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ABSTRACT

Would contemporary sculpture in the public space evoke a certain kind of a group dynamic processes?

The thesis is dedicated to the role and perception of the sculpture in the public space. Considering existing theories on the concept of public space (Habermas, Popper, Kołakowski, Hansen, Le Bon) and the role of sculpture in it (Groys, Miles, Lunaczarski, Krauss, Kobro, Strzemiński), as well as selected case studies in different cultural contexts (Serra, Hasior), a need was identified for a new theoretical concept: a sculpture as an element of public space evoking a group dynamic process. The author adapts Kurt Lewin's concept of the force field in group dynamics and other proven and widely recognised psychological concepts as a theoretical basis to measure an impact of a sculpture on its audience. The construction of a new method is described; its applicability is examined in pilot studies on selected sculptures in Poland and Northern Ireland. It allows to measure two aspects of the attitudes toward sculptures: cognitive and emotional (aspect of defensiveness). The third, behavioural aspect is concluded from phenomena observed in the research and interviews with sculptors and representatives of the authorities in Poland and Northern Ireland. The main study, which was conducted in Northern Ireland (Londonderry) and Poland (Nowa Huta), examines the relationship to sculptures three times during a period of time after erecting the sculptures. In closing, the author tries to answer the question: would contemporary sculpture in the public space evoke a certain kind of group dynamic process? In the conclusions, the doubts are considered and new research directions are indicated.
GLOSSARY

Attitude – understood in reference to psychological sources by Allan Allport and Daniel Katz. Related to sets of beliefs, feelings and behavioural tendencies that may occur toward factors such as significant social objects, group events or symbols.

Background – term in relation to Open Form by Oscar Hansen. For Hansen, an offset is a mimesis reconstruction of biological processes replicated in the architectural or sculptural form.

Borderline Personality – a complex type of personality disorder characterized by long-term disability to stable relations with other people, unstable sense of self, unstable emotions, depression in relation to fear, feeling of emptiness and self-harm.

Cognitive Space – term used by Oskar Hansen. Understood by him as set of physical dimensions where a person could cognate his own attitudes, in the temporal process where other members of the group are included. In the context of architecture, the term was used by Hansen in relation to the subject of open form.

Covariate – set attribute for a tested area of interest. It could be sex, age or any other attribute considered as valid. In contradiction to the variable, control covariate is used to build a framework for the area of research.

Democracy – a sociopolitical system based on the concept of its users sharing power and responsibilities.

Defensiveness – understood in reference to psychological sources gathered by George E. Vaillant in DSM-IV classification. However, for Kurt Lewin the defensiveness toward social changes played a main role in the measurement of group dynamics. Therefore, in the context of this thesis, defensiveness gains a broader meaning and becomes one of the key words of the research.

Defence mechanisms – various classifications of unconscious behaviours to reduce a person’s anxiety level and protect the imagination of one’s own self.

Derry/Londonderry – city in Northern Ireland. Dependently to the relation toward the city, the name Derry, or Londonderry is used. Therefore, in the Thesis often both names are used equally.

Falsifiability – a requirement for a valid argument based on scientifically conducted research. In context of the scientific epistemology of Sir Karl Popper, falsifiability must be gained by conducted replicability to be called knowledge. The argumentation on falsifiability is still open and widely discussed in the area of philosophy of science.

Force field – a term used by Kurt Lewin as descriptive model for social space of the person. The field could be interdependent with another person. According to Lewin, the impact of two or more force fields should evoke a dynamic process of change. However, that process would be in relation to a person’s defences.

Futura contingentia – a term expanded by Jan Łukasiewicz after Aristo. In true – false sets of contradictions the term was used to describe the future as an unchangeable area of logic. However, Łukasiewicz defined futura contingentia as an unset value in logic and classified
it as not yet determined. Therefore, for use in this thesis the approach of Łukasiewicz will be used.

Group – understood here as a self-organising structure of more than one element. Therefore, the aspect of recognition of self-organisation usually becomes a focus in research on their classifications.

Group dynamics – a collection of processes within (intra-relation) or between (inter-relation) social groups. The term was broadly developed by Kurt Lewin in the context of his research on the implementation of democratic relations in the group.

Good Friday Agreement – signed on 10 April 1998 between the Republic of Ireland, the United Kingdom and the main political parties of Northern Ireland. Considered as turning point (in a positive sense) after 30 years of conflict between loyalists and republicans.

Gorals – highlanders living in the region of South of Poland, part of Slovakia and Cieszyn city region of Czech Republic.

Historiosophy – philosophy of history. A reflexive approach to history understood as a whole process of set or unset changes in a linear area of temporal events.

Homogeneity – term used in the context of groups with similar attitudes or shared characteristics based on structuralised attributes.

Heterogeneity – term used in the context of groups whose members recognise themselves on a basis of diversity.

Interdependence – one of the attributes defining the group. Interdependence occurs when one member of the group is dependent on another.

Ireland – an island in the area of the North Atlantic, divided into the Republic of Ireland, which is an independent political state and a member of the European Union, and Northern Ireland which is a part of the United Kingdom.

Mimesis – philosophical term derived from old Greek word: μιμήσις. Term related to the subject of similarity or imitation. In the context of arts, a type of artistic resemblance of nature.

Method – a path to gain material of scientific quality to conduct research. Scientific quality in that sense is understood under conditions of falsifiability, replicability, extrapolation and compatibility with existing theories.

Multidimensional – in the context of that research, the term is used under relation to system theory of human personality.

Narcissism – understood here in a broader psychological sense, as a form of personal disorder in the DSM -IV classification. However, in psychoanalysis it is considered as an attitude toward one’s own ego. Narcissism will be understood here as a self-destructive state of a person that generates aggression.

Northern Ireland – political area belonging to the United Kingdom, physically located on the island of Ireland.
Nowa Huta – in English: New Foundry. Area build for workers of the foundry and industrial zone build in 1951 as a new part of Cracow. In 1990, a final administrative division of Nowa Huta districts was made by the Cracow city council.

Object – understood here under the condition of a psychoanalytic approach to the subject. Individually constructed imagination of person or a thing.

Object Relations Theory – a set of theories (Freud, Klein, Winnicot, Segal and others) on development of human identity (in psychoanalysis: Self) since the early childhood. In general assumption, the theoretical approach to the processed relation to the objects (e.g. mother, father, etc.) who structurally construct personality in the life time. In another word, a process of imagination on objects which in time of the life span of the person will be called ‘the reality’; by that person.

Open form – term used by Oskar Hansen to define architectonically or sculpturally organised space, where a person’s needs are focused on maximalization of cognitive processes. Open form in practice, should minimalize influence of overriding leadership and simultaneously raise importance of individuality.

Open society – term developed by Karl Popper after Henri Bergson to describe a social model based on self-responsible groups where influence of the leadership is minimalised.

Public space – an abstract platform for exchange of human needs, participations or declarations. Legal term in the context of most political systems except in totalitarian models.

Phenomena – deviations found in the systematized conduct of research; outcomes that present values beyond the neighbouring range.

Podhale – mountainous region on the South of Poland.

Poland – country in Central Europe. Official name: 3rd Polish Republic.

PRL Museum – a part of National Museum of Cracow. Place devoted to history of Nowa Huta during the existence of Polish People’s Republic.

Projection – term used in psychoanalytical context. A process which occurs between unconscious and conscious as an effect of assignation of own unaccepted feelings on another object.

Reduction – in the context of empirical research, a process in line of reasoning where a final and logical causation has emerged from a conducted experiment.

Sculpture – physical multidimensional object for which all dimensions must have same set of values variable to other multidimensions. This definition is logically true. As research is focused on sculpture and what could be attitude toward it, this definition cannot be based on the authoritarian declarations.

Self – used here in the psychological context. Generally, ‘Self’ is a complex set consisting conscious, unconscious, personality aspects and attitudes of a human being.
Social space – term used by Lewin in the context of force field. A space generated by a person’s individuality, needs, feelings and behaviour. Holds both abstract and physical values.

System theory – interdisciplinary method of research on interdependent systems. Therefore, changes in one’s system element should cause changes, dynamical or static, to the other systems that are related to the changed element. In the context of this study, the abbreviation is used in its psychological context of organisational behaviour.

Typology – a division of qualities by means of systematic classification.

Transference – unconscious act of rechanneling the attitude of the person toward the object. The process is based on the preliminary relation to parents (primarily the mother in most object theories).

Transcendence – a value beyond human cognition with already set attributes.

Trivalent, or three-valued logic – after Łukasiewicz, a system of logic where a third value could be added beyond true or false: not determined yet. Therefore, setting the attribute for the third value is focused on the subject of intention, the value will be terminated in the future.
ABBREVIATIONS

ATAQ – Attitude Toward Artwork Questionnaire.

AK – Armia Krajowa. In English: Home Army.

DSM-IV – shortcut for Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders classification by the American Psychiatric Association.


IPN – Instytut Pamięci Narodowej. English: Institute of National Remembrance

IRA – Irish Republican Army

MKDiN – Ministerstwo Kultury I Dziedzictwa Narodowego. English: Ministry of Culture and National Heritage

NI – Northern Ireland


PZPR – Polska Zjednoczona Partia Robotnicza. English: Polish United Worker’s Party

S-R – Stimulus Reflex theorem.

UK – United Kingdom
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The aims of the research

This study focuses on the analysis of homogenous attitudes toward sculpture in the public space by means of a method specially designed for that purpose.

Krauss, Hansen and Lacy focused on the statement that the reception of artwork in the public space is based on a certain type of homogeneity. Krauss, in her model of sculpture in an expanded field, presented an idea of the transcendental relation of art objects and the physical space within. Hansen declared concepts of open form, where sculpture and architecture should communicate with the responder in the cognitive space. Lacy observed the growing importance of the individual voice of an artist in the public space. These observations had one common ground: the attitude toward artwork in the public space caused certain social processes. Those processes, as Miles described on the example of the Sculpture for Derry Walls by Antony Gormley, question the sufficiency of the aesthetical language of sculpture in the public space. Miwon Kwon in her writings on the subject of the sculpture in public space had stated in the case Titled Arc by Richard Serra that the attitudes toward the artwork may include individual and/or group reactions. As Serra stated for himself, personal issues may change the impact dynamic of the artwork in the longitude process of its perception. However, the argumentation of those researchers never left the field of descriptive speculation, as it is understood in the context of scientific approach to the subject. Therefore, in the process of grounding an epistemology for this research, it could be argued that concepts belong to Futura Continenta in the trivalent logic of

---

3 O. Hansen, Manifest, Warsaw, Przegląd Kulturalny, Vol 5, 1959, p. 5
7 M. Kwon, One Place After Another: Site Specificity and Locational Identity, MIT Press, 2004, pp. 30 -31
Lukasiewicz as the third value: they are neither true or false, because the process of their falsifiability is not yet established.\(^9\) Therefore, exploratory part of this thesis will be a trial for those concepts in a set of conducted experiments.

**Justification for adopting the chosen theory**

The aim of the study was to look for another view on the relation between sculpture and public space supported by empirically tested theories from the field of psychology and group dynamics.\(^10\) Kurt Lewin’s theory of the force field and the three stages of group dynamics has been proposed as accurate to relate the subject. Lewin’s work has influenced Kariel’s concepts of self-regulating democracy in the context of sociology.\(^11\) Kariel noticed that Lewin’s view on psychology was focused on democracy and reconciliation. For Lewin, democracy must be learned anew in every next generation and therefore democracy and development of social sciences are mutually dependent. Lewin proposed ‘cultural diversity’ already in 1943 and perceived democracy as ‘plural’ in its nature. Because public art commissions (not only on sculptures) in contemporary political processes all over Europe were focused on finding a balance between cultural identity and cultural diversity in the communities, Lewin’s achievement should be considered as the most accurate tool for the research. Contemporary public art commissioning programmes often require the use of evaluation models for better understanding of the local communities’ needs. Therefore, the framework for the sources in the theoretical part of the research was constructed in relation to the theory on group dynamics by Kurt Lewin.

**Methodology**

This study focuses on analysing the attitude toward contemporary public sculpture in Northern Ireland and Poland through adaptation of the force field theory of Kurt Lewin. Methodology includes qualitative research with use of the new method called Attitude toward Artwork. This method is based on experimental use of a questionnaire on the groups in relation with the object recognized by them as the public sculpture.

Lewin reasoned that human relationships could be measured by defensiveness toward changes. That paradigm could help to establish the strengths of the emerging relations and their directions. Moreover, he also maintained that the strength of those relations could build new structures in the form of subgroups. Finally, those subgroups could interfere with each other (intra relations), or dissolve (extra relations). Lewin conceptualized that the process of interfering in the relationships in the group could be categorized in three stages. Examining the state of those relations three times after erecting a sculpture could reveal the essence of the social processes evoked by a sculpture in public space.

---


Why experiment with a new method is necessary?

The philosophical discourse as commentary to the artwork would not lead to any valid outcome. The argument that the lack of methods to ensure validity should be evidence for the free voice in the public space is false under any condition. The limitation of methods is not a limitation to knowledge. An anecdotical explanation was given by Feynman with the example of the flower, although the author himself left the question open about the origin of aesthetics. However, since the late 90s, neuroaesthetics have even started to provide insight into that matter.

Therefore, the reliance on descriptive sources of linguistic structures toward another descriptive context related to artistic practice could not be considered as valid development of knowledge.

However, Prof. Fernando Vidal noted after his presentation at the Neuroimages Conference that:

‘Just because people taking part in the neuroscientific study could observe the changes of the magnetic field in the work of the brain during their meditations analyzed with neurofeedback instruments, did not mean that their meditation abilities become better.’

Therefore, a study would require a reduction of the factors to reconstruct the situation where a relation between the sculpture and the audience can occur. That would be understood as a natural experiment, with the use of a sculpture and a designated method for the purpose of that study.

The possible outcome could be treated as an unbeatable paradigm in case of aesthetics or ethics in case of sculpture, because it ponders these phenomena from a different level. But at least it would bring some outcome of scientific quality without being marked as ‘another language game’ study. Michael Billig noticed in his critics on the theory of Kurt Lewin that most of the research done on the field of group dynamics touches two main subjects: historiosophical approach, or experiments which are based on the existing theory. Therefore, the fundamental subject of the ‘scientific evidence’ is missing and being replaced by a ‘common sense’ without an exploratory insight into the researched subject. Michael Billig noticed in his critics on the theory of Kurt Lewin that most of the research done on the

---

12 Bertrand Russell claimed: *Science may set limits to knowledge, but should not set limits to imagination.*
14 The experimental research on brain activity in the context of Kantian understanding of ‘beauty’ has progressed in the past two decades. According to Ishizu and Zeki, aesthetic judgment is related to affective work of the brain. The regions of the brain responsible for cognitive or perceptual processes are inactive. T. Ishizu and S. Zeki, ‘The brain’s specialized systems for aesthetic and perceptual judgment’, in: (ed.) John Foxe and Paul Bolam, *European Journal of Neuroscience*, Vol. 37, Issue 9, Wiley, May 2013, pp. 1413–1420. A different approach to the matter was explored by Battaglia, Lisandby and Freedberg who compared brain reactions to photographs based on Michelangelo’s *Expulsion from Paradise* with such reactions to the original. According to the authors, the brain was more active when stimulated with the original artwork. F. Battaglia, S. H. Lisanby and D. Freedberg, Corticomotor excitability during observation and imagination of a work of art, in: (ed.) Henry Markram, *Frontiers in Neuroscience*, Lausanne, École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne, Vol. 5 August 2011, p. 1.
16 F. Vidal, ‘Celebral Subject’: *Neurocultures: Brain Imaging and Imagining the Mind Conference*, Bielsko-Biała, University of Bielsko-Biała, Poland, 2016.
field of group dynamics touches two main subjects: historiosophical approach, or experiments which are based on the existing theory. Therefore, the fundamental subject of the ‘scientific evidence’ is missing and being replaced by a ‘common sense’ without an exploratory insight into the researched subject. The research on the attitude toward the artwork will explore the missing area between contextualized philosophy and the experimental practice both on the field of art theory and group dynamics. The outcome will be profitable when used by artists during their work with local communities. It would increase impact in case of complex public art commissions where the matters of quality of the artwork in context of the community interest will be discussed by the involved parties. Therefore, a special set of requirements to adopt the theory of Lewin should be done. The group dynamic theory with its three stages: forming, storming and performing was developed by its author in the conflicted environment, where groups had antagonizing interests. Lewin found, that democratization of those groups is possible by lowering the level of attitudes. In his theory, implicated process of sublimation would occur changes. Another solution to make a change, would be to replace the origin of conflict with the other target. As Lewin stated, the ‘force’ of the group understood as -intra and -extra relations toward the area of conflict cannot be stopped. However, if the group during the forming stage will focus on the another subject than it may form another social structure. Therefore, the sites where the samples will be taken should be a reconstruction for similar conditions proposed by Lewin. The groups should have expose strong local identifications and visit the site with the sculpture often. Those conditions indicate complex issues in the context of sculptures chosen for the pilot studies and the sample. The aesthetical classifications based on modernism (Strzemiński, Hansen) or postmodernism (Krauss, Ranciere) cannot be applied. They are not theories in the scientific sense and could not hold the paradigm of falsifiability requested in such a type of research. This research is not about how the sculpture is to be classified: figurative, transfigurative, monumental, abstract on non-aesthetic. In this research, the researched object should be looked through the experiments by the sample taken. Otherwise, the part of the research on the impact of art in the public space would be deluded by formal language without an insight into the core of the main question. Therefore, the classifications must be made on the condition for implementation of sculptures by the conflicted communities who are in search for the reconciliation process. The sites with sculptures should be open access public spaces like parks or plazas. The artworks should be commissioned in the time when the research had started. Another issue around questions about recognition the sculpture: as the possible ‘member’ of the group or an external indicator for group dynamics requested to create at least two new sculptures for taking the sample. Otherwise, it would be impossible to track the process of the experiment as valid.

**Justification for the chosen locations**

Northern Ireland and Poland had been chosen for the locations to conduct most of the case studies, pilot studies and to take the sample. Both locations include two or more local communities with antagonizing attitudes toward each other. Although for Northern Ireland and Poland the origins of those relations are historically different, the processes toward implementation of public sculptures may be observed on the similar features. In both locations, the tensions seemed to be most significant between groups with economically lower conditions. Therefore, the sculptures classified for the research should be researched in sites where the antagonising attitudes were significant in the recent past and currently those areas are taken under structuralized reconciliation processes.
According to UNESCO, in 2015 the sculpture was in third place among financed public residency art programs in the global West.\textsuperscript{18}

The report states that contemporary public art and cultural programs were focused on finding a balance between cultural identity and cultural diversity among the communities.\textsuperscript{19} Therefore, in exploring participatory design of public sculptures, their aesthetics and functions have become a significant issue.

The process of reconciliation or re-imagination of the community with the sculpture as an impact factor provides insight into projects implemented in Northern Ireland in the past decade.\textsuperscript{20} In contrast, it could be observed that in Poland, the sculpture in public space was designated to reflect the political perspective.\textsuperscript{21} The policy changes, particularly in Northern Ireland after 1998 and in Poland after 1997, merged the democratic processes in terms of public art.\textsuperscript{22} Although the pluralization of public space emerged dynamically in those areas, we still face multivalued judgments on the relation between public sculpture and public space.

**Choice of locations and time scale**

As explained in the following justification, the study is focused on the area of Northern Ireland and Poland. The locations should be focused on areas who witnessed strong antagonistic attitudes among the inhabitants in the recent past. The locations chosen to conduct the study are:

**In Northern Ireland:**
- Derry/Londonderry with the focus on the city walls area
- Ballymena city park as the possible place for mixing the groups
- Belfast including Sandy Row area

**In Poland:**
- Nowa Huta with the focus on the area close to the local industrial zone
- Cracow with the focus on areas where sculptures were vandalized
- Bochnia city park with the focus on areas where sculptures were vandalized

In the part for the theoretical research it was considered to focus on the period of the last 15 to 20 years due to significant changes in the interest of that research.

\textsuperscript{19} Ibid. p. 13
\textsuperscript{20} In reference to Northern Ireland Arts Council Building Peace thru Arts Program.
\textsuperscript{21} M. Małkowska, ‘Mafia Bardzo Kulturalna’, Rzeczpospolita, 10-12 Jan, 2013 pp. 4-6
\textsuperscript{22} In reference to Good Friday Agreement and Polish Constitution Article 73.
Methods used to support the main research

The research was supported by theoretical insight into different views of art in public space and various supplementary methods:

- Case studies
- Visual documentation
- Questionnaire
- Qualitative research
- In-depth interviews
- Thematic strictness
Structure of the chapters and introduction to the main sources

Chapter: role of art in the public space

The research focuses on the conditions under the group dynamic process that could occur between the artwork and the responders in the public space. To find out, at an early point in the research, whether such a process can be observed, the concept of public space is classified. The focal point for the selected sources is the aspect of the attitude.

The sources in the subchapter ‘A public space in the philosophy and art in relation to Group Dynamics of Kurt Lewin’ are chosen under the condition of observed symmetric, hierarchical or sequential interdependences with reciprocity in the context of the public space. Next, inquiry moves toward ‘Symmetric or hierarchical interdependence with reciprocity: Juergen Habermas, Karl Popper and Leszek Kolakowski’s views on public space’. The group dynamics ‘Sequential interdependence with reciprocity’ in the context of art in public space is next viewed on writings by Oskar Hansen and Christopher Lasch. That inquiry is expanded by the insight into Le Bon’s views on the crowd.

Next, inquiry moves toward ‘Symmetric or hierarchical interdependence with reciprocity: Juergen Habermas, Karl Popper and Leszek Kolakowski’s views on public space’. The group dynamics ‘Sequential interdependence with reciprocity’ in the context of art in public space is next viewed on writings by Oskar Hansen and Christopher Lasch. That inquiry is expanded by the insight into Le Bon’s views on the crowd.

In the subchapter: ‘Classifications of conceptualism by Grzegorz Dziamański’ the aspect of art as homogeneous focuses on the non-aesthetic and self-sustainable art. Next, the enquiry moves toward into cognitive aspect of the attitudes in the public space in LeWitt’s philosophy of the art. The phenomenological origins of Richard Serra sculptures are explored. Ranciere’s question for art as the attitude towards commodity is examined. Next, the autonomy of art in the public space includes the concept of Strzemiński, who tried to find a rational explanation for artistic independence in the public space juxtaposed in next subchapters with thoughts of Lunaczarski, Lenin, Leinwald or Krauss on Constructivism.

In the chapter: ‘The insight into subject of the sculpture in the public space’, research focuses on the specific conditions the sculpture in the public space could achieve through the impact with the responder. The subject of sculpture is examined under the aspect of being an ‘object’ in the psychological understanding of that term.

In the subchapter: ‘Multidimensional evaluation of sculpture’, the subject of sculpture is examined under two conditions: the relation of the sculptural composition to its own structure and its relation to the external space.

In the subchapter: ‘Sculpture in public space as social engineered activity’, the research focuses on the subject of sculpture in the process of contextualization of the artwork by the factor of documentation.

In the subchapter: ‘Commissioning the sculpture for public space in Northern Ireland and Poland – examination of legislative sources’, the research moves toward the findings related to legislation and commissioning of public sculpture in Northern Ireland and Poland.
In the subchapter: ‘Case studies of chosen sculptures in different cultural contexts’, the cases are chosen in relation to dynamic changes between authoritarian and democratic groups in the theory of Kurt Lewin.

The sources from the earlier subchapters regarding the authoritarian – democratic relation between the public sculpture and its responders were used as guidelines in selection of the additional sources.

Most of the sources were related to the last three decades of history of Northern Ireland and Poland. However, most significant examples relating to the previously gathered theoretical sources were also taken into consideration as points of reference to the main area of the study. The cases examined in that part of the study are divided into sections: sculptures that caused aesthetic conflicts, sculptures that caused political conflicts, sculptures that were vandalised because of ideology, or sculptures that did not cause any conflicts but influenced social changes.

**Chapter: In search of a method**

The research in this chapter is directed at the sources approaching the subject of group dynamics and psychoanalysis by the artists. The role of the study was to examine whether, in the opinion of the artists, sculpture causes the social processes described by Kurt Lewin. The research in that part provides insight into the artists’ understanding of the psychology. Due to the main scope of the thesis, this subject was limited.

**Chapter: A new method – Attitude toward sculpture questionnaire**

The research in this part of the thesis focuses on the empirical approach to the question: *Would contemporary sculpture in the public space evoke a certain kind of a group dynamic processes?*

This question is investigated by means of a set of experiments with a questionnaire, based on Kurt Lewin’s evaluation of the force field.

The goal is to examine empirically tested psychological theories, terms or concepts that could be helpful in constructing the questionnaire that is used in the further experiments.

**Subchapter: Empirically tested theories of psychology used in line of reasoning**

Here the study includes the collection of sources gathered under three conditions: review of theories related to the subject of group dynamics, object relation theory and an insight into cognitive dissonance. Next, it addresses the construction of the questionnaire, data evaluation, and the proposed conduct of the study. Finally, the method is criticised, based on possible limitations in its use.

Moreover, this subchapter provides insights into attitude, transference, defence mechanisms, copying, distinction between copying and defence mechanisms, and a wider evaluation of the terms group and group dynamics.

There are several reasons for including these sources, i.e. future accessibility to the sources is necessary to saturate the data from the sample and to enhance the validity of the construction of the questionnaire with psychological theories, and to improve the sampling process.
Subchapter: Construction of the questionnaire and its use

This subchapter presents the line of reasoning in the construction of the questionnaire, the method of data saturation from the sample, and an example of the use of the questionnaire. The subchapter includes hypothetical problems and limitations in use of the method in its qualitative aspects.

Subchapter: Research procedures

A plan for conducting the research is presented. The framework includes the sculptures chosen for the pilot study to test the use of the questionnaire. Next, the plan for final experiments with the sample is presented. The subchapter includes the questionnaire used in the study.

Subchapter: Interviews – supplementary method

This subchapter explains how the in-depth interviews were conducted. The purpose of the in-depth interviews was to gain a better understanding of the situation of the tested sculptures.

Chapter: Pilot Study to test the questionnaire


The purpose of the pilot study was to test the quality of the method in use, its practicality and possible limitations in use. However, the gathered sources provided a certain level of insight into the attitude toward sculpture that was supportive in the description of the conclusions.

The pilot studies are presented according to the following structure: time and place of the sample taken, purpose of the pilot study, a short descriptive overview of the artwork used as stimulus, a short description of how the sample was taken, exchange of information with stakeholders, phenomena, tables, graph and saturation.

Chapter: Sample

In this part a journal of samples is presented. Two tested sculptures especially designed for that experiment by the researcher (as a practical part of the research) are used to answer the question whether the sculpture in the public space can evoke a group dynamic process. The locations for the sculptures were the PRL Museum in Nowa Huta and Peace Flame Park in Derry/Londonderry, Northern Ireland, UK.

The journal from the research on the experiments includes: time and place of the sample taken, purpose of the research, concept of the sculpture, realisation of the sculpture and its implementation on site, exchange of information with stakeholders, a short description on how the sample was taken, phenomena, graph, tables and saturation.
Chapter: Outcomes

The chapter includes graphs, phenomena and saturation from the research conducted in Derry/Londonderry and Nowa Huta. The notes from the interviews are included in the Appendix as supplementary information.

Chapter: Conclusions, doubts, and new research directions

This chapter includes final observations from the study, possible doubts and further research directions.
1. ROLE OF ART IN THE PUBLIC SPACE

All sources from this chapter should be treated as theoretical concepts where the authors present some views on the structure of human relations in the global west.

The chapter: ’Role of Art in The Public Space’ seeks to gain insight into the conditions under which group dynamic processes could occur. Postulated processes take place between the artwork and the responders in the public space. At this stage of enquiry, it is necessary to classify the concept of public space. To perform that task, a juxtaposition is made. The structure of the sources is based on the phenomenological aspect of mutual contemplation.23 The focal point for the collection of these sources is the aspect of the attitude. Attitude is understood as a tripolar condition: cognitive, emotional and behavioural. Therefore, it is necessary to present sources both related to the concept of public space and the chosen attribute of attitude: the cognitive attribute.24

1.1.a Public space in philosophy in relation to the group dynamics of Kurt Lewin

The sources in this part of the enquiry are chosen on the basis of their relation to the subject of interdependence.25 The term ‘interdependence’ in Lewin’s theory means a dynamic whole based on interdependence rather on similarity.26 Donelson R. Forsyth summarised that thought into a statement, i.e. that members of the group will depend on each other, therefore their activities will be based on mutual relations in a proposed set of four interdependencies: symmetric interdependence with reciprocity, hierarchical interdependence without reciprocity, hierarchical interdependence with (unequal) reciprocity and sequential interdependence with reciprocity.27

Therefore, the sources for this subchapter are chosen under the condition of observed symmetric, hierarchical or sequential interdependencies with reciprocity in the context of the public space.

---


24 Lack of cognition would automatically exclude a process of somatisation of the object of ‘artwork’ by the responder. That would simply mean: lack of cognition would be a lack of impact of the artwork on the responder.


27 Donelson Forsyth gave a descriptive explanation of those four models after Susan Fiske (S. Fiske. Social beings: Core motives in Social Psychology (2nd ed.). Hoboken, NI: Wiley, 2010): Symmetric interdependence with reciprocity would mean a group where influences are equal. In hierarchical interdependence without reciprocity, the leader has an influence on the other members of the group. In hierarchical interdependence with (unequal) reciprocity, members of the group have dynamic influence on the leader, and the leader has influence on the group members. In sequential interdependence with reciprocity the actions are ordered between members of the group without a direct relation with a leader, but actions come from one member toward another in a sequential order. D. R. Forsyth, Introduction to Group Dynamics, Richmond, University of Richmond, (6th edition), Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Cengage Learning, 2014, pp. 8-9. http://scholarship.richmond.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1004&context=bookshelf (accessed 16 January 2015).
Symmetric or hierarchical interdependence with or without reciprocity:

As a starting point, the historiosophic theory of structural changes in the public space by Juergen Habermas is used. Habermas referred in his work to the matter of group dynamics in the context of importance for self-organisation of the society. His observations were juxtaposed with criticism of historicism by Popper. For Popper, the dynamic process of development in the social group was possible under rejection of the Platonic idealism used as a tool for political delusion. The argumentation of Popper was criticised by Kołakowski, who argued for acceptance of diversities in groups as the natural consequence in the process of their structuralisation.

Sequential interdependence with reciprocity:

The concept of open form by Hansen is presented, who proposed to use the term of ‘cognitive space’ in the context of public space. Next, that determinist approach to the matter of cognition by Hansen is juxtaposed with the criticism of Christopher Lasch, who observed that not all members of the public space would be willingly active. The argumentation of Lasch, based on observations of Kernberg and Kohut on pathological aspects of narcissism, closes the subchapter.

The next part of research moves onto the role of art in the public space. The concept of art in that context is examined under juxtaposition with the subject of interdependence. In Kurt Lewin’s force field theory, the reciprocity of one responder influences the area of reciprocity of another responder. However, Lewin observed that this process was not fully conscious. Therefore, the sources in the subchapter are related to the subject of art understood as a factor in the hypothetical process of forming the force field in the reciprocity context. The findings in the subchapters are provided due to their relation to the subject, but not to the historical timeline.

1.1.b Symmetric or hierarchical interdependence with or without reciprocity: Juergen Habermas, Karl Popper and Leszek Kołakowski’s views on public space

For Habermas, the civil society is undergoing an evolutionary process. However, the issue of public space will only be raised under certain circumstances, namely when the state starts to depersonalize itself. When the process occurred for the first time in the 18th century, the legal sphere of the state was meant to be the only public space of that time. The ‘public opinion’ was seen in relation to the emergence of financial potentates and their ways of communicating in the cultural salons of Western Europe. Habermas wrote that the establishment of the Academy of Art in 1648 in Paris and later independent exhibitions from

---

1737 onwards turned out to be moments when criticising art was no longer a privilege for the king.

Therefore, free criticism of artwork in public become a test for civil rights. Exchange of private communication, called a ‘world of letters’ by Habermas, dynamically influenced social changes of the era. The letters represented the private sphere of communication and their role, especially in exchange of thoughts between women. In opposition to that sphere of public life, Habermas points out official journals. The early press represented the voice of financial potentates and was printed periodically. In time, the journals turned to be a modern form of media. The transformation was dependent on the restriction of information. Evolution of the public space moved outside the critical debate of the 18th century salons to the 19th century informative and self-dependent bourgeois family model.

The transfer of opinions into the public sphere by the media in the 19th century was a symptom of ‘refeudalisation’. Habermas concludes that what was not being communicated could not be controlled. However, what already exists in a verbalized form could transform and become a form of control. In the wider sense, those processes were in relation to media, organisations and public institutions. Those stakeholders may control the ‘public group’ but simultaneously not be controlled by the public in reverse.

In modern times, the media are a privately financed structure. That social power would not allow for the independent creation of new forms of communication. Habermas in this sense explains that the power of the media lies on the axis of profit and sold information. The media mechanism of opinion management is directly related to commerce and politics. For Habermas, this is a correlation between the identity of the western citizen and consumptionism.

The public institutions were in relation to the process of reorganization of the public space with the use of pedagogical methods. The transformation of power in public institutions might turn into a possible way to resist political sovereignty. In that sense, Habermas claims that a private person may gain more independence in organised structures. The ‘private autonomy’ is a causative factor there. However, in the modern world, publicity could not be equal to public opinion. Public opinion governs, but is incapable of managing its own structure. The author emphasises that public opinion is characterized by a formless reaction to changes and is incapable of seeing the full spectrum of its own identity.

