collectively in their individuality, creating a unified work defined by the distinct qualities of each panel. The aim of the artists was to articulate the events of the period in a public forum that would visibly last past the immediate euphoria of the fall of

the Wall and imminent reunification. They saw their works as a way of marking the hopes of the people at the time and their struggles in the past, in the process creating a monument that would serve as both a place of memory, and through that memory, as a force of inspiration for the evolving present and future.[24]

While ephemerality is an integral part of de la Vega's work, permanence is a driving force behind the power of the East Side Gallery murals. In a city that has changed so rapidly since the fall of the Wall, public art that emphasizes attention to the present with regard to the past is essential. This process of remembering can be dangerous and must not be taken too far. In any public matter of history, it is imperative to show both the positive and negative aspects of a period and attempt to illustrate the greatest plurality of experiences possible. I believe the East Side Gallery is a perfect example of public art that engages with history in a constructive manner. On one hand it preserves a physical artifact—the Wall itself—and thus can give people a physical reminder of the structure that symbolized the city and the Cold War for almost forty years. More than a monument commemorating evil, though, the murals on the Wall provide the necessary interpretation and dialogue for historical, politically directed public art to be successful. The messages of the murals and their sheer number and diversity embrace the principle of difference. Coupled with the physical structure of now defunct Wall, the murals highlight the *dynamic* nature of history, not simply presenting a static and exclusive portrait of the past but giving the complexity of history a relevancy in the *constantly evolving present*.

Although much of this paper has focused upon the importance of the present moment, I have included this example of the East Side Gallery most of all to show that a consciousness of the present moment must have connections to the past and future. *A heightened awareness of the present does not mean an ignorance of the past or a disregard for the future.* The murals of the

East Side Gallery are an attempt to inspire this form of consciousness, one that is essential to connecting with our heritage, embracing its often unpleasant complexity, understanding our present reality, and being able to make constructive decisions for the future.

Ellen Harvey: Attention to Detail and Places of Disorders

Now we will look at Ellen Harvey's "New York Beautification Project" as an example of subtle public art that challenges the traditional notions of graffiti. During last winter, Harvey painted forty 5' x 7' oval-shaped landscapes directly onto the city's urban fabric. Using oil paints, Harvey worked in nearly all parts of the city, placing her "little landscapes" on dumpsters, walls, cars, phone booths, construction panels, fire alarm and traffic control boxes. The places that she chose for her work were spaces of "disorder," spaces that had already been bombed with graffiti and were therefore "not aggressively owned by anybody."[25] Technically her work must be considered as graffiti and that fact is central to her message. Using images that would conform to a popular conception of art and would be nonthreatening, Harvey was interested in exploring what reaction she would receive as "a vandal" juxtaposing "cute" romantic landscapes with the much-maligned and feared graffiti of the city.[26]

By entering into a dialogue with graffiti, Harvey was interested in examining what it is precisely about graffiti that intimidates people: if it is act the act of vandalism itself or the aesthetic of the work. Harvey says,

> Partly, the whole project was to see whether if you made something that was actually transgressive in the sense that you were doing something that you didn't have permission to do, but if it looked incredibly conformist and conventional and the kind of idea of art that a lot of people subscribe to, whether people would treat it as a transgressive act. Would they say, "Oh that's fine, because it's so cute and

> nice and everyone likes this kind of thing." I was doing it just to see whether what they looked like would trump the fact of what they were.[27]

For the most part, Harvey found that her paintings were incredibly well received, and that indeed, "what they looked liked [did] trump the fact of what they were." Asked what the political message of her project might be, Harvey says,

> The political message is very much about, this is a very privileged idea of art, this sort of idea, it's a kind of a Great White Master Ideal of what art should be, this kind of landscape painting, it's very much about the fact that this vilification of graffiti is not necessarily anything to do with the act of graffiti, it's actually about aesthetics, and those aesthetics are linked to different power structures. I mean there's no question that graffiti has an aesthetic that comes out of a culture that does not dominate the city. It may be very present, but it's not like the ruling class.[28]

