This LEA publication has a simple goal: surveying the current trends in augmented reality artistic interventions. There is no other substantive academic collection currently available, and it is with a certain pride that LEA presents this volume which provides a snapshot of current trends as well as a moment of reflection on the future of AR interventions.
Not Here Not There

VOLUME EDITORS
LANFRANCO ACETI AND RICHARD RINEHART
EDITORS
ÖZDEN ŞAHİN, JONATHAN MUNRO AND CATHERINE M. WEIR

Leonardo Electronic Almanac is published by:
Leonardo/ISAST
211 Sutter Street, suite 501
San Francisco, CA 94108
USA

Leonardo Electronic Almanac (LEA) is a project of Leonardo/
The International Society for the Arts, Sciences and Technology.
For more information about Leonardo/ISAST’s publications and
programs, see http://www.leonardo.info or contact
isast@leonardo.info.

Leonardo Electronic Almanac is produced by
Passero Productions.

Reposting of this journal is prohibited without permission of
Leonardo/ISAST, except for the posting of news and events
listings which have been independently received.

The individual articles included in this issue are © 2013 ISAST.
The Leonardo Electronic Almanac acknowledges the kind support for this issue of...

Every published volume has a reason, a history, a conceptual underpinning as well as an aim that ultimately the editor or editors wish to achieve. There is also something else in the creation of a volume; that is the larger goal shared by the community of authors, artists and critics that take part in it.

This volume of LEA titled Not Here, Not There had a simple goal: surveying the current trends in augmented reality artistic interventions. There is no other substantive academic collection currently available, and it is with a certain pride that both, Richard Rinehart and myself, look at this endeavor. Collecting papers and images, answers to interviews as well as images and artists’ statements and putting it all together is perhaps a small milestone; nevertheless I believe that this will be a seminal collection which will showcase the trends and dangers that augmented reality as an art form faces in the second decade of the XXIst century.

As editor, I did not want to shy away from more critical essays and opinion pieces, in order to create a documentation that reflects the status of the current thinking. That these different tendencies may or may not be proved right in the future is not the reason for the collection, instead what I believe is important and relevant is to create a historical snapshot by focusing on the artists and authors developing artistic practices and writing on augmented reality. For this reason, Richard and I posed to the contributors a series of questions that in the variegated responses of the artists and authors will evidence and stress similarities and differences, contradictions and behavioral approaches. The interviews add a further layer of documentation which, linked to the artists’ statements, provides an overall understanding of the hopes for this new artistic playground or new media extension. What I personally wanted to give relevance to in this volume is the artistic creative process. I also wanted to evidence the challenges faced by the artists in creating artworks and attempting to develop new thinking and innovative aesthetic approaches.

The whole volume started from a conversation that I had with Tamiko Thiel – that was recorded in Istanbul at Kasa Gallery and that lead to a curatorial collaboration with Richard. The first exhibition Not Here at the Samek Art Gallery, curated by Richard Reinhart, was juxtaposed to a response from Kasa Gallery with the exhibition Not There, in Istanbul. The conversations between Richard and myself produced this final volume – Not Here, Not There – which we both envisaged as a collection of authored papers, artists’ statements, artworks, documentation and answers to some of the questions that we had as curators. This is the reason why we kept the same questions for all of the interviews – in order to create the basis for a comparative analysis of different aesthetics, approaches and processes of the artists that work in augmented reality.

When creating the conceptual structures for this collection my main personal goal was to develop a link – or better to create the basis for a link – between ear-
These are four elements that characterize the work of contemporary artists that use augmented reality as a medium. Here, is not perhaps the place to focus on the role of publicity in art history and artistic practices, but a few words have to be spent in order to explain that publicity for artworks is not solely a way for the artist to gain notoriety, but an integral part of the artwork, which in order to come into existence and generate interactions and engagements with the public has to be communicated to the largest possible audience.

“By then, Kusama was widely assumed to be a publicity hound, who used performance mainly as a way of gaining media exposure.” The publicity obsession, or the accusation of being a ‘publicity hound’ could be easily moved to the contemporary group of artists that use augmented reality. Their invasions of spaces, juxtapositions, infringements could be defined as nothing more than publicity stunts that have little to do with art. These accusations would not be just irrelevant but biased – as in the case of Sander Veenhof’s analysis in this collection – the linkage between the existence of the artwork as an invisible presence and its physical manifestation and engagement with the audience can only happen through knowledge, through the audience’s awareness of the existence of the art piece itself that in order to achieve its impact an artwork necessitates to be publicized.

Even if, I do not necessarily agree with the idea of a ‘necessity manifestation’ and audience’s knowledge of the artwork – I believe that an artistic practice that is unknown is equally valid – I can nevertheless understand the process, function and relations that have to be established in order to develop a form of engagement and interaction between the artwork and the audience. To condemn the artists who seek publicity in order to gather audiences to make the artworks come alive is perhaps a shortsighted approach that does not take into consideration the audience’s necessity of knowing that interaction is possible in order for that interaction to take place.

What perhaps should be analyzed in different terms is the evolution of art in the second part of the XXth century, as an activity that is no longer and can no longer be resuscitated from publicity, since audience engagement requires audience attendance and attendance can be obtained only through communication / publicity. The existence of the artwork – in particular of the successful AR artwork – is strictly measured in numbers: numbers of visitors, numbers of interviews, numbers of news items, numbers of talks, numbers of interactions, numbers of clicks, and, perhaps in a not too distant future, numbers of coins gained. The issue of being a ‘publicity hound’ is not a problem that applies to artists alone, from Andy Warhol to Damien Hirst from Banksy to Maurizio Cattelan, it is also a method of evaluation that affects art institutions and museums alike. The accusation moved to AR artists of being media whores – is perhaps contradictory when arriving from institutional art forms, as well as galleries and museums that have celebrated publicity as an element of the performative character of both artists and artworks and an essential element instrumental to the institutions’ very survival.

The publicity stunts of the augmented reality interventions today are nothing more than an acquired methodology borrowed from the second part of the XXth century. This is a stable methodology that has already been widely implemented by public and private art institutions in order to promote themselves and their artists.