In that context, Habermas compares Kant’s public agreement with Hegelian public opinion. Habermas argues after Hegel that people and their nature can be defined only

---

31 Ibid. p. 195.
33 For Habermas, times meant the 1960s when his book was first printed.
34 Ibid. pp 189-199.
36 Ibid. p. 203.
37 In that part of his work Habermas indirectly refers to the group process. Ibid. pp.241-242.
38 Ibid. p.101.
by themselves. Otherwise, for Kant, public agreement was possible by an individual approach to moral law. Therefore, people in their natural condition remained separate.

Habermas derives the matter of ‘political revolution’ to Marx, for whom that was the main social factor.\textsuperscript{39} For Marx in that context, the bourgeois could not be considered as a political fundament for changes in the public sphere. Marx saw the solution in an active opposition to bourgeois society. The private sphere could not be autonomic (as Kant saw it) and had to become ‘public’.

Habermas raises the importance of the development of a constitution as a guarantor for laws for citizens.\textsuperscript{40} Critical communication is the source of pro-public changes. Lack of communication would lead to manipulation of that process by political forces.\textsuperscript{41} Therefore, contemporary citizens should develop knowledge about the structural organisation of their own society and be active in the transformation. In such a situation, critical publicity is possible.\textsuperscript{42} For Habermas, the channel of communication toward attaining privacy lies on the axis of family, community and secular organisations.

In a loose way, Habermas mentions Sigmund Freud’s clinical concept of paternal authority and describes social actions in a similar way to group dynamics.\textsuperscript{43} The theory of structural changes in public space belongs to post structural theories and is antithetical to the empirical school of functionalism, interactionism or usable theories in the context of behaviourism of Pavlov.

In the context of public sculpture, Habermas gives us a better understanding of the social purposes for which sculptures were implemented in public spaces: to clarify the role of public organisations and question the role of artists.

It could be assumed that for Habermas, the subject of public space simultaneously evolved from the hierarchical interdependence, without reciprocity toward hierarchical interdependence with (unequal) reciprocity.

\textbf{Karl Popper – against the public space?}

In ‘Popper, Objectivity and the Growth of Knowledge’ John Sceski structuralises the thoughts of Popper on public space. The public space should become an area unruled by traditional tribalism. Public space in the context of \textit{open society} should be a platform for the \textit{intersubjective testing of social activities}.\textsuperscript{44} Dorian Wiszniewski observes that Popper suggested that the concept that he called \textit{open society} was already declared in the modern understanding of the public space. However, the public-private platform of the public space did not develop self-responsibility. The tension between the public and private sector observed by Wiszniewski became a basis for his statement that the city landscape operates

\begin{footnotes}
\item \textsuperscript{39} Ibid. p. 123.
\item \textsuperscript{40} Ibid. p. 203.
\item \textsuperscript{41} Ibid. p 249.
\item \textsuperscript{42} Ibid. p. 248.
\item \textsuperscript{43} Although Habermas’ position contains many references, particularly in the case of Sigmund Freud, the author did not include any footnotes or references to the texts of the psychologist. Ibid. p.47.
\end{footnotes}
on local and global level. Therefore, a relation between territorial claims on cultural commodities should be examined under the condition of cultural differences.\textsuperscript{45}

In ‘The open society and its enemies’ Karl Popper presented the concept that ‘public space’ did not occur as an institutional area, but rather as a multiple – social platform of relations among individuals. In the system as such, legislative institutions should be only in the form of a ‘door keeper’, which would be focused on the possibly easiest ways of communication among individuals. The state should only intervene in a situation of social tension. Subjects such as religion, including the exchange of information, would lie on the plural platform. The author criticised Plato, Hegel and Marx; for Popper those philosophers were responsible for the lack of democratic changes, and the support of totalitarian systems.\textsuperscript{46}

For Popper, dialectics in the hands of leaders did not solve the problem of cultural taboos or negative customs, but in fact strengthened them. The author explained the matter of \textit{closed society}:

\begin{quote}
‘Based upon the collective tribal tradition, the institutions leave no room for personal responsibility (…) in what falls, the magical or tribal or collectivist society will also be called a closed society, and the society in which individuals are confronted with personal decisions, an open society.’\textsuperscript{47}
\end{quote}

For Popper, ideological pluralism in the public space should be far from institutionalized, because the institutions, as they are, would not guarantee freedom. To keep their freedom, citizens should confront their decisions. In such a model for public space, some individuals who may play a more significant role due to their activities (e.g. artists) may take on that role for other individuals. Popper compared such an alternative to class struggle, and stated that in the Marxist model of collective society, class struggle would in fact not be possible. To explain that, Popper compared a closed society to an organism, where individuals were bound by common social relationships, and therefore are unable to justify their own situation. In such a society they should accept their faith, with no concern as to their situation: as slaves, uneducated groups, or bigoted oligarchy. Therefore, class struggle could not occur, due to the self-interest of the groups who in his opinion would choose stagnation over action.

For Popper, open society was related abstractly to the \textit{transportation} of tolerance, where that status in itself does not have a static nature. Democracy mutates, can be lost, revived and lost again. The public domain was not a physical space, but an abstract collection of the ideas that the citizen could refer to. It was what Socrates believed in, and what Popper treated as the best attitude in a structure of an \textit{open society}.

Popper did not equate the thoughts of Plato and tyranny. In his writings, Popper clearly stated that Plato was against tyranny and oligarchy. However, for Popper, Plato put his


\textsuperscript{46}The book was written during World War II as a response – in the opinion of the author – to negative changes in the societies of Europe. The first edition came out in paperback in 1945 and was edited by Gombrich. The author focused on logical structures in the writings of the thinkers mentioned above, abandoning, what he called, historicism – understood by Popper as an explanation of social changes in the time with the use of different models of dialectics. E. H. Gombrich, (with Paul Levinson), \textit{What I learned from K. Popper, In Pursuit of Truth} (ed.) Paul Levinson, Atlantic Highlands NJ, Humanities Press, and Brighton, Harvester Press, 1982, pp.203-220.

scope on the factor of *happiness* as the driving force in the domain of public space. Platonic happiness was a condition that could not be treated as a stable function in social change. Therefore, happiness would not preserve the state from fall. Plato concluded that even the uncontrolled growth of population would occur social atrophy.\(^4\)

Popper pointed out that an important factor in losing democracy could be related to a loss of cognition, and its replacement by a kind of knowledge that would have led to the acceptance of a tribal state without questioning its totalitarian nature. To stop that process, people should consciously accept the ‘unknown’ in the process of mutual cognition in public space. Society faces ongoing challenges to discover and accept its own future, with possible failures on its path:

> ‘We must go into the unknown, the uncertain and insecure, using what reason we may have to plan as well we can for both security and freedom.’\(^4\)

The author presented the opinion that the factor for a group could be the set of individuals, who may delude their responders with an illusion of own doctrines. The individual should be made to believe that his state cannot be changed and his current position in life came from some sort of 'natural' change. Popper in that context criticised Marx's dialectics. For Marx history was equal to economy, therefore class struggle was a natural process.\(^5\)

However, for Popper, in a multi-dimensional social organism such an explanation could lead to propagandist ideology, which explained any movement of the new-born oligarchy toward the individual.\(^5\) At the end of chapter ten in volume one Popper suggested the answer to be the self-awareness of the individual. Later he developed that thought more openly in volume two of his book, namely that self-awareness could be achieved by a code known from the times of Heraclitean ethics and the fundamentals of Christianity: 'do not harm'. Such constructive evolution should be processed through education, therefore we should speak of an process extending over at least two generations.\(^5\)

In the name of education, Popper found the Aristotelean model as the most conducive for his concept. The individual should process his development by the virtue of his own harmonised distant view of any occupation, including science or art.

When Milton Friedman in his interview with Phil Donahue in 1979 pointed out a factor of, what he called, 'greed' as the economical consensus for open society and its relation to the free market, it was considered that the concept of Karl Popper will be a natural consequence after the clash of capitalism with Marxism-Leninism. Friedman’s concept of moral relativism

\(^{48}\) Citation: It was an effort [of Plato] to close the door which has been opened, and arrest the society by casting upon it the spell of an alluring philosophy, unequalled in-depth and richness. Ibid, p. 212.

\(^{49}\) Ibid, p. 214.

\(^{50}\) Ibid, p 5.

\(^{51}\) Popper developed that thought in his later text about science: “I found that those of my friends, who were admirers of Marx, Freud, and Adler, were impressed by a number of points common to these theories, and especially by their apparent explanatory power. These theories appeared to be able to explain practically everything that happened within the fields to which they referred. The study of any of them seemed to have the effect of an intellectual conversion or revelation, opening your eyes to a new truth hidden from those not yet initiated. Once your eyes were thus opened you saw confirming instances everywhere: the world was full of verifications of the theory. Whatever happened always confirmed it. Thus its truth appeared manifest; and unbelievers were clearly people who did not want to see the manifest truth; who refused to see it, either because it was against their class interest, or because of their repressions which were still ‘un-analysed’ and crying aloud for treatment.” K. Popper, *Science: Conjectures and refutations*, London and New York, Routledge, 1963, p. 4.

and the relation to the free market should in theory trigger a self-regulating mechanism of economic growth and equal chances for profit. The political changes after 1990 seemed to confirm that economic theory. But in 2008 Alan Greenspan (a long-time follower of the Friedman – Popper concept) in his speech on Capitol Hill told the House:

‘I made a mistake in presuming that the self-interests of organisations, specifically banks and others, were such that they were best capable of protecting their own shareholders and their equity in the firms,’\textsuperscript{53}

It could be assumed that for Popper the symmetric interdependence with reciprocity would present the best model of social relations.

**Leszek Kołakowski – barbarians in the public space?**

Leszek Kołakowski was mostly known for his findings in the field of the history of ideas, but in his later writings he also presented arguments for the matter of the public space in the context of freedom and individuality toward the mechanisms of the state. In his essay ‘The self-poisoning of the Open Society’\textsuperscript{54} Kołakowski referred to how Popper’s concept had been used by liberals.

The philosopher claimed, that liberals seemed always to be in a state of ‘central inmate optimism’ which characterized liberal philosophy en toto. The fundamental objection presented by Kołakowski was that optimism was rather an unfalsifiable belief, or only an opinion not tested in any empirical experiments.\textsuperscript{55}

After Bergson, whose social theory was developed later by Popper, a group should coexist in the values of tolerance, rationality and a lack of commitment to traditional authorities. However, Kołakowski stated his lack of optimism in that regard. There were several obstacles to gaining those values.

The society where everything would be plural could not be defended against external enemies. Kołakowski specified that for those enemies, the values of the Kantian imperative\textsuperscript{56} would be incomprehensible. If Popper’s model of society would be attacked, such a community could not possibly resist. It would not only be a matter of invasive interaction, but rather a further circumstance of regaining that sovereignty of an open society. Therefore, public sculpture in a way could be a testimony for an open society, and its potential vandalisation could be a message about that society’s condition. Kołakowski wrote about a ‘mutual limitation’ through the implementation of the values that could exist in an open social space, and that mental procedures were not always rational.

Kołakowski claimed that any efforts to input the values of tolerance, or any other Kantian imperative type of values to people who act without them in public space would in time start the destruction of an open society.\textsuperscript{57}


\textsuperscript{55}Ibid, p.163.

\textsuperscript{56}Ibid, p. 48.

\textsuperscript{57}That is a purely logical argument. If the collection (group) with the classification as a ‘pluralist’ gains another element of non-pluralist classification, it cannot be coherently classified as pluralist any more. We could refer here to Spinoza’s model of ‘facts’ based on Euclidean Propositions to support Kołakowski’s view on that matter. A. Matheron,
Open society would reject empirically founded findings about its own form. Therefore, it would become its own negation. What Popper called ‘irrational’ and therefore destructive tribal traditions, Kolakowski found to be natural elements of life required in the process of self-experience. For Kolakowski the problem rather lay in the danger of wishful thinking about one’s own possibilities, joined by a lack of experience. Such approach to the matter could produce an easy to control individual.  

In his essay ‘Looking for Barbarians’, Kolakowski critically reviews the assumption that the idea of cultural equality would mean the same as being equal. Tolerance expressed about different aesthetic criteria in the public space would not be the same as experience of different cultures in that space.

Kolakowski did not reject the concept of the open society. However, he was less optimistic about it. Free society should be based on at least two principles: free access to sources of information and equal participation in power. However, such a position of individuals to each other cannot be achieved by equality understood as economically equal at the ‘start in life’. Such a condition would lead to a totalitarian state. In that context Kolakowski referred to communism. The argument of Popper about the Aristotelean model of education would be a part of losing individuality. The universal education system is in fact, unequal, because it does not respond to the needs of the individual. Besides, there is always the factitious role of the welfare state:

‘There is no need to emphasise the fact that the welfare state does nothing to distribute economic power fairly or to “democratize” it; rather the contrary is true’.

Kolakowski juxtaposed the welfare state, which was not interested in legislative constructs to share the possible profits, with the concepts of the controlled economy. In the situation of total ownership – no matter in which political system – we cannot speak about the market. And abolition of the market would create a gulag society. Therefore, there would not be a good solution for any of the parties interacting in public space. Either one becoming stronger than the other would lead to the dismissal of democracy.

The subject of ‘tribal traditions’, where Kolakowski’s views opposed those of Popper, may play a leading role in the further enquiries about how sculpture was contextualized with the term of public space. Although Kolakowski regarded the concept of open space as interesting, he was rather skeptical about its practicality. It could be assumed that Kolakowski considered dynamical exchanges between groups built on hierarchical interdependence without reciprocity and hierarchical interdependence with (unequal) reciprocity as continuous processes.

---

58 (...) completely open societies do not allow themselves to be depicted as ideal, in either the normative nor methodological sense’ L. Kolakowski, Modernity on Endless Trial, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press, 1997, p. 164.
59 (...) when we apply, all cultures are equal, we see that there is a difference between artistic expression on the one hand and moral, legal, and intellectual rules on the other. In the sphere of art, tolerance comes easily, either because we are indifferent or because we see nothing logically wrong in the confrontation of different aesthetic criteria. Indeed, universalism tempts us, and we like to imagine ourselves capable of entering into the aesthetic perceptions of all cultures (...) Ibid. p. 20
60 Ibid. p. 170.
61 Ibid. p. 166.
62 Ibid. p. 167.
1.1.c Sequential interdependence with reciprocity: Oskar Hansen, Christopher Lasch

The architect Oskar Hansen presented the concept of the open form during the last International Congress of Modern Architecture (CIAM) in Otterlo in 1959. That idea had been slowly evolving since 1949, when Hansen, as a member of group Team 10, criticised Le Corbusier, his followers and the whole concept of the Athens Charter during the CIAM Congress in Bergamo. The concept of the open form evolved after Oskar Hansen’s contact with Henry Moore and Jerzy Sołtan. Hansen emphasised the influence of Strzemiński and Kobro on his way of thinking on merging architecture and art (sculpture, painting) into one symbiotic realm of aesthetics. Hansen was an architect with a good relation to sculptors or painters. He wrote about the concept of open form:

‘Open Forms are variable compositions – these are processes of life exposed by backgrounds […] The art in the convention of Open Form is based on forming cognitive space, understood as BACKGROUND that exposes changing incidents in the lives of nature and humans. It is about harmonious integration of forms of biological life on Earth with the space of human activity. The art in the convention of Open Form respects individualism of the recipient and creates a proper dimensional climate for reflections; in the same way, it is in opposition to the art of dominative object in space – the cult of dogmatic dictate.

In the manifesto by Hansen printed in 1959, the architect bounded the role of the sculpture with architecture as a synergy in the ‘cognitive space’. Hansen did not use the terms ‘private space’ or public space, but ‘cognitive space’. Therefore, in the concept of Hansen, the living space for a human being was also the space of mental development. It could mean that the process of living is equal to the process of ongoing education, including the physical presence of aesthetics. From the first statement in his manifesto, Hansen pronounced sculpture as equal to architecture, giving it a dynamic function for cognition which should lead to the sublimation of the responder:

Is the difference compared to space between contemporary sculpture and works of Michelangelo based on the epidermal changes only? And, in that context, in our contemporary thinking about treatment of the space is about the poetics of that space?

The term ‘epidermal’ used by Hansen in the chapter quoted above reflects the form of sculpture as an object recognised by the consciousness only. Something that could be immediately recognisable. That act of formal recognition by the responder would happen just by non-coherence of the sculpture with the surrounding space. Therefore, there would

---

67 Ibid.
be no further aesthetical – cognitive integration, seen by Hansen as a quality of the artwork. Hansen developed that thought in the next part of his manifesto:

"Monuments" are the expression of the principle of closed form, in which that formal factor and often its essence is determined once and for all. They are passive to the changes happening over time. At the time they are deployed, they become antiques. As far as the convention of the closed form, which is shaping the system detached from its own environment, we can still accept it as legitimate, its use for controlling the more complex phenomena in the material sense (like the changes over time) seems to be a misunderstanding. The resulting collision with the "excess" of that space will cause the imbalance of the composition of the whole entity. That misunderstanding simultaneously causes a lack for the communicative space. By shaping space that way, we get only a part what we could get and we miss the target.  

Hansen pointed out that the role of the creator of living space was to respond to a need to communicate in that space. Although his text, printed after the CIAM congress, focused on the negative formalism of the monument and 'closed form' versus 'open form', Hansen just briefly exposed his idea how the coherent language of architecture with sculpture should be deployed. The key term, which seems to be fundamental in the idea of Hansen, was the concept of the offset. Therefore, the visual language of architectural form in open space could be a relation of dimensional passages, where sculptural detail, transportation and architectonic cubicle respond to each other.

In the projects of Hansen we can find traces of the concept of the open form, realised simultaneously with his idea of the 'linear continuous system'. For Hansen, transport routes were a core aspect related to the process of cognition of the space. In that sense Hansen was close to Le Corbusier, for whom the transport route was also a way for the 'cognition' of the reality. That could in fact be the only point where Le Corbusier and Hansen could meet, because Hansen wanted to create a situation where architecture and sculpture may create a cognitive process. However, Hansen opposed Le Corbusier’s approach to the aspect of ordered reality.

The thought of Hansen on Linear Continuous System could be transferred on the field of Group Dynamics. It could be asked, did the aesthetical transformation of space with sculpture and architecture in LCS could start the sequential interdependence with reciprocity.

---

68 Ibid.
69 Hansen’s Linear Continuous System is based on the principle of three parallel urban zones. First, basic zone is a habitual and services urban area. That zone played a central element in the whole system. Parallel to that zone is agricultural, including forestry and light industrial area. Final, and parallel to the other zones is the area with the heavy industry. O. Hansen, _Ku Teorii Formy Otwartej._ Warsaw, 2005, p. 27.

70 “One of the highest delights of the human mind is to perceive the order of nature and to measure its own participation in the scheme of things; the work of art seems to us to be a labour of putting into order a masterpiece of human order” Le Corbusier called the cohesion for his aesthetical language a System of Sensations. C. E. Jeanneret aka ‘Le Corbusier’ and A. Ozenfant, Purism, reprint from L’Esprit Nuoveau, 1921, (ed.) R. L. Herbert, _Modern Artists on Art_, Ten Unabridged Essays, Spectrum Books, 1964, p.62.
Christopher Lasch – narcissism in relation to the public space

As opposed to Hansen, Christopher Lasch postulated that not all members of the public space would be interested in the cognition of it. Lasch arrived at that belief through his views on the subject of pathological narcissism, previously analysed by Otto F. Kernberg and Heinz Kohut.\(^{71}\) Two main factors in the rise of narcissism in the public space were the banalization of artists’ ‘confessions’, and the simultaneous influence of the mass-media not being interested in confronting the receivers with the everyday banalities of life.\(^{72}\) The narcissistic personality of our time – as it was called by Lasch – suffered. However, artistic values could not help to develop any mechanism to change that state, due to the notion of Kernberg that a narcissistic personality would not accept any values.\(^{73}\) Similar observations, although with another line of reasoning and not based on any experiments, could be related to the thoughts of Walter Benjamin on the problem of cognition of an artwork.\(^{74}\) The lack of accepting values was explained by Lasch as the state where the person was not interested in cognition of the internal or the external world:

*The Narcissist has no interest in the future, because, in part, he has so little interest in the past.*\(^{75}\)

Lasch presented the thought that the evolution of theatre could be a mirror for the reception of art in the group. The ‘classical’ theatre was focused on dealing with neuroses, whereas plays by Ionesco or Beckett focused on a borderline personality due to their presentation of a ‘fear of close relationships’.\(^{76}\) The reception of artists, who abandon self-consciousness in favour of self-attraction, would produce an art made by narcissists for the narcissistic society. Furthermore, it was the context around art, i.e. that judgment should be equal to pluralism of public space, which let narcissists change the society. What could that mean?

For Lasch, after Kohut, narcissism somehow, like the lack of sleep, gave no possibility for the full process of cognition – memorization and further self-development. In comparison to basic needs, the narcissist would prefer fantasy over sex or food, being in fact permanently insatiated and starving. Lasch described that as an obsession of contemporary times,

---

\(^{71}\) Otto F. Kernberg and Heinz Kohut are considered as two main thinkers on the subject of narcissism developed from the thoughts of Sigmund Freud. Freud defined ‘narcissist disorder’ as a type of psychosis, while DSM-III classification placed narcissism as a type of clinical phenomenon of disturbances in the experience of self. Gillian A. Russell described different viewpoints on narcissism by Kernberg and Kohut as: “Kernberg (1970, p. 63) looks for the denial of the analyst as an independent person, whilst Kohut (1972, p. 371) diagnoses patients as narcissistic only when their transference relationship is ‘idealizing’ (i.e. the analyst serves as an idealized self-object) or ‘self-aggrandizing’ (i.e. the analyst serves as a mirror for the narcissistic personality disorder of the patient’s grandiose self).” G. A. Russell, Narcissism and the narcissistic personality disorder: A comparison of the theories of Kernberg and Kohut. *British Journal of Medical Psychology*, vol. 58, Issue 2, The British Psychological Society Printed in Great Britain, 1985, pp.138-139.


\(^{73}\) Ibid. p.41.

\(^{74}\) Benjamin pointed out the problem of ‘aesthetical distraction’ in relation to the reproduction of images with banalization of the message. Source: Benjamin W., The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction (1936) UCLA School of Theatre, Film and Television; transcript 2005, p.18.


\(^{76}\) Ibid. p. 88.
where a person is locked in his own self-conscious perception-cognition processes and tortures himself.\footnote{Ibid. pp. 91-99.}

In the relation of group behaviour with art, Lasch explained that the basic definition of the group required the same features for the whole group. If those features would be narcissistic, then art would not help to change that group. Lasch compared the individual artist to sports events that declassify artistic performance as an ‘explosion of violence’.\footnote{Ibid. pp 106-107.}

However, Lasch separated primary narcissism from its further, secondary form. Thereby he related to Klein’s text from 1934 ‘Love, Guilt and Reparation’ where she gave a psychological explanation of the attitude of the child to its mother. The healthy transference process which should occur and develop in every relation in the further life of the child was an ongoing wish to make amends. Those amends would be in relation to love, appreciation, admiration or devotion. Therefore, those dependences and defences against separation would lie in opposition to subjugation and conquest in the further life of a person. However, Lasch concluded after Klein that primary narcissism could be related to the preservation of a primary relation with the mother in a positive development of the person’s identity.\footnote{Ibid. p. 243.}

The subjugation of nature by technology was a form of regressive narcissism. Lasch concluded that subjugating nature was an illusion of primal omnipotence, where the person refuses to accept own limits of collective self-sufficiency.\footnote{Ibid. p. 244.} New forms of spirituality like the ‘New Age’ were not per se ‘spiritual’ but just another form of subjugation. The New Age took spirituality as a formal issue, turning it into a form of an escape from true relationships. Relationships were for Lasch, after Freud, probably the only way to experience a self-development process that could develop an adult personality.\footnote{Ibid. p. 248.} Therefore, in the natural consequence of growing narcissism, the New Age for Lasch became a substitute for the process of one’s own emotions with art.

Lasch’s conclusion could be taken as opposing the idea of Hansen, where the relation of the person toward the public space could be shaped in a sequential interdependence with reciprocity. However, the observations of Lasch on narcissism as a factor in group relations could question the controlled development of hierarchized structures in the public space.

1.1.d Gustave Le Bon and his views on the crowd

Gustave Le Bon’s most significant work: The Crowd: A Study of the Popular Mind, could put under the question the concept of the public space. Observations of Le Bon were considered as fundament on further development on knowledge on the groups’ behaviour. However, Le Bon himself did not divide the crowd into the subgroups and their intra or extra relations. He was also limited in his research to the historiosphic approach.

Le Bon focused on the characteristic of the crowd by describing transformations which occurred in France. The subject of the French Revolution was often given as the example for non-rational behaviour. Le Bon classified the crowd as set of de-personalized individuals
with lowered level of intelligence simultaneously characterized with replicatory patterns in behaviour. The crowd ‘thinks’ using pictures, where those pictures do not have to be related to each other in a rational pattern. The ideas can exist for the crowd separately from their function. The cognition for the crowd happens in the process of analogy, or consequential reasoning. The crowd is vulnerable to wonders, miracles. Therefore; the religion, tradition, beliefs and the leaders promising visionary concepts will be strongly influential on the crowd. In opposition to Habermas, Le Bon claimed, that institutions have limited impact on the crowd. The new government would rather change the aesthetical picture of its own outlook, than change the internal structure. Le Bon gave an example after Dostoyevsky, the story on young Russian nihilist, who removed icons from the orthodox church and replaced them with works of Buechner and Moleschott. For Le Bon, the content and form were not changed, although the object of worship was changed. In the bigger picture, it was the words and delusions who were most influential on structuralizing of institutions by the nations who created them. Therefore, for Le Bon after Macaulay, consequential and longitude operations were the most influential on the crowd’s structure. The crowd properly steered by its leaders could follow their will without questioning. Le Bon gave examples of terms especially influential on the crowd, like: democracy, freedom, socialism or equality. Although the meaning of those terms evolved in time, the crowd will accept them as a part of their own identity. Therefore, if the terminology on the disliked by the crowd subject will be wisely changed, then the crowd could still accept it under the other name. Sculpture and architecture, as well other forms of culture, emerged from the need for being deluded. For Le Bon, in opposition to Hansen, the crowd do not want to be cognitive. The crowd will stand against individuality, which try to disappoint the crowd’s delusions. Therefore, the only practical way to re-construct the crowd is to create the situation for self-experience for the crowd. That can be achieved by repetitive and longitude activity of that specified experience. On the contrary, reasonable, rational and open actions toward the crowd may cause eruption of the aggression against the rationalizing individuum. Le Bon considered, that every group, no matter human or animal have natural tendency to search for the leader. The leader should bring faith and respond on the submissive needs of the crowd. The priorities for the leader in the process of steering the crowd are: statutory approach to shared information, repetition of that information and what Gustave Le Bon called ‘contagion’: raising an irrational believes and feelings. A special role on relation between submissive crowd and active leader plays the prestige. Le Bon classified prestige as an act of fascination on someone’s repetitive success. Therefore, one of the paths to increase influence on the crowd by the media was limitation of personal critics in the articles and exchange them with generalizations. Moreover, for Le Bon the media existed not to inform, but to gather the information about the population. Le Bon brought the fundamental classification of the crowd: heterogeneous and homogeneous.

83 Ibid. p. 90.
84 Ibid. p. 102.
85 Ibid. p.111.
86 Ibid. p.114.
87 Ibid. pp. 116-117.
88 Ibid. pp. 117-118.
89 Ibid. p.125.
90 Ibid. p.131.
91 Ibid. p.149.
Heterogeneous crowd could be nameless (the crowd on the street) or not anonymous (the parliament), where homogenous crowds could be sects (religious, political), casts (military, priests) or classes (bourgeois, peasantry). The processes and relations in the crowds are circular and temporal. The process of heterogeneous and homogeneous relations in the groups will structuralize until some idea will bound that’s group identity. When in the process of independent factors that idea will fall, then the social structure will dispel, too. In that moment, the society will become again a barbaric and de-individualized crowd.

In a preface to Le Bon’s work from the Polish edition printed in 1986, Stanisław Mika presented wide critics of his book. According to Mika, Freud noticed that some of the descriptions of the crowd behaviour by Le Bon remind him the behaviour of his own patients. For Mika after Michael Billig, there were confirmative sources, that Mussolini had a correspondence with Le Bon, who was openly negative towards the socialist movement. According to Eley Geoff, Hitler was eager reader of Le Bon’s book. For Marieke Ohlberg also Lenin was influenced by Le Bon’s writings. For Mika; further critics of Le Bon work by Turner and Killian provided, that the crowd do not have such monolithic structure as Le Bon claimed. Crowd is made from the individualities with different motivations. Therefore, a knowledge on those motivations may successfully decrease drive towards aggression, not only rise it as Le Bon conceptualized.

1.2. Art as homogeneous aspect of public space

In this subchapter, the aspect of art as homogeneous concept focuses on the non-aesthetic and self-sustainable aspect of conceptual art, providing the classifications by Grzegorz Dziamański, Rosalind E. Krauss and Donald Kuspit. The art of Sol DeWitt is examined in-depth in that context. The space-transformative aspect of Richard Serra’s works is presented. The intention is to focus on that form of art where the communication of art is limited to maximising the impact on the audience, with simultaneous minimalisation of the formal structure for that communication. As the term of group dynamics are related to interactions between living human beings, it is significant to look for sources where artists postulated direct interdependence with reciprocity without giving the artwork the factor of commodity. The aspect of equalisation in directly experiencing art could be seen by conceptualists as the natural consequence of artists’ activities in the public space.

---

1.2.a Classifications of Conceptualism by Grzegorz Dziamański

The art theorist Grzegorz Dziamański divided conceptualism into five different subgroups after Alberro, in his writing about Kossuth, Flynt, Sol LeWitt and other representatives of the broad subject of that movement in art:

To the he first collection Dziamański put the conceptual art of Henry Flynt focused more on structure, equalising non-verbal grammatology, e.g. musical notes, and verbal meaning. Although Flynt gave no direct examples of his thoughts on conceptual art, Dziamański presumed his actions to be closer to minimalism and to Fluxus, a movement to which Flynt belonged.

In the next collection Dziamański put the conceptualism of Sol LeWitt defining it as the hermeneutical concept of art. Artists should present the process of creation as a holistic idea. There was no private sphere for preparation or for the creative process. The whole act, from creation to recognition by the viewer, was a whole. Therefore, in the conceptualism of LeWitt there was no place for a ‘mistake’, but a scope on the record for creation. Logically, that attitude let art be a transmitter, capable of influencing other artwork, a perception, or a cultural convention. Physical form was not only one possible variation of artworks. In that sense, LeWitt opposed the Platonic concept of ideas and, closer to Aristo, saw art as an empirical act of the human presence. The generation of the thought named ‘art’ in the mind of its creator will flow into the physical word, including all closer or more remote actions related to that single piece of art. LeWitt presented a rare example of someone’s ability for meta reflection in a work of art, when he pointed out that the same process, were it to become a virtue, would produce ‘slick art’ – a kind of formalist mannerism.

For Dziamański, Joseph Kossuth could present the analytic conceptualism. The action of the group of responders was more important here as a grassroots movement, rather than seeking a purely rationalist concept for ‘human perfectionism’ – presented for example by modernists like Greenberg. Kossuth used the Kantian concept of analysis – synthesis used in the grammatical structures, and presented the view that artworks belong to the collection of analytical acts of human culture. Kossuth’s equalisation between art and language came from his research on an ontological basis that art is a form of language. Artwork can be understood and read by the viewer in the same process as he reads a sentence. Therefore, Kossuth focused on research for spreading the etiology of art by multiplying its descriptive functions or definitions. According to Dziamański, another member of Art&Language, Terry Atkinson, claimed in the first number of their magazine, in a certain opposition to Kossuth, that artwork has at least one of four possible features: a morphological feature culturally associated with its nature, a new morphological feature, the feature of belonging to art in its own context, or the feature to exist purely as a theoretical structure. A model of Atkinson separated analytical conceptualism from an act of inspiration, whereas both Kossuth and LeWitt assumed that there was no place for such an action.

---

101 Ibid. p. 189.
102 Although they both referred to Kant as the fundamental theory. For more about criticism of Greenberg’s approach to Kant, please look at observations of Costello on De Duve’s criticism of Greenberg. D. Costello, Greenberg’s Kant and the fate of aesthetics in contemporary art theory, in: (eds.) R. Stecker and T. Gracyk, Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism, 65 (2), 2007, pp. 224–225.
Although all conceptualists maintained a critical discourse with society, Dziamański classified some of the artists under the definition of critical conceptualism. Artists like Daniel Buren, Olivier Mosset, Michel Parmentier, or Niele Toroni were those who were devoted to meaninglessness as a form of message toward the responder. That form of conceptualism in fact requires a solid existence of an already highly developed social structure. The more the communicative grid was developed in the local group of responders, the stronger the impact of a formal concept by the critical conceptualist was possible, through the creation of art in a non-structuralised form.