Harvey sees her work as also a means of encouraging people to consider the character of these often-overlooked spaces and what they might reveal about people's desires. Describing her interest in such spaces, she says,

> I am interested in these places that are kind of spaces of disorder. I mean interested in this idea, that the city doesn't have much public space, and where it has public space it's very regulated what you can do with it. So it's interesting to me, these spaces that are owned but not really aggressively and that's manifested by the fact that people do all kinds of silly things, like pee on the walls there, or they do these little drawings, or they sign things, and stick up posters. There is sort of this idea, that it doesn't really belong to everybody, but it kind of does…. I think they are an important breathing space for the city. And I do think that a perfectly controlled city is not very interesting. What's interesting about a city are these sort of random things that happen. And that goes with the physical plot of the city. These are spaces where random interactions happen.[29]

Harvey recognizes that such places in the city are embedded with meaning. These are the places where for one reason or another people have found the freedom to directly imprint themselves into the city. Furthermore, she understands that these unregulated places are where we can engage in the spontaneous interactions that can make our lives so interesting and where we may explore our interconnectedness (think back to *Run Lola Run*). Harvey is neither adamantly for

nor against the behavior that often inhabits these places, but she is interested in bringing attention to such places as spaces that are revealing of people's natural character and the character of city life itself. She sees them as places where people act on the city as if it is a "canvas," people's natural attempts in a place with so little personal space to create a place of their own. Harvey says,

> Most of the time people don't think of the city as a canvas. And I like this idea of the city as a canvas. The idea that the painting goes on a blank surface, the painting's portable, it's nice to think about the city as this whole thing that people create in this incremental way all the time. People are constantly interfering with the city, signing it, doing things to it, and yet, that kind of self-expression is seen in a negative light. I don't know why that necessarily should be. I feel that it's a pretty common urge to make part of the city your own.[30]

Once again, Harvey does not feel strongly that such urges are necessarily positive, but she recognizes them as widely evident in human behavior, and thus, important to point out.

Harvey sees her work as directed towards two separate audiences, the non-art audience of the street and the art world audience that sees her work in galleries. Her use of traditional media and the idea of the romantic landscape are a means by which she attempts to critique this dichotomy. She says,

> One of the reasons that I work with traditional media, like drawing or painting, is because I think traditional media are interesting because for the vast majority outside the art world that's what they think of when they think of art…. I tend to do projects that take small parts of traditional media art practice and ask what does this particular kind of thing tell you about what maybe people want from art. I am interested in connecting this larger, popular conception of art with the more insular art world of today.[31]

The "New York Beautification Project" is an intriguing attempt on one hand to highlight the division between these audiences and at the same time provide a common ground through which the expectations and function of art in society can be examined. Harvey's work stimulates a dialogue between both the popular world and the art world, hoping to inspire in each

consideration for what lies at the root of their different perceptions of "art." Harvey asks, "What does it mean to have different ideas of art in different places? Are those things irreconcilable?"[32]

Along these same lines, in her extensive work in the street, Harvey recognized the different worlds that tend to bypass each other every day in the public realm of the city. She says,

> I think that most people in the city, or a lot of people, experience public areas of the city as spaces to pass through, but then there is a huge population of people who experience the streets, the sidewalks as places *to be*, and the two don't meet all that often, because the people passing through don't even register the people who are standing still.[33]

An immensely humble woman, Harvey does not see her work as potentially bringing these two crowds together—she believes that is too much to ask from art. However, I would argue that her project, even if only on the smallest scale, has the potential to raise awareness of our experiences of the street and by drawing our attention to details may raise our consciousness of the complex diversity of our environment. A *passer-through* might be surprised by one of her small pictures, become drawn his or her immediate surroundings, and thus begin to more closely notice the greater environment around him or her.