Publicity and community building have become an artistic methodology that AR artists are playing with by making use of their better knowledge of the AR media. Nevertheless, this is knowledge born out of necessity and scarcity of means, and at times appears to be more effective than the institutional messages arriving from well-established art organizations. I should also add that publicity is functional in AR interventions to the construction of a community – a community of aficionados, similar to the community of ‘nudists’ that follows Spencer Tunick for his art events / human installations.

I think what is important to remember in the analysis of the effectiveness both in aesthetic and participatory terms of augmented reality artworks – is not their publicity element, not even their sheer numbers (which, by the way, are what has made these artworks successful) but their quality of disruption.

The ability to use – in Marshall McLuhan’s terms – the medium as a message in order to impose content by passing institutional control is the most exciting element of these artworks. It is certainly a victory that a group of artists – by using alternative methodological approaches to what are the structures of the capitalistic system, is able to enter into that very capitalistic system in order to become institutionalized and perhaps – in the near future – be able to make money in order to make art.

Much could be said about the artist’s need of fitting within a capitalist system or the artist’s moral obligation to reject the basic necessities to ensure an operational professional existence within contemporary capitalist structures. This becomes, in my opinion, a question of personal ethics, artistic choices and existential social dramas. Let’s not forget that the vast majority of artists – and AR artists in particular – do not have large sums and do not impinge upon national budgets as much as banks, financial institutions, mili- taries and corrupt politicians. They work for years...
with small salaries, holding multiple jobs and making personal sacrifices; and the vast majority of them does not end up with golden parachutes or golden handshakes upon retirement nor causes billions of damage to society.

The current success of augmented reality interventions is due in small part to the nature of the medium. Museums and galleries are always on the lookout for ‘cheap’ and efficient systems that deliver art engaging fantasies and governmental permissions. Capital costs are minimal, in the order of a few hundred dollars, and they lend themselves to collaborations based on global networks.

Problems though remain for the continued success of augmented reality interventions. Future challenges are in the materialization of the artworks for sale, to name an important one. Unfortunately, unless the relationship between collectors and the ‘object’ collected changes in favor of immaterial objects, the problem to overcome for artists that use augmented reality intervention is how and in what modalities to link the AR installations with the process of production of an object to be sold.

Personally I believe that there are enough precedents that AR artists could refer to, from Christo to Marina Abramovich, in order develop methods and frame works to present AR artworks as collectable and sellable material objects. The artists’ ability to do so, to move beyond the fractures and barriers of institutional vs. revolutionary, retaining the edge of their aesthetics and artworks, is what will determine their future success.

These are the reasons why I believe that this collection of essays will prove to be a piece, perhaps a small piece, of future art history, and why in the end it was worth the effort.

Lanfranco Aceti  
Editor in Chief, Leonardo Electronic Almanac  
Director, Kasa Gallery

In the 1960’s, artist Robert Smithson articulated the strategy of representation summarized by “site vs. non-site” whereby certain artworks were simultaneously abstract and representational and could be site-specific without being sited. A pile of rocks in a gallery is an “abstract” way to represent their site of origin. In the 1990’s net.art re-de-materialized the art object and found new ways to suspend the artwork online between website and non-site. In the 21st century, new technologies suggest a reconsideration of the relationship between the virtual and the real. “Hardlinks” such as QR codes attempt to bind a virtual link to our physical environment.

Throughout the 1970’s, institutional critique brought political awareness and social intervention to the site of the museum. In the 1980’s and 90’s, street artist such as Banksy went in the opposite direction, critiquing the museum by siting their art beyond its walls. Sited art and intervention art meet in the art of the temporary non-sites, and through the papers included in this volume, we live in? What representational strategies are contemporary artists using to engage sites? How are sites politically activated? And how are new media framing our consideration of these questions? The contemporary art collective ManifestAR offers one answer.

“Whereas the public square was once the quintessential place to air grievances, display solidarity, express difference, celebrate similarity, remember, mourn, and reinforce shared values of right and wrong, it is no longer the only anchor for interactions in the public realm. That geography has been relocated to a novel terrain, one that encourages exploration of mobile location based monuments, and virtual memorials. Moreover, public space is now truly open, as artworks can be placed anywhere in the world, without prior permission from government or private authorities – with profound implications for art in the public sphere and the discourse that surrounds it.”

Richard Rinehart  
Director, Samek Art Gallery, Bucknell University
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Spatial Art: An Eruption of the Digital into the Physical

by SIMONA LODI

text analyzes the work of artists who use augmentation, information and immersion in specific contexts – public or private spaces – with or without authorization. Their goal is to create interventionist actions and collective experiences within an experimental augmented framework. These artists play on ambiguities in defining what reality is – how it is perceived, felt and detected. The aim of the analysis is to understand socio-cultural transformations in the fields of art and technology in social space, and what new forms of aggregation and participation have developed, providing an opportunity to reflect on new concepts of democracy that are emerging in our global media age. Recently Gibson described things this way: “Cyberspace has everted. It has turned inside out. Colonized the physical.” We no longer go into the network; instead, it is the network that comes into us. Digital data and services are embedded “in the very fabric of the physical world.” This is not only a technological issue, however; it is also a matter of aesthetics: every generation has its own art and artistic trends.

INTRODUCTION

A SYMBOLIC WORK

Let’s begin with the symbolic work “The Apparition of the Unicorn, Pink and Invisible at the Same Time” by the artist collective Les Liens Invisible, in which “Art overtakes Faith in imagination.” These prankster artists took the phenomenon of web-based parody religions to produce a humorous intervention that breaks the law at the same time. Using augmented reality, they brought about an event that people on the Internet had long been waiting for: the apparition of the Invisible Pink Unicorn, a legendary figure that first appeared on the Net in the early 1990s as an emblem to satirize theistic belief. In the words of Steve Eley “Invisible Pink Unicorns are beings of great spiritual power. We know this because they are capable of being invisible and pink at the same time.” The goddess made her appearance as a cyber-monument in Saint Peter’s Square in Rome on April 23 – Easter Day – 2011. The work demonstrates the illegal, unauthorized use of public space. Perhaps not everyone knows that the eponymous square in front of Saint Peter’s Basilica is not located on Italian territory as the Vatican City, home of Pope Francis I, is an independent state. It is also an undemocratic state, where protests and demonstrations of any kind are strictly forbidden, a situation guaranteed by tight security.