1.2.b Sol LeWitt – the enquiry into the cognitive aspect of the attitude in the public space

Aesthetics, although not mentioned directly as one of features of art (Terry Atkinson preferred to oscillate around the linguistic aspects of ‘morphology’), could be understood as the ‘act of presence’, but not as an ‘external’ form for transcendent thought. Therefore, for Sol LeWitt the descriptive act of documentation of his thoughts before the final act of producing the artwork was equal in the context of ‘reason in chaos’ to the act of art itself.\(^\text{103}\)

In that context Rosalind Krauss pointed out that the reality of the abstractive language of art (understood here as non-verbalized, although still a grammatically correct form of language) moved the weight of the perceived reality by the participant in his process of experiencing the artwork from the visual, illustrative objectiveness into the mechanical constitution for the process of thinking. Krauss used the word ‘text’ to focus on that issue.\(^\text{104}\)

In ‘LeWitt in Progress’ Krauss focused on the ‘cognitive’ approach to the matter of art by the participant. This means that art has been seen not as a vehicle of the idea but as a technique to which, as quoted by Krauss, Victor Shklovsky called the ‘algebrization’. The sculptural objects of Sol DeWitt were supposed to be in that context, the emanations of the linguistic concepts – as Lacan after Levi-Strauss or Jacobson would call them, and the algebrization referred to the structuralised process in verbalization. The substance of words and the process of their appearance for LeWitt was an act of deduction by rules.\(^\text{105}\) The process of cognition of a dimensional object as ‘rational’ – because its form shall be limited to the basic act of presence in reality, was obviously a process for the artist.

In a similar view on the attitude toward the object of art, Krauss supported her conclusions on LeWitt with the text ‘The Look of Thought’ by the critic Donald Kuspit.\(^\text{106}\) Krauss concluded that the critic saw art as an activity of what he called transcendental ‘ego’. Therefore, the presence of a dimensional art object in (public) space could be the deification of the human mind by another human. Kuspit saw cognition-participation on the level of the conscious state of mind as a possible link to the other person through the ‘sublimated’ object of art. The existing form of art would be achieved as complete, when the visualized object

---


\(^{105}\) Ibid. pp. 46-60

presented the model of the mind of its creator, and therefore will be ‘read’ by the other viewer as a receptor in the moment of cognition.\textsuperscript{107}

The aspect of art as structuralised in its own grammatic communication could be analysed beyond the area of art criticism. Lyotard in ‘The Postmodern Condition’ pointed out that language-games\textsuperscript{108} should be carefully analysed. The subject of the quality of language as ‘abstract’ with limitation to the matter of spoken words is in the focus of the theorem of Jerrold J. Katz. The theorist pointed out the problem of seeing the structure of cognition beyond the sphere of grammar by Platonists.\textsuperscript{109}

The equation between mind and verbalized information came from Beckett, whose approach was an inspiration for LeWitt:

\begin{quote}
For if I see myself putting to sea, and the long hours without landfall, I do not see the return, the tossing on the breakers, and I do not hear the frail keel grating on the shore. I took advantage of being at the seaside to lie in a store of sucking-stones. They were pebbles but I call them stones. Yes, on this occasion I laid in a considerable store. I distributed them equally among my four pockets, and sucked them turn and turnabout.\textsuperscript{110}
\end{quote}

The evolution of the problem of how to communicate verbalized information by its physical de-construction and further cognition to influence a group of responders became the main scope in the area of the artistic experimentation of LeWitt.

Donald Kuspit called art seen as a technique the process of \textit{algebrization}. That state of art could be achieved by the conscious action of the artist on the ‘sublimated’ element of the physical world as the message for the group. Therefore, such an act could simultaneously test the artwork. That process, defined by Kuspit as the \textit{activity of transcendental ego}, should be achieved by the deduction of the rules, which in the opinion of Kuspit was achieved by Sol LeWitt in his consequent procedures of making conceptual art. Therefore, the \textit{algebrization} of the reality by an art object must emerge from the artist’s discipline in a rationalised action, into to the public sphere and the group relations.\textsuperscript{111}

Kuspit equated between different \textit{models of mind}, or, as he called it: the deification of the human mind. Therefore, Kuspit presented rationalisation as the logical and conscious state of mind responsible for the creative process. If the ‘mind’ has a reasonable structure, we

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{107} R. E. Krauss, \textit{The Originality of the Avant-garde and Other Modernist Myths}, Massachusetts, MIT Press, 1986, pp. 245-246.
\item\textsuperscript{111} It is fundamental to understand that the rational process of action had slightly different meanings for Kuspit or LeWitt than the term used in psychoanalysis or group dynamics. Therefore, that subject needs a short explanation, to avoid misunderstandings in the thesis.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
could talk about a set of multiplicated patterns, which should exist in a monistic structure as an act of *respondus* to each other.

Sol LeWitt saw abstraction in the independent realm, which still could influence the outer, real world (the public space) by the act of igniting the reflections of the other. LeWitt equated abstraction and reflection; he went further claiming that abstraction is free from the obligation to picture the world.\(^{112}\)

LeWitt also noticed the importance of stimuli. In his text from 1967 he pointed out that conceptual art does not have to be exactly logical, but what makes the process understandable is the logical consequence of doing it.

One should consider the following empirical generalizations LeWitt made about the new art of 1967:

- *This kind of art is not theoretical or illustrative of theories; it is intuitive, it is involved with all types of mental processes and it is purposeless.*
- *Conceptual Art is not necessarily logical [. . . ] Ideas are discovered by intuition.*
- *Conceptual Art does not really have much to do with mathematics, philosophy, or any other mental discipline.*
- *Conceptual Art is made to engage the mind of the viewer rather than his eye or emotions.*
- *Conceptual Art is only good when the idea is good.*\(^{113}\)

Differently to Sol LeWitt, in Joseph Kossuth’s way of seeing conceptualism, and for other members of the Art&Language group he belonged to, one should speak more precisely about analytical conceptualism, or linguistic conceptualism.

Another problem, which emerged from the research around the texts of LeWitt and fellow colleagues from the field of conceptual art, was adequate to the criticism by Osbourne about the works of Kossuth and LeWitt\(^ {114}\); actually, the way LeWitt defined ‘undefinable’ as ‘there is always...’ was not in fact an intelligent turnaround of the basic problem of philosophy since Aristo and Plato: how to explain the influence of the word of ideas in the materialistic world.\(^ {115}\)

Costello after Osbourne concluded that the works of LeWitt were rather ‘models for artworks’ rather than art itself. Similar observations were made by Boris Groys, when he pointed out the role of Kantian logic in accordance to his views on aesthetics, leaving the subject for ‘talent’ as art, or models of art.

---


\(^{114}\) For Osbourne, DeWitt’s conceptualism was weak or inclusive. In 1999, Osbourne distinguished between the ‘expansive, empirically diverse and historically inclusive’ taxonomy of conceptual art advocated by Sol Le Witt in his ‘Paragraphs’ and ‘Sentences’ (discussed in detail below) which he called ‘weak’ or ‘inclusive’ conceptualism, and the ‘restricted, analytically focused, and explicitly philosophical definition’ advocated, in competing ways, by Joseph Kossuth and the Art & Language group, which he calls ‘strong’ or ‘exclusive’ conceptualism, for obvious reasons. D. Costello, Kant After LeWitt: Toward an Aesthetics of Conceptual Art, in: (eds.) P. Goldie and E. Schellekens, *Philosophy and Conceptual Art*. Oxford, Oxford University Press, 2007, p.93.

\(^{115}\) Both Plato and Aristo presented their own views based on determinative aspects of their own dialectical systems.
1.2.c Richard Serra’s phenomenological origins – space, cognition and construction

The works by Serra which belong to open access public spaces were discussed by Helen A. Fielding for phenomenological origins of his works in the context of Merlau-Ponty approach to the cognitive processes.116 For Fielding, the sculpture of Serra was in a bilingual state of indicating the impact towards relational perception and the different individual states for that perception during the contact with the object in the same moment.117 Author focused on the subject of ‘dwelling’ as the term to describe that phenomenological relation between the work of art, its physical surroundings and the person who experiences the contact with the sculpture.118 However, for Serra himself, the focus of his own work was pointed towards the ‘industrial’ aspect of the creation process: contact with the other co-workers and to move beyond the individually understood aesthetics.119 That approach was called as the denomination of Constructivism by McShine, for whom Serra approach to the process of creation far was beyond classical sculpting and involved filming, drawing and writing, where the most important aspect become the process of thinking, not the material itself.120 Although not spoken directly by the author, the constructivist aspect of Serra’s work is not historically directed onwards constructivist movement of the First Avantgarde but rather the understanding the constructivism delivered from Piaget’s theory of human development of knowledge philosophically based also on Merleu-Ponty’s phenomenology.121 Anna C. Chave pointed out the certain dualism of the Serra’s works after Douglas Crimp. These sculptures hold the presence of the artist himself, probably because of the technological implications to be exposed. Simultaneously, they become a political manifestation asking for responder’s self-identification.122 For Krauss, before the removal of Serra’s Tilted Arc had happened, the main specification for his art were axiomatic structures between what was and what could not be the architecture.123 However, in the context of the main question of this research, the case of Tilted Arc by Serra went beyond the primal experimentations of the artist. The site-specific art the sculpture was, existed any longer when removed by the decision of the court.124 Perhaps Tilted Arc incorporated multivalued attitudes towards own sustainability – what should not be seen as the ‘mistake’ or ‘fault’ as Judge Re judged the artwork. The sculpture become an implication for phenomenological study on cognition of the public space. Not any longer just a ‘sculpture’ and not any longer just a ‘site-specific’. Therefore, the research on the attitude toward the sculpture in the public space should include the revision for classification for the sculpture in its own grammatical context, beyond the model of Krauss for the

117 Ibid. p. 278.
118 Ibid. p. 267.
120 Ibid. p.64.
121 Please compare text of McShine, Cooke and Rajchman with Merleu-Ponty subjection that phenomenology is not introspection but the stadium for the origins of the being in the act of consciousness. S. Nowacka-Dobosz, J. Femiak, B. Pełraszewska-Softys, Rola ciała w kształtowaniu świadomości – inspiracje filozoficzne i naukowe, Akademia wychowania fizycznego Józefa Piłsudskiego w Warszawie, 2015, p. 56.
sculpture in the expanded field. As Maturana explained in his system theory, organization is not a synonym for structure. In his model the cognition of the artwork would be internal process. In the Maturana model of experience, the act of cognition was neither hierarchical, nor in ontological reduction. The lines of reasoning could co-exist in the form of multiverse. The part of System Therapy was related to the cybernetic eco-anthropology of Gottlieb Guntern. That concept was based on the paradigm, that a human was not an independent entity. Human being was in relation with others (person, biosocial environment). Therefore, the observations of a human should include those systems of relations. In Maturana's model work of Serra could co-exist simultaneously at least under three areas: area of transcendental ontology, area of subjective latitude and area of constructive ontology.

1.2.d Attitude toward commodity in public space named art? Enquiry into the views of Jaques Ranciere

In the philosophical essay of Jaques Ranciere, the subject of aesthetics itself became the issue of social power. Ranciere observed that the dictate of aesthetics was achieved by the distribution of the sensible, understood by him as another heterotopia. Therefore, not the art itself, not the sculpted object, but the situation of the distribution of information around the object of art was a primal factor in establishing social structures.

Ranciere presented two different possible philosophical ‘orders’ of the judgment of reality to start his discourse with that dichotomy. For him, there was a connection between thought and the exterior world in the Kantian philosophy, which provided a theoretical basis for the development for modern utopias. All those models had to clash with the reality of the Holocaust. For Ranciere the ‘flight of the gods’ – a belief that the utopian world ended with the Second World War – gave way to Hegelian politicizations, including his understanding of Freud.

Ranciere referred to Freud, then wrote about his connection between Walther Benjamin, Marx and surrealism in the context of the possible mechanical ways of the creation of art objects. At that moment he focused on the Marxist theory of fetishism:

Commodities must be torn out of their trivial appearances, made into phantasmagoric objects in order to be interpreted as the expression of society’s contradictions. Scholarly

---
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131 Freud was a specialist in the field of neurosis. Although he presented his political views, he was always focused on analysis from the point of view of a ‘Neurosis doctor’. C. G. Jung, Ueber das Phaenomen des Geistes in Kunst und Wissenschaft. Essay: Freud, trans. Robert Reszke, Patmos Verlag 2001, Wydawnictwo KR 2011, p.67
history tried to separate out various features within the aesthetico-political configuration that gave it its object.\textsuperscript{133}

Ranciere wrote about artistic regimes in the context of the difference between modernism and postmodernism. He analysed his question in the context of the political use of aesthetics. Firstly, modernism had no influence on the group as a factor.\textsuperscript{134} Its power was based on imitation of the originals. The author came back to Plato again and derived his model of true and false arts. Next, he brought the mimetic principle, which in the opinion of the writer was a regime of poetics, or a regime of representatives. Therefore, we could talk about the regime of art and the regime of aesthetics. Ranciere reminds us about the ‘true Homer’ – who created laws while simultaneously being unaware of his own role in that process. Aesthetics were described then as a kind of specification. Specification (specialization) cannot evolve, it is in its own final state. Therefore, art based on that principle would end – Ranciere mentioned constructivism and futurism as examples.

Ranciere pointed out that even the political ideas of Freud, Schiller or Kant, who all came from German Romanticism, had become non-representative cultural actions toward the representative act of ‘paternal oppression’. Thus, postmodernism for Ranciere was the process of reversal.\textsuperscript{135} If one-sided written history was fiction, then we should redefine the concept of the utopias.\textsuperscript{136} As a ‘phantom historical reality’, history could be considered as a faulty tool to understand our reality. Ranciere supported his theory with the philosophy of Aristotole, to describe different possible views on the same subject. In his opinion, what was brought to the participant in verbalization processes would be a deformed utopia – medial and influential, but not existing in the real world.\textsuperscript{137}

Ranciere presented his view on mechanisms, which created a regime of aesthetics in large groups of the population. His observations in the field of culture considered problems around the role of the ‘leader’ and the fetishized objects that could play the role of an aesthetic controller. In that sense, he provided undoubtedly Freudian views on the group dynamic social processes probably occurring in the ‘primal horde’. Ranciere supported his opinion about those social mechanisms with the classification of society and culture presented earlier by Schiller. In the area of German idealism, art and productivity were related. Art as the transformation of thoughts become a sensorial experience for the society.\textsuperscript{138}

Therefore, art in the opinion of Ranciere was not an exception to other forms of economic activities:

\textit{Whatever might be the specific type of economic circuits they lie within, artistic practices are not exceptions to other practices. They represent and reconfigure the distribution of these activities.}\textsuperscript{139}

Political universalism was possible in a singular form only, the recent 200 years of art became singularly related too. The ‘equality’, understood by Ranciere in the context of
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\bibitem{139} Ibid. p.48.
\end{thebibliography}
universalism, helped to classify aesthetics in arts, but did not leave the circle of idealism. That method of classification of art led to utopian thinking. Ranciere presented opinions about the quality in different equalities. The understanding of equality in painting was not the same as equality in literature. The author used hermeneutics as a methodology to notice that the source of the problem lay in the process of verbalization.

The incorporation and disincorporation in verbalization processes would not mean body and spirit and cannot stand as nature of art.\[140\] Again, art was politicized. Therefore:

*Comment is not a category of art.*\[141\]

The aesthetics had their own politics, although without their own criteria. Aesthetics would only offer choices. Finally, Ranciere left histotrophic epistemology in his research, and by juxtaposition of earlier evidence, declared that art is not a form of politics, but could be politicized. The reception of Brecht’s play by intellectuals was not the same as factual feelings about the ‘Three penny opera’ by the proletariat.

The views of Ranciere could be juxtaposed with Julian Spalding’s opinion on the omnipotence of the funder. The art critic took a part of Serota’s text from *Experience or Interpretation, The Dilemma of Museums of Modern Art* (1996) to explain:

*No longer can the curator be seen solely as the dispassionate judge of quality, who visits the studio or private collection to select the works and to assemble a body of material which will be presented to the public in the museum. Instead the curator is a collaborator, often engaging with the artist to accomplish the work.*\[142\]

In the model of Spalding about artwork commissioned by institutions, we could presume that what speaks for the quality of e.g. sculpture in public space is not the impact of the artist, but a constructive relation between the artist and his funder. Spalding noticed that the invention of the idea for artwork became more evident for Serota\[143\] than the process of creation and its further presence to the public. In such a realm as his, the question about the originality of the early works of Pollock made during the sessions with Dr Joseph L. Henderson would not exist.\[144\] Forgers like Elmyr de Hory, portrayed by Orson Welles in *F for Fake*\[145\], would in fact be some kind of ‘original’ artists. De Hory claimed, when he was documented during his forgery of a Modigliani drawing, that he made ‘his’ Modigliani – better than the original. De Hory when asked by Welles about originality as the value of the artwork said:

*Let’s see, we could find one Modigliani made by Kisling, a Modigliani by Elmyr, and one Modigliani by Modigliani.*\[146\]
1.3 Art as non-homogenous (autonomic) aspect of public space

In this subchapter the inquiry into sculpture as non-mediation in public was given. Observations of Anatolij Lunaczarski were juxtaposed with sources relating to private opinions on role of art in the post-revolutionary world by Lenin. The supportive critics by Leinwald on public art in the early times of revolution in Russia was given. The main sources in that part of research were supported by Malevich and Tatlin’s concepts on the role of art in the public space as a factor in education.

1.3.a Anatol Lunaczarski, Vladimir Ivanovich Lenin – the impact of an artwork on the group

Members of the constructivist movement in Soviet Russia quickly faced problems beyond theoretical discussion on the impact of art in the public space. One of men, who was in the position to balance the political game around the position of avant-garde while Lenin was still alive, was Anatol Lunaczarski. Lunaczarski gave evidence on the existence of a critical view on art in Russia after the October Revolution. The Commissar included his views on the relation of public sculpture with the group. In contrast it should be considered that text could also be a prominent element of social manipulation, if we consider the historical fact that the meeting of WCIK (Всероссийский Центральный Исполнительный Комитет – All-Russian Central Executive Committee) in August of 1917 was only attended by five artists (including Mayakovski and Blok – only those two names were mentioned in the text of Lunaczarski). Lunaczarski and some artists from the circle of constructivism knew each other from before the revolution (they had group exhibitions in Western Europe) and later, when the first Artists Associations were set up in Russia. Lunaczarski later reflected on avant-garde and modern Soviet realism in art:

(…) the cultural activity of the state has one other constant target, namely to spread the revolutionary style of thinking, the feeling and activism in the whole country. And that’s why

---

147 Lenin had no patience for what he called ‘futurists’. According to Poklewska, already in December of 1918, Lenin ordered Lunaczarski (Narcompros – People’s Commissar of Education) to ban ‘futurists’ writings, firstly from the newspaper ‘Isskustwo Komuny’. After four months, all writings of ‘futurists – constructivist’ could be no longer be printed anywhere anyway, because the leader (Lenin) represented such a power in the mind of his followers that most of the art-related newspapers were shut down without an official order. J. Poklewska, Art in the service of Stalinist propaganda (Sztuka w służbie Stalinowskiej Propagandy), in: (ed.) S.Salomonowicz, Toruń, Czasy Nowożytne, Zarząd Główny Polskiego Towarzystwa Historycznego 6, 1999 p. 250.


149 According to Alexandra J. Leinwald, Lunaczarski strongly opposed the division of art from the state – which was pledged by some artists who attended that meeting. Please compare with Lenin’s opinion on constructivists and Lunaczarski as Commissar: A. J. Leinwald: In the beginning of controlled culture. Russia 1917-1922. In: Kwartalnik historyczny no. 3, Warsaw, Polish Scientific Publishers PWN 1993, p. 67, 69, 71, 72.

the state asks that question: if the revolution could give the soul to the art, then the art would give the revolution its language.\textsuperscript{152}

Later,

(…) Propaganda and agitation are nothing else but continuous proclamation of a new faith, based on a solid knowledge. I think there is no doubt that the more artistic such a preaching is, the stronger it works. We know that a very talented orator or some publicist will reach into the hearts much quicker that someone not granted with artistic talent. For that reason, the communist party, being the collective propagandist and the collective spokesman of the truths of our day, shall arm itself with the weapon of art, which will become the fundament of agitation. Not only the poster, but the painting, the statue – although with a narrower impact, but with a deeper emotional charge – could become an instrument in assimilating the communist truth.\textsuperscript{153}

In the second paragraph mentioned here, Lunaczarski made an assumption that he was writing about ‘new faith based on a solid knowledge’ – therefore, he referred to the basic Marxist concept of his ‘scientific philosophy’ – but later, in the same paragraph he mentioned that artistic talent came from some unknown source of gratification.

Public sculpture (or art in a broader sense) in the opinion of Lunaczarski was closely bound to the interest of the party, i.e. the Marxist concept, where art and politics shall be one ‘natural historical consequence’. However, Lunaczarski left the artists a ‘free will’ in the context of aesthetics only. It could be understood here that the idea of revolution as a source of transformation of public life and public space needed a reflective influence from the side of an artist – as the representation of individualism was seen by Lunaczarski as an act of ‘truth’ – and was necessary to be believed in by the artist and the viewer.

The comparison of the artistic individuality relatively bonded with the act of propaganda in the new faith – revolution – former acts of medial agitation (the collective spokesman) may not be efficient enough, but still necessary. For Lunaczarski, non-verbal communication of public art (sculpture) was not good enough. Not because it was a form of visual art, but because the party, and Lunaczarski as Bolshevik Narcoproms, were unable to fully control those forms of actions.

For Lunaczarski, the artistic act of a revolutionary sculptor was to give his faith to the political power of the party, and through that political act become visible in the public space. Lunaczarski did not leave any free space for individuality for the artist in that context.

In next part of the Lunaczarski’s text we can read:

In the first years of the revolution its influence on the art was hardly perceptible. Including ‘Twelve’ of Błok and some other things in the type of ‘Misterium’ - buffo by Mayakovski, there were many good posters, some not bad monuments, but it all was incommensurable with the revolution itself. It could be largely explained that the huge ideological and


\textsuperscript{153} Ibid. pp. 3-4.
emotional essence of the revolution requires expression of a more or less realistic type, bright, full of ideological and emphatic dynamics. Meanwhile, artists – realists and representatives of artistic trends close to realism, as I mentioned above, were far more resistant to the revolution than innovators (whose abstractionism works perfectly with artistic design and ornamental functions), who proved to be powerless, when it was necessary to give psychological expression to new revolutionary essence. Therefore, we cannot assume that revolution (I emphasise again that I am talking here about the first years, when the revolution’s influence was the strongest and its manifestation was the most striking) would create some kind of own artistic form.\textsuperscript{154}

Lunaczarski pointed out that the realism of the revolution (understood by him as social changes) was not the same as representativeness of the artists who were a part (whether active or passive) of the revolution themselves.

Although the aesthetics of the revolutionary forms in design and abstractive artworks was a kind of success, it was still not enough to depict the full impact of the revolution, understood here as a total kind of transformation of life. Therefore, art for Lunaczarski was not a transforming power, or it had not gained such a level of power. Not because of its own idealism, but to the definite failure of the artists, who did not have enough mental abilities to fulfil their roles.

Finally, it should be noted that in the context of the cited paragraph, artist for the revolution could not be considered as an ‘artist’ understood in the capitalist – bourgeois affiliation, for example an individual who ask questions or questions a certain social order – as Krauss e.g. saw Duchamp, or as the metaphysical leader who helped lost souls – as Carl Gustav Jung saw Picasso.\textsuperscript{155} For Lunaczarski, artists were none of those. Firstly, it could not be an individual, not a person with a function – but just a function. In that context, art and the artist were carriers of the idea of revolution in its aesthetical, physical shape in the nameless crowd of the dynamic ‘red’ collective.

Lunaczarski did not mention his own setbacks in that text. After the inspiration of Lenin by Campanella’s utopia, the Commissar was asked by him to execute the order about the decree ‘On the monuments of the Republic’ from 12 April 1918, whose main idea was to create large-scale monuments and posters presenting idols of the revolution.\textsuperscript{156} According to Alexandra Leinwald\textsuperscript{157}, the hastily made sculptures in nonresistant materials brought the opposite effect to the one idealized by Lenin:

\textsuperscript{154} Ibid. p. 5 The ‘artistic form’ at the end of the quotation was in original: ‘artistic robe’ – an untranslatable Slavic idiom. Something we can observe, but have no insight into.


Weak and naive sculptures instead of agitating for revolution often aroused hilarity. For example, the statue of Marx and Engels unveiled in Moscow in November 1918 gave the spectators the impression that both revolutionaries were presented as bathing in a tub.\textsuperscript{158}

Certainly, not all objects mentioned by Leinwald were constructivist, or constructivist-like sculptures. Very few artists, not directly sculptors, had the feeling that the function of art in public spaces terminated by the political implications made by the Soviet revolution was far from the declared policies of Lunacarski.\textsuperscript{159}

That comparison could be made, if we look at Lenin’s words to Jurij Anninekov:

You know, I am not strong in art [...] art for me is... something in a shape of intellectual swamped gut [Slavic idiom: blinded gut] and when its role of propaganda, indispensable for us, will be accomplished, then we will destroy it, because of its uselessness. [...] In general, as you know for sure, I do not feel any sympathy for intellectuals, and our slogan ‘liquidate illiteracy’ shall by no means be understood as a drive to create new intellectuals. ‘Liquidate illiteracy’ purpose is for every peasant, every worker to independently and without any help read our decrees, orders and calls. The target is completely practical.\textsuperscript{160}

It may sound unusual to someone who may associate Lenin with positions like: \textit{Leo Tolstoy as the Mirror of the Russian Revolution}\textsuperscript{161}, or \textit{On Proletarian Culture},\textsuperscript{162} but after a structured analysis we may find that the whole activity of Lenin in the field of revolutionary culture was indeed practical propaganda. The Hegelian dialectics mixed with ‘historical consequentialism’\textsuperscript{163} in the text about Tolstoy was, in fact, denunciation of Tolstoy as a person and transformation of his individuality into a pro-revolutionary, but controllable

\textsuperscript{158} Ibid p. 72.
\textsuperscript{159} The novel ‘We’ from 1921 by Yevgeny Zamyatin, written in a futurist style, was a philosophical overture on humans who spend their lives creating their own prisons. In ‘We’, the main character, Delta-503, on the one hand was a constructor/architect of the Integral – a perfect system of mind-machine and apparatus of State. Delta-503 was deceived by his own choices (by the discovery of his own will), which led him to the destruction of his only love to I – 330, the female – by the system he was building earlier. The book could be considered as a descriptive observation of the times in which Zamyatin himself lived. Y. Zamyatin, \textit{We} (Russian: Mbi) completed in 1921. First published in 1924 by E. P. Dutton in New York, translation by G. Zilboorg.
\textsuperscript{160} In Polish: „Wicie, ja w sztuce nie jestem mocny [...] sztuka dla mnie to… coś w rodzaju intelektualnej ślepej kiszki, i kiedy jej propagandowa rola, nieodzowna dla nas, zostanie odegrana, my ją — dziek, dziek! wytniemy. Z powodu nieprzydatności” „W ogóle, do inteligencji, jak na pewno wiecie, nie czuję dużej sympatii i naszego hasła zlikwidować analfabetyzm » bynajmniej nie należy tłumaczyć jako dążenia do powstania nowej inteligencji. „Zlikwidować analfabetyzm » należy tylko po to, żeby każdy chłop, każdy robotnik mógł samodzielnie, bez niczyjej pomocy czytać nasze dekrety, rozkazy, wezwania. Cel całkowicie praktyczny” The Polish reprint was used as available source. The book was also printed in English in 1966 in New York by Inter-Language Literary Associates. J. Annienkow, \textit{Dniennik moich wstriez}, vol. 1, Moscow 1991, p. 28; vol. 2, p. 269—270.
\textsuperscript{163} What is essential model for Marxism – Leninism ‘methodology’. Leszek Kolakowski: ‘there is no doubt that this universalization of Marxist ideology is due first and foremost to Leninism, which showed itself able to direct every existing social claim and grievance into a single channel and use the impetus thus provided to secure directorial power for the Communist party. Please look at: L. Kolakowski, \textit{Main Currents in Marxism}, vol. 3 Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1978 p. 492.
function. That approach would connect with Łunaczarsky’s opinion, that artists do not necessarily have to be ‘individual’ to be conscious of their own ‘revolutionary’ features. Lenin understood (or, at least he pretended to understand) the revolution as a natural and subconscious process. The work of Gustave Le Bon about political crowds had its reminiscence in Lenin’s thinking about the practical use of ‘sculpture in the public space’, where its presence would be considered as an ‘impact’ for transformation of the nameless crowd dictated by one leader – Lenin himself. Such an opinion was shared by a researcher on Lenin’s person in the context of group dynamics: Robert Service linked the text of Lenin: ‘What has to be done’ with fundamental ideas of, among others Le Bon, Freud and Weber.164

1.3.b Art as the Attitude in the planned model of public space. From Constructivism165 toward Social Realism.

This short review into constructivist art is presented from the position of the artist’s interest into ways of raising the attitude toward art.166

Constructivism was understood as an avant-garde movement in relation to the revolution in Russia. One of the first theories related to the ‘constructivist’ concept of art rationally influencing the public space was presented during a group exhibition in 1920 in Moscow.167 The theoretical writings of the Polish constructivists group BŁOK shed more light onto the interest of those artists into achieving an impact on the responders through the scientific approach to the matter.168 Especially the last two chapters of ‘Theory of vision’ by Władysław Strzemiński from 1958 may provide evidence of the actual intentions of the artists in question.

The transformation of ‘Soviet’ sculpture not as element of ideological battle169, but as a structurally organised programme, could be considered as important, if we consider the text

---


165 The constructivist term was not split into: Intuitional abstraction, Cube-futurism, Suprematism of Malevitch, Lucczism, Prouns of El Lissitzky, Osip Brik Productivism, Mechano-Facture of Berlewi or Unism of Strzemiński. This subchapter focuses on the behavioural aspects of attitude in groups in relation to views of chosen sources.

166 For example: For Kurbanovsky it seemed to be a source about explanatory role of Freudian psychoanalysis in works of Constructivists if the subjective opinion of the author on Freud could be considered as true. In fact, the problem was that author’s ‘explanations’ on Tatlin’s ‘psychoanalytical’ art was not a psychoanalytical diagnosis per se. The strongest evidence in the text lay in the part about rejection of ‘Marxists Psychologists’ like Nikolai Osipov by Freud and the turn toward Watsonian Behaviorism. That should be considered as evidence for the separation of constructivism from the ‘western’ avant-garde.A.A. Kurbanovsky, Freud, Tatlin, and the Tower: How Soviet Psychoanalysts Might Have Interpreted the Monument to the Third International. In: Slavic Review, vol. 67, no. 4, Urbana, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, 2008, pp. 892–906. www.jstor.org/stable/27653029. (accessed 10 November 2015)


168 The relation between Strzemiński, Kobro and Malevich could be considered as a rotation toward the thoughts of Marx with an attempt to avoid historicism. Y. A. Bois, Painting as Model, Massachusetts, MIT Press, 1990, pp. 123-157.

by Alexander Romanovich Luria\textsuperscript{170} about the development of broadly understood ‘cognitive psychology’ in the USSR:

\textit{Soviet Psychology, using the notion of consciousness as “conscious existence” (\textit{das bewusste Sein}) as a starting point, has rejected the view that consciousness represents an “intrinsic property of mental life,” invariably present in every mental state and independent of historical development.}\textsuperscript{171}

Luria, in the context of the cited paragraph, pointed out that consciousness related to Marxist – Leninist concepts defines the state of mind in the presence as the only possible state. Other factors (like sculpture) may stimulate that state of being, therefore the question for a Soviet psychologist would be just how to increase that stimulus. Furthermore, Luria wrote about how Soviet behaviourists argued about the relation between verbal and non-verbal communication:

\textit{Children assimilate languages as a ready-made product of sociohistorical development – and use it to analyse, generalize, and encode experience. They name things, denoting them with expressions established earlier in human history, and thus assign things to certain categories and acquire knowledge. Once a child calls something a “watch” (\textit{chasy}), he immediately incorporates it into a system of things related to time (chas); once he calls a moving object a “steamship” (\textit{parovoz}), he automatically isolates its defining properties - motion (\textit{vozit’}) by means of “steam” (\textit{par}). Language, which mediates human perception, results in extremely complex operations: the analysis and synthesis of incoming information, the perceptual ordering of the world, and the encoding of impressions into systems. Thus words – the basic linguistic units – carry not only meaning but also the fundamental units of consciousness reflecting the external world.}\textsuperscript{172}

The aspect of the ‘making masses free’ and their ‘transformation into a new society needed a practical aspect of the “impact”.\textsuperscript{173} In UNOVIS program for education\textsuperscript{174}, created by Malevitch, there was an interest in the avant-garde per se, not seen as aesthetics, but as \textit{emancipation} (and therefore political action). That assumption by Malevitch was not ‘politically correct’ in the context of the revolution. The author used sources like: Cezanne, cubism, futurism or van Gogh. Suprematism for Malevitch had not direct relation to constructivism, although he used the words:

\textsuperscript{171} Ibid, p 4.
\textsuperscript{173} As Gustave Le Bon noted, it had been empirically observed that the structure of language in the large groups did not change rapidly. However, the meaning and process of reasoning was far quicker and more dynamic. G. Le Bon, \textit{Psychologie des Foules}, (1929, edition 36) trans. Stanislaw Mika, Warsaw, Polish Scientific Publishers PWN, 1986, p12.
Construction of nature, displacement of construction and elaboration of a new Cubist one [...] 175

In his views on social changes, the artist concluded that public space could be influenced or re-transformed by art. For Malevitch, art education should evolve in the ‘natural order’ from Marxist historiosophy with a strong input on artistic ‘privacy’ and so-called individualism. 176 The program focused on the merger of artistic individualism and the use of new technologies (construction as a mechanical transformation was understood here directly as the construction) to achieve a holistic outcome in the future works of art.