Harvey's work also conforms to the theory of public art I have been espousing throughout with its ephemerality and element of surprise. These pieces will not last forever and their temporality is a part of the message. Oil paintings are usually always done to be for the ages, but Harvey "being perverse, thought it would be fun to do ephemeral oil paintings."[34] As such, I would characterize Harvey's work as "ephemeral details." In their ephemerality, their unusual content for being graffiti, and their small scale, the "little landscapes" surprise viewers, drawing them into the moment and potentially inducing a new, more open and attentive way of seeing the city's public spaces.

Salvador González: Community Spirit and Color

The last artist we will look at is Salvador González, a Cuban muralist whose work in Havana is one of the most remarkable public art projects I have ever encountered. So far, the examples we have seen have focused upon: 1) inspiring moral and thoughtful behavior (de la Vega); 2) utilizing history as a means of raising consciousness and attempting to create a more promising future (the East Side Gallery); 3) drawing attention to the expectations of art in both the popular sphere and the art world, the dichotomy between these spheres of society, the different levels of interaction in the city's public areas themselves, and the significance of the city's spaces of "disorder" (Harvey). González's work is an example of art that provides a community with an important spiritual center and preserves the sacred cultural heritage of a people and neighborhood.

The work that we will focus upon is the Callejon de Hamel, an alley in the turn-of-the-century tenement district of Cayo Hueso in Havana where González has lived for much of his life. Historically, the neighborhood developed primarily with the cigar trade, but today the old buildings have fallen into severe disrepair (like most of Havana). Cayo Hueso has a large Afro-Cuban population, much of which practices Santería, a religion that combines many traditional Yoruban rituals and beliefs with the saintly figures of Catholicism. González's murals and sculptures in the Callejon de Hamel are an expression of this religion and the alley functions as an important place for people in the community to practice Santería rituals and traditional Afro-Cuban dance together.

The project started on April 21, 1990 when González was invited by a friend who lived in the alley to come and paint inside of his house. When González arrived, he was inspired to do the

mural outside on the street instead. At the time, the alley was a rough place: there were many people that hung out there and drank and there was a great deal of garbage. González began painting the garbage and the walls and soon committed himself to creating a completely new identity for the small street.[35]

The result of González's many hours of work is a remarkably vibrant space, decorated in nearly every place from the sidewalk to the sky with incredibly bright murals, sculptures, plants, and poems. The colors González uses are important to the work and understanding it as public art intimately related to expressing a particular culture. Each Orisha—best defined as "a facet of God," "a selected consciousness within the great consciousness"—has a distinct color, and González's use of color corresponds to the different Orishas that he wishes to portray.[36] The work then becomes directed to an audience that has the specific cultural knowledge to interpret the murals in such a way. Of course, the aesthetics of the murals are accessible to anyone, but the deeper meaning that González incorporates in his work is *unique and personal* to a select audience.

González describes the origin of the Afro-Cuban culture as such: "The river is the great secret of the religion, its current, its strength, its change. Here is the beginning of the Yoruba culture, the culture that was brought from Africa, and was transplanted here in Cuban soil, and has become our Afro-Cuban culture."[37] Once again, we confront the metaphor of the river, and along with it, the principles of "current" and "change." Central to Santería is the flow of the present moment and the fluctuating reality of life. This aspect of the religion and Afro-Cuban culture is possibly best not expressed in the pure aesthetic beauty of the González's art in the alley, but in the many different ways the alley is *used* by the people of the city to practice their Santería religion. Far more than a static monument to a particular culture, the Callejon de Hamel

is a place where this culture can be expressed and evolve. There are frequent rumba dances performed by members of the community, along with occasional poetry and theater events. There are also shrines that are frequently visited.