Parody religions have developed with ease over the web, which as a medium facilitates the global spread of ideas and behaviors that use artistic strategies as a tool for delving into the depths of society. Ideas and behaviors flow uninterrupted from society to the web, and then back again, in a process that can only be appreciated with the theoretical help of memes, that is what Richard Dawkins, in applying Darwinian theory to culture, defines as that which survives in the evolution of knowledge, making ‘memes’ comparable to ‘genes.’ The Invisible Pink Unicorn was chosen by the artists because it had become a rallying point for activists, and in a certain sense ‘illegal’. Les Liens Invisibles announced the first ever public appearance of the magnificent figure of a pink unicorn... suspended in air over the Vatican Obelisk, surrounded by devoted believers, pilgrims and tourists” of all kinds in St. Peter’s Square in Rome at midnight on Easter day, comparing it to a “collective mystic vision.” According to the artists, “As far as it is universally recognized that Easter transcends its meaning in other monotheistic religions as a ‘pass over’ moment, even the Invisible Pink Unicorn manifested itself and personified a new crucial moment, opening a new shining season for collective visions and joyful hallucinations.”

The work can clearly be interpreted as a critical analysis of religion and of how beliefs in general take root and spread across the web, feeding off convictions which technology has enabled to spread and creating mythologies that develop through websites, mailing lists, and the posting of texts and blogs. The action is an example of an exercise in mapping Net mythologies and how they spread virally. Ideas, philosophical systems and religions are, therefore, sets of memes;
Aesthetic movement is emerging. “We’re all supposed everything-on-everybody. We now expect objects to everything and everybody conveying content and mean everything and everybody. According to the authors, “the Invisible Unicorn is not a joke and it won’t be removed from its current position. The virtual sculpture is ‘real’, (in)visible and it has to be taken into serious consideration: it is the way a recontextualized symbol can alter, challenge and re-shape the perception of a public space – especially a very closed and symbolic one like the [sic] St. Peter’s Square in Rome.”

As Paola Antonelli points out, “In contrast to the twentieth-century triumph of semiotics, which looked down on communication as nothing but a mechanized transmission of coded meaning, the twentieth-century has begun as one of pancommunication – everything and everybody conveying content and meaning in all possible combinations, from one-on-one to everything-on-everybody. We now expect objects to communicate, a cultural shift is evident.” A New Aesthetic movement is emerging. “We’re all supposed to think that an avant-garde is impossible within post-modernity, so we don’t talk about it much nowadays; the very term ‘avant-garde’ sounds musty and weird now, very old-fashioned future. However, time passes and such things happen anyhow, because generations change and technologies change. Changes in personnel and the means of production will trump the formulations of an aging philosophy. These avant-gardes pretty much must happen, and there isn’t any honest way to fob this problem off onto some romanticized vision-bots. The bots are just not going to carry that water-bucket. There’s an Uncanny Valley there.”

SQUATTING IN SPACE

Exploring the issue of “Site vs. Non-site,” or “Not Here, Not There” brings us to the topic of representation in art and to the movements that are opposed to it, along with their theorists, such as Robert Morris. Abstraction, and hence non-representation, was one way of decisively opposing representation in art, instead promoting aesthetics focused on the substance, essence or identity of an object through the elimination of all its essential modes, characteristics or concepts. At the same time though, the representational element was recovered through objects being site-specific without being sited. These developments over the 1960s and 1970s mark out an ideal progression taking us to two key issues of contemporary art: one tied to ‘official designated sites’ and ‘unofficial urban sites,’ which are often claimed or taken over by art; and another tied to the closely-related issue of the immateriality of art.

The historical beginning of it all is widely considered to be from a methodological point of view at least, the exhibition “Les Immatériaux,” organized by Jean-Jacques Lebel. The exhibition was, in reality, a ‘non-exhibition’ embodying a new curatorial approach in terms of both the object displayed and the issues addressed. The exhibition can also take the credit for having legitimized post-industrial art in the digital global era, at a time (1985) when it was still marginal-

ized and yet to be accepted by the art establishment – something that would not happen until the mid-1990s at least. Most of all, however, it introduced a definition of art that for the first time was free of technical terms, its relationship with technology is anything but subordinate, considering the social, economic and political impact that it has. For an in-depth look at what the use of the term ‘immaterial’ means in this context and at the differences between the de-materialization of an artwork and the disappearance of the object, I suggest reading the work of Harold Rosenberg, who gauges the connection between art trends and new technologies. Instead, as concerns the spiritual meaning with which Yves Klein used the word ‘immaterial’ at the end of the 1950s, here I use the word in the contemporary sense of information technology and the post-industrial age.

With the birth of net art, the web began to be used as the space par excellence for all that was immaterial, encouraging new directions in art focused on the real versus the virtual. “The 1990s were about the virtual. It started with the media obsession with Virtual Reality (VR). It is quite possible that this decade of the 2000s will turn out to be about the physical – that is, physical space filled with electronic and visual information.” Since 2002, Lev Manovich has traced the development “of the technologies which deliver data to, or extract data from, physical space – and which are already are widely employed at the time of this writing (early 2002/2005):” Manovich thus turns the crux of the matter on its head; the point is not technology but space, and the definition of art that overlays and occupies that space.

ART AND POLITICS

What impact does this style of art have on society and on the public? In what way does it appropriate public and private space? And in doing so what political issues does it raise and what participatory democratic processes does it activate?

William Gibson in a recent article writes:

“Jeremy Bentham’s Panopticon prison design is a perennial metaphor in discussions of digital surveillance and data mining, but it doesn’t really suit an entity like Google. Bentham’s all-seeing eye looks down from a central viewpoint, the gaze of a Victorian warden. In Google, we are at once the surveilled and the individual retinal cells of the surveillant, however many millions of us, constantly if unconsciously participatory. We are part of a post-geographical, post-national super-state, one that hardly says no to China. Or yes, depending on profit considerations and strategy. But we do not participate in Google on that level. We’re citizens, but without rights.”