In historical sources, constructivism in the context of educational-propagandist role was replaced in time with social realism. However, the activity of the members of the movement did not end in 1932 with the decree On the Reconstruction of Literary and Art Organization. 177

From 1956, after final decisions by Khrushchev 178, the artists and art theoreticians of the first avant-garde living in the communist block were allowed to come back to art academies in most of the countries behind the ‘iron curtain’ and start to work again.

After years of being marginalized (in the USSR since 1934, in PRL since 1946) those artists could work officially again and make contacts with their colleagues abroad. That led to an exchange of concepts in art theories and culture (e.g. a short period when Foucault was working for the French embassy in Poland in 1958-59 and collected contacts with the local art community of Warsaw 179), and later, when the next generation of artists brought an exchange of concepts to the international field. 180 Research on the field of constructivism in relation to the field of behaviourism, but not psychoanalysis (as Krauss understood constructivism, in her findings on Pevsner and Gabo 181) would provide more information.

If we were to compare the influence of Bauhaus in Germany with the influence of Strzemiński in Poland, it would be difficult to identify a specific point in time when constructivism ended. That would probably bring another problem with the designation of

175 Ibid. p. 137.
176 The same fundamental point of view was made by Władysław Strzemiński in his “Theory of Vision”.
177 The transformation of Socialist Russia into the USSR was a long-term process. The term ‘reconstruction’ used in the title was in reference to ‘coming back’ to the sources of Marxism, understood as the rejection of ‘alien’ factors: “A few years ago the influence of alien elements, especially those revived by the first years of NEP, was still apparent and marked.” Reconstruction of Literary and Artistic Organisations, Central Committee of the All-Union Communist Party (Bolsheviks), Decree on the Reconstruction of Literary and Artistic Organisations. April 23, 1932 In: (ed.) E. Bowlt, Russian Art of the Avant-garde: theory and criticism 1902-1934, New York, Viking Press, 1976, pp. 288-290. Official date of establishment of socialist realism was related to Soviet Writers Congress in 1934 with active role of Gorky, Radek, Bukharin and Zhdanov. A. I. Stetsky, Under the flag of the Soviets, Under the Flag of Socialism, Speech delivered in August 1934. [website] https://www.marxists.org/subject/art/lit_crit/sovietwritercongress/stetsky.htm (accessed 7 January 2015)
180 E.g. Tadeusz Kantor or Jerzy Grotowski.
modernism toward constructivism in the context of the use of public space. Although some art critics define the end of modernism in architecture (and by that in the physical public space) on the exact date of 15 July, 1972 at 3:32 pm., we cannot find an exact date for the possible end of modernism in the public space. Although modernism lost its primal drive to exist as western cultural propaganda’s answer to Soviet expansion, the question as to the purpose of implementing contemporary sculpture into public space should not be diagnosed on the matters of aesthetics only. As Noam Chomsky noted, the propaganda methods used by the Soviets were similar to those used by the western block during the cold war era.

1.4.a Attitude toward heterogeneous art in the public space – the enquiry into the Theory of Vision by Władysław Strzemiński

The main source of research was the concept of Władysław Strzemiński, who tried to find a rational explanation for artistic independence in the public space. His observation on the materialist relation of brain waves to the reception of physical reality in the last chapter of his ‘Theory of Vision’ was juxtaposed with the concept of fetishism of commodities by Marx. The inquiry could help in understanding artist attitude toward public space by his fascination with Russian school of behaviorism and neuroscience (Konarski, Telpow).

The ‘Theory of Vision’ was a complete work based on historiosophy, art theory and certain sources from the field of behaviourism. The work contained the analysis of the theory of vision, theories of understanding the evolution of consciousness of vision, and the progress

---

182 The architectural critic Charles Jencks used that date in reference to the demolition of blocks of the Pruitt-Igoe housing complex in St. Louis, Missouri. Those housing blocks were considered as most advanced and iconic architectural constructions due to the standards of the Athens Charter by Le Corbusier (1943). In Jencks’ opinion, the demolition of the complex was physical proof for the end of ‘rationalism, behaviourism and pragmatism’. J. W. Bertens. *The Idea of the Postmodern: A History*, New York, Routledge, 1995, p.80. Although the discussion about the end of modernism is still open, please see: K. G. Bristol, The Pruitt-Igoe Myth, in: *Journal of Architectural Education*, 44/3, May 1991, pp. 163-171.


185 Władysław Strzemiński was the creator of unism in painting, a constructivist painter, a professor of art in the Art Academy in Łódź, an engineer, and the husband of Katarzyna Kobro. Both wrote more than 40 theoretical texts about art and sculpture. He was a friend of Malevich, both cooperated on the theoretical texts about Suprematism.

186 Strzemiński first built a historiographic approach to art evolution based on Marx’s: *The Fetishism of Commodities and the Secret Thereof* (source: K. Marx, *Capital A Critique of Political Economy*, Book One: The Process of Production of Capital, 4th chapter, Volume One, first ed. 1867) to finally break off the aspect of political economy with arts by his observation of the process of creation of artwork as a rhythmic wave of the brain. Strzemiński’s work is strong evidence of the constructivist relation to the Watsonian school of behaviourism rather than psychoanalysis, as Krauss saw the role of Gabo and Pevsner in her Passages about Modern Sculpture.
of vision based on the study of the real world. He defined the concept that ‘thought’ in the object/painting that is not supported by ‘visual understanding’ would lead to ‘formalism’.

The author explained ‘vision’ in the context of the evolution of the eye. To see was a process, in fact two processes, firstly evolutionary, perfecting the biological construction of the eye, secondly perfecting the ability to use seeing by the conscious mind of the viewer. Therefore, seeing/vision is not a passive process. The eye becomes ‘accustomed’ to one type of seeing. The author gave as an example the textile worker’s process of seeing, which would be used to see more defects on the cloth, but that could not see more elements in a field of corn. Therefore, the seeing becomes specified in one way. The thinking process is the real process – constructivist or unist painting is real painting (as based on physiological, behaviourist mechanisms, explained by the author in the last chapter). Strzemiński used the term ‘professional visual efficiency’. The painting/art object was outside the historical processes as an unchangeable picture of nature – the most important was what the human was aware of in the process of development of vision.187

Next, idealistic aesthetics would see art as the object but not the human activity (in the understanding of Marx). Author juxtaposed this unity of vision with developmental dialectics – the picture of the world becomes distorted; therefore, we should talk about vision and awareness of vision. That development was conditioned historically and related to class struggle.

Strzemiński related the Marxist context of commodity to the evolutionary evolution of the human eye.188 With the support of Marx’s class struggle theory, the author represented the opinion that art should confirm the rank of the class in rule, and, as the attribute of power, be separated from the other forms of human activity.189 In the hands of the ideological leader art started to become a separate expression of power. In the formal sense, art of that time represented ‘contour in contour’. The ornaments were without ‘individual life’.190 The beginnings of the perspective were dependent on the meaning. The problem of seeing the reality in the sense of struggle between dialectics and idealism lay in humans and their perception of the world, not in the observed object.191

Strzemiński presented the term ‘architectonisation’, as the possibility of moving the dimension instead of moving the number. Architectonisation brought the possibility to simplify the process into the 5:4:3 scale called the ‘golden ratio’, which was known to him as the universal key for composition.192 This new type of awareness of vision made it possible to rebuild all the formal ways of expression.

---

188 With the use of the evidence from the field of anthropology, the author started to derive his views about how an object was seen in the stone age. As evidence Strzemiński wrote about the experiment with Australian Aborigines, who were unable to notice the human silhouette in black & white photos but could see objects in contours. Next, Strzemiński followed the basic evidence from the field of evolution. Historically, in the beginning individuality was locked in the scheme. Ibid. pp.21-23
189 Ibid. p. 30.
190 Ibid. p. 35.
191 Ibid. p.233.
192 Ibid. p. 58.
The vision of mass was a commodity vision. The concentration of the artists and society on mass as the formal language in art was strictly connected to the development of global production, slavery and expansion of the markets. Artists’ occupation with mass brought advanced forms of perspective in art. Strzemiński noticed in that context that Plato was unable to see the perspective. Therefore, the formalism of the commodity époque was a despotic art.193

Strzemiński concluded that using physiological vision and knowledge about the social process could be also studied with physiological methods. That was the way to separate empiricism from the true realism of art.194 He focused on the explanation of the field of vision and peripheral vision in the sense of sequences in the process of seeing. The vision was not monospecific. The eye was in continuous movement and saw the reality in the process of accommodation. Therefore, copying art from photography was not a real/true195 process of observation. The vision of human by the human was divided into at least three processes: physiological, psychophysical and conscious, simultaneous responses.196

The key term used by Strzemiński to define the quality and impact of the artwork on the viewer (changing the era’s attribute) was ‘formalism’.197 For Strzemiński, formalism was a state of group consciousness, where that group (artists, to be more precise) was unable to see and understand its own achievements of aesthetical language. After the moment of discovery of a new form of non-verbal communication, there was a stage of copying fresh solutions and multiplying them.198 It was fundamental to see in that context that ‘formalism’ was a distinct term dividing constructivists from other artists, not by the object of art, but by the process of making art. For Strzemiński, ‘formalism’ was a kind of non-constructive thinking that should be an act of awareness for anyone who calls himself an artist. In opposition to that way of thinking, Izaak Brodsky and his fellows from the AkhRR group were using the same term – formalism – as an insult to any abstract form of art, where ‘formal’ meant a derivation from the word ‘form’, with a lower context: meaningless form. Brodsky used ‘formalism’ as an attack – the term pointed out artists related to abstraction as ‘pro-bourgeois’, which in the times of Lenin and Stalin could have severe consequences.

193 Ibid. p. 78.
194 Ibid. p. 193.
197 An object/painting that is not supported by ‘visual understanding’ would lead to ‘formalism’. For Strzemiński, the awareness of vision enriched the endless road of consciousness. To support that thought, Strzemiński criticised what he called, ‘idealistic realism’. The idealistic realism was unable to support or explain historical changes. Therefore, the artist working in that manner was distorting nature. Each époque has its own borders of vision. The definite type of awareness of vision equals the definite type of vividness. The writer defined formalism as a method of borrowing of formally defined, already existing objects and mechanically re-building them. Therefore, the awareness of vision did not develop autonomously. Ibid. pp 13-20.
198 The efficiency to develop the society was connected to a way of vision in a certain order. In that process, realism would become formalism in every culture and époque. It was a recurrent process, when culture would reach its own limits for development. The aesthetical formalism of each époque could be divided into elements: silhouette, modern factors, perspective in context of parallel progress, afterimage. The author saw the origin of ‘beauty’ in the form of a spiral – understood as the symbol of the effort. Ibid. pp. 63-66.
Social realists defined the vision of the revolution as an act of the collective, and that group was meant to be peasants and workers; therefore, the language of abstraction could not be derived from that sort of collective. The term ‘formalism’ was used then as an act of political attack by pro-Stalinist social realists, especially in the time of the Great Purge. Meantime, for Strzemiński, formalism was an act of non-thinking, non-observing, non-creating art but following the aesthetical symbols characteristic of each era (Quattrocento, Baroque etc. etc.)\(^ {199}\) to please the responders. Or in fact to become like a responder, where artistic talent is replaced by a craft.

Realism was a term related to formalism, understood here as its opposition. For Strzemiński realism was not an act of the photographic copy of an image. It was a process of observation, a stimulus and response that happens in the paradigm of rhythmical-neurological processes of the brain. Therefore, what was ‘real’ in the artwork was affirmative for the collective mind – because all minds work the same in the context of behavioural processes. Therefore, Strzemiński rejected (in his understanding) the philosophy of Wittgenstein, as ‘non-practical’, because the cognitive model of the philosopher for Strzemiński did not connect to the physical form of reality, where the artwork was placed.\(^ {200}\) By his model of realism, the author claimed artwork was being processed all the time as physical emanation, because the work of the brain was also a physical act of living. Therefore, as all Marxists, Strzemiński rejected the act of reason in Kant’s philosophy as ‘non-material’.

Observation is a key methodology to not fall into formalism. For Strzemiński observation was a materialistic act in the presence for the presence. More interestingly, that does not mean searching for abstract forms, but to transfer observed ‘reality’ by conscious work of the brain processes (rhythms).

We will divide the physiological vision into three types of vibrations of the brain after P.M. Teplow’s ‘Psychology’: rhythmical vibrations, mechanical vibrations and bioelectric vibrations. That last vibrations have another three divisions: motoric, visual and audial. Next, we shall consider Z. Konarski’s ‘Physiological fundamentals of memory’ that conditioned reflexes are built on impulses ‘A’ and ‘B’. Conditioning of our anatomy causes us to see the rhythm, but we are not conscious of that process. The rhythms become a part of nature. Therefore, for Strzemiński, Wittgenstein’s philosophy would lead to a deformation of realism when applied by the artist.\(^ {201}\)

Strzemiński pointed out the connection between realism and productive powers. He criticised artists and art theorists as neglecting the observation processes. The author directly pointed out that vision and art are impulses. Those impulses in the brain will work

\(^ {199}\) The logical mathematical vision of the era after Quattrocento was a fiction and was also in contradiction to the empirical process of seeing. For the first time Strzemiński used the term ‘physiological vision’ in a wider aspect. Basic space existed as the interdependence between the observer and the observed phenomenon. Vision was a behavioural act and depended on the order of colours and forms. Ibid. pp. 154 – 161.

\(^ {200}\) Strzemiński neglected the Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus by Wittgenstein, and claimed that the process of seeing was a physical, material process, not the cohesion of independent realities. Impressionism was an act of verbalization without the knowledge of the outside world. That type of art was strictly bound to the social class. Ibid. p. 167

\(^ {201}\) Ibid. pp. 234-238.
similar to a spiral in a dynamic movement, and be based on the ongoing process of creation of new connections between conditioned and structuralised reflexes. The intensity of conditional and non-conditional reflexes is a process of the consolidation of memory. Strzemiński had noticed the process between the act of creation by the artist, and the process of consolidation of the artwork in a physical world, to be similar to the relation of conditional and non-conditional reflexes. Therefore, we could reconstruct the speed of the visual impulses, for example in the art of van Gogh. At that moment, Strzemiński himself questioned if nature is rhythmical, and answered that nature is inexhaustible and has an infinite number of visual components – but the vision of van Gogh on nature was compatible with the physiology of the visual perception.

Therefore, it was not the spiritual but the physiological aspect of ‘vision’ that would allow the artist to transform himself into a conscious receptor of the reality.

For Strzemiński, construction and rhythm were materialistically related to the work of neurological impulses. Therefore, the cognition of an object and the reaction – i.e. the transfer into artwork – happens simultaneously. Strzemiński did not focus on the process relating to the conscious choice of what to create – he rather concentrated on the will of the artist to respond to reality and understand artwork as a processed state of mind, which in psychology is called intellectualization, or rationalisation. In that sense Strzemiński remained in the main stream of Marxism, where revolution of the masses was understood as a natural consequence, with decisions made on a group level. Therefore, art for Strzemiński in fact, was revolution.

1.4.b Attitude toward homogeneous art in public space. Constructivism in the West in the eyes of Rosalind Krauss.

The concept of Strzemiński and his observations related to the Soviet school of behaviourism stands in bright opposition to what Rosalind E. Krauss wrote about constructivism in her Passages of Modern Sculpture. Krauss moved from the beginning of modernity in sculpture to the first years of constructivist art in Soviet Russia. The author explained the formalization of space by Tatlin as ‘culture of materials’. Next, the art of Gabo and Tatlin was compared: for Gabo reality was transcendent and for Tatlin reality lay in the matter of ‘factor’. Gabo had expanded his views, from transcendent reality into a form of creation of sculptures he called ‘stereometry’. Krauss explained that concept after Gabo as the notion between real time and conceptual time and saw in Gabo a mechanism of thinking idealism. Derivations from Russian constructivism, such as artists connected to the movement and their ideas were developed later in the school of the Bauhaus. Meanwhile, for Krauss, constructivism and futurism were an artistic work with time, real time and simultaneously the ‘present time’, as understood by Marxist dialectics.

---

204 Ibid. p. 244.
2. INSIGHT INTO THE SCULPTURE IN THE PUBLIC SPACE

The research focused on the specific conditions that sculpture in the public space could achieve through the impact with the responder. The subject of sculpture was examined under the aspect of being an ‘object’ in the psychological understanding of that term. Following the observation of Lewin, on the importance to establish properties of the phenomena during the experiments, the cultural values and subjective views on term of sculpture were included in the research.207 Therefore, the sources gathered in this part of the study were supportive in the construction of the outcome from the tested sample.

2.1.a Multidimensional evaluation of sculpture

The subject of sculpture was examined under two conditions: the relation of the sculptural composition to its own structure and its relation to the external space. That part of the study was based on the concept of sculpture as a self-coherent construct by Katarzyna Kobro and the evaluation of sculpture in the context of site-specific artwork contextualized by Rosalind Krauss.

Katarzyna Kobro was focused on the function of sculpture in space, as a measurable form of dimension – but not on the interference of an ideal object within an existing space. Izabela Stronias presented a direct overview on that integral issue of Kobro’s sculptures:

Sculptures of Kobro founded on the structural mimesis will comply with any conditions that are mathematically computable, where the mathematical formula of its own construction at the same time is the formula of life still present in the world of nature, hence the constant references to the golden ratio. Therefore, in art the change of organically structured forms into aesthetical superstructures is possible. The harmony of unity is an exterior revelation of the number.208

Supposedly the final effect, in the physical reality of the space, should allow us to rotate Kobro’s sculptures, change their positions, or expose them in different surroundings and still the aspect of their scale to the other objects and their coherency would remain harmonious with non-sculptural space, beyond the final form of the artwork.

Katarzyna Kobro explained that relation of the composition of the sculpture with the surroundings in the text she wrote together with her husband. That is presented here, as an important part directly related to this thesis:

1. Sculpture is a part of space; its provided condition is an ‘organic’ connection to that space.
2. Sculpture is not a composition of the form by its own, but the composition of the [whole] space.
3. The energy of the shapes following one after the other in space creates the spatiotemporal rhythm.

4. The source of the harmony of the rhythm is a measure that emerges from the number.  

In the sculpture by Kobro, time was understood as a process of the reaction to an artistic object. Findings that could also be related to the Stimulus - Reflex theory were present in the form of a constructivist act of thinking by that sculptor. The controlling element of the relation between the cognitive process of the viewer with an existing object of the sculpture with the surroundings was the rhythm.

In the ‘Passages in Modern Sculpture’, Krauss exposed some interest of sculptors in extension of sculptural language outside its physicality that led some of them into the field of performance as a form for artistic expression. As the source, Krauss mentioned the art of Yvonne Rainer and Robert Morris. The author used his own explanation to derive the problem of visual perception, with use of the ‘phenomenology of perception’ by Merlau-Ponty. Next, there were two points that concerned the provenance of sculpture: historically, from Rodin and Brancussi as the origin of that object, and its situational coherence and factuality. To elucidate the second point, the art of Bruce Nauman was derived. In his art the fission of space was achieved by the use of video projection. From critical reviews on Nauman’s video works the writer built the question, ‘how should sculpture be understood?’ The importance of that question developed from the philosophical rhetoric around the refutation of sculpture as a mythologized subject. Therefore, Krauss asked what sculpture is, or what sculpture could become. The arguments juxtaposed by her were built on the method of ‘facts for facts’, therefore the author enhanced he object of sculpture into the self-efficient ‘art for art’s sake’.

The minimalism examples of the works by Richard Serra, Frank Stella and Donald Judd were allocated between subjects like: ‘found object’, ‘repetitive structure’, ‘organization of space’ and ‘vital order’. The key term used to bind those structural verbalizations of critical reviews by Krauss’ art objects was the word ‘balance’. She again referred to her view on constructivism in her rhetoric. Those derivations were linked to works of Jasper Jones and Andy Warhol.

The rejection of the capability to focus only on the object by those mentioned in the last passage led to:

210 Classical Stimulus – Reflex theory, called also Classical Conditioning theory, was presented by Pavlov and later developed by Watson. In general assumption, the procedure of learning can be achieved by repetition of the biological stimulus paired with the neural stimulus. The relation between S-R theory and Kobro’s theory on sculpture lies in hers approach to the sequential and rhythmical form considered here as the stimulus. Robert A. Rescorla presented a paper about classical misunderstandings around classical conditioning. R.A. Rescorla, Pavlovian Conditioning It’s Not What You Think It Is American Psychologist, in: (ed.) A.E. Kazak, American Psychologist, 43(3), 1988, pp.151 – 160. First definition of Classical Conditioning was derived by Pavlov. I Pavlov, Conditioned reflexes. New York: Oxford University Press. 1927.
212 Ibid. p.230.
213 Ibid. p.239.
214 Ibid. p.240.
216 Ibid. pp.243-244.
217 Ibid. p.249.
in structural or abstract terms, compositional evidence of the minimalists to deny the logical importance of the interior space of forms – an interior space which much of the previous twentieth-century sculpture had celebrated.218

Krauss used the term ‘logic of organics’219 and through her earlier opinion on constructivism developed term: the organics of love. On the same page Krauss referred to Judd’s (and Moore’s, as an earlier historical reference) works which in the critical review of Krauss become a ‘trace of sculpture’. Next, the author wrote in that context about the necessity to divide the psychology of the artist from the art object.

Krauss expanded her critical review to research about Jasper Jones and the philosophy of Wittgenstein. Jones had attacked the ‘illusionism of art’ in his essential idea that there was no connection between the psychological matrix and the final object of art. Artists were battling with ‘denied non consciousness’.220 To support her view on that subject, Krauss derived Wittgenstein’s logical construction about [facts] and their self-relation. The philosophical text of the philosopher announced the possibilities of the cognition of the object.221 Therefore, in the case of minimalism art in the example of Frank Stella’s works we should speak of the ‘intention of art’, which was to search continuously for order to achieve its final logic. In Krauss’ opinion the art of Stella revealed that:

[...] expurgation of illusionism is unintelligible apart from this intention to lodge all meanings within the conventions of a public space.222

She explained minimalism as the externalization of significance, which would be a “compulsion to rationalisation”. In the next part of the book the author went back to Robert Morris again to note that art is a processed operation in the viewer’s private realm.223 For Krauss the works of Serra were a development of Morris’ first steps in the direction of understanding sculpture. The three-dimensional object of art in the example of Carl Andre become an ‘endless chain’ with the self-logical, self-sufficient ‘principle of non-artificial adherence’; an art that created itself.224

Krauss reviewed her primary question again and returned to her critical review of the shortlisted development of art by Rodin and Brancussi. Her observation of changes that occurred in the field of sculpture included the ‘vocabularity of form to the radically abstract’.225 Those changes were developed around one unchangeable phenomenon, i.e. that the imprint of the human was still perceptible in art objects. Art had received the possibility to exist as a double negative, which had been pointed out by the author in the example of the Spiral Jetty by Robert Smithson.226 That artwork was a ‘phenomenological evidence’ for art and a psychological response to objectivity. In the author’s opinion, contemporary sculpture was obsessed with the idea of passage, and she explained that the derivation was a starting point in her future ‘research’ through art.227
In the work of Krauss we may see the development of a certain path of thinking among her chosen sculptors of the 20th century, and the path of imprinting their individuality onto the substance of matter. Dealing with the consequences of aesthetic language was mostly based on the Freudian model of transference. Finally, there was an attempt to correspond with the viewer, not through the physical matter. It could be traced by borrowing terms from the field of psychoanalysis into art language, often used by Krauss to support her cosmogony.

2.1.b Marcel Duchamp’s Fountain – an object of art that caused a group dynamic process?

Rosalind Krauss made an historical and formal overview on the first works of Duchamp and his primal inspirations: art generators and industrial objects, where human thought was still present. Therefore, Duchamp can be ‘discovered’ in the context of art that could ask questions. ‘The Fountain’ of the artist is not a formal intervention. For Krauss it was a tangible, correct artwork with erotic emanation. The matter of Duchamp’s ‘erotism’ was further explained by the author in questions she put to the ‘object’ of art. In her derivation, ‘The Fountain’ was a sculpture that could not be understood only in the field of consciousness, therefore the author appealed to the field of psychoanalysis and called it a ‘psychopathology of everyday life’, which was obviously a misuse of ideas. The narration in Duchamp’s works was a kind of physical oxymoron. The way that narration was built was in an opposition to the hermeneutics verbalized by the artist. But in Krauss’ opinion, that was the key to understand Duchamp’s aetiology.228

Krauss concentrated on her own interpretation of the object produced by Duchamp, on her own understanding and use of psychoanalytical terms. Although the world of art owes some credit to Krauss in the field of art, Krauss’ interpretation of Duchamp’s work does not explain how that ‘erotic’ emanation of the artwork was discovered by her. The passage about the ‘psychopathology of everyday life’ was in relation to Freud’s work from 1901 about his approach to interpretation of dreams in the context of neurotic mechanisms229, not erotism. For Sigmund Freud, what he described as libido was not erotic. The love impulse, a kind of life force which, according to Freud, may emanate in the human mind as ‘love’, if we would focus consciousness on morally higher needs, was indeed based on his (and C. G. Jung’s) observations of dreams to explain neurotic behaviour230, but neither on the aesthetics of life, nor on erotism. Krauss’ writing about the understanding of the sculpture was focused on the physical aspect of the object, in a strategical purpose to use the object as an explanation to her further derivation about the existence of art from its context. In a way, those were also the words of Duchamp to other members of the Society of Independent Artists in New York in 1917.

Duchamp probably foresaw the reaction of the committee to the object by ‘Mr. Mutt’. He probably knew, even before the object was rejected, that the Fountain had no chance of being exhibited. Therefore, Duchamp was the artist who presented his privacy in the public sphere as the artistic value. The act of rejection gave him the possibility to express the

---

228 Ibid. pp. 72-83.
concept behind the object itself. The concept was far more important in itself than the ready-made piece of bathroom fitting. The physical object – the Fountain - was a vehicle for the idea of art, but not the interpretation of it (after Duchamp, Krauss turned it into the object that was able to ask questions). One might ask whether Duchamp emanated his personality, leaving the public free to judge. That was new for the times he lived in – the possibility for the artist to transform the group of responders by the object, knowing their possible reaction. Although ‘The Fountain’ was not exhibited in 1917 despite Duchamp’s position in the Society\textsuperscript{231}, thanks to the protection of some galleries in the 30s\textsuperscript{232} his concept survived in the form of documentation\textsuperscript{233} and further explored in the 60s. By making fourteen copies of the Fountain, one of them which can be seen in the Tate Modern\textsuperscript{234} today, the idea of ready-made got a new story behind it. The issue of the object as ready-made increased the role of the artist, but followers of Duchamp often focused on the issue of the physical object, treating the idea of ‘individuality exposed’ by their focus on the object.

2.2 Sculpture in public space as social engineered activity

Boris Groys’ observation on the role of documentation in the process of contextualization of artwork opens this subchapter. The sources included observations on relations of social factors with aesthetic judgment in possible implications for art. The research was channeled toward the different reflections on establishing artwork in the public space in writings of Faye Carey and Gheorghe Catalyn. The sources included opinions of Malcolm Miles, Miwoon Kwon, or Claire Bishop on the issue of reception of the sculpture in the public space in the context of art public programs. Sally Wills thoughts on the disproportion between commissioning administrative management and public art were presented.

Boris Groys noted in Art Power that the group of receivers who respond to objects of art may not deal with the ‘art’ directly, but with art documentation. In the context of basic typology, art documentation is not art, but the verbalized source about non-verbal communication held by the objects of art themselves.\textsuperscript{235} Groys divided art documentation in two ways: the recorded processes related to happenings\textsuperscript{236}, and any other form of artistic integration with the responder. The other way was the role of art documentation as the re-transmission of life processes. In that context, Groys claimed, after Foucault, Negri, Agamben and Hardt, that the responder who deals with such activity will experience biopolitics.\textsuperscript{237} Biopolitics, in a wider range of understanding, shifted direct life experience

\textsuperscript{236} Happening is a form of organized activity based on human interactions with the object or other people under artistic context. Term was used for the first time by Alan Kaprow. Happening [website] https://www.britannica.com/art/Happening (accessed 7 June 2017).
(one of the features devoted primarily to a modern view on art, for Schiller’s views on cure from alienation\textsuperscript{238}) onto artificial understanding of the surrounding reality.

Groys continued the thought of Walter Benjamin that sculpture becomes limited with the contact and further influence on the audience, if compared with the possibility of the cinema with its ease to replicate its own form.\textsuperscript{239} For Benjamin, replication led to a kind of aesthetical distraction, where the role of the mechanism of attracting attention to the aesthetical ‘aura’ of art led geometrically to the loss of quality. Benjamin observed the conjunction in the reception of the replicated forms of aesthetics like movies. In that form of communication, the growing need for ‘pleasure’ instead of the Schillerian idea for the development of the responder becomes significant. Benjamin noticed the link between a need for the unification of desires and the possession of aesthetical objects. Formally, the text of Benjamin led to the discovery of the importance of ‘kitsch’ in group reactions.\textsuperscript{240} Walter Benjamin conceptualized, that the ‘aura’ of an art piece could be reproduced to influence the population. However, process of multiplication will cause decrease of artistic quality.

The belief that replication would be allowed to influence group reactions was also praised by Lenin, when he spoke to Łunaczarski in 1922:

\textit{So, you must firmly remember, that for us the most important of all arts is the cinema.}\textsuperscript{241}

Coming back to Groys, the loss of the significance of sculpture in public space for media related to replication technologies was connected to the responders’ lack of interest in understanding the background processes in the creation of the artwork.\textsuperscript{242} In the opinion of Groys, the solution to access wider audience with the sculpture was used in social realism, by replication of the same poses, gestures, symbols and details in socialistic monuments made by the Soviets.\textsuperscript{243}

Public art always had a strong relation to legislative processes provided by the State, and eventually to political groups opposing social regulations.\textsuperscript{244} The actions of the latter groups, like the approach of feminists to the subject of public space, have been evolving during the past 40 years. Each of those groups had a different focus; therefore, the methods used by the artists sought to attain the highest efficiency. The role of sculpture moved slowly from the functional monument onto social interaction art. As Faye Carey noted, after 1977 when the Arts Council of Great Britain established the Art in Public Spaces programme, there was a necessity for open debate between the different parties involved. The subject of a new collaboration between architects and artists led to the creation of open platforms of exchange in the forms of seminars and education programmes.\textsuperscript{245} The idea came from Deanna Petherbridge, who managed most of the significant changes to establish the forum. As Martin Schonefeld from KIOER later noted, even years after the creation of such open

\textsuperscript{238} J.C.F. von Schiller, Letters Upon the Aesthetics Education of Man, Letter XX and Letter XXI. Due to limitations of the mind, the process of determinism required for human development will require external sources. Therefore, aesthetics will play the role of a positive influence of developmental processes for the mind.


\textsuperscript{240} W. Benjamin, \textit{The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction (1936)} UCLA School of Theatre, Film and Television; transcript 2005 et al.


\textsuperscript{243} Ibid. pp. 144-146.


platforms for communication, the tensions between architects and sculptors still seemed to be the strongest.246

Unlike Groys or Petherbridge, who saw the decrease of sculpture in public spaces in comparison to other forms of artistic activity mostly in economic factors, Berger, like Benjamin, saw the problem in the reception of art in the aesthetic-inductive context. The key term for Berger was ‘images’, where the perception of art was seen in materialistic terms. For Berger, the mind would not consider whether the visual impression was from the original sculpture or just the printed photo.247 In fact, the device used to record the image of the object in the hands of the performer – any kind of performer – played the most significant role. Berger focused on the manipulation of data. The picture of the sculpture itself, and it being reprinted within another context, would not only influence the reception of the object itself, but the whole group of responders related to that object of art in a way that could have nothing in common with the primal concept of the artist.248

Claire Bishop postulated that a sculptor, or any other artist who wishes to work contemporarily in public spaces, cannot ignore the social structure that his artwork will be involved in. In the beginning of her work she claimed there was a gap between sculpture commissions related to market agenda as a kind of ‘outer’ public realisations, and long-term public art projects with more coherent programmes. The matter of ethics became more significant in the process of the creation through the involvement with the receivers.249 After Grant Kester, Bishop put forth the opinion that without a bipolar dialogue the essence of art could not be achieved today. As an example after Kester, Bishop presented the work of Rachel Whiteread, House, from 1993. In her opinion, the sculpture realised in the studio and implemented after the region of East London could not be well received, due to the artist’s earlier lack of contact with the local community.250 The place for sculpture in public space could be better related if left as a question, or a platform for social research. The participatory role between the object of art and the receiver would be possible by such forms and actions that could include technophilic populism, as the Groupe de Research d’Art Visuel once presented.251 The research of GRAV on the synthesis between sculpture and spectacle led to a direct ‘democratization’ of the receivers in their art activities. Another subject was the choice of location, possibly close to widely inhabited areas or places of work and leisure to exert the highest influence on the responders.

As Malcolm Miles noted in his observation of the demolition of Gormley’s group of sculptures in Stavanger, [public] art is an intervention into the system of classification already existing in the moral issues presented by the group.252 According to Miles, the works of Gormley in Stavanger were attacked in a way that should exclude ‘rational’ behaviour of the vandals. Miles presented the thought that in public space the sculptor should be more aware of possible interventions of the crowd. That would include the role of the artist more
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246 Martin Schonefeld interviewed by Krzysztof Krzysztof, 2015, Appendix A.
248 Ibid. pp.17-18
251 Ibid. pp.78-79.
as an indicator of a subversive process in the public space. The process was explained by Miles:

[Subversion] is not a matter of admitting people to monumental status but of interrogating it and, where possible, of inverting the way that status is read from within the genre through which it is normally affirmed. It is useful to be clear about this difference.²⁵³

Atherton and Wilbourne are examples of artists capable of subverting already existing cultural materials into a new public platform, looking for paths to engage with the responders. Another example given by Miles was the works of Michael Sandle.²⁵⁴ In both examples Miles focused on the issue of re-working existing cultural material by artists. Therefore, an aspect of ‘engagement’ was subverted to the already existing platform of culture. For example, in the case of Sandle’s work St. George, the artist worked on the existing icon of the knight killing the dragon – the personification of evil, which Miles called ‘making a spoof monument’. That use of encrypted symbols was a work on the existing archetype. The deconstruction of the aesthetic monumentality of the artwork gave the sculpture a possibility for political engagement in the context of its public existence.