The result of such constant use is a *human* space. It is a place imbued with *people acting in the present moment*. All of the murals and other artistic ornaments are part of a larger project that centers upon *interaction*. As both a community center and artwork, the Callejon de Hamel illustrates a positive unity between art and society. The essence of the space and the art itself is directly related to the people that use it and give it meaning. Without the community the art would not exist. The beauty and inspiration of Callejon de Hamel is that it is *alive — it is living*.

What Public Art Should Strive For: A Conclusion via Italo Calvino's *Invisible Cities*

One of the most interesting works of literature on the city is *Invisible Cities* by the contemporary Italian author Italo Calvino. The story of the book revolves around an imaginary conversation between the explorer Marco Polo and the emperor Kublai Khan. Khan is interested in hearing Polo's descriptions of all the cities in his empire. Within this framework, Calvino writes short vignettes of imaginary cities. One of these cities is Phyllis and we will examine Calvino's portrait of this place to complete our journey. Calvino writes,

> When you have arrived at Phyllis, you rejoice in observing all the bridges over the canals, each different from the others: cambered, covered, on pillars, on barges, suspended, with tracery balustrades. And what a variety of windows looks down on the streets: mullioned, Moorish, lancet, pointed, surmounted by lunettes or stained-glass roses; how many kinds of pavement cover the ground: cobbles, slabs, gravel, blue and white tiles. At every point the city offers surprises to your view: a caper bush jutting from the fortress' walls, the statues of three queens on corbels, an onion dome with three smaller onions threaded on the spire. "Happy the man who has Phyllis before his eyes each day and who never ceases seeing

> the things it contains," you cry, with regret at having to leave the city when you can barely graze it with your glance.
>
> But it so happens that, instead, you must stay in Phyllis and spend the rest of your days there. Soon the city fades before your eyes, the rose windows are expunged, the statues on the corbels, the domes. Like all of Phyllis's inhabitants, you follow zigzag lines from one street to another, you distinguish the patches of sunlight from the patches of shade, a door here, a stairway there, a bench where you can put down your basket, a hole where your foot stumbles if you are not careful. All the rest of the city is invisible. Phyllis is a space in which routes are drawn between points suspended in the void: the shortest way to reach that certain merchant's tent, avoiding that certain creditor's window. Your footsteps follow not what is outside the eyes, but what is within, buried, erased. If, of two arcades, one continues to seem more joyous, it is because thirty years ago a girl went by there, with broad, embroidered sleeves, or else it is only because that arcade catches the light at a certain hour like that other arcade, you cannot recall where.
>
> Millions of eyes look up at windows, bridges, capers, and they might be scanning a blank page. Many are the cities like Phyllis, which elude the gaze of all, except the man who catches them by surprise.[38]

The story of Phyllis and "our" experience is that of unawareness. Phyllis is full of beauty, and at first we see this, but after a while we become accustomed to our surroundings and lose touch with our environment. Besides the functional elements of the city—"a door here, a stairway there, a bench where you can put down your basket, a hole where your foot stumbles if you are not careful—"the city is invisible." We become alienated. When our eyes trace over the landscape, "they might be scanning a blank page." The only way to *see* the beauty and complexity of the city is to catch it by surprise, to be tuned into the present moment and the immediate nature of a place's ever-changing existence. The aim of public art should be to raise a consciousness within people that inspires them pay attention to and care about themselves, their community, and their environment. This awareness will allow people to realize their potential power as individuals in an infinitely interconnected web.

James de la Vega, the muralists of the East Side Gallery, Ellen Harvey, and Salvador González are examples of artists whose work I believe is inspiring on this level. While very different in their projects—ranging from heavy moralism to intense politics to subtle and minor

details questioning art and public space to the expression and preservation of Afro-Cuban culture—all of these artists reconnect the artist to society and create engaging places that encourage people to become *passionate* about *uniqueness*. Their art is an expression of difference and the local, drawing attention to the immense diversity of humanity, and in that action, furthering the cause of unity through our differences. It is *urban* public art, working with the randomness and constant unpredictable interaction unique to the city. They are adding to the complexity of our human spider web, establishing new nodes of distinctness and facilitating interaction that can help to spin strands between us.