Manovich explains: “This close connection between surveillance and assistance is one of the key characteristics of the high-tech society. This is how these technologies are made to work, and this is why I am discussing data flows from the space (surveillance, monitoring, tracking) and into the space (cellspace applications, computer screens and other examples below) together.” It is easy to see that the heart of the matter lies in the definition of, or focus on, social space, or Augmented Space, as a specific characteristic of high-tech society. The technologies available to us – ubiquitous computing, augmented reality, wearable computers, smart building, home automation, smart objects, smart phones – are all what we might call ‘pervasive computing,’ which seeks to link changes in the environment with computer systems, which are otherwise static. Nowadays, our approach to these technologies has become a geo-referenced phenomenon with biopolitical connotations, as it affects our
political constitutions, sets of values, existing practices and the common sense traits of our everyday cultures and forms of life. It does so in different ways, but the end result is the same; the Internet has everted, over-lapping layers of data over physical space. Deriving the term from ‘augmented reality,’ Manovich refers to this new kind of space as “augmented space,” which is becoming a reality and works very well. What is never explicitly mentioned, however, are the political implications that naturally arise from this overlaying of layers, made possible by tracking and monitoring users: “delivering information to users in space and extracting information about these users are closely connected. Thus, augmented space is also monitored space.”

In response to this encroaching form of social control, the imaginary group of artists Les Liens Invisibles, consisting of Clemente Pestelli and Giovani Quin-tini, accepted Share Festival’s invitation to produce the Special Project 2010 with their usual creative cheekiness. Specially designed for the sixth Piemonte cal tourism. Setting their sights on augmented reality, this new kind of space as “augmented reality,” which is becoming a reality and works very well. What is never explicitly mentioned, however, are the political implications that naturally arise from this overlaying of layers, made possible by tracking and monitoring users: “delivering information to users in space and extracting information about these users are closely connected. Thus, augmented space is also monitored space.”

In response to this encroaching form of social control, the imaginary group of artists Les Liens Invisibles, consisting of Clemente Pestelli and Giovani Quintini, accepted Share Festival’s invitation to produce the Special Project 2010 with their usual creative cheekiness. Specially designed for the sixth Piemonte Share Festival, the project mustered all the surreal and virtual imagination that lies at the centre of their work to invade Turin’s urban environment. R.I.O.T./Reality Is Out There was a series of urban strikes invisible to the naked eye – but for that no less tangible – using augmented realities that surround us every day. Deconstructing the natural association that has existed ever since the Stone Age between reality and the tools we build to control it, R.I.O.T. turns this relationship on its head by using reality as a tool, as a means through which we move to explore a universe visible only on our smart phones, creating a paradoxical tourism. Setting their sights on augmented reality, or rather on the what the myth of ‘augmented reality’ appears to promise, the city of Turin was invaded by a series of imaginary installations squatting in key locations. The public was invited to uncover the virtual sculptures through a game, a digital urban treasure hunt, and was treated to the sight of flying objects such as floating bananas, Facebook banners, revolutionary slogans, Space Invader icons and so on.

The desecrating collective showed no mercy in its manipulation and recontextualization of reality via an inverse process compared to the past, intervening in reality so as to subvert the map. Intervention took place in symbolic locations around town, creating a hybrid flux, the psychogeography festival.

Sander Veenhof and Mark Skwarek, the two artists behind the invasion, extended to the public a ‘cordial’ tongue-in-cheek invitation to their temporary exhibition, adding a post scriptum that the MoMA itself was yet to be involved. Squatting in the halls of the MoMA invasion, other projects with direct political connotations for the Art System have been organized by other artists. One very clever example was the virtual augmented reality show held on October 9, 2010 at the MoMA building in New York – only the MoMA did not know about it. The infiltration was organized as part of Con-flux, the psychogeography festival.

Tamiko Thiel’s work was exhibited in MoMA as part of the art intervention by Manifest.AR. The meaning of the work lies in the title R.I.O.T./Reality Is Out There, which alludes to the possibility of a return to the exploration of reality, and the overcoming of traditional antitheses between the real and the virtual by using ‘low cost’ reality-browsing technologies.

Here, real and virtual space interact so as to create a single social environment, made possible ever since digital space became an integral part of the city itself. The game is, therefore, an urban hack, the reappropriation of public space via intervention directly on the streets, squares and roads, and under monuments, porticoes and buildings. It is action in the collective digital sphere to create an unexpected gulf, cultural jamming, a guerrilla attack on communication in the global city. As a symbolic act, Les Liens Invisibles’ urban hack is an aesthetic overexposure, an exercise in the subversive use of augmented reality, which becomes un-reality, a vision, an augmented dream in subcultural practices. It is less about public space and more about destruction, interruption and aperture, in an effort to crack open standard mechanisms of closure.

MoMA Invasion

Other projects with direct political connotations for the Art System have been organized by other artists. One very clever example was the virtual augmented reality show held on October 9, 2010 at the MoMA building in New York – only the MoMA did not know about it. The infiltration was organized as part of Con-flux, the psychogeography festival.

Sander Veenhof and Mark Skwarek, the two artists behind the invasion, extended to the public a ‘cordial’ tongue-in-cheek invitation to their temporary exhibition, adding a post scriptum that the MoMA itself was yet to be involved. Squatting in the halls of the MoMA
Veenhof and Skwarek attribute remarkable responsively taking over the MoMA. In the artists’ statement, their works on all the floors of the building and effects monitored and watched at the same time; it is a space museum, showcasing the radical new possibilities and reality art in its proper context: a contemporary art field of art; depending on the way one looks at it, it is artistic freedom or just plain illegal.

As yet another label, ‘Spatial Art’ is hardly indispensable and will probably be short-lived. Nevertheless, it can help us reconstruct the narratives of certain specific artistic practices which, as has happened in the past, have been variously labeled computer art, software art, net-art, electronic art, tech-art, new media art, digital art, bio-art and data-art. Some of these names overlap each other or denote the same type of art; others carry a clearly historical connotation. All of them, though, are intimately connected with a digital, global society. Over time, they have lost their punch and been replaced or recalled as the vestiges of an age of critical study of the relationship between art, technology and society. Spatial Art overlays and unites several spaces into one, making artistic use of time, movement and data or information in a space defined by growth in technological interaction, i.e., a data-space. Spatial Art speaks to a public on the move, to a public that is mobile and not stationary, obliging us to realize that the media that we wear are part of the objects that make up our world. In 2005, Manovich conceptualized a scenario akin to the world presented in the film “They Live,” directed by John Carpenter. In that world, special sunglasses revealed subliminal images and the real information underlying physical media (newspapers, billboards), in a reality augmented by messages of alien persuasion (obey, consume, watch TV, etc.). Today, additional layers of information are conveyed directly to people living in the smart city.