The work of Sandle presented another issue. The artist worked on the possibility to foresee the reaction of the responders. The relation between the responders’ reaction and the primal idea of the artist locked in the physical form was one of the key issues in the process of commissioning the sculptures for open public spaces. As Julian Spalding admitted, the artwork itself in not ‘alive’ on its own. No matter how much the artist would try to emphasise his own personality and his own ‘life’ into the process, the artwork would only be ‘alive’ in the lives of others.²⁵⁵

A found object, whether it is a brick or a urinal, cannot by itself inspire you with a heightened level of consciousness, just because it is selected and placed in a gallery. You can look at these things with a heightened consciousness, certainly, but you can never know, just by looking at them, if you are sharing the artist’s consciousness of these things.²⁵⁶

The question that should be asked then would be: how could sculpture be created to gain the highest level of impact on the group of responders with a high probability of success? Does the success of sculpture in public space mean a certain ecstatic happiness of the group of responders? Or should we rather speak about the attention gained by many, sometimes conflicting, groups who by the presence of the sculpture in public space meet and re-structure themselves?

Gheorghe Cătălin in his theoretical work reviewed several views on possible factors in the process of establishing artwork in the public space. Cătălin divided the areas of the research into four main courses presented in different theories of the public sphere:

After Negt and Kluge, the mercantilist dichotomy between the bourgeois and proletariat, where proletarian idealism becomes a substitute for social survival of the bourgeois,
After Hardt and Negri, the access to communication in variable forms which are hierarchized by the capitalistic state,

After Habermas, the operations of the state through the channels of communication – especially media supported (or owned) by the establishment,

After Nancy Fraser, the self-sustainable spheres of public exchange of power thanks to independently supported discourse.  

Cătălin also investigated the findings of Miwon Kwon, who claimed in her epistemology, supported by typological structures from the theory of communication practices by Raymond Williams, that most examples of commissioned artworks in public space generally had authoritarian origins. 

The author postulated that group relation to sculpture in public space was a predictable process, indicated by different social factors. In a way, Cătălin, similar to Kwon, did not leave the circle of Marxist approach to the subject, i.e. that the actions of man toward public art was related to primal indicators, understood here as political purposes. From Cătălin’s research it could be concluded that objects of art were rather not present in public for the aesthetical grammatology they could ignite in group processes, but as channels of communication between the parties. That postmodern approach to the subject was not proven by any experiments in public space by the researcher. The paper rather concentrated on findings of intellectuals who used historiosophy as a method.

Thanks to historical evidence, Kwon observed that in the beginnings of public sculpture after the Second World War, artists in the western political ‘hemisphere’ like Henry Moore were not interested in ‘participation’. Not even the subject of site-specific sculpture existed in the intention of the sculptor. In Kwon’s opinion, the reason for such a relation between the private views of the sculptor in the public realm could be that most sculptors were convinced about their own male power. Kwon noted, after Williams, that even artistic programmes run from the sixties as ‘pro-public’, or more precisely ‘pro-civic’ were, using Williams’ typology, paternalistic.

This relation evolved over the last forty years from the question ‘is public sculpture a kind of landmark, an emanation of power, or does public space coherent with sculpture (and vice-versa) become involved in local publicity?’ For Kwon, the question of the function of public art evolved after the 1970s when minimalism become recognised as an ‘icon’ for public commissions by the GSA or One Percent programmes. The issues around investments in public sculptures in the 70s led to a certain division in opinions about them. For Kwon, that was a pleasant, decorative contrast in the surroundings of the sculpture landscape, or, as she called it: ‘empty trophy’.

Kwon found, after Janet Cardon’s text from 1980, that a rejection of abstract art by the public often became ‘evidence’ in the eyes of the artists that the social ferment around the
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The work of art was a value of its own quality. The dynamic reaction of the responders toward the object gave the feeling of ‘truth’ about the quality of sculpture as its ‘entry’ into the public realm. From then on, public initiatives related to sculpture became a sort of imperative for the critical consideration of the ‘success’ of the artwork.

The significant problem, as extracted from the writings of Kwon, could be described as the lack of a tool to measure the exact value of sculpture in the public space. After a discussion between Greenberg and Krauss about the Kantian imperative and Hegelian dialectics, the debate did not seem to move forward. Kwon proved that the factors that influenced the development of public art programmes like the GSA – related to architectural commissions, the NEA – related toward ‘social interventions’ or European programmes such as the Peace through Arts programmes in Northern Ireland263 were many, but aesthetics was not one of them, at least not understood in the way Greenberg understood the Kantian imperative, or Krauss’ defence of Hegel.

The issue that emerges from the findings of Kwon is the question whether the significance of sculpture in public space relates to legislation (e.g. the Serra sculpture on Federal Plaza, racial issues (Ahearn’s works in South Bronx264) or valorization of urban identities (the Places with a Past programme265) as evidence for its impact. What could be answered by Kwon is that most of the legally run public commission programmes do not present a role for ‘better art’, but rather an anthropological discussion at best, or an authoritarian influence at worst, for one sole purpose: control.266

In the essay ‘Critical Spaces. Monuments and Changes’ by Malcolm Miles, the author focused on changes in the perception of the artist to the subject of the ‘city’ as a place for artistic experiment. Miles referred to his personal visit to Derry where he witnessed acts of vandalism to Anthony Gormley’s sculpture267 and notes that it could not carry the burden of the conflict. The author uses information from different fields such as Marxists theories by Lefebre and Foucault, and Deutsch, or artists like Rachel Whiteread, Claes Oldenburg or Coosje van Bruggen to emphasise three important words: transformation, intervention and manifestation, which play key roles in the cohesion of art in the public space. The writer wanted to bring closer the role of the impact of public artwork and extend the role of monumental art in the process of the democratization of public space.

In the ‘Challenges of Making Art in Public’ by Shelly Willis, the author focuses on the division between the theory of the public commissioning process in the USA and realistic problems artists encounter in that field. The author questions the limitations of the art commissioning on the art by Ann Hamilton, against Vito Acconci or Cliff Garten. Willis points out that the quality of artwork cannot be overthrown by limitations made by the commissioners and the system of administration. That field should evolve.

263 Daedrie Robb. Belfast Art Council Director, interviewed by Krzysztof Krzysztof, 2015, Appendix A
266 Ibid. p. 109.
267 This passage is written in the context of TSWA-3D project in 1987 held in Derry/Londonderry. Brendan McMenamin and Declan McGoangle interviewed by Krzysztof Krzysztof, 2016, Appendix A.
2.3 Commissioning the sculpture for public space in Northern Ireland and Poland – examination of legislative sources

From the area of theoretical writing, the research moves toward the sources related to legislation and commissioning of public sculpture in Northern Ireland and Poland. Those two geographical areas of research are examined in the context of perception and function of sculpture in the public space, its evaluation by commissioning bodies, and the legal definition of art and public space in those countries. The sources were examined under the condition of relating them to Kurt Lewin’s observations on the distinction between autocracy and democracy in the context of leadership in the group. Two other important issues related to the subject of that research was to find if the commissioning processes included group dynamic processes in the evaluation stage, and if commissioners considered non-rational behaviour in the process of evaluation and perception of the commissioned artworks. At this stage of research, the study of the used sources could help to find the best use of the method in comparison to existing evaluation models.

2.3.a Analysis of commissioning processes in Northern Ireland in the recent decade

The insight into legislative procedures relates to specific legal Acts issued since the Good Friday Agreement with the inclusion of the local authorities in Northern Ireland and the governments of the Republic of Ireland and the UK. The Agreement outlined the fundamentals of the positions of the political entities, included purely legislative subjects such as administrative changes, and also included a formal declaration about establishing a culture of tolerance and reconciliation. The framework did not focus particularly on the subject at the time, but some parts of the agreement certainly had a strong influence on the future movement of the local administration toward the inclusion of sculpture as an element of political changes toward the declared aims of ‘tolerance’ and ‘reconciliation’.

The significant points of the agreement were:

- Removal of the checkpoints and military installations. This not only influenced sociological changes, but implemented further changes in transportation, planning and art-in-site commissions.
- Removal from public spaces by all sides of the conflict such objects that might significantly disorder the reconciliation processes.
- Pluralism of justice administration.

From that basic information it could be derived that the legislative process allowed for further movement for all included political entities in building open society structures. At that stage, the legislation did not specify how the culture of Northern Ireland should be understood in terms of its own coherency, except to try to create public pluralism for all included groups of interest in those processes.

---

270 Ibid. pp. 22-23
271 Ibid. p. 25.
272 Ibid. p. 27.
To look deeper into the structural changes in Northern Ireland after 1998 in the context of the interaction of sculptures in public spaces, we should provide insight into influential institutions that already existed before the Agreement. One of those stakeholders would be the Planning Appeals Commission and the Arts Council.

The Planning Appeals Commission was established under Article 111(5) Planning (NI) Order 1991. The role of the commission was to regulate legislative procedures in implementation of permanent physical objects (e.g. architecture, roads and cultural objects) as an independent legislative body.273 The legislation underlying the authority of the commission stated that:

[5] Section 26 of the 2011 Planning Act requires applications for planning permission for certain major developments to be made to the Department for Infrastructure rather than to the local council. The major developments concerned are those which have been identified by the Department as being of significance to the whole or a substantial part of Northern Ireland, having significant effects outside Northern Ireland or involving a substantial departure from the local development plan. (…..)274

which in the context of sculpture in public space should be understood as a matter in the hierarchy of public interest. Therefore, the commissioners working for institutions would look for the so-called greater good of the whole community, understood here as the whole infrastructure. Although objects of culture were not directly mentioned, the role of the commission could have direct influence on any stakeholder interested in permanent installations of sculpture in the public space in Northern Ireland. The three factors that would be in the hands of the commission: charging costs to parties that had not finalized plans, appeal to stop a construction process, and social analysis by conducting research with the local parties of interest, all of which could influence the sculpture commissioning processes.275

The developmental plans were credited as the legislative framework. In the framework strategy for planning of Belfast city for 2015 276, we could read that one of the significant issues regarding public interest would be areas of archaeological importance. Developers had the duty to inform the authorities about any such discovery. Existing cultural heritage, especially such that had been influencing the landscape since the 17th century, would play the role of landmarks in any further development on their sites. Therefore, the historical preservation and conservation of those sites were considered to be of primary importance.277

The document had a directive stating that non-residential objects that did not meet high design standards would not be granted planning permission.278 Although that passage was
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directed at the stakeholders interested in the development of cultural and leisure objects in the area of Belfast, it should be understood that ‘non-residential’ also fits the definition of objects of art that could exist with non-residential architecture. The paper did not contain any further explanation of what should be understood as ‘good design’ but provided the reader with a passage about rather moral issues related to the developmental processes:

*The Department wishes to secure high quality of design, layout and landscaping in all-new non-residential developments to ensure more attractive and sustainable urban environments for present and future generations.* (…)\(^{279}\)

Although the definition of 'more attractive' design could not tell the reader what exactly should be understood as high quality in terms of cultural goods, the next passage in the document about tourism may shed more light on the subject.

In the part Policy OS3, the department provides certain directions about restrictions for development for objects in open spaces – understood also as areas of transportation. Those objects cannot influence citizens’ amenity, have a destructive impact on goods of archaeology, culture, or preservation of historical sites, or interrupt the transportation routes, and they should be:

[…]*sympathetic to the surrounding of the environment in the terms of sitting, layout and landscape treatment;* \(^{280}\)

According to the department, tourism as a factor played one of the two most significant roles in the developmental processes in contemporary Northern Ireland. The process of strengthening the influence of tourism in the area was set out in seven points. They included: growth in the interest of international tourism in Northern Ireland – especially in Europe, structuralising social processes with local groups in the context of growth of the capital, development of tourism infrastructure, establishing the image of Northern Ireland as a place worthy to visit on the basis of positive images from the area, to protect and enhance opportunities for tourism, promote the region as a centre for culture, sports and business, with a special scope on the development of the metropolitan area in the contemporary goods of culture, leisure and historical heritage.\(^{281}\)

The department presented its fellow stakeholders in the developmental plan for Belfast. In the context of local culture, the University of Ulster was mentioned in an informative way, as an institution that aimed to rebuild its infrastructure, double the number of students and develop a science park. Other mentioned issues included the development of arts, design and textiles (one of cultural heritage issues for Northern Ireland) for the local area. That plan of the University of Ulster was simultaneous to the plan of the department to increase employability in the area. The main scope of the department in the context of the generally understood culture was to present Belfast as a *modern European City*. Other stakeholders mentioned in that role were among others Queens University and the National Art Gallery. Institutions that would require additional interest, according to the department, would be Ulster Hall, the Lyric theatre, the Old Museum of Arts Centre and the Crescent Arts Centre. The closest stakeholders for the department, which would play a role in their developmental
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plans in the metropolitan area were also presented. They were the Department of Culture, Arts and Leisure (DCAL) and the Arts Council.282

For any future stakeholder who would take an interest in installations in the public (open) space in that area, it may be interesting that the plans of the department were set in 2004 and presented a framework until 2015. The paper included brief information from other local stakeholders, whose developmental plans were already ongoing. That could mean not only to pay attention to certain regulations (e.g. the protection of the existing urban heritage with significance for tourism and propaganda), but also to include the factor of time planning in the implementation of sculpture in open public spaces.

The next set of factors related to the context of the impact of sculpture in open public spaces can be found in the strategic planning of the Department of Culture, Arts and Leisure of Northern Ireland (DCAL).283 They do not have a mandatory character, but rather present some statutory ideas how the DCAL sees the cooperation with and the financing of artists. Another issue was presented in the context of the relation with audiences. The chairman of DCAL in the years 2011-2016, Bob Collins284, pointed out that for a good quality of culture and arts, the participants in the process should be open to the idea that we are speaking of a complex situation:

Art is not created in a vacuum. (…)285

Art has a function for the community. For Bob Collins, art had a positive role for the community because its presence could influence the development of the local potential in both ways: artists for the community and the community for artists. Therefore, the role of DCAL was to help amplify the relations between artists, works of art and the group of receivers by the creation of possibilities in different platforms: financial, communicative, informative and educative. Mr. Collins pointed out that the binding factor for the properly understood strategy for the development (and investment) of the arts was taking responsibility for that:

[...] those who receive public funds do everything possible to ensure that the bounty of those resources are enjoyed by and their benefits brought to those who, for whatever reasons, have not had the opportunity or the occasion to know them before now.286

Behind the general words about the role of arts for the community, this passage gave evidence about the work of the DCAL: to ensure that the happiness of the local community, understood in anthropological terms proposed by Lorenz about the ‘parliament of instincts’ 287, would lead to a general decrease of aggression.
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In the opinion of the DCAL, the strategy called *Creative Connections* brought certain developments in the area of public arts in the first few years of the 21st century. They were obtained by giving access to cultural events in the radius of 20 miles for every citizen of the region, with the help of the funds from the lottery, an investment of GBP 40.7 million was settled to reconsolidate the *most deprived areas* on the platform to end local racism, poor economy or general social conflicts, through the Re-Imaging Communities Programme devoted to place artists’ works directly to the local communities, 192 projects were implemented to decrease sectarianism and racism (the issue of The Troubles was not directly mentioned, although ‘sectarianism and racism’ would be understood as a direct connection to the troubled past).  

Under the themes of: Champion of Arts, Promote Access and Build a Sustainable Sector, the DCAL understood the investment and control over participatory projects to help the artists with their promotion, documentation of the Northern Irish heritage including the times of the Troubles, creation of the dedicated gallery of Northern Ireland, Re-Imaging Communities Programme, to fund education school programmes related to the arts, to give financial aid to people with limited funds who are interested in high culture, to increase art projects dedicated to elderly people by 100%, to help artists representing ethnic minorities by 200%, to establish a dynamic network between sectors of culture, industry and education and to strengthen contacts with foreign cultural institutions.

In the context of this thesis, the most important program run by the DCAL was Re-Imaging Communities.

In the catalogue ‘The Public Art Handbook’ established by the Art Council of Northern Ireland’s Director of Visual Artists, Toby Dennett, there was a statement about public art:

*Public art is about engagement and discussion, about new ways of thinking and looking, it is challenging, creative, ambitious and, dare one say, ‘controversial’.*

That statement appeared in an 84-page booklet devoted to one cause: to help cultural organisations and bodies of interest in Northern Ireland and Ireland to understand the path to obtain funding from the government’s sources for culture. The term *Aesthetic* appeared twice in the whole document – for the first time in the section regarding the commissioning process, on page 19, when it was referred to as being one function of public art. It appeared on page 21 for the second time, in a general specification of artworks defined as ‘public’.

The booklet included a list of keywords; those related to the subject presented by Dennett and Harron were:

*Engagement, discussion, creative, ambitious, controversial, thinking, community, research.*

Other keywords found in the booklet related to common artistic language used by artists:

---


Impact, vision.

Finally, the last keyword was added in relation to the context of research formally used by Harron, to emphasise the importance of proper recognition of the site, the community needs and the process of preparing the developing brief. The chosen keyword was: Ethics. Since establishment of the 1951 Arts Act in Ireland the issue of ethics in research was an ongoing and statutory development. Ethics as the standard in research stands in the documents like: Arts Act 2003, the Ethics in Public Office Act 1995 and the Standards in Public Office Act 2001 and the Code of Practice for the Governance of State Bodies 2009.

The keywords were presented from the most used to the least used in the whole text, without further insight into the broader context or meaning. The issue for that short structural grammatical research was to establish what terms were in focus of the Arts Council when working on the handbook.

The keywords were counted with the use of the ‘find’ section in the Adobe PDF formatting program. The final outcome of the findings is presented in the Table no. 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Number of appearance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creative</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vision</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engagement</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thinking</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambitious</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controversial</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethic</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Number of appearance for chosen terms in Public Art Handbook for Northern Ireland, 2006

As could be extracted from that basic experiment, the most commonly used word in the text was Community, followed by Creative and Vision. The keywords Engagement, Discussion and Research were in the middle of the list, although the keyword Community appeared
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more than four times more often. The words that appeared the least were: thinking, ambitious, aesthetics, controversial and impact. Finally, the keyword ethic did not appear at all.

The handbook provided fundamental knowledge about the management process of commissioning public artwork. That process could be presented in stages:

In the first stage, to create a network of stakeholders and inform them about the proposal in the form of a brief. In the second stage, the brief has to include data: Details of team members and their roles. Selection process. Working Context. Budget, including: advertising and selection costs; artist’s fee; materials and fabrication (production) costs; installation and transportation costs; travelling and workshop expenses; professional and legal fees; insurance costs; consultation costs; VAT; contingency; maintenance costs; publicity, documentation and launch costs. Timescale, durability, maintenance, and health and safety procedures. Considered themes. Technical information. Dimensions and weight requirement. Description of the site. In the third stage, there are open variables about the selection process of the commissioners. The Arts Council proposed open submission, limited competition, direct invitation or purchase of contemporary work straight from a gallery or other cultural institution. Technically, the variations of the selection process gave the commissioner a free hand to act without the necessity to explain the chosen method of selection to third parties. The Arts Council stated that although any competition model would be possible, only an open competition could be financially supported by the Council. The only exception would be in case of a lack of collective agreement by the panel related to shortening the funds.

In the fourth stage, the shortlisting and the final selection of the artwork should be made by a panel, ‘as representative as possible’. The project of the artist should be scored with the criteria of artistic quality: appropriateness of submission, quality of examples of previous work submitted, previous experience in working in the public realm, consideration of health and safety issues, durability and implications for future maintenance. The Arts Council could be involved in the contracting process between the artist and the panel. That involvement would be based on the possibility of receiving funding, as written in the handbook:

"it may be necessary to await the outcome of a funding decision for the second stage before actually entering into a firm contract with the selected artist".

The summary of the project, when started after signing the contract should include: names, addresses and definitions of the parties. The brief. The proposal, which should include drawings or photographs of a maquette. Insurance and professional indemnity requirements. Fees, costs and payment schedule. Key contractual dates. Ownership of work, copyright and moral rights. Defects in warranty terms. Warranty of originality. Site preparation, installation and maintenance, obligations. Permissions, such as planning permission or performance licenses. Formal acceptance and arbitration routes. The copyright of the work would always remain with the artist. This paragraph states that eventual profit related to intellectual law shall remain with the artist. It should be remembered in that context that the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act 1988 includes in sections 12 to 15 the issue of duration of the copyright (which could be important in case of
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decommissioned sculptures), and in section 31D the issue regarding licensing of the work. Section 62 states the copyright would not be infringed by making visual copies of the original e.g. by graphic or video documentation. Section 77 requires identification of the author as a legal necessity, if the artist is the originator of the artwork, as stated in section 11. According to section 96 and 191I, the copyright owner could infringe the copyright by himself. In contrast, it should be noted that there was an issue between an act of vandalism to the sculpture in the public space and the copyright law in the context of who would be responsible for the re-construction of the artwork after partial or full destruction. Section 191I and 191J could refer to that problem. In ‘A Word for Maintenance’ Harron proposed that reconstruction of the sculpture after damage by third parties should lie in the hands of the commissioners. The documentation and evaluation should be kept by the commissioners. One of the reasons for documentation given by Harron was to give future commissioners a good basis for the next art commissions. In the guideline the issue of launching the finished artwork was highlighted; it should be an event for everyone involved in its realisation. Involvement of media should be considered.

The handbook includes several examples of case studies from the sites with realised objects. The idea was to give future commissioners a wide range of possibilities, from single standing sculptures, through integrated art projects to community engaged artworks and temporary objects of art.

The briefs for artists preparing for the Building Peace thru Arts Program run under the Arts Council of Northern Ireland usually had a regular formula. From examples of briefs for art projects for Larne, Dromore, Dundalk, Drogheda, Redhills and Belfast City Cemetery, the context for such a document had been saturated. Usually, the brief included: application process, background, artist’s brief, public art selection panel/steering group, expression of interest submissions, budgets, fees and expenses for shortlisted artists, arts/design team responsibilities, the commissioner in action responsibilities, project timeline, ownership, contractual arrangements, submitting an expression of interest and further Information, and appendices.

Most of the projects proposed were focused on linking reconciliation, remembrance, education and community cohesion. The artwork should be made in durable materials with funds usually not extending GBP 45,000 in total. The artist should have earlier experience in public art commissioning. The shortlisted artists (usually three persons) may count on GBP 500 to help them realise models. The selection process would be achieved by means of scoring. Most of the briefs included a scoring table with evaluation given (Table 2).
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Table 2: An example of the scoring table used in evaluation of the project for Building Peace thru Arts Program.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Valuation</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Artistic Quality</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approach</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community engagement</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholder engagement</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, the briefs did not include a methodology explaining how the scoring process was to be implemented. On the example of Building Peace through the Arts – Another Brick In The Wall: Larne Public Art Commission, in Appendix B, section on Assessment Framework\(^{302}\) only presented the scoring system. The highest rank of five points was given for:

*The content of the Expression of Interest is excellent and fully addresses the requirements of the brief.*

and was called ‘Excellent’.

The other extreme, the poor score one-point assessment, was defined as:

*The content of the Expression of Interest is poor and fails to address the requirements of the brief.*

The lowest, called ‘Unacceptable’ was scored zero points and defined as:

*No response or unacceptable information provided.*

The saturation of data from the briefs led to the question: What was excellent and what was unacceptable in the context of art? If the scoring system was in relation to the brief’s requirements, it could be considered that the judgment of the artwork, although a collective action of the group, had to be made on assumptions. That would also include group dynamic processes in the group and their focus on the relations toward its own coherency (otherwise, the group would cease to exist) to keep its own identity.\(^{303}\)

Methodologies used on researched populations, as was done on examples from Northern Ireland, did not include the problem of subconscious collective processes with sculpture, not to mention that no one asked whether the process occurred, or how such processes could occur. In a study on the methodologies used in audits on public art by Catharine Ward Thompson, Andrew Patrizio and Alicia Montarzino\(^{304}\), the methodologies of Selwood (1995), Seine (2003) Bovaird (1997) or Craig (2003) surveys about the relation of sculptures with communities were focused on aspects such as framework, finances, social position or relation of the citizen to the state, rather than on the aesthetic quality, impact and possible change made by the object of art with the community. A study by researchers from the

\(^{302}\) Building Peace through the Arts – Another Brick In The Wall: Larne Public Art Commission, p.13 [website]


OPENSpace group shed light on this significant problem, which also appeared in the theoretical part of the study made in that research project.

However, certain observations on sculpture understood as social space were made in the work of Joanne Wallace.

In the final report by Joanne Wallace from January 2016 about the Evaluation of the Building Peace through the Arts: Re-Imaging Communities Programme, which was an externally prepared audit about the final shape of the programme, it could be found that:

Surveyed groups (both Protestant and Catholic) had strongly agreed (82% answers, n770), that thanks to the consultancies programme run in relation to art commissioning processes, they could express their feelings. The same group of responders gave the lowest level of agreement (53% agreed answers, n499) to the statement that the sessions raised issues that had not been actually discussed before.305

The impact of the commissioned artworks was most successful for seeing the area in a better light (95% answers). The questions about possible changes for the future of the area after the project’s impact, and the chance to bring the community together gained lesser ratings in the survey (number of 89% answers). It should be indicated that generally all answers about the project’s impact gained highly positive answers, oscillating around 92% of the responses.306

The artists who participated in the commissions on stage two of the project development often complained to the stakeholders about the lack of time for them to prepare for the final project evaluation and create the proposed maquettes.307

From the gathered sources, it could be indicated that both communities had the strong desire to strengthen their relationship.308 The same groups indicated that they did not find that the removal of historical heritage of the troubled past (e.g. murals, or memorizing conflict monuments) was always a good idea. The new sculptures, like the work of Shiro Matsuyama or the sculpture from Dundalk by James L. Hayes, were adapted to different levels of interaction.309 The outcome from the final report prepared by Wallace shed a certain amount of light on the question how sculpture interacted with or related to the group processes occurring in public spaces. Probably the most controversial issue was the wish expressed by the surveyed groups to increase the chances for a less sectarian and more coherent community, with the same expressed need to protect some cultural symbols of the past. That could mean that uses of contemporary sculpture in the public space could be presented on more platforms. It could be also presumed that the form and function of the sculptural art object should emerge from dynamic activity between the mind of the responder and the object of art, as Wallance observed in her study.
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2.3.b Enquiry into commissioning processes in Poland in the recent decade

The sculpture in the context of conflict in public space: artistic, mercantile, or legislative, was treated in a broader aspect of this research. The situation in Northern Ireland with its publicly exposed sculpture was very specific. To maintain a good quality of the study, the researcher decided to juxtapose the gathered sources with the condition of sculpture in public spaces in Poland, with certain historical and quasi-political similarities. Due to the nature of the research, the gathered findings included interviews with artists having practice with both sculpture in public spaces and the organisation of public sculpture events.

In Poland, the stakeholders usually involved in commissioning, or implementing sculptures in public spaces would be the Ministry of Culture and National Heritage, the Association of Polish Artists, the Orońska Sculpture Centre, the Adam Mickiewicz Institute, and local city councils. Although the main question of this study focused on sculpture but not on monuments, it would be difficult not to notice the strong conflict between ‘monument hatchery’ as Artur Tajber called it, and efforts to place sculpture in public space, made among others by Jerzy Bereś.310 Those more interested in the problem of ‘monumentalization’, or ‘iconization’ of cultural identity by commissioners in Poland should be led to the phenomenal PhD research by Dr Kazimierz Ożóg. Probably the only example of the de-contextualization of a monument of John Paul II onto sculpture, an installation and a ‘community friendly’ object found among more than 240 sources by Ożóg, was the work by Adam Olejniczak called the Saint Pilgrim Library from 2005 in Głogów.311

In the context of the ministry’s involvement, that government institution was focused on financial support in visual arts, where its role was defined as:

*The strategic objective of the Visual Arts Program is to support the most valuable phenomena in Polish contemporary art after 1945 and to popularize the most interesting developments from that period in art from Poland and over the world.* 312

The practical realisation of that idea was given into the hands of the Zachęta National Art Gallery officers.313 Artists as individuals could not directly ask for grants. Words such as *Ethics* or *Quality* did not appear in the protocol of the funding programme. The word *Community* was used just once, in the scoring protocol. The criteria acquired for funding were presented as follows: the visual art proposal should be in the context of the interest of Polish culture, it should propagate achievements of Polish and international art, be innovative, the proposal should serve cultural identity, tolerance for other cultures, could apply to a special historical jubilee or event and involve local communities, and the applicant should have gained previous experience in the organisation of similar projects.314

---

Zenon Butkiewicz, the Director of the Department of National Institutions of Culture in his answer to the researcher on 10th January 2011 about the involvement (or lack of it) of the institutions in the realisation of contemporary sculptures in public spaces in Poland stated that:

[...] I would like to inform that neither the institutions of culture, nor the MKiDN perform toward the artists, or their creativity the infamous role of the censor.

In the context of the question how the involvement of the MKiDN could help to look for a public space place for sculpture, free from cultural codes, Butkiewicz answered:

[...] I find it hard to refer to your questions about free from cultural codes space for sculpture - not only the space, but each of us is a "carrier" of many cultural topics, "freedom from them", or their creative use is a matter of individual choice. The action of "openness" or "closeness" by any institution in today's reality would be ineffective, and pure propaganda.

In the context of the fact that financing of non-governmental organisations by MKiDN was given into the hands of another institution of culture (Zachęta), the statement about non-involvement and non-censorship would require deeper analysis in the future. Most of the sculptures co-funded by the MKiDN in recent decades were monuments implemented with the purpose of protecting Polish historical heritage. It should be noted that often the subject of 'community involvement' in the context of co-funded sculptural monuments was in the form of a life-sized sculpted figure(s) sitting on a bench, where the responder – usually the tourist – could sit with the sculpted ‘person’.

The legal side of the implementation of the sculpture in public space in the case of Poland was constructed on the fundament of Article 73 of the Polish Constitution. It states that everyone shall have the freedom of artistic creation, without any additional legal contra arguments added. The same article speaks about free access to education. In the young democracy of the Polish Republic, Article 73 may play different roles, subject to the actual policies of the state. Since 2015 onwards the Institute of National Remembrance (IPN) prepared more than 300 monuments (the IPN website mentions 500 monuments) which remembered Soviets in Poland, for removal. The action of the IPN brought mixed responses, not only from the side of Russian diplomatic officials. According to Piotr Polechoński from the newspaper Glos Koszaliński, the city council representatives he

---

315 Mr Butkiewicz worked in department when the ministry was under Mr Bogdan Zdrojewski.
316 Letter from Mr Zenon Butkiewicz to Krzysztof Krzysztof, 10.01.2011, Appendix V.
317 Zachęta, similar to Adam Mickiewicz Institute would not exist without financial support from MKDiN. The proclamation of the ministry, that they would not influence decision-making in those institutions, just because officially they do not belong to the MKDiN structures, could be questioned.
interviewed called the idea of the IPN nonsense. The mayor of Biały Bór, Mr Paweł Mikolajewski stated:

*No monuments should be liquidated, because each of them is a record of our history, whatever it was* 

Therefore, the relation between artistic creation and free access to education in the Polish realm of public space could be troublesome to define.

To have a better insight into the subject of the research, the researcher interviewed several stakeholders who had practical experience in the context of the implementation of contemporary sculptures in public spaces in Poland after the year 2000.

### 2.4 Case studies of sculptures related to whether sculpture can evoke a group dynamic process

This part of the thesis focuses on which sculptures could start a dynamic group process, and under what conditions. It will rely on descriptive findings from three collections. The first is significant historical examples of artwork used in a discussion in the West and in the Soviet Union. Next, it focuses on cases from Northern Ireland from the period shortly prior to the Good Friday Agreement until 2015. The last collection of cases includes works from Poland.

The cases will be reviewed under the following conditions:

- Cases of sculptures that meant to evoke dynamic changes in the public space between responders, in the context of their reception on an aesthetical basis.
- Sculptures that probably evoked dynamic changes leading to open conflicts in the public space between responders, in the context of their reception on a political or ideological basis.
- Sculptures that provoked conflicts in the public space between responders, in the context of their reception on an unclear basis and that have been destroyed or damaged.
- Sculptures that probably did not cause conflicts in the public space between responders in the context of their reception, but that could have influenced social changes.

The cases reviewed in this subchapter are chosen in relation to dynamic changes between authoritarian and democratic groups in the theory of Lewin. According to his empirical findings, the authoritarian domination in the group is aggression-based action. Moreover, dominant behaviour by one member of the groups is interdependent with the members of

---


the other, primarily non-aggressive groups. The aspect of the role of aggression in the group toward the sculpture was examined under three main approaches to that subject. First the classical frustration-aggression theory (Dollard, Doob, Miller, Mowrer and Sears, 1939), where increased aggression is related to rising frustration in the process of reciprocity. The second aspect of aggression taken into consideration is the observations by Konrad Lorenz. For Lorenz, aggression was related to wellbeing achieved on the level of basic impulses. Both theories are related to Sigmund Freud’s approach to aggression, for whom the dualist role of Eros (live drive) and Thanatos (death drive) were in continuous conflict. In the concept of Freud, that conflict was a primal source of aggression. Erich Fromm presented a theory that opposed those neoinstinctivists, as he called them. For Fromm, aggression should be examined under the context of human passion, as one of the ways of experiencing and subjectively understanding the process of life.