Let us return to *Wings of Desire*. While on the surface art is an aesthetic project, my argument here is that aesthetics can have an immense impact upon the social reality of our lives. One of the questions Wenders raises is: "When will you finally pray with your own words and not for eternal life?"[39] When will one realize his own individuality, embrace that, and immerse himself in the present moment? Damiel is, of course, the character for whom this question finally becomes a reality, and as stated in the introduction, it is through his eyes—maybe more broadly, his senses—that Damiel finally understands the truth and beauty of human life. At the end, he is able to say, "Now…I know what no Angel knows."[40] Now…he has taken "the plunge" and is flowing in the river, in a current that may only sweep up those who embrace mortality.

I will end this essay by saying that this paper must be seen as more than a document made of paper. I hope that it may be a departure point of inspiration. I know the process of researching and writing has been inspiring for me. I hope that you feel the same way. In the tradition of *Wings of Desire*, let us take a look over the glorious wonder that is the city and say: "We have embarked!" Let us understand that the essence of this project is that it is "To Be Continued."[41]

Notes

1. Wings of Desire, produced, written, and directed Wim Wenders, 2 hr. 8 min., Orion, 1987, videocassette.

2. Ibid..

3. Ibid..

4. Run Lola Run, written and directed Tom Tykwer, 1 hr. 21 min., Sony Pictures Classics, videocassette.

5. Wenders.

6. Ibid..

7. Ibid..

8. Suzzane Lacy, "Introduction: Cultural Pilgrimages and Metaphoric Journeys," in Mapping the Terrain: New Genre Public Art, ed. Suzzane Lacy (Seattle: Bay Press, 1995), 19-46.

9. Lacy, 19.

10. Suzi Gablik, "Connective Aesthetics: Art After Individualism," in Mapping the Terrain: New Genre Public Art, ed. Suzzane Lacy (Seattle: Bay Press, 1995), 77.

11. Ezra Pound, The Cantos of Ezra Pound (New York: New Directions, 1995), 37.

12. Saul Alinsky, Reveille for Radicals (New York: Vintage Books), 55.

13. Lacy, 39.

14. James de la Vega, interview by author, 5 April 2001.

15. Ibid..

16. James de la Vega, A Selection of Thoughts by New York City's Sidewalk Philosopher (New York: James de la Vega, 2000).

17. de la Vega, interview.

18. Ibid..

19. Ibid..

20. Ibid..

21. Ibid..

22. Ibid..

23. Ibid..

24. “History of East Side Gallery,” Berlin Wall East Side Gallery, 21 April 2001, <http://www.eastsidegallery.com/historyesg.htm> (25 April 2001).

25. Ellen Harvey, interview by author, 30 April 2001.

26. Ibid..

27. Ibid..

28. Ibid..

29. Ibid..

30. Ibid..

31. Ibid..

32. Ibid..

33. Ibid..

34. Ibid..

35. A Cuban Legend, produced and directed Bette Wanderman, 1 hr. 21 min., KW Filmworks, 2001, videocassette.

36. Afolabi, “What is an Orisha?”, A Tradtional House of Lukumi Orisha Worship — Santería, 18 March 2001, <http://www.yemoja.com/orisha.htm> (1 May 2001).

37. Wanderman.

38. Italo Calvino, Invisible Cities, (New York: Harvest, 1972), 90-91.

39. Wenders.

40. Ibid..

41. Ibid..

Bibliography

Afolabi, Ile. "What is an Orisha?" A Tradtional House of Lukumi Orisha Worship — Santería. 18 March 2001. <http://www.yemoja.com/orisha.htm> (1 May 2001).

Alinsky, Saul. Reveille for Radicals. New York: Vintage Books, 1969.

Barthes, Roland. Camera Lucida: Reflections on Photography. Translated by Richard Howard New York: Hill and Wang, 1981.