What is Spatial Art? What is its goal? What tools does it use and how is it best exemplified? What is it that we are witnessing? From an aesthetic point of view, the question of space is not new in art. Reaching out into the third dimension, into space, from a flat, two-dimensional canvas is a recurring theme throughout the history of art. Perspective in Renaissance Art was itself a technical expedient for creating the optical illusion of depth, just as the introduction of oil paint permitted multiple layering and hence three-dimensionality in art. In the post-war era, space was a key central concept of Spatialism as an art movement, and was also present in many other art movements over the twentieth century, though in different forms and with different connotations. The intuition that any new language of sculpture was dependent on the notion of space as a means of overcoming the static nature of the work was already present in Boccioni, for instance, while Pinot Gallizio, in his Cavern of Antimatter (1959), took his work in an ‘environmental’ direction that would be developed into the happenings and installations of the 1960s.

Nowadays the problem of bringing together two different spaces is conceived in much broader terms. Overlying dynamic and contextualized data onto physical space brings change, dynamism, interactivity and multimedia. An aesthetic analysis of this practice is crucial for understanding the artistic paradigm and giving artists themselves the opportunity to take a fresh look at past experiences with space, and at how both temporal and spatial dimensions can be inserted in their work to overcome the stagnant nature of art. That is how to introduce into an artwork those elements that characterize reality as the continuous flow of states that we perceive as change. The contrast between site and non-site, between the real and the virtual, between being here and there at the same time – the ubiquity of objects and images, the relationship between physical space and artworks – is a field widely explored by artists.

So what is human-object communication? How is the relationship immaterial and what are the social and, ultimately, political implications of that immateriality? Every single place on Earth has coordinates that can be tracked technologically; every single space can be surveilled. As Korzybski put it, the map is not the territory – a concept later examined and developed by Bateson, though also explored by Borges in his well-known short story On Exactitude in Science. Maps today – spanning Google, GIS, GPS and the entire web itself, including games such as FourSquare and social networks, which themselves publish content in the form of maps, graphic data and infrastructures that are directly geolocalized, and hence are forms of territorial representation – have become activities and practices of socialization, interacting with social life. The result, as we have seen, is the illusion of living within a technological Panopticon in which it is no longer possible to dabble in any form of expression beyond control and outside of sovereignty: we ourselves produce the data that fulfill the contemporary paradigm of surveillance and control. By subjectifying the process of subjectification, biopolitics is self-generating. ‘Biopolitics’ is the term by which Foucault refers to how, ever since the eighteenth century, we have sought to rationalize issues for a government that are specific to groups of human beings living as one population, such as health, hygiene, births, lifespan and race. The technological Panopticon is an expression of augmented power that pervades from the inside out, constructed as a series of multiple power relationships. Through those power relationships, through the invisibility of control, the biopolitics of social control is applied.

The concept of space has evolved from an implicit counterpart of new work in aesthetic fields (as theorized briefly within the context of the historic avant-garde movements) to become a theoretical and practical element underpinning a new approach to art.
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The Invisible Pavilion was an unwired, experimental hallucinatory experience of augmentation, information and immersion in a specific context, involving the unauthorized use of public space, which squatted in the exhibition spaces of the 54th Venice Art Biennale. It was a performance involving the flow of digital-based works of art, which filled the whole Giardini concourse where the national pavilions were located. Curated by Les Liens Invisibles and I, the main purpose of the project was to augment the spaces of the Biennale with a stream of signs and symbols, in an attempt to emphasize how producing art is a state of flow in the ‘always-on’ age. The format used for inviting artists to contribute to the performance was also designed specially for the use of augmentation, information and immersion. Artists were not asked for ‘one’ piece from a collection but for a ‘stream’ of pieces since the idea was not to use the augmented space to reproduce the same curatorial scheme as the visible Biennale. The Invisible Pavilion project led to a new partnership with the artistic collective Manifest.AR and their Venice Biennale 2011 AR Intervention. Together a format was built that stepped up the interventionist component of the projects.

The underlying question was how to give new meaning to the concept of public space, changing its proprietary boundaries, and to the concept of what it is to perceive reality.

Nine artists – Artie Vierkant, Constant Dullaart, CON-TENTS.NET, IOCOSE, Jon Rafman, Les Liens Invisibles, Molleindustria, Parker Ito, and REFF – RomaEuropa FakeFactory – were invited to contribute to the pavilion project, turning the Biennale space into a performance by providing a stream of works for the entire length of the exhibition. What the artists had in common, and hence the reason why they were all invited to take part, was their focus on confronting our perception of reality through the conscious, mocking and obviously hypercritical use of new media. The invitation to contribute to the Invisible Pavilion was yet another chance for them to comment on the art industry and all its contradictions in the context of the Venice Biennale.

Molleindustria is an Italian team of artists, designers and programmers, whose aim is to encourage serious discussion of the social and political implications of videogames. Their strategy is to involve media activists, net-artists, habitual gamers and detractors of videogames. Their intervention and contribution to the Invisible Pavilion targeted the Chinese Pavilion after Chinese artist Ai Weiwei was arrested at Beijing Airport on April 3, 2011, while en route to Hong Kong.

This work was positioned by the artist in front of the Chinese Pavilion to protest against the arrest of the artist Ai WeiWei and Chinese censorship.
While the international art community is mobilizing for the release of Ai Weiwei by pressuring Chinese authorities and demonstrating at embassies around the world, the Venice Biennale provides a central stage for government-endorsed Chinese art, becoming, de facto, an accomplice of this unacceptable attack on freedom of expression.

For REFF, ‘Defining what is real is an act of power. Being able to reinvent reality is an act of freedom. REFF promotes the dissemination and re appropriation of all technologies, theories and practices that can be used to freely and autonomously reinvent reality.’ This commitment is what led the artists to invent conceptual artistic practices are grounded. For the invisible Pavilion, the collective produced Blemish, one of the most scheming and intriguing works streamed. As the artists explain, “The work blemish pursues the technological limitations of mediated images by extinguishing single components of it. Ephemerical image vacancies are inscribed in the mobile display as a layer of defective pixels and can be read as an intervention in the technological conditions of devices that serve for the representation of reality by digital means. Equally, blemish is an intervention in the public space, giving priority to the context of the global art world as well as targeting the blind spots of its modes of production and representation. The unstable nature of reality as well as the contemporary methods of its reproduction is called into question. Which of the significant components of a digital product are visible, which are not? Which components of an overall image are not on display, deliberately or accidentally? Which of the many artistic formats appears in the canon of contemporary art, which of them are blanked out in the file’s operating system? The immaterial defect of form – a dead pixel – is inscribed in the auratic art spaces of the Venice Biennale. Barely perceptible for the viewers it is disguised as a loose arrangement of black squared errors which finally can be read as an abstract comment about the blemished context of art.”