The sources from the earlier subchapters regarding the authoritarian – democratic relation between the public sculpture and its responders were used as guidelines in the selection of the sources.

Most of the sources were related to last three decades of history in Northern Ireland and Poland. However, most significant examples relating to the previously gathered theoretical sources were also taken into consideration as points of reference to the main area of the study. That section includes Richard Serra’s work Tilted Arc, Mai Lin’s Veterans Monument, Frederick Hart’s Three soldiers, Vladimir Tatlin’s Monument of the 3rd International and Vera Mukhina’s Worker and the Kolkhoz Woman.

2.4.a Significant historical examples of artworks used in a discussion in the West and in the Soviet Union

Three Soldiers by Frederick Hart and Veterans Monument by Maya Lin

As a critical example, the social tensions were chosen around Maya Lin’s ‘Vietnam Veterans Memorial’ (1982); war veterans forced the committee to add figurative sculpture to the area of the monument. There is very limited information about that compromise in public arts, hence a direct quotation from the text by Tom Wolfe is added:

(...) Many veterans were furious. They regarded her (Maya Lin’s) wall as a gigantic pitiless tombstone that said, “Your so-called service was an absolutely pointless disaster.” They made so much noise that a compromise was struck. An American flag and statue would be added to the site. Hart was chosen to do the statue. He came up with a group of three

---

326 According to Dollard, Doob, Miller, Mowrer and Sears, the relation between aggression and frustration was presented by the authors of the theory as: “The occurrence of aggressive behaviour always presupposes the existence of frustration,” and “the existence of frustration always leads to some form of aggression.” B. J. Bushman, L. Rowell Huesmann, Handbook of Social Psychology, in: John Wiley&Sons, Published Online, 30 Jun 2010, p.838.
330 Erich Fromm: The truth is that all human passions, both the “good” and the “evil,” can be understood only as a person’s attempt to make sense of his life. Ibid. p. 9.
soldiers, realistic down to the aglets of their boot strings, who appear to have just emerged from the jungle into a clearing, where they are startled to see Lin’s V-shaped black wall bearing the names of their dead comrades. And later: (...) President Ronald Reagan presided at a dedication ceremony unveiling Hart's "Three Soldiers" on Veterans Day 1984. The next day, Hart looked for the art reviews . . . in The Washington Post . . . The New York Times . . . and, as time went by, other magazines. And once more, nothing . . . not even the inside-out tribute known as savaging. "Three Soldiers" received only so-called civic reviews, the sort of news or feature items or picture captions that say, in effect, "This thing is big, and it's outdoors, and you may see it on the way to work, and so we should probably tell you what it is." Civic reviews of outdoor representational sculpture often don't even mention the name of the sculptor. Why mention the artist -- since it's nonart by definition?331

From the text of Tom Wolfe it can be concluded that Hart’s ‘Three Soldiers’ not only divided the group of responders to the work of Maya Lin, but also strengthened the force of dynamic changes. It would be important to investigate the attitudes within the group of veterans, and the work of the media, probably trying to evoke a different reaction from the responders.332

Richard Serra’s ‘Tilted Arc’

This sculpture evoked mixed reactions, which in the end led to dismantling the object after several years of trial. The object was described in relation to the Berlin Wall, a symbolic obstacle for immigrants, some type of ship, Noah’s Ark, a graffiti ‘welcome’ wall, or criticism of the FBI.333

The sculpture was removed from the NYC Federal Plaza by a decision of the court in March 1989, a few days after the U.S. Berne Convention declaration, the text of which was upheld by Serra for the protection of his rights. After the removal of sculpture, the artist called the Berne Convention for the protection of Literary and Artistic works a ‘meaningless piece of paper’.

The decision of the Court was based on not accepting the work of Serra as a work of art. The judge’s decision was made in the name of U.S. Federal Law after hearing 150 witnesses. Neither the Berne Convention nor the statutory position of the artist did in this case give enough ‘weight’ as proof that the ‘Tilted Arc’ was an artwork per se. For Chief Judge Edward D. Re (in his private life, a professional classic musician) the value of the

332 The unsolved problem of the compromise described above continued with questions about the aesthetical response to Ground Zero in New York. Finally, we have today a post-modern architecture building by Daniel Libeskind, titled Freedom Tower, with a hyper realistic sculpture called ‘America’s Response Monument’, (or: De Oppresso Liber) by Douwe Blumberg (2011) beneath it. In the light of the example described above, the historiosophic concept of Habermas that public space be kept free to be a place for critical exchange of thought did not sustain the factual situation: that the group that organised itself to suppress the power of the State had simply not noticed that it is only one among many groups that also oppose the state – but they may use different transformation methods to show their voice in public discourse. On the other hand, Habermas’ observations compared with Maya Lin and Hart’s works were precise in one case: what is written about can become a matter of discussion, but can also be controlled. What is not written about does not exist.
proof was based on the witnesses – mostly users of the public space of the Federal Plaza in Manhattan – who did not see the ‘Tilted Arc’ as a work of art but simply an abstract form that prevented them from reaching their destinations more quickly. What is questionable until today in that case was the behaviour of the judge himself, who avoided calling the work of Serra ‘art work’ during the process, but was asking the elementary question about the idea of calling the sculpture ‘artwork’\textsuperscript{334} \textit{per excellence}.

It could be considered whether the ‘form descriptive to descriptive’ line of reasoning presented by Serra in his defence was used as a ‘word game’ by the judge, to present the ‘evidence’ in the case just to confirm his own affiliation.

\textbf{Tatlin 3\textsuperscript{rd} International and Shukov Tower}

The theorizing of Tatlin can be compared to the text of Nicolai Punin and his critical review devoted to the project/conceptual work of Tatlin: a ‘Monument to the Third International’\textsuperscript{335}. After a formal description of the concept (spiral, rotating offices, including a radio station on the top), the author revealed the purpose of the model: in the sense of Marxist-Leninism, for Punin:

\begin{quote}
(…) a social revolution by itself does not change artistic forms, but it provides a basis for their gradual transformation.\textsuperscript{336}
\end{quote}

The monument as a form of propaganda was exposed and explained. The author sought a relation to the Renaissance. In his opinion, individualized iconic heroes of the bourgeois society could not be proper carriers of communication. Therefore, that text was officially devoted to the purpose and role of constructivist sculpture as propaganda. Punin used common objects of industrial reality as evidence that ‘agitational action’ of figurative, static art will do not influence the masses. In that sense, the author claimed that the recognition of the surrounding reality should be related to the aesthetic language of art. For propaganda purposes, Punin ignored the fact that (…) \textit{a tram stop [which] is more than an obelisk} was quite an unseen element of the architectonical landscape outside of Moscow in the early 1920s. Therefore, the author referred to the imaginary, conceptual and future aspect of the whole idea of Tatlin (the ‘Monument to the Third International’ was never realised). From the text of Punin we may also track his relation to futurism (figure – static, machine – dynamic). In a formal sphere of language of aesthetics, the author did not develop a new typology, but supported himself with concepts of futurists; hence it would be good to consider his writings in the political context, as rather aesthetic.

In opposition to the described Punin propaganda – the conceptual model of Tatlin, it would be necessary to note that the most monumental and simultaneously constructivist object that was realised was a radio station near the centre of Moscow.

\textsuperscript{334} If most of the witnesses would call it a piece of art, then Serra’s sculpture would be naturally protected by the Berne Convection as an ‘object of cultural heritage’. (ed.) E. A. King and G. Levin, \textit{Ethics and the Visual Arts}, New York, Allsworth Press, 2006, p. 185.

\textsuperscript{335} N. Punin ‘The Monument to the Third International’ Moscow, 1920 et al.

\textsuperscript{336} Ibid. p.2
The best known and largest architectonical constructivist realisation in Moscow that still exists today is the hyperboloid, 160 metre high Shukov Tower. This steel object has been used as radio station tower ever since it was constructed in 1920-1922, and is still in use today. The Shukov Tower seems to be a factitious monument of the revolutionary times, where function equals aesthetics. Punin, who also wrote about that radio station, referred to the constructivist theorem of Rodchenko that revolutionary artists should work like a worker in three aspects of artistic realisation: material, construction and volume.

A monument must live the social and political life of the city and the city must live in it. The author did not hide that an idea of the commission about the sculpture was to present utopian, conceptual form, to be used as a propaganda icon of the revolution in the exhibitions of the West.

We maintain that the present project is the first revolutionary artistic work, and one which we can send to Europe

In that concept, the ‘Monument of the Third International’ is a symbolic work based on the cosmic order (Punin: spiral) in the kinetic turn of its own dichotomy, where suspended architectonical cubes (offices) represent holistic, ideal – utilitarian society. In the context of the main question of this thesis, it should be considered that the sculpture model by Tatlin played a role in the visualization of a perfect society and was exposed only in Moscow and Petrograd to attract the viewers with idealistic propaganda. It was thanks to Punin’s (and Mayakowski’s) role in the description of Tatlin’s wooden monument model that the concept of constructivist monuments could spread.

Vera Mukhina: The worker and the kolkhoz woman

Vera Mukhina was a sculptor and clothes designer who was first categorized as ‘constructivist’ during the period of the revolution. She cooperated with the costume design for the ‘Rose and Cross’ of Blok in 1919, and later, in 1925 designed ‘Patterns for the Proletariat’ – a series of clothes for different ‘working class’ social groups – together with Nadezhda Lamanova. But the most recognised object of her work was The Worker and the Kolkhoz Woman, exhibited in the USSR pavilion in the International Exhibition in Paris in 1937. The USSR Union of Artists was created five years earlier, mostly on the basis of AKhRR, which upheld traditions of the Peredvizhniki movement. Step by step, Mukhina became a leader among sculptors of socialist realism after 1926, moving away from the constructivist movement (at least in its aesthetical structure). What happened?

Recently, according to the Russian culture website Russia-ic.com, Vera Mukhina was called the ‘Queen of Soviet Sculpture’. The authors of the short video from the internet site were probably referring to her expansive interests in visual arts. Her earlier works, e.g. ‘The wind’ from 1926-27 were closer in aesthetics to Maillol than to Rodin or Bourdelle (where Mukhina studied during her years of education in Paris). In her earlier works Mukhina represented an interest in subjects not directly related to the concept of revolution as the...

339 Ibid. p.3
'dynamic group force', but rather a quasi-form of realism related to personal observation (her sculptures Peasant woman, 1927 or Fertility, 1934) of being human. If we would abandon the historical fact where, and under what circumstances her sculptures from that period were made, we could probably easily put them close to the French sculptors mentioned above, without a trace to the revolution in Soviet Russia, at least in the subject of their aesthetical presentation.\textsuperscript{341}

The Worker and the Kolkhoz Woman was strictly a different kind of sculpture for Mukhina. Not only due to the scale, but due to the behavioural and conceptual aspect. Not by coincidence, the artwork was made in welded stainless steel – the first time that technology was used on such a scale. It was to present technological advancements of the USSR Moreover, the sculpture was finalized and transported to Paris, where it stood in front of the German Reich pavilion (where, for comparison, Tatlin’s Monument of the Third International, was in fact just a model presented in several (better or worse) copies and exposed to the public only in Petrograd and Moscow). In the context of behavioural reaction, it must be noted that the scale of that art object was to incite a reaction of the leader\textsuperscript{342} to be followed by the crowd/group. A male – female junction of idealized figures was presented in a dynamic form, where the dominant element was a stylized symbol of the USSR – in fact an \textit{abstract} element of the hammer and the sickle (there is no practical use of both these tools together in reality, therefore, they are not \textit{real}, but an \textit{abstract} message). There is another hidden message here too – that idealized symbols were better accepted by the enhancement of a response-behavioural stimulus mechanism, by the sculptor adding a suggestive detail: the easily noticeable, hard nipples jutting from the woman breasts, beneath her almost invisible shirt. To understand this aspect, we have to be aware that sexual elements in social realist art were not strictly accepted by the PolitBureau. The decision to allow this suggestive stimulus to be exposed in the sculpture should clarify that the purpose of the sculpture was agitation on every level of consciousness of the receiver – in that case the visitor to the USSR pavilion in Paris in 1937.

In comparison to later works of Mukhina, it seems possible that the theoretical concept of Lunaczarski that revolution needs original and talented artists, who are not exactly conscious of their role, beyond the conformist followers, could be correct.

Although her sculpture had a certain propagandist success\textsuperscript{343}, there was no following of her aesthetical objects among later social-realists monuments, who mostly presented static, vertical humanoids (not exactly realistic) presented alone (Lenin in Nowa Huta by Mariusz Konieczny 1973-1989) or in a group (once the largest group in the world, the composition of Stalin leading the proletariat by Otokar Švec, Prague, 1955-1962). This leads to questioning how Mukhina arrived at such a coherent concept in the context of the ‘Worker

\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{341} In 2015 works of Mukhina were being promoted as Russian ‘Art Deco’ by Foundation ‘Art Russe’ founder, Mr. Andrei Filatov on his web programmes devoted to the contemporary French responders. \textit{Vera Mukhina. Worker and the Kolkhoz Woman}. [online video], 2015, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=cNsGtbUQjac (accessed 20 March 2015)
\textsuperscript{342} Understood there as an abstract concept of the Revolution, the idea.
\textsuperscript{343} Worker and the Kolkhoz Woman become a symbol of the MOSFILM and is still being reproduced.
and the Kolkhoz Woman’, and was it possible for her to structuralise all the aspects of that sculpture by herself?

The plaster model of the monument was done in 1935, already aiming at the exhibition in Paris. The dimensions of the plaster sculpture were 163×112×116 cm, (64⅛×44×45¾ inches). In that model, the aspect of the breasts was not so exposed; the figures had softer, more tender bodies. In the model, the anatomy of the woman’s body is correct – the breasts are in different positions due to the raised hand of the female. Meanwhile, in the final monument, the breasts were not sculpted anatomically and are in the same position – supposedly to get a stronger stimulus from the responder. The stylized hair of the ‘kolkhoz woman’, was rather copied from some contemporary ‘Vogue’ magazine than from a village girl working in the field.

According to Levon Koyojan344, the creation of the sculpture was no coincidence. The role of man – worker and woman – peasant was a transcript from the already used models, symbols of Soviet propaganda. The architect Boris Iofan, who was responsible for the pavilion base for the sculpture, found reminiscence to the Malevitch concepts on art.345 The concept of the peasant woman as the symbol of Soviet agriculture was used already in a Nikolai Kochergin poster from 1920.346 The merge of the city proletariat, the future of the USSR (presented by male workers) and agricultural ‘old’ Russia (the kolkhoz female) related to the new Stalinist concept of order in the USSR. and his constitution from 1935. The process of the creation of the final model was very limited for time – the artist had only three months to finalize the project with a group of collaborators. That leaves the question as to whether the simplification of the details in the sculpture in comparison to the first plaster model, as we can see in the photographs of the disassembled monument by Maxym Sevryguin on russiapedia.rt.com, were dictated by technology and time.347.

The Mukhina sculpture could trigger a question: Was socialist realism art a natural consequence after the first years of the revolution in Russia? The arguments by Stalin and Lenin that better acceptance of the socialist realism aesthetics was presented by the AKhRR group were not enough in the context of the findings from the field of cognitive psychology used in the USSR, because of the pragmatism of Lenin and the personal ‘taste’ of Stalin, and related to the denunciative practices of people like the ‘pro-regime critic’ Leopold Leonidovitch Awerbach.348 More important in the context of the study at hand was the pragmatic junction, based on the behavioural principle between verbal messages to the Soviet public (literature, posters, cinema) which could later be re-read in the sculptural objects, and by that process finally lead to a ‘controlled group process’ (at least in the intention of the interested parties) in public space.

344 L. Kojoyan, ‘Worker and Kolkhoz Woman, From Propaganda to Nostalgia’, Essay, the University of Maryland, 2011, et.al.
345 Ibid. p. 6.
346 Ibid. p.11.
Therefore, it should be considered that if we look into the process of the transformation of the public space by sculpture in the Soviet Union, the process from Tatlin’s Monument of the Third International to the monument of Mukhina could be a form of ‘battle’ between abstract art, based on Pythagorean concepts, and figurative ‘cult’ sculptures, but in the sense of group dynamic processes a natural consequence of that time. In modern Russia, the subject of constructive behavioural junction of sculptural form in the name of pragmatic social impact/effect might be a generally accepted issue. In 2000 the Russian post printed a 1.50 Rubel stamp where the symbolic ‘Russia’ was represented by Tatlin’s and Mukhina’s sculptures. The text on the stamp was exploratory in the context and meant: ‘The symbols of the socialist development /building/ construction/ system’ – four meanings for one word: ‘строительство’.349

We could try to transport the observations of Luria to review of the sculpture of Mukhina. The relation between building a verbalized message and sculptural form could be presented in steps: The sculpture, to achieve impact, could be a collection of related aesthetic details, with their own, coherent meanings, which together build a structuralised message.

The details (e.g. a hammer and sickle in Mukhina’s sculpture) should be named before implementation – like the subject of peasant woman or working man, which since 1920s already existed in Soviet propaganda in propagandist literature or on posters.

The composition of the sculpture could be dictated by the process of stimulus – reaction chains. That means the process of reading the form of the art object could not be based on only one impulse (which Malevich actually tried to achieve in his Black Square). It could be a chain relation in their own common grammatology that is easy to recognise – but not exactly to understand! After all, what is to understand in the position of a woman and man standing with two tools above their heads?

The process of stimulus – response350 could dynamically evolve without a moment for selfconscious reaction of the viewer. Therefore, objects like Tatlin’s sculptures could not match the task, not because of the aesthetics, but because they required their own self-interpretation. In that sense and in a way of the paradox, Tatlin had unconsciously denied his own idealism.

Finally, the responder could arrive at the assumption that he had come to understand the sculpture by himself, through his own, privately processed act of free will. In fact, what Soviet psychologists probably wanted was that it should be achieved by a reaction of the viewer to the stimulus, in a carefully designed process. If all viewers would arrive at the same assumption in that process, what would have happened in theory was that the leader (e.g. Lenin, Stalin or any other group leader) reacting to a crowd would react like to one person.351

349 English phonetical pronunciation: ‘строительство’. Full text was: Simbolyi Epoki Socialistchsekego Stroitelstva’.
350 Frederick Toates explained, that the subject of stimuli do not have to be a biological object only. The function of ‘sign’ is most important. F. Toates, The Interaction of Cognitive and Stimulus–Response Processes in the Control of Behaviour.in: Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews, Vol. 22, No. 1, Great Britain, Elsevier Science Ltd., 1998. p. 65.
351 For Reicher, in the theory of Le Bon about crowds, was that the crowd remains ‘speechless’ when the information is being dictated. Le Bon ideas in that ways stands in opposition to Lewin’s. Richer wrote: On an ideological level, Le Bon’s ideas serve several functions. Firstly, they act as a denial of voice. If crowds articulate grievances and alternative visions of society - if, in Martin Luther King’s resonant phrase, crowds are the voice of the oppressed - then Le Bonian
2.4.b Cases preceding the Good Friday Agreement, and further possible implications on the case of the Dromore Cemetery INLA monument and Antony Gormley’s Sculpture for Derry Walls

The public discussion about social reconciliation around the issue of the Troubles was individually set by the sculptors in Northern Ireland before the Re-Imaging Programme was established. Jane Leonard in her work on memorials to the causalities of the conflict in Northern Ireland divided sculptures used as memorials into two groups: those commissioned by individual stakeholders, and those that were a personal reaction of a sculptor. The main subject of those mostly temporary sculptures or installations was to contextualize the victims of the conflict. F.C. McWilliam Woman from Belfast from 1972\textsuperscript{352}, made in cast bronze, was rather a type of gallery piece with a commercial context\textsuperscript{353}, although it simultaneously became a source for the theoretical research on the subject of the complex history of Northern Ireland.\textsuperscript{354} According to Leonard, the sculpture by Anne Cheyne, ‘Regeneration,’ placed in Blackstaff Place, Belfast caused mixed emotions. The fiberglass and bronze sculpture in the form of a butterfly and caterpillar was, in the opinion of the artist, a symbol of the changing generation of citizens of Belfast in the 90s. The object was not perfectly exposed, and its visual presentation was disturbed by garbage and shards partly covering the view.\textsuperscript{355} In 1995 the sculptor Peter Rooney presented a dove made from temporary materials (plywood) that was mounted by him on a plinth where the statue of ‘roaring’ Hugh Hanna stood before its damage by an IRA bomb in 1970.\textsuperscript{356} According to Leonard, the sculpture of Rooney was burned down by loyalist groups days after its implementation on Carlisle Circus. Despite that, Rooney implemented other sculptures of iconic doves in other areas of Northern Ireland. The monument of Hugh Hanna was not restored due to interior conflicts among the Presbyterian community, although the action of Rooney started a first stage of a backlash from certain parts of the Loyalists who urged the city council to reconstruct the statue.\textsuperscript{357}

It could be asked, how sculpture of Rooney impacted the Presbyterian community, even though the original object had been burned to ashes.

In recent decades, several sculptors find themselves in opposition, not to sectarianism in public space of Northern Ireland, but to legislative actions of public sculpture


\textsuperscript{352} J. Leonard, Memorials to the Causalities of Conflict: Northern Ireland 1969 to 1997, Belfast, Northern Ireland Community Relations Council, 1997 p. 27.


\textsuperscript{354} D. Jewesbury, Looking at the Woman in Bomb Blast, 2014 [website]

\textsuperscript{355} J. Leonard, Memorials to the Causalities of Conflict: Northern Ireland 1969 to 1997, Belfast, Northern Ireland Community Relations Council, 1997 p. 27.


\textsuperscript{356} L. Murphy, ‘Roaring Hugh Hanna, the Preacher of Hate’, Andersonstown News August 22, 2013

commissioners. Tonya McMullan presented a performative art action in relation to the sculpture Spirit of Belfast by Dan George. For McMullan, the funding of projects like the Spirit of Belfast works as the removal of local artists from public spaces by granting projects focused on giving a new-but-illusionary face to Belfast.358

Antony Gormley’s Sculpture for Derry Walls

The sculpture by Gormley was a site-specific commissioned artwork for the TSWA 3D project in 1987. Originally there were three identical casts of iron sculptures exposed in three locations of Derry/Londonderry historic city walls: east wall, oriented toward the Foyle River, close to the Walker Monument, oriented toward the Bogside and on the Bastion oriented toward the Fountain Estate.359 The TSWA 3D project was one of many realised by Jonathan Harvey, a co-founder of Television South West (TSW) that was established in 1977.360 Shortly after implementation of the sculptures several acts of vandalism were committed against them.361 For Malcolm Miles the case was a base for the speculation that sculptures could not be proper conveyors of ideas for conflicted communities like those one in Derry/Londonderry.362 For Gormley himself, sculpture in general played the role of a ‘witness’ of human changes in a temporal reality. Therefore, sculpture could play a significant role in moments of political and social equinox. In Gormley’s opinion, the sculpture for Derry Walls was to:

‘draw energies to itself, possibly becoming the focus of reconciliation’363

The sculptures of Gormley were relocated in 2001; their new positions were on the east wall bastion, in the Millenium Forum theatre and on Newmarket street.364 The dimension of each sculpture was: 196 x 193 x 54 cm. Each of the sculptures present the same form: an iron-cast form of a human body reduced to the simplified silhouette of two humanoid object with theirs arms spread horizontally. The only open form

361 Brendan McMenamin and Declan McGoangle interviewed by Krzysztof Krzysztof, 2016, Appendix A.
and detail was the holes in the place for the eyes. That formalist solution gave a possibility for the viewer to look through the sculpture’s ‘eyes’ as the spectator of reality transformed by the sculpture itself. The orientation of the sculpture was partly toward the Derry Walls and partly toward the internal part of the old city of Derry. Looking through the sculpture’s ‘eyes’ gave the spectator a possibility to choose one of two directions to look through. The horizontally spread ‘arms’ of the silhouette of two joined men could be a resemblance to Christianity as the general concept. Gormley’s sculpture did not have any other religious attributes recognised as Stigma.  

**Dromore Cemetery INLA Monument**

The attempt to adorn public spaces with the use of sculpture in Northern Ireland as monuments could be regarded as mostly conflicting. In 2000 in the Dromore cemetery, the ten feet tall statue that presented an armed INLA man on a classicist plinth was erected to commemorate the ten deaths of republican hunger strikers in 1981. The object met with strong resistance from the side of the community, presented in the BBC by the Democratic Unionist Party assembly member Gregory Campbell. Campbell pointed out that:

*If people want to glorify terrorism and mass murder, it should be done in a place where the general public don’t take exception to it,*

Over the next seven years the BBC kept the up same tone about the monument, highlighting the issue of the object in the context of its removal urged later by another UOP alderman, Willie Hay. In 2007 Hay used the legislative path of argumentation that the Omagh District Council acted in an unauthorised way during the process of the erection of the monument. His plea to the Equality Commission was successful on some points:

The object was erected by breaking the letter of the law of the Omagh District Council based on the 1998 Agreement in the context of lowering the chances for future cooperation between conflicted communities. The object was not pluralist in its aesthetic form. Finally, the Dromore Memorial Committee did not gain access to the ground in a legal way.

There was a slight difference between the versions of the BBC and the Derry Journal on the issue of the eventual dismantling of the object. The BBC reported the intention that the object will be removed in its text version, whereas the Derry Journal had a more balanced tone, with the opinion of a City Derry Council spokesman who said that:

---
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It is our understanding that the offending monument in Dromore was not erected to commemorate anyone buried at the cemetery but in memory of persons who died and are buried elsewhere. The position, therefore, seems to be quite different and distinct from that pertaining to the controversial memorial in the City Cemetery.370

The next issue emerging from the words of Hay and the response of the Council was the matter of ownership of the land, and who would decide about the implemented object. The cemetery had a specific position, in-between the memorizing of the dead and political messaging. Hay, similar to Campbell urged for presenting the cemetery as a ‘plural space’, which could be already related to the matter of the hierarchical structure of an actor in the cultural bias processes371 between both communities. Both members of both political parties (DUP and IRSP) were involved in shaping the sociological behaviour of the responders in that public ‘debate’, simultaneously asking for political pluralism presented in the public media – which were not plural by definition.

The object itself, described mostly in political-symbolic contexts, gained aesthetic criticism from Dr Patrick Muldowney372, who referred the static composition of the monument to another military monument, the Diamond War Memorial.373

No glorification of war

I WISH to express concern at the public display in Derry of a sculpture depicting an armed man in what can only be described as an obscene glorification of political violence. I am referring to the monument in the Diamond in which a soldier is portrayed in the act of driving a bayonet in a downward direction presumably into the body of an opponent on the ground. The monument itself regularly forms part of commemorations of the last century’s military activities against the homes and persons of villagers, tribesmen and farmers in all corners of the globe. Perhaps the city fathers might consider making a formal apology for this city’s role in giving aid and comfort to military aggression against people who had not themselves come here to initiate hostilities against the people of Derry. When did the Turks, the Kenyans, the Egyptians, the Malays or the Boers ever do anything against us? When did the Chinese ever try to promote at gunpoint a trade in opium in the streets of Derry? When are we going to stop using our schools, churches and public spaces to commemorate and glorify warmongering, political violence and terror?374

For the stakeholders involved in the erection of that INLA monument, the object become a source for further political activities, or for presenting political statements in a broader way (Muldowney). The aesthetic side of the project was mostly not mentioned, nor its symbolical function. Among other dimensional objects that memorized the Troubles, one presented a rare example of a fully sculpted statue.

Jane Leonard had researched several objects in her monograph with a similar function to the INLA monument from the Dromore cemetery, but most of them were playing with

370 Ibid. (accessed 23 February 2016)
372 Muldowney was a member of Irish Labour Party. He was active in cases like to support UN membership for Palestine. Sadaka.ie, The Ireland Palestine Alliance, 2011 [website] http://www.terrasantalibera.org/Sadaka_Advertisement_September17-2011.pdf (accessed 6 March 2016)
The war memorial in Enniskillen, County Fermanagh, during its renovation process in 1991 was remodeled under the supervision of architect Richard Pierce by adding plinth sculpted doves, which symbolized the victims of the IRA bombing in 1987. The information added to the plinth of the memorial, that eleven added doves were for the killed ‘neighbours’, encountered some social ostracism from the part of those related to the victims of that bombing. The INLA monument from Dromore was far more direct in its paramilitary form in comparison to the monument from Enniskillen or to the Republican Memorial in Crossmaglen, Armagh by Yann Goulet implemented in 1979.

2.4.c Cases of sculptures implemented after the Friday Agreement

As Dr Daniel Jewesbury stated during his speech in the F.E McWilliam Gallery, the object Beacon of Hope conducted under the supervision of Andy Scott was erected in unusual circumstances in Belfast in 2006. Dr Daniel Jewesbury presented his findings on this object of art in the F.E McWilliam Gallery in 2016. In his speech about the ‘legalization’ of the city plaza for the implementation of that sculpture, he declared that the presentation of the work had a strong political background with unclear actions bypassing the Belfast Arts Council legislatives. Although Dr Jewesbery gained knowledge about the process behind the creation of the Beacon of Hope, he was unable to initiate enough counterreactions among the citizens to stop the implementation of the object, commonly called ‘Nuala with the Hula’ or ‘The Thing with the Ring’ by the locals.

Dr Daniel Jewesbury, an artist and researcher from Northern Ireland was asked in a five-minute interview with the ‘Alan in Belfast’ podcast radio about his comment on the ‘Rise’, which was implemented in the Broadway roundabout in Belfast in 2010. In the opinion of the artist, it could be observed how issues around turning that Belfast area into a tourist-friendly space had been visible in recent sculpture commissions. The public part became a part of the equation, where the main issue was around the question whether objects of art should be permanent or temporary. Dr Jewesbury asked whether the more than €400,000 spent on the Rise was a good idea if, in the area of Belfast, such a sum of money could have been spent on more local art events/artists and pro-culture organisations.

378 Seminar on ‘Public Art in conjunction with the ongoing Banbridge Public Art Commission process’, held by Dr Riann Coulter, F.E. Mc William Gallery, on 14th April 2016, with Dr Danel Jewesbury, Prof. Declan McGonagle, Dr Philip Napier, Dr Sally Williams and Brian Conolly. The speeches of Dr Jewesbury, Prof. McGonagle and Brian Conolly were recorded.
380 Author Andy Scott, sculpture Beacon of Hope was placed on the Thanksgiving plaza in Belfast on the private land of one of the sponsors. The object is 19.5 metres high.
He also provided deeper insight into the contemporary problem of art commissioning in Belfast in his text co-written with Robert Porter\textsuperscript{384}, where he focused on possible alternatives for the region of the Broadway area instead of the Rise. Possible solutions were identified by using historical and philosophical findings from Alain Badiou and Gilles Deleuze.\textsuperscript{385} The implementation of the Rise 'killed' the possibility to interpret the situation of ongoing social changes in the area of Broadway by local artists and dedicated communities. The Rise was chosen instead of the winning project by Ed Carpenter due to changes in steel prices in the period between 2005 and 2009.\textsuperscript{386} Dr Jewesbury observed that without the use of any sources from the historical and sectarian background of the area, the commissioning process became a sociological \textit{spectacle}. He pointed out that the possibility for interaction with so-called 'locals' was buried by giving the area of Broadway the object which physically took over the space without any private interaction. Finally, Dr Jewesbury asked about the importance of a critical public art practice that should include transcendental space for an \textit{announcement of possibility}. That would mean an ongoing process, rather than a temporary intervention with a long-term, undefined effect.\textsuperscript{387}

This artist’s activity in the field of public sculpture was not limited to critical writings. One of the public art commissions in Belfast stopped by Dr Jewesbury was an object called Magic Jug.\textsuperscript{388} The object, in the intention of the commissioners from the North Roads Service and the Department of Environment, was going to raise the quality of the city in terms of tourism. In response, Dr Jewesbury with Declan Hill (architect) prepared an open letter signed by more than 140 specialists from the field of art, design and architecture. The document was published on 21 May 2010 and included extensive criticism of the project.\textsuperscript{389} The issues raised were:

In the context of Procurement, there was not sufficient expertise made. Dr Jewesbury and Hill noticed a lacking influence of the Arts Council prerogatives during the reception of the project.

In the context of the location, the scale of the object which was going to rise up to five metres, would interrupt the pavements.

In the context of a Wider Plan, the object had not been considered in the context of long-term changes. The commissioners did not take into consideration the consequences of placing the object in the area located on the Westside Regeneration Plan.

In the context of Sustainability, the material used for the object – Chinese Black Shanxi granite – would be a waste of funds on transportation, and its carving would produce waste

\textsuperscript{384} Ibid. [podcast]
\textsuperscript{386} Ibid. p. 38.
\textsuperscript{387} Ibid. p. 51.

That last paragraph could shed certain light on the experience of the conflicted parties in the context of transportation and waste production. Firstly, if the Magic Jug was going to be carved in China, the legislative jurisdiction of the Arts Council of Northern Ireland would not appear there. Therefore, the aspect of waste could not be argued. Next, the transport of any merchandise from China is free. That legislative diagnosis of the letter of Dr Jewesbury and Hill showed certain aspects of their critical work: to use any possible argument to stop the implementation of the Magic Jug. The letter did not include any references to the classical language of aesthetic (wrong scale, lack of detail, non-dynamic composition, pseudo-Greek amphora with no historical connotations to the area etc.), but was full of quasi-legislative language. It could be considered that the success of Dr Jewesbury and Hill's letter lay in its rhetoric and number of gathered signatures, but not in essential aspects.