Baudelaire, Charles. The Painter of Modern Life, and other Essays. Edited and Translated by Jonathan Mayne. London: Phaidon, 1964.

Berlin Wall East Side Gallery. 21 April 2001. <http://www.eastsidegallery.com> (25 April 2001).

Buck-Morris, Susan. The Dialectics of Seeing : Walter Benjamin and the Arcades Project. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1989.

Calvino, Italo. Invisible Cities. Translated by William Weaver. New York: Harcourt Brace and Company, 1974.

Castleman, Craig. Getting up : subway graffiti in New York. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1982.

Coffield, Frank. Vandalism and Graffiti : The State of the Art. London : Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation, 1991.

A Cuban Legend. Dir. Bette Wanderman. 1 hr. 21 min. KW Filmworks, 2001. Videocassette.

Deutsche, Rosalyn. Evictions : Art and Spatial Politics. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1996.

Döblin, Alfred. Berlin Alexanderplatz: The Story of Franz Biberkopf. Translated by Eurgen Jolas. New York:Continuum Publishing Company, 1997.

Edelson, Bob. New American Street Art. Woodstock: Soho Books, 1999.

Ferlinghetti, Lawrence. A Coney Island of the Mind. New York: New Directions, 1955.

Ferlinghetti, Lawrence. A Far Rockaway of the Heart. New York: New Directions, 1997.

Ferlinghetti, Lawrence. Wild Dreams of a New Beginning. New York: New Directions, 1988.

Ferrell, Jeff. Crimes of Style : Urban Graffiti and the Politics of Criminality. New York : Garlan 1993.

Flagge, Ingeborg. Kunst im offentlichen Raum : Kunst im stadtischen Alltag. Stuttgart : K. Kramer, 1991.

Fleming, Ronald Lee. Placemakers : Creating Public Art that tells you Where you are : With an Essay on Planning and Policy. New York : Hastings House, 1981.

Gablik, Suzi. The Reenchantment of Art. New York : Thames and Hudson, 1991.

Gilloch, Graeme. Myth and Metropolis: Walter Benjamin and the City. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1996.

Gleick, James. Chaos: Making a new Science. New York: Viking, 1987.

Harvey, Ellen. Interview with author. 30 April 2001.

Hoffmann, E.T.A. "The Sandman." In E.T.A. Hoffmann Tales, edited by Victor Lange. New York Contiuum, 1982.

Jacobs, Jane. The Death and Life of Great American Cities. New York: Vintage Books, 1992.

Kunstler, James Howard. Home from Nowhere. New York: Touchstone, 1998.

Lacy, Suzanne (Ed.). Mapping the Terrain: New Genre Public Art. Seattle: Bay Press, 1995.

Lefebvre, Henri. Critique of Everyday Life: Volume 1. New York : Verso, 1991.

Lippard, Lucy. The Lure of the Local: Sense of Place in a Multicentered Society. New York: The New Press, 1997.

Marx, Karl. The Portable Karl Marx. Edited by Eugene Kamenka. New York: Penguin Books, 1983.

Miles, Malcolm. Art for Public Places : Critical Essays. Winchester : Winchester School of Art Press, 1989.

Miles, Malcolm. Art, Space and the City : Public Art and Urban Futures. New York : Routledge, 1997.

Miles, Malcolm. The Uses of Decoration : Essays in the Architectural Everyday. New York : John Wiley, 2000.

Nietszche, Friedrich. On the Genealogy of Morality. Edited by Keith Ansell-Pearson. Translated by Carol Diethe. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.

Post-graffiti. New York : Sidney Janis Gallery, 1983.

Pound, Ezra. The Cantos of Ezra Pound. New York: New Directions, 1995.

Reichl, Alexander. Reconstructing Times Square: Politics and Culture in Urban Development. Lawrence: University Press of Kansas, 1999.