Constant Dullaart’s Invisible Watermark and Jon Rafman’s works Pollock Tank, Georgia O’Keeffe Spinner and Matisse David, forming part of the series Brand New Paint Job, have much in common with the ‘New Aesthetic’ theorized by James Bridle. The concept deserves particular attention as the New Aesthetic could well become the next big thing in art today. I make particular reference here to Bruce Sterling’s “Essay on the New Aesthetic,” which starts out as a commentary on John Bridle’s panel at South by Southwest 2012, but goes beyond Bradley’s ideas. The extensive debates raging on the most popular mailing lists, such as Nettime, SPECTRUMedia, and New Media Curating, show just how much we need to stop and reflect on a number of intriguing issues, such as the points raised and focused on by Bruce Sterling.

“The New Aesthetic concerns itself with ‘an eruption of the digital into the physical’. The ‘New Aesthetic’ is a native product of modern network culture... The New Aesthetic is a ‘theory object’ and a ‘shareable concept’... Above all, the New Aesthetic is telling the truth... Next, the New Aesthetic is culturally agnostic... It’s also deep. If you want to get into arcane matters such as interaction design, computational aesthetics, covert surveillance, military tech, there’s a lot of room for that activity in the New Aesthetic. The New Aesthetic carries a severe, involved air of Pynchonian erudition... It’s contemporary. It’s temporal rather than atemporal... It is generational.”

Lots of images made up of lots of pixels was the answer to a figurative approach to the New Aesthetic’s reproduction of reality, questioning the unstable nature of the real world and the contemporary methods used for its digital reproduction. The invisible Pavilion was used as a space to post images using augmentation, information and immersion techniques to confuse the audience, prompting the public to think about the temporary nature of reality and contemporary methods of reproducing it. On show was a series of invisible components making a global image, which purposefully and randomly represented the leftover mistakes of a restrictive, institutional system. Ultimately, they were a comment on the abstract and defective context of art, which creates gaps and blind spots – or invisible pavilions – in its methods.
of production and representation. Those spaces are experimental and not created by invitation, but ultimately they are not a provocation. Rather, they are a bit of black humor, casting a wark at the aura that shrouts the Biennale, that historic, promised land – an aura, which tends to, lift in the midst of augmented reproducibility. They are an emblematic abstraction to decorate with illusion and signal change in a venue, a city, a place that speaks and interacts, that informs us continuously, non-stop. They announce that human-machine interaction, the interface, has become the urban environment, a collective external space, a pavilion – an area in which to aggregate and share information in real time, which changes our perception of the physical venue through a gesture that transforms the city a gesture by artists that are augmented town planners. Building this r/Reality is not, however, a conscious decision. It is a fact, a place into which town-planning artists are thrown. It is a r/Reality that is not an object distinct from what it will become, but the object of its own becoming. The artist is the builder of what the world will become r/Reality that exists as an expression of art – an art that is no longer an interpretation of the world, but an act of dialectical transformation of the tangible and intangible, the visible and the invisible. For this r/Reality, for this pavilion which “comes into being on its own,” the spatial art r/Reality actualizes the metaverse in the real universe, merging the digital and the real into a single, common space.

SPATIAL ART CONTINUED...

Working on the Invisible Pavilion project for the 54th Venice Biennale, it so happened that we came across another group of artists working on much the same issue, so we decided to cooperate with them and launch a joint attack on the Biennale from different fronts and perspectives. In June 2011, the cutting-edge international cyberartist group Manifest.AR issued a statement to the general public and to the president and director of the 54th Venice Biennale informing them that they had created additional pavilions in the Giardini concourse, built in the new medium of augmented reality and that some of the works had leaked out into the public space of Saint Mark’s Square. The statement announcing the unauthorized intervention was directed critically at Bice Curiger’s “five questions” and the “ILLUMInations” theme of the exhibition, stating that their uninvited participation would “not be bound by nation-state borders, physical boundaries or by conventional art world structures,” and “As ‘one of the world’s most important forums for the dissemination and ‘illumination’ about current developments in international art,’ the 54th Biennale of Venice could not justify its reputation without an uninvited Augmented Reality infiltration,” raising questions of “physical and hierarchical boundaries.” The artists Mark Skwarek, Sander Veenhof, Tamiko Thiel, Will Peppenheimer, John Craig Freeman, Lily and Hong Lei, Naoko Tosa and John Cleater all took part directly in the project.

As Tamiko Thiel explains,

“Augmented reality has redefined the meaning of ‘public space.’ As corporations privatize many public spaces and governments put the rest under surveillance, augmented reality artists take over the invisible but actual realm that overlays real space with multiple parallel universes. Augmented reality actualizes the metaverse in the real universe, merging the digital and the real into a single, common space.

Augmented reality can conquer space but it is not indifferent to space. With my artworks you must negotiate real space in order to view the works.

They are usually not single images or objects, but installations that surround you. In order to look at them you must move your body in space, looking up, down and twisting around.”

In Shades of Absence: Outside Inside, Tamiko Thiel inserted into the closed curatorial space of the Giardini concourse in Venice the silhouetted figures of artists who have been threatened with arrest or physical violence. Regardless of whether they are outsiders or insiders to the Art System, known internationally or only within small circles, their work has excluded these artists from the safety of protected space.

In contrast, John Craig Freeman explains that the

“Use [of] augmentation, information, immersion in a specific context in my work means to design, question and expand the notion of ‘public’ by exploring how digital networked technology is transforming our sense of place. I use new technologies to produce large-scale public work at sites where the forces of globalization are impacting the lives of individuals in local communities.