To 'get around' legislative procedures and implement the object in the city centre without previous communication with the local community, the physical space beneath the plinth of the sculpture was established as a private, but equally public market square. The space for the plinth was sold to the commissioners. The implementation of the sculpture positioned a part of local artists and art critics against the commissioning body, although the object got some reception, mostly from tourists. In some of the researched examples from the years 1991-2010, a visible tension could be noticed between some individual Northern Irish artists and public commissioners, and with the inclusion of the Arts Council as a legislative body. The featured issues of that tension could be diagnosed as differences in approach to the 'letter of the law' inscribed in documents like the Agreement, city council or Arts Council documents by interested parties, approach to the sculpture in public space from different angles of interest: as an object of ideological possession, sociological imperative, mercantile object or actionist factor, differences in the scope of the visionary context of what exactly is public space and how it is understood by the stakeholders and differences in understanding what would be a permanent or temporary role of the sculpture in the public space. It should be noted that sculptures made from time-resistant materials could be demolished, as happened to the work of Joan Smith, or decommissioned, as happened with the sculpture of Brian Conolly titled Turning Point,

- financial difficulties caused by insufficient financial management, as happened with the primal concept for Broadway, Belfast, or with the not realised sculpture of Louise Walsh for Londonderry in 2006.
- issues regarding differences in seeing the memory of cultural icons, as in the case of the proposition for the sculpture of an oversized red hand in the area of Odyssey grounds, Belfast which was a concept of the photographer Declan O’Neill presented in the Belfast Telegraph in 2010.  

Therefore, the legislative process of commissioning sculptures could not be statutory. The commissioning process, with its underlying political factors, would be one separate collection of laws. Simultaneously, the process of ownership of the artwork after the artist was paid could turn the artwork from the object of culture into a perpetual possession of the commissioner, who might – if found profitable in any way – decommission the sculpture from public space. That would mean that in the name of the law an object of contemporary commissioned public sculpture would not be permanent and not recognised as heritage, but rather an element of political anthropology in social practice.

According to artist the Lesley Cherry, the turning point in the triangular model of power exchange: artist – community – commissioner for the area of Ulster was her work Remember/Respect/Resolution exposed in exchange with the paramilitary mural in the area of Shankill road in 2009. The influential role of Ms. Cherry in the process of establishing the sculpture with the local community was carefully projected and mentored by herself. Thanks to her studies by means of defined research tools, as well as consultations with a large number of local individuals, the consensus with the sculpture was based on scientific research rather than an act of ‘artistic intuition’.

The problem about finding the right solution for the context and form for the sculpture in the public space implemented in sight of the conflict was spotted by Elena Bilodeau. On the example of the sculpture by Maurice Harron, Hands Across the Divide, sculpted for Derry, Londonderry and presented in 1991. Bilodeau argued that in the after 22 years from the implementation of the artwork, the symbolism of sculpture needed re-definition. The concept of the Syrian artist Khaled Barakeh from 2013 to join the distance between the two statues of men exposed as trying to grasp hands, was based on his belief that his work of that symbol might influence the responders to forge closer relationships. Because of the lack of further research about the perception of Barakeh’s action with Harron’s sculpture, Bolideau had to finish her observation on a general note:…:

Perhaps the day for Barakeh’s sculpture to fill the space between the hands has come. (…)  

---


399 Ibid. p 30.
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… to justify that political changes positively influenced the peace process in Derry/Londonderry. The writings of Bolideau were based on basic forms of dialectics, whereas the sculpture of Harron, or the Peace Bridge in Derry, were considered as symbols to describe the sociological background of the city.

2.4.d Cases of sculptures in relation to the Re-Imaging Community Programme and City Council pro public art programmes in Northern Ireland.

Shiro Masuyama’s Five Apples

The work of Shiro Masuyama was developed from a small 40x40x20 cm model where real apples drowned in resin were used to describe the artist’s idea. Each of the five apples presented a different symbol related to the apple as an object: Adam and Eve, Beatles, Steve Jobs, Newton, and Wilhelm Tell. According to the artist, the artwork was based on different meanings: religious, scientific, storytelling, business and pop culture. Those different subjects meant to be linked by the biological shape of the apples. The artwork was meant to have no historical (in the context of the place) connotations. In the context of aesthetics, the object of Matsuyama could be recognised as a group of five sculptures reconfiguring the site by its own self-structured composition on a metaphorical level. It could be also considered as installation on site due to the factitious lack of borders to its own effect on the surroundings. The group of apples was cast in resin and painted to become an enlarged mimesis of natural apples. The average size of each apple was around 165 cm in diameter. The height of the apples varied due to the respective subject. For example, the Adam and Eve apple was presented as the scrap of an apple. Newton’s apple was presented as smashed on the ground. Job’s apple was cut in half and could also be used as park bench. Tell’s apple was ‘shot’ with an arrow. The Beatles’ apple was a full and undamaged representation of an apple. The whole composition took up about 18x13 metres of space. At a distance of ten metres from the apples the commissioners placed a green painted table with an explanation of the project. The sculpture was placed near two paths in the green area of the park. The sculpture could be accessed directly from the paths. The location of the Five Apples was on the highest hill in the park, placed above the leisure and sports activities site, less than twenty metres from the wall of the park. The sculpture was surrounded by a green area with many trees.

The sculpture Five Apples was unveiled on 29 June 2015. In the next two months it was severely damaged. After conducting a case study on the sculpture, including an interview with the artist\textsuperscript{402}, it seemed important to investigate the case with an empirical study. In the first concept of the stakeholders sculpture of Matsuyama was going to stand in the school area \textsuperscript{403} Duclug Partnership and East Antrim Borough Council, with financial support of the Arts Council Building Peace through the Arts, Re-Imaging Communities programme and

\textsuperscript{401} In the context, whether those apples were a mimesis of natural apples, hyperrealist objects of art or eventually surrealist due to the way how they were presented on site was not the issue. Any taxonomy could be used here. Research was not made to prove or disprove if surrealism was more important than hyperrealism or mimesis of a giant apple could be considered as correct due to the fact that we do not have apples of that size in nature. All those issues were artistic concepts, not falsifiable and within the field of academic descriptiveness.

\textsuperscript{402} Shiro Masuyama interviewed by Krzysztof Krzysztof, 2015, Appendix A.

\textsuperscript{403} Ibid. [interview]
PACE III United Europe program, as: an artwork of excellence, developing a sense of ownership and pride and most importantly helping to create a new shared symbol of diversity for all. Matsuyama was mostly oriented on expressing the subject of diversity. After the attacks on the sculpture, the artist started to visit the site and repair the damaged artwork. Finally, after about three months, the attacks stopped. The person responsible for the attacks was never found.

The artist, in his declaration to the local press after the acts of vandalism wrote: ‘as a professional artist I cannot leave the sculptures within this terrible situation’. The Mayor of the Mid and East Antrim Borough Council Billy Ashe in an interview with Armanda Ferguson about vandalism in Ballymena communicated that attacks on Matsuyama’s sculpture were “an attack on the community”.

Ross Wilson – Mother, Daughter, Sister

The sculpture by Ross Wilson is an approximately two metres tall statue of a young woman wearing classical women’s fashion from the mid-50s to early 60s. The female faces the building of the old tobacco factory. The posture of the woman is static, her left arm raised holding a bag. The artwork is cast in silicone bronze alloy and patinaed. The length of the neck could be oversized, although the effect adds more ‘lightness’ to the whole statue. The base contains brief information about the artwork and its purpose.

According to the artist Ross Wilson, the sculpture is a homage to the women of Sandy Row. The project was financed from the sources of Arts Council Building Peace through the Arts, the Re-Imaging Communities programme and the Peace for Reconciliation PACE III programme managed by United Europe, and supported by the International Fund of Ireland. The organisation responsible for the management of the whole project was Belfast South Community Resources, which aimed to create an artwork that could multitask by capturing the memories of women of all ages living in that area of Belfast.

The sculpture was placed approximately 20 metres in front of the mural picturing ‘King Billy’. Sandy Row was a loyalist stronghold of the U.D.A. and U.F.F. during the Troubles. The mural of King Billy replaced earlier mural pro-loyalist work with strong paramilitary aesthetics. According to the final report by the Department for Social Development on the needs of working class protestant communities from 2012:

“In Sandy Row, 57% of households with children are headed by lone parents who require support and encouragement to access training and employment opportunities. 21% of the

---


The sculpture of John ‘Rinty’ Monaghan in Cathedral Gardens, Belfast, by Alan Beattie Herriot

Alan Beattie Herriot made the sculpture of the boxer based on a photo of Rinty singing after winning a fight. Monaghan is portrayed in his boxer outfit, smiling, holding the microphone in one hand and raising the second one in a gesture of victory. The figure was sculpted with a high standard of realism in dark patinaed bronze. Including the basis, the sculpture is ten feet tall. The artwork is oriented toward Donegall Street, standing approximately 25 metres from the south wall of the university building. It is possible to reach the object from both sides. There are two architectural concrete constructions near the left and right side of the sculpture, with plants growing in them. There is a possibility to sit on benches close to the sculpture. Behind the artwork is the open space of the plaza with a main road. Approximately 50 metres behind the sculpture are three large buoys. The shape of the park is not regular, with many asymmetrical orientation points such as buoys, street lights and a bus shelter. The main points of architectonic significance from the point where the sculpture is placed are the university, the cathedral and the Belfast Telegraph newspaper building on the other side of Donegall Road. The sculpture of Monaghan is not symmetrically placed on the plaza, and is more visible from the side of the road rather than from inside the plaza.

The sculpture was installed on 20 August 2015 with the assistance of Monaghan’s family. It was the first of three sculptures of local boxers important for Belfast’s sporting history. The project was coordinated and funded by Belfast City Council. Monaghan was a first flyweight boxing champion in 1948, when he won by KO in the seventh round, with Jackie Patterson winning the Commonwealth (British Empire) flyweight title, the BBBoC British flyweight title and the National Boxing Association World flyweight title. The boxer was also known to sing: ‘When Irish eyes are smiling’, originally written by Chauncey Olcott and George Graff Jr, after winning a fight. According to Dan McAlister and Maurice Fitzmaurice from BelfastLive, Monaghan played an important role in the local community where his statue was placed. People living near to Buoy park could easy get to the sculpture. In the concept of the commissioners, the sculpture of Monaghan should focus on raising the pride of being a Belfast citizen in the community.

2.4.e Overtaking public space by sculpture in Poland after 1997. Cases of Hasior’s sculpture on Snożka Pass, Słowacki’s monument by Stasz and Xavery Dunikowski’s Saint Anna Uprising Act Monument

Xavery Dunikowski’s Saint Anna Uprising Act Monument

The Saint Anna Monument, now called ‘The uprising act’ in Poland, near Opole was re-sculpted by Xavery Dunikowski between 1946 to 1955 from a former pro-Nazi architectural mausoleum for 51 fallen members of the Freikorps, projected and finalized in 1938 by Robert Tischler. Before later re-builds, since 1921 that was a memorial for German soldiers on the private land of count von Francken-Sierstorpff, a member of the NSDAP.

After being freed from Auschwitz concentration camp in 1945 by the Soviets, Dunikowski received the opportunity to reconstruct the quasi-architectonic composition on Saint Anna that had been partly destroyed by Soviet soldiers. The region of the mountain was heavily damaged during the battle on 21 May 1921 during the 3rd Silesian Uprising. It was also a site of religious practice. The local communities, defined by the new government as dangerous due to their real, or hypothetical connotations to the Germans during World War II, were re-located by force. Therefore, it become important to create a new meaning for the site that was neither religious, nor related to German culture. However, the aspect of 3rd Silesian Uprising should be evoked as evidence in the Marxists-Leninist course of dialectics. The purpose of the monument was to present a new political order in a form of easily accessible *biblia pauperum*.

The remaining fragments of the monument were re-constructed into a massive object with four pillars. On the walls of the pillars Dunikowski carved series of people, in a quasi-Egyptian narrative style. The carved groups included women with children, working foundry men, soldiers with characteristic Soviet-type World War II helmets, and Slavic warriors.

The orientation for the use of the object was also changed. Before de-reconstruction, the main site was an amphitheatre below the rock the mausoleum used for political purposes of the NSDAP. After completion of the new monument in 1955, the main access to the object was from an open space on top of the mountain. The object fell into disrepair after

---


415 Although promoting the walking ‘stations of the cross’ in that region, the monument was never mentioned by religious sources e.g.: Góra Świętej Anny, 2004 [website] http://www.swanna.pl/ (accessed 18 February 2015)

416 According to Ryszard Kaczmarek, since the beginning of 1945 first transports of Germans were transported from region of Upper Slesia to Germany. R. Kaczmarek, *Górny Śląsk Podczas II Wojny Światowej*, Katowice, Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego, 2006, p.407.

1990, until 2005 when it was renovated.\textsuperscript{418} Since 2016 the amphitheatre is used for the rock festival Igrzyska Rockowe (Rock Olympics).\textsuperscript{419}

\textbf{Władysław Hasior's Sculpture on the Snożka Pass}

In 1966 a new sculpture/monument was erected in the Snożka Pass, on the border between the Gorce and Pieniny mountains.\textsuperscript{420} The creator of the artwork, Władysław Hasior, later claimed that his sculpture was devoted to all people who died in that region, which was heavily devastated by war and post-war actions:

\textit{We are getting closer to the main sin in my life. The monument “Glory” ... That monument will always play an important role in my artistic adventure. I come from ‘Janko the Musician’ - I must play. So I came up with an idea of the playing monument, absolutely simple matter. It would play thanks to the power of nature. Thanks to the mountain winds. Some say ominously, critically - so you're nice and sympathetic, and you put a monument for the Communists. And others see it as an object that could only be, because it is not, has not been finished, like some important phenomenon. It could be the first playing monument in Europe. It is true that the authorities who were ordering that monument, wanted to commemorate the people who fought on their side in our small civil war. For me it is a memorial to all those, who were entangled in the gears of history, shooting each other in this area, sometimes without being aware of what they were involved in.}\textsuperscript{421}

The abstract form ended with triangular shaped objects, which were also going to be the organs that would play a 'melody' on the wind for the dead. Hasior himself was born in that region and witnessed war and post-war chaos. After the death of Stalin, the situation of the second avant-garde was a bit better (Strzemiński and others were allowed to work in academies in the Polish People’s Republic after 1953\textsuperscript{422}), but there was no permit from the state for individual actions for the artists. For example, the monument devoted to Neil Armstrong and individually created by Danuta Nabel-Bochenek was totally demolished by an official order, days after its creation in 1969.\textsuperscript{423} Hasior was no exception, he had to cooperate for permits (and money) from the state. But when the object was made, the state changed the context. A plaque was added to the sculpture/monument, with the inscription:

\textit{Faithful sons of the fatherland who died in Podhale in the struggle to consolidate the people's power - the society of Kraków for the 100th anniversary of the Polish State 1966}\textsuperscript{424}

\begin{flushright}
\footnotesize
\textsuperscript{420} Coordinates: 49°27′07″N 20°19′01″E
\textsuperscript{422} Andrzej Tajber interview by Krzysztof Krzysztof, 2015, Appendix A
\textsuperscript{423} M. Syrda-Śliwa, ‘Bronowianki portret własny’, Gazeta Bronowicka, Kraków, Rada i Zarząd Dzielnicy VI Krakowa, no. 30, 1999, et. al.
\end{flushright}
Another added detail was a social-realist group of soldiers carved in stone. They were holding guns and were placed in vertical positions under the plaque. After the grand opening, it was quickly discovered that the sculpture had no elements able to create audio effects. There were several versions of why that happened: 1) the local priest destroyed those elements, 2) Hasior himself changed the concept when he realised that his sculpture will gain another, political context, 3) the state limited the funding of the monument, 4) the object was wrongly constructed and unable to produce sound.\textsuperscript{425}

With time, the sculpture gained huge interest among people devoted to Hasior’s work, who admired it without any political connotations. In contrast, among part of the local community and related to the political opposition, the monument become a symbol of the Communist occupation of Poland. Therefore, it is here referred to as a sculpture/monument. Followers of Hasior saw the sculpture, and followers of political revisionism – the monument!

According to media sources, the most crucial time for the sculpture was the period 2008-2010, when a local history teacher and a scout leader with the help of ‘Law and Justice’ party politicians made attempts to dismantle it.\textsuperscript{426} However, they failed. The sculpture was ‘de-communized’. The plaque with the inscription was removed, the sculpture was repainted and restored by a private sponsor. Local authorities from the nearby village Kluszkowice ordered Gorals musicians to play at the re-opening, giving it a new audience. The sculpture was finally able to produce some sounds, not organs, as in the first concept of Hasior, but pastoral bells that were hung on the sculpture. Although discussion about the sculpture continued, it had become more of a tourist attraction, with a symbolic role of the past history.

The possible destruction of the sculpture had changed into its own success. The object was not only not demolished, but also restored. Its final function had been transported closer to its primal idea of the sculpture for all who fought in the period of 1939-1947. What were the factors?

The object was well known in Poland, as well in the countries where Hasior exhibited during his life, e.g. in Norway and Italy. That helped in the organisation of a counter-strike, by a group of people who resisted the political movements of the Law and Justice party to dismantle the object. The non-formal leaders of the group of activists among academics were Prof. Andrzej Szarek and Prof. Jerzy Fober from the University of Cieszyn, both former students of Hasior. Other influential leaders were local politicians: Mayor Waldemar Wojtaszek, councillors Jolanta Frankiewicz-Bednarczyk, Tadeusz Wróbla and an ex-soldier, amateur sculptor Jerzy Sosna.\textsuperscript{427}

The sculpture became protected by the local community, represented by the politicians mentioned above, who mostly saw it as a kind of a tourist attraction. The region is very picturesque, with an artificial lake nearby and several spas built recently. Today most of the

villagers from this region make money from tourism.\textsuperscript{428} It was a natural consequence that the sculpture of Hasior would be seen as a tourist attraction rather than a historical monument.

The object was restored by a large group of independent shareholders. That included the Czorsztyn Community and the Foundation for the Development of the Czorsztyn Lake, who collected money from private sources due to the fact that the Law and Justice local leaders were opposed to funding the restoration.\textsuperscript{429}

Neither the initiator of the action against the sculpture, local history teacher Adam Błaszczyk, nor the politician Anna Paluch were born in the region. Błaszczyk came from Łódź, where he was already involved in pro-nationalist institutions.\textsuperscript{430} His contacts in the region were based on other scout groups, whose members were mostly from other regions of Poland. Although very active in his field of interest, he did not have enough influence on the shape of local interests. Meanwhile, many people who opposed the action of dismantling the sculpture were people (including Szarek, Fober or Hasior himself) born in that region and also former students of the Kenar School. Hasior was also a teacher in the ‘Kenar’. The authority of the professorial body also had a strong influence on young students of art, who after the words of Szarek, “that action of Błaszczyk was ‘barbarism’”, stood against the politicians of the Law and Justice party by using Facebook as a source of communication.

The whole process was broadly discussed in the media, especially in the main stream sources, such as Gazeta Wyborcza, where ‘ordinary people’ commented that they wanted to keep the sculpture. There was no direct obscurantism against the sculpture in the local sources, instead informative language was used.

The committee against the monument, which included the Władysław Zamoyski Club from Zakopane, the Main Board of Association of Highlanders, the Gymnastic Society “Sokół” from Zakopane, the Association of Polish Spisz and Orawa Friends Society did not present any considerable programme for the region of the Kluszkowice village as an alternative for the location. The committee only commented that the monument was a glorification of communism, presenting one side of the history. In fact, many Gorals involved in the military actions of the World War II in that region preferred to be part of the peasant battalions rather belong to the Homeland Army. Therefore, the argumentation of the committee (generally financed by US-Polish immigrants) for the Homeland Army was not well received. The peasant battalions had the better ‘memory’ among the locals, due to their function as lawmakers during the war, in close cooperate with the local peasantry, whereas the Homeland Army rather presented the picture of a ‘landlord’s’ agenda, treating villagers like servants.\textsuperscript{431}

The change of the inscription from the primal text into the relative title: ‘Organs’ created at least some new nonpolitical context for the sculpture. Although the story behind the artwork


\textsuperscript{429} Żelazne Organy, Kluszkowice, Fotopolska.eu, 2012 [website]


was known from many historical sources, the change of the title made the reception of the sculpture closer to its ‘given’ title by the artist himself.

The situation around the sculpture of Hasior could be evidence that the strong context of the artwork may actually be its value. In an atmosphere of conflict raised in political circles, the sculpture was able to ‘defeat its own quality’ by multiple factors. The existence of that object bound together different groups of interest: academics, friends and students of Hasior, businessmen and local community leaders. The paradox was that the form of purely constructivist-abstractive art became easier to defend as a sculpture than if it would have been a figurative monument (the vertically positioned soldiers were finally removed with the first inscription in 2010).

**Śląwicki’s Monument in Lublin by Kazimierz Stasz**

The monument of polish poet Juliusz Słöwacki was made in 1999 inside habitual complex in Lublin by the sculptor Kazimierz Stasz. The complex was earlier designed by Hansen in the years 1964-1975. The monument was a typical memorizing object with elements of text and a partly realistic head and torso of Słöwacki. Although the monument was meant to be representative for the concept of a ‘free’ Poland from the Soviets, the aesthetic form of the monument was ironically a hyper-social realist object. There was no open commission for the monument and its realisation was made on a political basis. According to Kazimierz S. Ożóg, Stasz, who was the local Lublin artist, had only realised small sculptural objects before (mostly medals). Because he was an active member of Solidarity and in the local section of ZPAP, the decision to make the monument by him was decided by three local powers: church, local politicians and the administrator of the complex, Jerzy Wójcicki (none of them were a local citizen). The sculpture did not play any special role in what Hansen called the ‘cognitive space’ of the complex he had designed. Object of Stasz could be considered as an example for many similar projects: commemorating history and simultaneously being aesthetically close to socialist realism. Hansen, who still lived in 1999 was not invited to the board of commissioners.

---


434 Stasz was mentioned on the website of the Lublin Polish Association of Artists (ZPAP) as a skilled organiser and one of the members of the association who transformed it into legal a institution after 1989. ZPAP Lublin, 2017 [website] http://www.zpap-lublin.pl/index.php?option=com_content&view=category&id=86 (accessed 3 September 2015)

435 Bogdan Zdrojewski, who was in years 2007 – 2014 the Polish Minister of Culture, had openly said about the core of the problem with monuments in Poland. According to him, those object serve the commissioners but not the community. The term used in Poland to describe that cultural phenomena is called ‘monument – o – mania’ (in Polish: pomnikomania, Polish ‘pomnik’ is the word for English ‘ monument’). B. Zdrojewski, ‘Minister: w Polsce panuje "pomnikomania". Przez nią kraj staje się brzydszy’, Onet Wiadomości, 2010 [website] http://wiadomosci.onet.pl/kraj/minister-w-polsce-panuje-pomnikomania-przez-nia-kraj-staje-sie-brzydszy/p2h1k (accessed 1 June 2017)
Tomasz Koclęga - Transience

The first contemporary sculpture erected in Rybnik was ‘Transience’ in 2013 by Tomasz Koclęga.\(^{436}\) The sculpture is placed near the local airport on a roundabout, on the road 44 between Żory and Rybnik.

The sculpture was created without any consultation with the local communities. The work of Koclęga presents a transfigurative object made from plastic cans and resin with fiber glass, of a person who stands on one leg with arms wide open, like a child pretending to be an ‘airplane’. After the installation of the sculpture there was a wave of opposition, documented in the form of comments left on the internet.\(^{437}\) The strongest opposition toward the sculpture was represented in the opinions and questions: why is the city of Rybnik investing in art but not schools, hospitals or other opinions, defined as ‘social issue’ initiatives. The other argument for the rejection was that artists should not be paid ‘more than hard working people’. The opposition to that art object was also a petition to the Voivod of Silesia by Mr Tadeusz Dybała\(^{438}\), that the sculpture in his opinion would cause car accidents. Next, according to Mr Dybała, the city of Rybnik had not paid PLN 59,000, but PLN 79,000 to the artist. After a local inspection in 2013 by Voivod’s Silesian Provincial Inspector of Building Construction, the petition of Mr Dybala was rejected. In the years 2013-2015 the sculpture was vandalised twice with vulgar graffiti with pro-hooligan slogans.\(^{439}\) After the first few months, the level of rejection to the sculpture started to decrease. Currently (the situation in 2016), the opinion of local communities in Rybnik is considered to be more positive.

Ryho Paprocki – Garden of Salt and Art

The work of Paprocki was a temporary sculptural installation\(^{440}\) made from plastic stretch tape. The material was mounted on the ground with the use of metal rods. Other ends of the tape were connected to the trees in the park, without damaging the trunks. The repeated structures created a rhythm of lines ‘suspended’ in space between the ground and the trees. The lines interfered with the surrounding and their own structure as well as giving an optical illusion of a solid, permanent structure. The object harmonised with the site, but simultaneously reshaped the context of the park. The structures created intervals that vibrated slightly with the movement of the trees in the wind. The artwork occupied 25 by 15 metres of the park area and was approximately 3.5 metres high. There was free access to the work from the paths in the park. The artist left some brief information about the project hanging on a string, asking not to destroy the work. The object could be seen from two streets running parallel to the park from a distance of approximately 100 metres. Inside the


\(^{440}\) The artist himself openly shared his problem to classify his 3d artwork as installations of sculptures. The concept and theoretical background placed his concepts closer to installation, but the repetitive use of the same material and insight into importance of constructively used material were closer to the language of sculpture.
park, close to the artwork several benches were accessible. It was possible to park a car on the street close to the park. The Solinary Plant park space was approximately 300 metres from the old town centre, with shops, cafeterias and a city plaza. The surrounding architecture was mostly 19th century original buildings in typical post Austro-Hungarian imperial style.

The work of Paprocki was officially commissioned by the Bochnia city Civil Budget and Salina Nova Foundation as an element of the ‘Salinada’ project. The name of the project had a semiotic relation to world ‘salt’ (Polish: sól), due to the fact the Bochnia city is the oldest region of salt mining in Poland since medieval times. In an interview with the local newspaper, Paprocki described his artwork:

*This time the installation was based on the letter "S" as a specific initial signifying SÓL. Bochnia is a salt city. The letter "S" radiates in four directions of the world. It will be interesting after dark and at night, too. Also on sunny days. Then, thanks to the light specific reflections appear on the tendons, which always lie in the letter "S"*

Shortly after the exposition of Paprocki’s work a discussion took place from 15 July 2015 on the internet ‘Disquis’ forum. Five out of ten opinions were directly offensive toward the artwork and the artist himself.

/bond/ - It will be in pieces by Saturday night;)

/kigs/ - I would say there is never enough weirdos

/janoek/ - man, could I hire you to hang some underwear to dry?

/solniczka/ - Planty have seen many like those

/Obserwator/ - Cool, original not serving as anything but ‘artwork’. Could Mr Artist cover those concrete weights with some fur and glue some legs then it could liken a spider (not Jack!).

Only one out of ten people openly expressed their positive attitude toward the work.

/ad/ - Great Installation – congratulations to the artist. More initiatives like those and our city would be revived.

Although the artwork gathered more negative opinions from the website, the work of Paprocki was not damaged in next three weeks.

---


442 Polish idiom: ‘I have seen enough bad things like that before’, or: nothing special’
The research in this chapter is directed at artists’ approach to group dynamics and psychoanalysis. It examines if sculpture, in the opinion of the artists, could give rise to the social processes described by Kurt Lewin. The chapter includes findings from essays by Simon Baker and Maria Walsh as reference points to the of force field theory. The fought of Walther Benjamin on the relation between aesthetics and politics is presented in works by Gregory Sholette, Jeanne Marie Gagnebin, Carla Milani Damião and Clarissa Ricci and leads to the subject of pedestal. This subchapter is not directed toward merging the artistic approach to the subject with the field of psychology. It not disclose the interest of the artists into psychoanalysis but gives insight into the artists’ understanding of psychology by the artists. Due to the main focus of this thesis, this subject is limited.

3.1 Insight into use of psychological terminology by art historians

In ‘The Optical Unconscious’ Rosalind Krauss investigated insight into Gestalt therapy compared to a Klein Group model. Unfortunately, her confusing and inconsequent language on psychological theories disqualifies her in this matter. Therefore, her evidence is only presented in the context of the history of art.

Krauss noticed that for Sol DeWitt, the perception of artwork could not be related to the physical area of the responder in public space only. It was consistent in all processes that take place in the responder’s mind. Although DeWitt was descriptive but not explanatory, later experiments from the field of neurosciences could be considered as supportive evidence for his approach. Prof. Fernando Vidal defined that as the process of somatisation of the Self. Therefore, it could be considered to link conceptualism with issues from group dynamics in their ontological relation.

The insight on submerging the psychoanalytical concepts into the field of art were taken by Maria Walsh and Julia Kristeva. In her book Art & Psychoanalysis, Walsh wrote about the Kleinian approach to transference:

While Kleinian psychoanalytic theory has had its art-historical proponents, mainly in the 1950s Britain through the philosopher Richard Wollheim’s championing of art critic and

---

444 Gestalt theory, by Frederik Salomon Perls, was a junction of other theories from the field of psychology and philosophy – including among others the Field Theory of Kurt Lewin. Perls’ starting point in his theory was not sexual drive, but hunger as a basic factor for human behaviour. Source: F. Perls, R. Hefferline, and P. Goodman, Gestalt therapy: Excitement and growth in the human personality. In: The Gestalt Journal Press, New York, Highland, 1951. Gestalt as philosophical theory was criticised as unfalsifiable because of being based on phenomenology and existentialism. Bruce, Green and Georgeson pointed out it is not qualifiable by overwhelming descriptiveness, without confirmative evidence in the area of psychological practicality. Source: V. Bruce, P. Green, and M. Georgeson, Visual perception: Physiology, psychology and ecology, Hove and New York, Psychology Press. 2003 p. 110. Krauss saw no difference between Perls with Wertheimer, whose holistic theory on perception was adapted by Perls. The ground evidence: M. Wertheimer, "Untersuchungen zur Lehre von der Gestalt." In: Psychologische Forschung vol. 4, 1923, pp 301-350. The other thing was that concepts of Wertheimer or Edgar Rubin were considered as evidence for rational processes in the area of perception – cognition - memorization by Perls, not just perception, as Krauss understood it. Source: E. Rubin, Visuell wahrgenommene Figuren. Copenhagen, Glydenalske Boghandel, 1921.
painter Adrian Stoke’s Kleinian-inspired writings, in the 1990s’ climate of postmodernity Klein and other object-relations such as D.W. Winicott were not thought to have much to offer in relation to the contemporary world of mediation, whereas Lacanian psychoanalytic theory aligned with the dominant ethos that identity was constituted by means of signifiers external to the subject and was, therefore, precarious at best, illusory at worst. 446

From the passage quoted above we may find several issues relating to the these theoretical findings. The first issue, the psychoanalysis by Klein was in the interest of some artists; a good source related strictly to British sculptors of the 50s on that topic could be a text by David Hulks 447 about the works of Henry Moore and Lynn Chadwick. On the second issue, Cadieux, Walsh and Hulks wrote about Klein’s subject of Transference without actually knowing it. There were no direct sources related to the text by Klein about transference from 1952 in any of the essays of those art theoreticians. 448 Walsh only related to early Klein’s work ‘Early Stages of the Oedipus Complex’ from 1928, which was written by her long before her publication on the mechanism of transference. Hulks supported his evidence with two texts by Klein, ‘On the Theory of Anxiety and Guilt’ 449 and ‘Notes on Some Schizoid Mechanisms’, both written in 1948. 450 All of the above writers mostly used the source texts of another arbiter from the field of art theory, which seemed fascinated by Klein and Freud. Finally, it seems that the most interesting aspect of Klein’s observations (mistakenly understood by art theoreticians as ‘theorems’) to the artists (Burgeois 1999, Pondick 1990) or art theoreticians 451 were in the context of descriptive aspects on pain, fear or ‘hatred’. Those aspects were transited by e.g. Kristeva as political feminization ideology, where terms of Kleinian (or Freudian, in general) writings become supportive for political activities.

The passage above could prove that what Klein (or previously Freud) considered as the observation on the subconscious mechanisms of the human mind during the process of growth from infant to adult, was used by certain artists and art theoreticians in their writings as non-scholar reference.

The ‘allegory’, which in the context of aesthetics should be naturally bound to psychoanalytical projective tests, in the works of some post-war artists analysed by Walsh that problem seemed to be grossly misunderstood. It seems that those artists wanted achieve the physical emanation of an art object by the transcription of their unconscious

448 In opposition to Freud, Klein defined that relation to the object in the central part of life and auto-erotism and narcissism results from the fact of the contact with the object, (in Freud’s theory it is the opposite). That means, the process of transference is the same as the determination of the relations with the object. Klein’s conclusion is in that in the methodology of psychoanalytical treatment the therapist must slowly repeat the process to link earlier and later experiences to integrate with the primal problem. M. Klein, The Origins of Transference. In: International Journal of Psycho Analysis, The Bulletin of the International Psycho-Analytic Association, volume 33, 1952, pp. 433-438.
449 Which actually was the first important text of Klein about the problem of Transference seen differently to Freud.
transference process. That could explain why Freud, and later Lacan were so eagerly cited, but still without a deeper analysis of the question what an object actually is in strictly psychoanalytical terms. In art of Jean-Jaques Lebel we may see an example of that 'strictness', by his understanding of the mind as a magazine of objects (Portrait of Nietzsche from 1962, or Monument to Felix Guattari from 1994). A similar recognition of the mind process as bipolar to politics was evident in works of Christian Boltanski (e.g. ‘The Lost Workers Archive and the Work People of Halifax 1877-1982’, made in 1994). The fascination of Lebel with Guattari’s ‘schizoanalysis’ (Deleuze and Guattari, 1983) and his political activity does not explain anything toward psychoanalysis in the context of understanding the Object.\textsuperscript{452} Another example of treating the matter of subconsciousness directly ‘as its written’, could be taken from Rona Pondick’s approach to the texts of Klein, when in her work the Little Bathers from 1990-91 she presented a group of anamorphic spheres with biting teeth – as her understanding in relation to Klein’s observations on the behaviour of toddlers. The biting and splitting of the early child was seen by the artist and art critic as a direct form of artwork and therefore considered by them as a ‘true’ object.