Remesar, Antoni. Urban regeneration : a challenge for public art. Barcelona: Universitat de Barcelona, 1997.

Robinson, David. Soho Walls : Beyond Graffiti. New York : Thames and Hudson, 1990.

Rowe, Colin. Collage City. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1978.

Run Lola Run (Lola Rennt). Written and directed by Tom Tykwer 1 hr. 21 min. Sony Pictures Classics, 1999. Videocassette.

Senie, Harriet and Webster, Sally (Eds.). Critical Issues in Public Art: Content, Context, and Controversy. Washington: Smithsonian Institution Press, 1998.

Sennett, Richard. The Conscience of the Eye : The Design and Social Life of Cities. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1990.

Sennett, Richard. The Fall of Public Man: On the Social Psychology of Capitalism. New York: Vintage Books, 1974.

Sennett, Richard. The Uses of Disorder: Personal Identity and City Life. New York: W.W. Norton, 1970.

Sennett, Richard. Flesh and stone : The Body and the City in Western Civilization. New York: W.W. Norton, 1994.

Silva Tellez, Armando. Punto de Vista Ciudadano : Focalizacion Visual y Puesta en Escena del Graffiti. Bogota : Instituto Caro y Cuervo, 1987.

Stahl, Johannes. Graffiti : zwischen Alltag und Asthetik 1990. München : Scaneg, 1990.

Stahl, Johannes. An der Wand : Graffiti zwischen Anarchie und Galerie. Köln : DuMont, 1989.

Suter, Beat. Graffiti : Rebellion der Zeichen. Frankfurt am Main: R.G. Fischer, 1988.

Treeck, Bernhard van. Graffiti Lexikon : Street-art : Legale und Illegale Kunst im offentlichen Raum. Moers: Aragon, 1993.

Van Hollebeke, Mark. "The Pathologies and Possibilities of Urban Life: Dialectical and Pragmatic Sightseeing in New York City." 16 April 2001. <http://trill.cis.fordham.edu/~gsas/ philosophy/vanhollebeke.htm> (March 17 2001).

de la Vega, James. A Selection of Thoughts by New York City's Sidewalk Philosopher. New York: James de la Vega, 2000.

de la Vega, James. Interview with author. 5 April, 2001.

Venturi, Robert. Learning from Las Vegas. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1993.

Wings of Desire (der Himmel über Berlin). Written and directed by Wim Wenders. 2 hr. 8 min. Orion Home Video, 1989. Videocassette.

Photo Album

I have included a photo album with images directly related to the material of my essay. The first fourteen pictures are of the work of Salvador González, Ellen Harvey, and James de la Vega. I do not have any pictures of the East Side Gallery, but there is a website where all of the murals can be seen from photographs taken in 1990 (http://www.berley.com/esg/index.htm). The other pictures I have included are photographs of interesting pieces of public art that I have taken while walking around New York. The emphasis is upon works that embody the form of public art for which I argue: they are all local pieces, they stand out as eccentric and unusual in the landscape, many are ephemeral, and often they have political intent. I hope that you enjoy them.

Location of Photos:

1. Salvador González: Callejon de Hamel, La Havana, Cuba

2. Salvador González: Callejon de Hamel, La Havana, Cuba

3. Salvador González: Callejon de Hamel, La Havana, Cuba

4. Ellen Harvey: 436 W. 126th St. btwn. Amsterdam and W. 127th St.

5. Ellen Harvey: 436 W. 126th St. btwn. Amsterdam and W. 127th St.

6. Ellen Harvey: Staircase to 118 E. 1st St., btwn. Ave. A and 1st Ave.

7. James de la Vega: Underpass of Metro-North Train, E. 104th St. and Park

8. de la Vega: “In the theater of life, you too will have your moment”: E. 104th and Lexington

9. de la Vega: “Homage to Picasso”: E. 107th St. and Madison

10. de la Vega: “JFK”: E. 104th St. btwn. Lexington and 3rd Ave.