I have been interested in emergent technology as art practice and public art as intervention for over two decades. Intervention in both institutions of high culture and intervention in government policy and nation states. In November, 1990, I created Op-
John Craig Freeman, 2012. Since 1993, hundreds of young women have been murdered and their bodies abandoned in vacant lots around Ciudad Juárez just over the border from El Paso. Monumento a las Mujeres Desaparecidas, 2012, John Craig Freeman and Christina Marin, Location-based Augmented Reality. © John Craig Freeman, 2012. Since 1993, hundreds of young women have been murdered and their bodies abandoned in vacant lots around Ciudad Juárez just over the border from El Paso.

A whole new scene is emerging. Here I would also like to look at other exhibitions and projects connected with the topic of Spatial Art, with the aim of expanding the field of research and gauging the progress made in augmentation, information and immersion by the contemporary art world. Starting with the question: if the concept of data-space has become a dominating paradigm for contemporary society, what are the implications for art?

In contrast with the concept of the Internet everting overflows onto society, compelling contemporary artists to explore the relationship between art and social life, to find the intersection between the self and society, and to depict, directly and exhaustively, the features of the society in which they live. These artists represent contemporary thought in their way of representing ubiquity as a real condition of everyday life, transforming it into symbols of rich cultural connotations. Ubiquity is a forceful display of the role that art plays in understanding a global world, where artworks reflect not only the artists’ perspective on reality, but also shed light on our own experience of the world.

We have looked at how and where the distinction between public and private space breaks down, at how new space and new territory for art are being opened up, at reactions to data-space. The concepts of art in public space, art as public space and art in the public interest have all changed, paving the way for a return of political activism in the social function of art. In this context, does it still make any sense to talk about public space and public art? Can we still speak of artistic universals?

The conclusions lie within the approach taken to the topic; an approach that is neither technological nor geographic, but rather driven by an interest in capturing the virtual into the physical to parody the idea of ubiquity, where it is the real object that acts as an avatar for the virtual. Aram Bartholl [9] takes the virtual into the physical to transform it into symbols of rich cultural connotations. Ubiquity is a forceful display of the role that art plays in understanding a global world, where artworks reflect not only the artists’ perspective on reality, but also shed light on our own experience of the world.

For the past eight years, I have worked on the corner of Tremont and Boylston Streets overlooking the historic Boston Common, the first public park in the United States. I walk across the park every morning. As I do, I often contemplate the role that the town square plays in the shaping of political discourse and national identity formation. As the location of the public sphere, the town square is where we air grievances, display solidarity, express our differences, celebrate our similarities, remember and mourn... In the early 1990s we witnessed the migration of the public sphere from the physical realm, the town square and its print augmentation, to the virtual realm, the Internet. Augmented reality brings the placelessness of the Internet and its physical manifestations of place, as a world-wide public square. [10]
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ing the cultural climate and a certain psychological and anthropological dimension of our perception of public space, of overcoming limits, of the concepts of material/immaterial, visible/invisible, real/unreal. Set off against the artists and the exhibitions described in this paper are the museums, venues or sites that already exist. What we have is not the definitive story of a movement but rather an account given by a series of individual works and by continuous links to real and virtual situations. The conclusions are given by the account pieced together by artistic works that make use of those elements that characterize reality as the continuous flow of states that we perceive as changes in life and in the space we live. The works are individual, shifting, subjective accounts, more from the point of view of an art world outsider than from an insider. This can be seen in Will Peppenheimer’s SkyWrite art: We Need Something, which appeared virtually over Queens in New York throughout the Occupy Wall Street protests in 2012.

The game of claiming to be outside any official system or establishment is itself a strategy for earning one’s self a role as spokesperson of dissent, while it is also interesting as an expression of artistic freedom. The framework of the exhibitions described is shaped by the continuous friction between the individualism of the artists and the institutional nature of the events they target. It all turns on an ambiguous division that is technically ironclad as it overlaps the problem of perpetual newness that augmented reality and the New Aesthetic express. Changes in public space have become manifest in the augmented power of biopolitics, in the critical analysis of ubiquitous computing, in the question of surveillance versus inverse surveillance, in freedom of speech, in the permeability of boundaries, in locative media, in developments in the political and social environment, in the Panopticon, in interventionism in the art system (such as the Venice Biennale and MoMA invasions), in issues of democracy and privacy, in the tracking and profiling of data flows underpinning the growth of a database culture. All these changes have contributed to the construction of a new digital identity — but is it an identity that we really want? As this new identity shapes living conditions in urban and private life in the smart city, mobile communications and handheld devices are erasing our personal presence, shifting the focus of accessibility onto the issue of digital inclusion/exclusion. A conflict has emerged between the individual and the community which itself is cardinal to the Art System and world of galleries and museums, which is substantially market-based. In this way, Spatial Art reflects the constant tension between the multiplicity of individual artists and the organizational unity of the system in general. There is no other unifying thread for Spatial Art, and as an element even it, perhaps, is paradoxically absent. All we have are clips, words, floating objects, statements, made-up chemical formulas, fragments of non-narrative accounts, elements without structure. What would appear to emerge is, on one hand, the figure of the artist as messenger and innovator of roles and meanings, championing an anti-establishment art; on the other, the artist as the teller of fragmented narratives of reality and immateriality. They are witnesses of a fundamental anthropological change because as artists they are outsiders to the art market and the system in general, taking on an ethical role on which their exhibitions are premised. Their standing outside the system in general makes them morally invincible and irreproachable, and if what they do is illegal, it means they are treading on fiercely contested ground.

Artwork that is secret, or invisible or in some way a ‘revelation’ in space also takes on an aesthetic element shaped by the artist’s being an outsider to the Art System, to the world of art based on economic rather than cultural value. For mainstream art scenes, not producing for the market is ultimately the last real responsibility of the artist as a pioneer and critic, as a futurist who can bring about change even through simple, surreptitious gestures. This image of the artist may well be just a myth – but why reject it and the evocative appeal that it continues to command? ■
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Is there an ‘outside’ of the Art World from which to launch critiques and interventions? If so, what is the border that defines outside from inside? If it is not possible to define a border, then what constitutes an intervention and is it possible to be and act as an outsider of the art world? Or are there only different positions within the Art World and a series of positions to take that fulfill ideological parameters and promotional marketing and branding techniques to access the fine art world from an oppositional, and at times confrontational, standpoint?