11. de la Vega: “Become your dream”: E. 104th St. btwn Lexington and 3rd Ave.

12. de la Vega: E. 104th St. and 3rd Ave.

13. de la Vega: E. 104th St. and 3rd Ave.

14. de la Vega: “Homenaje ál gran pintor de España Diego Velázquez”: E. 104th St. and 3rd Ave.

15. The Point: Garrison btwn. Baretto and Manida, Hunts Point, the Bronx

16. Kelly and Intervale, the South Bronx

17. Kelly and Intervale, the South Bronx

18. Baretto St. btwn. Lafayette and Garrison, Hunts Point, the Bronx

19. “Tats Cru”: Westchester Ave., the South Bronx

20. Westchester Ave., the South Bronx

21. Westchester Ave., the South Bronx

22. Westchester Ave., the South Bronx

23. 12th Ave. btwn. W. 14th St. and W. 13th St.

24. Socrates Sculpture Park: Broadway at Vernon Boulevard, Long Island City

25. Socrates Sculpture Park: Broadway at Vernon Boulevard, Long Island City

26. Socrates Sculpture Park: Broadway at Vernon Boulevard, Long Island City

27. Socrates Sculpture Park: Broadway at Vernon Boulevard, Long Island City

28. Socrates Sculpture Park: Broadway at Vernon Boulevard, Long Island City

29. “Life”: NE Corner of Prince and Elizabeth

30. “I Want my Planet Back” “The Beauty is the Act”: NE Corner of Prince and Elizabeth

31. “I Want my Planet Back” “The Beauty is the Act”: NE Corner of Prince and Elizabeth

32. “The Beauty is the Act”: NE Corner of Prince and Elizabeth

33. NE Corner of Prince and Elizabeth

34. Kenmare btwn. Hester and Grand

35. Mott St. btwn. Prince and Houston

36. 190 Bowery, entrance at corner of Spring St.

37. 190 Bowery, entrance at corner of Spring St.

38. Kenmare btwn. Hester and Grand

39. Spring St. btwn. Bowery and Elizabeth

40. Prince St. btwn. Mott and Elizabeth

41. Mott St. btwn. Prince and Houston

42. Entrance to Fusion Arts: Stanton btwn. Bowery and Chrystie

43. Entrance to Fusion Arts: Stanton btwn. Bowery and Chrystie

44. Eddie's Sculpture: B-6 Garden, E. 6th St. and Ave. B

45. Eddie's Sculpture: B-6Garden, E. 6th St. and Ave. B

46. Eddie's Sculpture: B-6 Garden, E. 6th St. and Ave. B

47. Eddie's Sculpture: B-6 Garden, E. 6th St. and Ave. B

48. E. 8th St. btwn. Ave. B and Ave. C

49. E. 8th St. btwn. Ave. B and Ave. C

50. "The Struggle Continues/La Lucha Continua": E. 8th St. btwn. Ave. B and Ave. C

51. La Plaza Cultural: Ave. C and E. 9th St.

52. La Plaza Cultural: Ave. C and E. 9th St.

53. La Plaza Cultural: Ave. C and E. 9th St.

54. La Plaza Cultural: Ave. C and E. 9th St.

55. E. 10th St. btwn. Ave. B and Ave. A

56. E. 10th St. btwn. Ave. B and Ave. A

57. E. 10th St. btwn. Ave. B and Ave. A

58. E. 10th St. btwn. Ave. B and Ave. A

59. Allen St. btwn. Stanton and Houston

60. Bedford Ave. btwn. N. 5th and N. 4th

61. Ché y Albizu: E. 105th St. and 3rd Ave.

62. Ché y Albizu: E. 105th St. and 3rd Ave.

63. Ché y Albizu: E. 105th St. and 3rd Ave.

64. E. 108th St. btwn. Madison and Park

65. “Outside of Society”: E. 108th St. btwn. Madison and Park