This question is premised on a fallacy from the outset: there is no ‘Art world’. Art is part of the ordinary world: just like culture and knowledge, it is a public good. Art is not separate from the world or from society. There is, however, an ‘Art System’, which is based on the market. The players in this system are conditioned by the market, so art has become a commodity to be bought and sold.

The border today is between being and not being part of the market. On one hand, there is the Art System, based on galleries, dealers, museum, foundations, magazines, blogs, auctions, art fairs, and collectors (private collectors, banks, companies and museums). On the other, there are artists who stay out of the art market – though not out of art – because the artists decide to be free and to opt out from buying and selling. Freedom of expression is a fundamental, intrinsic value of art, yet it is not accepted by the art system. Scandal is accepted, but it is really just a technique for raising market prices, and these sorts of scandals never have any real consequences – they do not mean anything real or interesting for culture or knowledge, or for art itself. A whole history of art could be written tracing economic cycles and the financial highs and lows of the art market speculation. In the early 1980s, for example, the Transavantgarde movement suddenly popped up. It included some really great painters – don’t get me wrong – but the point I want to make is that when the economy is booming, the art system always responds with big art that grows with it such as installations, sculptures or experimental art, which become ornamental. The Art System is based on marketing, and it works very well as a system. It creates big exhibitions, coffee table catalogues, celebrities, and it makes money – lots of money. Charles Saatchi is a perfect example how to apply the rules of advertising and brand techniques to the Art System. But the cultural value of a work of art does not come from the market.

“In The Truth in Painting, Derrida describes the parergon (par-, around; ergon, the work), the boundaries or limits of a work of art. Philosophers from Plato to Hegel, Kant, Huysler, and Heidegger debated the limits of the intrinsic and extrinsic, the inside and outside of the art object.” (Anne Friedberg, The Virtual Window: From Alberti to Microsoft (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2009), 13.) Where then is the inside and outside of the virtual artwork? Is the artist’s ‘hand’ still inside the artistic process in the production of virtual art or has it become an irrelevant concept abandoned outside the creative process of virtual artworks?

I don’t think philosophers really understand anything about art – they love to speculate; they love words; they love ideas. They start from art, but it is only an intellectual expedient for philosophical theories. Anyway, the question is whether the ‘hand’ of the artist is still inside the artistic process in tech-art, and the answer is yes. Being ‘hands on’ is one of the most important statements of tech-art, but it has a rather different meaning.

This is a very contemporary conceptual leap beyond Walter Benjamin’s aesthetic vision of the artist. Benjamin’s vision is a legacy of the industrial age, a chronicle of the time of the changing status of the artist – from the independent creator, tied to traditional artistic apparatus and one’s own manual ability, to the artist as producer. In using photography, for instance, a typical art medium of the industrial age, the artist was perfectly part of the economic and production system undergoing radical transformation. Today, in a globalized and interconnected world, the artist uses the same IT tools that are widely available to everyone and appropriates not a technique, but a methodology – that of a ‘process of expression’ that takes on the aesthetic value of art, leaving the task of production to the curator and the museum. Thus, the artist expresses and the curator produces.

Virtual interventions appear to be the contemporary inheritance of Fluxus’ artistic practices. Artists like Peter Weibel, Yayoi Kusama and Valie Export subverted traditional concepts of space and media through artistic interventions. What are the sources of inspiration and who are the artistic predecessors that you draw from for the conceptual and aesthetic frameworks of contemporary augmented reality interventions?

That’s another idea that I disagree with. Tech-art – or ‘new media art’, ‘digital art’, ‘software art’, whatever you prefer to call it – represents a clean break with the history of the avant-garde and 1960s/1970s art, both formally and in terms of content. Artists who create their work illegally (in 2010 I curated Cease & Desist Art. Yes, this is illegal!), for instance, have nothing in common with Fluxus. ‘Illegal art’ is a form of aesthetic expression that conveys a strong realism and idealism. And it’s not the only example.

A lot of historic baggage is attached to virtual interventionists, which they need to free themselves of – or rather, art theorists do. Hybrid, interdisciplinary figures are emerging today who do not distinguish their artwork and political commitment from their
In the representation and presentation of your artworks as being ‘outside of’ and ‘extrinsic to’ contemporary aesthetics why is it important that your projects are identified as Art?

Curators are always asked the same thing; is it art or is it garbage? I’ve been asked this question ever since the start of my career as an art critic and curator, especially when speaking about contemporary art. People look at Lucio Fontana’s works and say, “What’s this cut in the canvas? Is this supposed to be art? I can do better than that!” Or at Kazimir Malevich’s abstract paintings and say, “It’s just a black and white square!”

So by what criteria, by what value system should art be judged? Should it be marketing, or the history of art or even personal tastes? You’ll never get a straight answer from art critics. I once heard Achille Bonito Oliva, a world famous Italian art critic and founder of the Transavantgarde movement, say, “I have expert eyes and a strong heart.”

More seriously though, art is an expression and reflection of the relationship between economics, technology and society. Artists have always used all sorts of technology; today they use technology as a language, or they use it to create a meta-language to construct a critical vision of technology and reflect on its relationship with culture and society. Visionary, presaging or anticipatory, though not supernatural in their power to see into the future, these artists contribute to the material process by which ideas from diverse fields feed into one another and become new cultural configurations. That means using the Web as a language, medium and subject; it is networking, interactivity, activism, tactical media and media manipulation and collaboration, all tied strictly to the social context. These artists play an important role in developing ideas that have broad cultural ramifications for the way we view art. In this sense, they don’t speak the same language – so having expert eyes is a help! It means going to festivals, museum exhibitions and galleries; it means reading blogs, listening to what’s happening on the scene. All this is forming a new aesthetic, or rather the New Aesthetic is already here. This is a reference to Bruce Sterling’s “Essay on the New Aesthetic,” which begins as a commentary on John Bridle’s panel at South by Southwest 2012, but goes beyond Bradley’s ideas. Every art critic needs a common umbrella under which to put new aesthetic criteria. Maybe this definition will have a longer shelf life than others. I like it, and you can discover it too by reading the article I’m writing for the LEA issue on the topic of “Note Here, Not There.”

REFERENCES AND NOTES

Deadly Cuts To The Arts

A New International Initiative of the Museum of Contemporary Cuts in collaboration with Operational and Curatorial Research

museumofcontemporarycuts.org/deadly-cuts-to-the-arts/
ocradst.org