3.2 André Breton’s approach to Le Bon’s psychology of the crowd

The research by Simon Baker\textsuperscript{453} leads to the question if one of the most assumptive relations of art with that field of psychology was presented by André Breton.

For Breton the most important elements of psychoanalysis were those that influence the ‘crowd’ and could ‘sublimate’ it into a socialist mass. For André Breton surrealism was a synthesis of Marxism, with Sigmund Freud and Gustave Le Bon’s opinions about the psychology of crowds. The potential came from the diversity of aesthetic forms. The author of the Surrealism Manifesto believed that the group could do more than an individual (in this case: the artist). Breton noticed the need for artistic expression in public spaces after reading Le Bon’s ‘Psychology of the crowd’ (actually: ‘The Crowd: A Study of the Popular Mind’, first English edition in 1896). Breton created his own theory, where exaltation would be possible in a revolutionary crowd by contact with surrealist art objects which should ‘sublimate’ Freud’s ‘paternal horde’ into Breton’s ‘fraternal community’ as some sort of ‘organic’ substance of consciousness. Breton justified his ideas as a way to dismantle the Nazi crowds. He believed that the leftist crowd could have a different construction than the Fascist or Nazi group. In the Nazi crowd, for Breton, people lost their identity to idealize a single object, e.g. like their leader; that is how Breton understood Freud. The answer/solution for that mechanism for Breton was a ‘found object’ that should create a sublimation above the ‘ego’ level in the group and form a non-iconic form of crowd that would still be able to act ‘organically’. The ‘found object’ multiplies its own presence in the


mind of the crowd. Then, it joins people in a net of ‘group consciousness’ as they respond to the ‘instinct of death’. Breton was rather looking for a justification of his theories on something that was already happening in art. In the positions written by Breton, e.g. Documents 34, Mad Love or the Contre-Attaque papers, the author claimed an equation of the ‘found object’ which, by its presence, led to the relative communication of the crowd.

It was significant in the context of Le Bon’s writings about group dynamics to ask about a further development in contemporary sculpture in that field after Breton (or simultaneously in Soviet Russia). If we look into the overall criticism of Le Bon (especially his attitude to the politicization and fascination toward Marxism) made in an essay by Reicher, it is easy to observe that group dynamics was one of most practically used sections of psychology when speaking of what in art is called the ‘impact’ to achieve ‘social change’.

3.3 The pedestal: neither the sculpture nor the installation.

In chapter 2. Insight into the Subject of the Sculpture in the Public Space a preliminary meta-analysis of the gathered sources shows that classification for sculpture is not limited to aesthetical classifications. Searching beyond aesthetics, for Walter Benjamin, the mechanism of attention to the aesthetical ‘aura’ would indicate the loss of the artwork quality. A need for desire to gain ‘pleasure’ would be stronger than need for intellectual development. Reception of art turned into a form of ritual due to development of reproduction technologies. Benjamin noticed link between need for unification of desires and the possession of aesthetical objects. He divided multipliciated ‘copy’ of the artistic original from its ‘aura’. However, Benjamin did not follow dialectical materialism of Georgij Plekhanov, but based his observations on Marxist approach to human development more closely to Freud. Sholette followed fought of Benjamin and gave the historiosphic observation, that even the subject of artistic autonomy had become a potential

---

454 ‘Consciousness’ in Bretone’s understanding of those terms. Neither sublimation, ego, nor consciousness in that passage were used by him properly in reference to Freud’s works.
455 S. Freud, Beyond the pleasure principle, Internationalen Zeitschrift fur Psychoanalyse, 1920.
456 A. Breton, R. Caillois, Rene Char, Rene Crevel, Eluard, Max Ernst, Dali, Magritte, Tzaraor, Bruxelles, L’Arc - Intervention surrealiste - Documents 34, 1934.
457 A. Breton, Mad Love, Paris, 1937.
460 W. Benjamin, The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction (1936) UCLA School of Theatre, Film and Television; transcript 2005. et. al.
for political agenda since the Cold War era. Therefore, sculpture in public space could not any longer be defined by its designation with the pedestal. Gagnebin and Damião after Benjamin, presented opinion that raising the sculpture on the pedestal was usually an act of warfare hegemony. Clarissa Ricci made an inquiry into a subject of the anti-monument. For Ricci, dealing with the pedestal gave a situation for a public object of art which is neither the sculpture nor the installation. Her analysis of the use of pedestal by Emilia Kabakov, Rachel Whiteread and Piero Manzoni, or re-defined function of the plinth on the Trafalgar Square moved subject of pedestal towards artistic activism. Ricci proclaimed, that recognition of the pedestal as self-sustainable object of art raised significantly after political changes of 1989. The case studies on works of Hasior and Dunikowski in this thesis could confirm observations of Ricci and Sholette. Especially in case of Hasior, the removal of the element of the base turned the object from the monument back into the sculpture in-site. Five Apples by Masuyama could be the signal toward the local community, that non-plinth sculptures are community friendly. However, works of Serra or Gormley even without a plinth raised the offensive reactions against them. In the opposition to the strategy of Arts Council of Northern Ireland, the local groups dictated by political interest used pedestals as direct message toward the responders. Such practice was visible both in Poland and Northern Ireland in case of Dromore memorial or Transience by Koclega in Rybnik. Therefore, it should be observed, did the issues around pedestals will be raised during the experiments by the responders.

---

4. A NEW METHOD - ATTITUDE TOWARD SCULPTURE QUESTIONNAIRE

The research in this part of the thesis focuses on the empirical approach to the question: *Would contemporary sculpture in the public space evoke a certain kind of group dynamic processes?*

According to Gustave Le Bon the attitudes of the crowd were irrational reactions. For Kurt Lewin the attitudes were changing timely, where irrationality was most significant in the beginning of the process. Lewin explained, that in the final stage, irrationality was covered by convictions raised in the process of mutual cognition and interaction⁴⁶⁶. Lewin presented evidences opposite to concepts of Andre Breton. For Breton, responders of art in the public space would change by their individual sublimation indicated by the surrealist object. Reicher explained, although very little can be said about exploratory aspect of group dynamic processes, it could be presumed with the modern level of knowledge, that attitudes in group will start form the process of individual approach toward risk taking. Naturally, in such a process, the attitudes would form from assumptions; not particularly as an act of sublimation. Therefore, irrationality should be considered as a fundamental issue in case of the judgement of the artwork in the public space. The reception of the artwork in the public space is rather irrational process than rational. The sources from the field of group dynamics confirms, that the described by Miwon Kwon practice to control the public space by visual forms of art would be a failure. Artistic practices which would not include time-processing factors could cause low impact on the community. Starting from that part of the research, the meta – inquiry of gathered sources of art theoreticians, art practitioners, case studies and commissioning procedures in Northern Ireland and Poland should be juxtaposed with the conducted experiments.

Opinions of artists on sculpture, philosophical enquiries into the subject of public space or sources used in case studies could not be granted as well-established ground theory. Therefore, the problem was reduced into a set of experiments with the use of a questionnaire based on Kurt Lewin’s evaluation of the force field. The questionnaire was designed for two functions: lower the defenses in the process of conducting the research and to measure attitudes toward the sculpture.⁴⁶⁷

The research was moved forward to examine empirically tested psychological theories, terms and concepts that could be helpful in the construction of the questionnaire used in the further experiments.

4.1 Framework to develop the method

Although the method is based on a model developed in accordance with the theory of group dynamics by Kurt Lewin⁴⁶⁸, his work would need to be supported from the areas of object theory, system theory and social psychology to design a qualitative method.

---

⁴⁶⁶ Although not mentioned by Lewin directly, it could be presumed that the group of Neurotic defences classified by Vaillant would be most accurate to explain human acts in that process.

⁴⁶⁷ The questionnaire was used as a part of qualitative methodology in a form of stimuli for the questioned person to obtain measurable answers.

The outcome of the partly projective questionnaire will be countable, and it will be elaborated and validated with Lewin’s theory. The main question will be ‘is sculpture recognised as the social space of a person, or as another member of the group?’ The ‘individual’ would not be recognised by social attributes, but by the process of simultaneous understanding and examination of the object through the question: ‘is that a projection’?\textsuperscript{469}

If such phenomena could be measured, then experience with the artwork could be seen as a kind of process. However, it should first be examined whether the experience with the sculpture under such conditions can be measured. The method could be named: Attitude Toward Artwork.\textsuperscript{470}

4.1.a Theoretical review of theories about Group Dynamics, Object Relation Theory and a basic explanation of the Cognitive Dissonance phenomenon

The research plan includes the works of Lewin (1944; 1947) and their critics (Montessori, Edward, 2011). Next, the work of Melanie Klein (1952) is examined about the problem of Transference. Her text will help to understand the individual differences in the attitude to the art object in a psychoanalytical context. The next issue considered in the context of the review are the observations of Leon Festinger (1957), who introduced the concept of cognitive dissonance in social psychology. These sources will provide a theoretical basis for an epistemological approach to the problem that will be tested further with the use of natural experiments with sculpture in public space.

4.1.b Review of questionnaire construction, data evaluation and research conduct

To build a questionnaire and develop the evaluation of gathered data (called the saturation process), we focus on the usefulness in public spaces and the possible basic control scale design, as it was derived from the writings of Williams and Chambles (1992). The questionnaire contains two types of questions: projective and declarative. The concept of projective questions is taken from Catternal, Ibbotson (2000) and an understanding of declarative questions is based on the works of Gunlogeson (2002). Finally, we review the different aspects of the conduct of the study in public spaces with sculpture.

It should be considered that the limitations of the used method could influence the quality for replication. That means possible similar outcomes on the tested subject with the use of different methods. However, the phenomena that could occur may provide information about undiscovered aspects of the studied problem. It should be considered in that case to simulate the construction of the study in SPSS programming, in order to check the case studies for proper covariates (Merton, Brzeziński, 2004). The research on the method and its use should be finally tested by taking samples from specially designed sculptures to look for phenomena that confirm the force field theory of Lewin.

\textsuperscript{469} Andrzej Kokoszka explained subject of projection between individual and the group by commentary of a group therapy specialist, Yvonne Agazarian: the person is better able to observe the object by introspection of the whole group. However, the sum of improperly developed attitudes would disable the achievement of fully developed group relations. A. Kokoszka, \textit{Psychoanalityczne ABC, Podstawy Psychoanalitycznego Myślenia}, Kraków, Univeristas, 2015, p.49.

\textsuperscript{470} ‘Attitude’ understood in three aspects: cognitive, behavioural and emotional.
4.2 Empirically tested theories of psychology used in the line of reasoning

The research includes the collection of sources gathered under three conditions. First are reviews of theories related to the subject of group dynamics, object relation theory and an insight into cognitive dissonance. Next are propositions on questionnaire construction, data evaluation and research conduct. Finally, there is criticism of the method based on possible limitations in its use.

The study includes insight into the subject of attitude, transference, defence mechanisms, copying, distinction between copying and defence mechanisms, and wider evaluations of the terms group and group dynamics.

The purpose of including these sources in the study was the necessary accessibility to the sources to saturate the data from the sample, and to test the validity of the construction of the questionnaire with psychological theories and a sampling process.

The following review of the necessary concepts to develop the epistemological background for the method includes: Attitude, Cognitive Dissonance, Transference, defence mechanisms, Copying, Distinction between copying and defence mechanisms, Group and Group Dynamics.

4.2.a Attitude

The subject of attitude has been raised in the context of the construction of the method to test the impact of sculpture in public space. It is necessary to provide insight into the matter of attitudes and define that term. Gordon Allan Allport gave a new classification for the term of attitude: 471


An attitude is a mental and neural state of readiness, organised through experience, exerting a directive or dynamic influence upon the individual’s response to all objects and situations with which it is related.

Therefore, when we speak of any mental response toward artwork, we speak of the attitude in the psychological context. At that moment, an ‘artwork’ in any sense is the product of the mind, as it was considered by Sol DeWitt. The fundamental definition of Allport on attitude become also explored on the field of neuroscience. In the 50s and 60s the issue of attitude was raised by researchers such as Festinger, Heider and Osgood in the context of the cognitive dissonance theory as:

The consistency between mental components and the complex processes that are set in the motion to achieve mental alignment (after: Abelson, 1968)

In the context of behaviourism, considered in its primal form as classic conditioning, we would speak of attitude as the most basic form of learning related to processing fear and relation to others.

That observation, made by Banaji and Heiphetz after Pavlov, could help to understand the attitude toward art in public spaces related to sectarian aspects of cultural life in Northern Ireland. During the data collection, ‘attitude’, seen as something one can learn from others – should be taken into consideration.

One of the most common ways of measuring attitudes were adopted by Likert in the scale commonly known as the ‘Likert Scale’.

Although there is much research on the subject of understanding and measuring attitudes, the general understanding is still based on the work of Daniel Katz. Katz classified attitudes into four functions. He joined four main paths of attitudes in the main areas of psychology: behaviourism, psychoanalysis, doctrines of ego psychology and Gestalt psychology: The instrumental, adjustive or utilitarian function, related to the behaviourist theory of learning; The ego-defence function, related to the psychoanalytic subject of defences, The value-expressive function, related to processes of individual fulfillment on the level of one’s own personal concept of oneself in the area of the doctrines of ego psychology; The knowledge function, related to personal research of the individual in his perception of structural reality. The perceptual and simultaneously cognitive functions would be related to the principles of Gestalt.

---

487 ‘Recent research has supplemented this Pavlovian model of fear learning with evidence suggesting that people can acquire an attitude of fear toward objects that have been associated with pain in others’. Ibid. p. 370.
490 Ibid. p. 170
Katz’s classification could be considered as structural insight into a wide area of research on the human personality. Katz clarified that the model proposed by him was not a strict doctrine but a form of regulation of the problem raised around the different approaches to the subject.

DETERMINANTS OF ATTITUDE FORMATION, AROUSAL, AND CHANCE
IN RELATION TO TYPE OF FUNCTION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>Origin and Dynamics</th>
<th>Arousal Conditions</th>
<th>Change Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Adjustment        | Utility of attitudinal object in need satisfaction. Maximizing external rewards and minimizing punishments | 1. Activation of needs  
2. Salience of cues associated with need satisfaction | 1. Need deprivation  
2. Creation of new needs and new levels of aspiration  
3. Shifting rewards and punishments  
4. Emphasis on new and better paths for need satisfaction |
| Ego defense       | Protecting against internal conflicts and external dangers                          | 1. Posing of threats  
2. Appeals to hatred and repressed impulses  
3. Rise in frustrations  
4. Use of authoritarian suggestion | 1. Removal of threats  
2. Catharsis  
3. Development of self-insight |
| Value expression  | Maintaining self identity; enhancing favorable self-values image; self-expression and self-determination | 1. Salience of cues associated with values  
2. Appeals to individual to reassert self-image  
3. Ambiguities which threaten self-concept | 1. Some degree of dissatisfaction with self  
2. Greater appropriateness of new attitude for the self  
3. Control of all environmental supports to undermine old values |
| Knowledge         | Need for understanding, for meaningful cognitive organization, for consistency and clarity | 1. Reinstatement of cues associated with old problem or of old problem itself | 1. Ambiguity created by new information or change in environment  
2. More meaningful information about problems |


After Katz, Hogg and Vaughan in 2005 defined attitude as:

A relatively enduring organization of beliefs, feelings, and behavioural tendencies toward socially significant objects, groups, events or symbols⁴⁹¹.

The triangular set of ‘beliefs, feelings and behavioral tendencies’ were structuralised in the tripartite model by Spooncer\textsuperscript{492}, where all components were included in the individual’s verbal statements about the intended behavior (Table 4).

![Tripartite model of Attitude](image)

Table 4: Attitude in tripartite model set of beliefs, feelings and behavioral tendencies’ according to Spooncer.

The model of Feelings, Beliefs and Behaviour was structuralised and replaced in an ‘ABC’ attitude scheme. The shortcut was related to the terms: Affective, Behavioural and Cognitive. The most often used citations according to Vishal Jain\textsuperscript{493} were Eagly, Chaiken\textsuperscript{494} and Van den Berg\textsuperscript{495} (Table 5).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shortcut</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>Affective</td>
<td>relates to feelings of the individual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>Behavioural</td>
<td>individual intentions and actions taken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>Cognitive</td>
<td>beliefs of the individual</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The questionnaire should include insight into the tripartite scheme and those elements of Katz’s theory that would relate to the reaction of the stimulus – sculpture in public spaces by the individual. It would also be worth taking the derivation of the ABC model proposed

\textsuperscript{492} F. Spooncer, Behavioural studies for marketing and business, Leckhampton, UK, Stanley Thornes, 1992
by Jain into consideration, where all components are equally measured in a set of internal relations presented by Jain as Triodes (Table 6):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TRIODE</th>
<th>AFFECT</th>
<th>BEHAVIOUR</th>
<th>COGNITIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PPP</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PPN</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNP</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PNN</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPP</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPN</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNP</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Positive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NNN</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>Negative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Jain’s model, although descriptive, could bring more clarity in the saturation of data about measuring the strength of forces toward the sculpture verbalized by the responders while taking the sample.

It should be remembered at this point that there are several other concepts regarding the attitude and human psyches’ functioning in the contact with broadly understood objects of external reality.

**4.2.b Cognitive Dissonance**

The cognitive dissonance theory should also be taken into consideration. The reason to consider Leon Festinger’s theory was the inconsistent, surprising and irrational actions within the attitude toward artwork, which seem to be related to group dynamics explained at the level of the community.

Festinger made several conclusions that could be related to the issue of the attitude toward artwork in the context of dealing with anxiety and stress. Festinger was a student of Kurt Lewin, and after shifting from the field of group dynamics became more interested in earlier fields of Lewin’s research related to cognitive processes. His efforts resulted in finding an

---

anomaly of human behaviour related to the process of change of attitude. In the works of Acharya, Blackwell and Sen, the basic definition of cognitive dissonance is given as:

\[\ldots\] an individual experiences a mental discomfort after taking an action that seems to be in conflict with his or her starting attitude. Individuals then change their attitudes to conform more closely with their actions, leading to an important source of attitude formation and change.\(^{498}\)

Based on a series of experiments by Festinger\(^{499}\) it could be derived that cognitive dissonance has certain aspects in common with behaviourism, although the method of compliance was different in Festinger and his associate Carlsmith’s study. In their experiment on the representative sample (a ‘statistically significant’ group of participants) it was found that people who were paid less for doing a boring task convinced themselves that the task was enjoyable, whereas people who were better paid\(^{500}\) mostly convinced themselves that the task was boring. The issue was not whether the task was boring or enjoyable. The issue was that both groups lied to themselves for different reasons – which was explained by Festinger as high dissonance in the case of the group paid less, and low dissonance in the case of the group paid more for the same task. In both cases people lied to themselves to justify their actions.

The process of cognitive dissonance has been explained in several stages. During the action, the inconsistency would occur within or between two or more attitudes. That inconsistency would raise the level of discomfort that led to change: of the action itself or, mostly, of the perception of this action. In contrast, if we could speak of the lack of or very limited change of attitude during the action, then we could speak of consistency. Therefore, the responder’s perception of consistency or inconsistency of his own action would lie in an individual and subconscious process of relations between personal attitudes, or relations between his beliefs and actions.\(^{501}\) In its outcome, dissonance would bring three possible solutions: change the beliefs, change the action or change the perception toward the action. According to Prof. Richard H. Hall, the last possibility could be related to the neurotic set of defence mechanisms described as rationalisation.\(^{502}\)

The later theory of Festinger was developed into an alternative theory of self-perception by Bem\(^{503}\). However, in the research on attitude toward artwork the basic theory of Festinger would be chosen in the first place. It should be taken into consideration that obtaining data from an interviewee is done at the risk of cognitive dissonance. To avoid inconsistency, the relation between the responder and the questioner should as far as possible be kept on


\(^{500}\) 20 USD, where the group paid lesser amount was 1 USD for the same task. Ibid. p. 207.


neutral ground. The researcher should also limit information about his own personal views on the subject of the study.

Moreover, the responders could ask additional questions due to their own dissonance level to avoid unpleasantness. Any situation of that type that could occur during the research process should be immediately noted on the questionnaire as an additional type of data. The collection of phenomena of that type could improve the understanding of the level of risk taken during the implementation of the artwork in public spaces, which could also appear in the process of taking the sample in advance.

4.2.c Transference\textsuperscript{504}

To understand the complexity and diversity of attitudes toward artwork, the term of transference seems to be needed. Although psychoanalysis in itself seems controversial, this term adds much to its content. This thesis focuses on transference as it was conceptualized in the works of Melanie Klein. In her writings Klein focused on the problem of transference of one’s internal world of feelings and phantasies to objects in external reality. She started with a critical review of Sigmund Freud’s writings; then her work was developed and popularized by Herbert Rosenfeld and Anna Segal. Her findings were based on case studies of children’s behaviour. She compared her findings about the role of transference in therapy also with the earlier opinions of Sigmund Freud. ‘The Origins of Transference’ were considered a milestone in understanding the ways of how relation to an object is created. Klein found that transference was the same process as the relation to the object, which means it plays a central role in the emotional life of the person. The essay was also an insight into the problem of transference in the general, not only therapeutic, meaning which explains its importance in social life.

Melanie Klein explained her own views on the problem of transference derived from Sigmund Freud’s concept, where the ‘object’ was an independent matter. Because she used quotations from Freud and the text was very coherent in its meaning, it was decided to review those elements of text that could shed more light on the issue of the ‘object’ and the relation toward it, with a different approach to the usual aesthetical.

Klein explained that for Freud there were new versions or facsimiles of the tendencies and phantasies that were aroused and made conscious during the progress of the analysis, but they had this characteristic peculiarity, they replaced an earlier person with the person of the physician.

To simplify those words, for Freud the person unconsciously created a ‘mirror’, his/her own ‘vision’ of the person he contacts with.\textsuperscript{505} Later in the text Klein cited more aspects of transference related to the findings of Freud. The instinct of death, psychoanalytic explanation of impulse, ego and id and Oedipus complex were summarised by Klein with her own findings. Klein presented the thought that transference was present throughout the


\textsuperscript{505} Freud wanted psychotherapy to be reserved only for physicians. He was against putting the patient beside the therapist, because of how he understood the subject of transference.
whole life of a person, and thus not only related to the therapy process.\textsuperscript{506} The child in the primal stage was under the influence of ‘forces’ like the relation to its mother’ breast, pleasure, denial, omnipotence and idealization etc. for the first three to four months of life which it explains to itself as ‘good’ or ‘bad’ Klein, in opposition to Freud, defined that relation to the object was the central part of life. Therefore, auto-erotism and narcissism result from the contact with the object\textsuperscript{507} That would mean that the process of transference was the same as the determination of the relations with the object. In conclusion, in psychoanalytic treatment the therapist must slowly repeat the process to link earlier and later experiences to integrate with the primal problem. The author explained that better activation of the ego and reducing the power of phantasms on objects would enrich a patient’s life. That would mean the weaker the power of transference, the more conscious/self-controlled could the life of such a person be. For Klein, the psychoanalysis was not only the cure \textit{sense stricte}. She understood it as the tool that could be used by the patient for his composure. In the Kleinian model of psychoanalysis, there is no separation between patient and therapist. Therefore, the relation between sculpture and responder, in the context of Kleinian understanding of attitude, would be an ongoing and open process, where the artwork was understood not as physical object, but a mind process that could be equally take place with other processes related to attitude toward the object. If we could make a contribution to that, then gathering the data about descriptive processes could be considered as a form of expression of an engagement with the sculpture.

The works of Melanie Klein were ‘historical’ in the evolution of psychoanalysis after Sigmund Freud.\textsuperscript{508} Melanie’s Klein’s views on origins of transference were considered as a revolt against Freud. In her book about Klein, the psychoanalyst Julia Kristeva represented the opinion that the findings of Klein played a role in complementing the theory about unconsciousness.\textsuperscript{509}

The next step in the completion of the Kleinian theory were writings of Donald Woods Winnicott, who investigated the relation between mother and infant. The outcome of his research was observations of what he called a transitional object – an object that mediates an internal world of phantasies and external reality.\textsuperscript{510} Winnicott stated that relations with a transitional object could be influential for much longer than just early childhood and was generally in relation to self-security in process of experiencing reality. If his concept could

\textsuperscript{506} The relation to the artwork during the engagement with it. In the Freudian concept artworks and objects could have autonomy. No artwork – no relation. In the Kleinian concept, the process of relation toward artwork would be an effect of a self-learning process classifying someone’s Self, because it was created on the level of an early toddler.

\textsuperscript{507} As presented in the footnote above, Freud’s concept was the opposite.

\textsuperscript{508} S. Freud, \textit{Fragment of an Analysis of a Case of Hysteria} Collected Papers 3, 1905, S. Freud, \textit{Psycho-Analysis} Collected Papers 5, 1922; and S. Freud, \textit{The Ego and the Id}, 1923

\textsuperscript{509} J. Kristeva, \textit{Melanie Klein}, Columbia University Press, 2004

\textsuperscript{510} Winnicott found that the relation could exist not only to e.g. the mother’s breasts, but a toy, or any other object the infant would consider important as physical transition in communication and cognition. I could give an example from my own perspective. Once I wanted to read a book to my two-year old son Telemachus to teach him new words. He listened but did not repeat the words. Then I took his favourite toy, a car, and told my son that his car will teach him new words. When I played that his toy was reading the book, my son immediately started to repeat all the words from the story. Source about transitional object: D. W. Winnicott, \textit{Playing & Reality}, London, Tavistock Publications, 1971 pp. 1-4.
be investigated more in the field of art, then the matter of ‘transitional object’ should be used in descriptive art theories on the matter of impact of the sculpture in the public space.

Therefore, in the visual arts, the issue of transference could play a fundamental role. The transition of Melanie Klein’s findings in the field of art could mean that the relation art–responder in that model would be more complex and put the autonomy of the artwork in relation to unconscious mechanisms held by responder. For Klein, the person could make a relation with the object based on the determinant of auto-erotism and narcissism to satisfy own unconscious Self. The essay of Klein may also help to shed more light on censorship processes of public sculptures.\textsuperscript{511} Finally, the author’s conclusions may supplement the positions from the field of art therapy and psychoanalytic diagnosis with the use of visual arts.\textsuperscript{512}

The term transference as seen by Klein could play a fundamental role in the saturation of the outcome from the sample. How to implement the results of the findings to Kurt Lewin’s ‘force field’ would be a basic problem. The essay of Klein may help to avoid a false interpretation of the outcome. The findings of Melanie Klein would create a new understanding of the art theories referring to psychoanalysis in toto. It could help to ask about the possible role of psychoanalysis in arts, if the process for its adaptation to the receiver was possible with the conscious agreement of the viewer.

4.2.d Defence Mechanisms

The issue of defence mechanisms relates to individuals’ in-depth emotional reactions to an object. In the process of contact with the artwork it could be presumed that the responder’s choice would be partly based on his defence against an awareness of object. It should be explained here that defence processes play the role of a transmitter between either subconscious or conscious areas of the personality, or between the personality and the external world. George Eman Vaillant explained the role of defence mechanisms:

\textit{Adaptive defences are essential to positive mental health. Defences reduce conflict and cognitive dissonance during sudden changes in internal and external reality. If not modified, sudden changes result in anxiety and/or depression. First, defence mechanisms can restore psychological homeostasis by ignoring or deflecting sudden increases in affect and instinctual press. […] Defences, no matter how ingeniously assessed, reflect value judgments about mental process, as do process concepts in physics (e.g., forward motion and velocity). All three—velocity, forward motion, and defences—depend on the vantage point of the observer and involve processes rather than static qualities like mass or}


intelligence. Nevertheless, if people wish to understand their own lives in time and space, these are judgments worth making.\textsuperscript{513}

The passage by Vaillant was taken from his text about issues regarding the DSM-IV classification, whose main role was to enable the diagnoses of mental health problems. Vaillant noticed that the use of the DSM-IV required a longitudinal study.\textsuperscript{514} The questionnaire built to measure attitude toward artwork could not be adopted the same way as the DSM-IV. The DSM is a psychiatric tool, not adapted to assess social processes, and invariably requires a process of observation that takes time. The questionnaire built to measure attitude toward artwork could not be adapted in the sense of psychoanalytical strictness.\textsuperscript{515} The research would not relate to measure the human condition or patterns of behaviour in the sense of personality, but to focus on the matter of defensiveness toward the artwork only. Therefore, the issue of defence mechanisms should be considered under different conditions. In the assessment of the sample, it should be considered that if a responder answers somehow confusingly, not related to the subject or is simply in denial, we could count his behaviour to one of four main groups of defences: pathological, immature, neurotic or mature. The set of behaviours in this specific situation does not mean a pattern of behaviours most commonly called a personality.\textsuperscript{516} As Christopher Lasch noticed, defences classified under the group of neurotic defences would be a minimum in participation with the arts. Therefore, those observations should be made in the process of taking the sample, when defence mechanisms have been noticed. In addition, their potential meaning should be examined in the context of the impact of sculpture in public spaces. However, one should always remember that a healthy, mature personality can behave in an immature or even pathological way under certain circumstances and use less developmentally advanced defence mechanisms. A healthy personality just has a broader spectrum of defences and could ‘choose’ between them, depending on the situation.


\textsuperscript{514} Ibid. p. 90.

\textsuperscript{515} The psychoanalytical settings to define defences were even longer processes. In describing interview techniques used to diagnose defensive mechanisms according to Baneke after Greenson (1967), the sessions of 45 minutes were repeated for around three years in an average setting. J. J. Baneke, Interview Techniques and Assessment of Defence Mechanisms, in: (eds.) M. Olff G. Godaert H. Ursin, Quantification of Human Defence Mechanisms, New York Berlin Heidelberg , Springer-Verlag, 1991, p.43.

\textsuperscript{516} The subject of personality can be seen in many contexts: developmental, psychoanalytic or behaviorist. In the context of research on the attitude toward sculpture is being viewed under conditions of confirmative discoveries of Nisbett and Wilson (1977) on Poetzl (1917), that people have minimal access to their cognitive processes. D. Westen, G.O. Gabbard and K.M. Ortigo, Psychoanalytic Approaches to Personality, in: (eds.) O. J. John, R. W. Robins and L. A. Pervin, Handbook of Personality, Third Edition: Theory and Research, New York London, The Guilford Press, 2010 p.79.

That observation should be made under the condition that some defences would always occur in the process of contact with art. They were, as Vaillant noticed, that natural processes and the complete lack of defences would mean a basic difficulty of contact with the external reality and even be the same within a psychotic state. The question is the quality of defence mechanisms, not only if they appear.

4.2. e Sublimation

The central role among all defensive mechanisms in the context of attitude toward artwork is sublimation. In the field of psychoanalysis, Kevin Jones presented an overview of psychoanalytical theories related to the sublimation process during someone’s reaction to art. Freud, Klein, Segal and Winnicott all made different observations on the matter of sublimation, although they all connected it to the process in relation to art. For Freud, sublimation was divided between different personality types: a romantic personality, and an artist who was trying in a conscious way to push his creativity through resolving internal conflicts. Klein located sublimation in the repetitive process of relations between the object. The artistic creation was considered as the inner travel to fulfil the loss of the mother in the transference toward other significant objects. Segal rooted her opinion to

---


518 Probably that division made by Freud could, completely hypothetically, somehow explain the popularity of Freud among art theoreticians. Freudian opinion on sublimation was promoting an opinion that an artist was somebody ‘special’. A.A. Salvi, Psychoanalytic aesthetics: the case of Miró and the ‘child-like’. PhD thesis, London, Middlesex University, Middlesex University Research Depository, 2003, p. 122.

519 Ibid. pp. 139 -143.
sublimation in aesthetic judgment. The process could occur in a triangular relation between Ego, understood as an instance of psychoanalytically understood personality, symbol and the object. Therefore, Segal indicates the symbol as a stage of development in the Kleinian theory of transference. For Segal Ego – a core instance in personality – would not recognise the difference between object and the symbol, therefore, at least in theory, in reality applied the construct of the symbol as bringing information about the object and the Ego. Segal, similar to Freud, found an artist as a person capable to express his own phantasies in external materials. Therefore, an artist could work on his self-development thanks to those processes. The observations of Segal could be related to the fundamentals of art therapies and engagement during the creation of a piece of art. Such approach to sublimation could be referenced to the Handbook for Building Peace Thru Arts Programme, where the matter of engagement was most often raised. For Segal, sublimation in the context of art processes was the fulfilment of internal harmony. In the other words, the aesthetic object would be what could become the final form of fulfilled harmony. Not in a materialistic, anthropological or abstract sense of formalism, but as fulfilment of one’s unconscious needs. Therefore, Segal redirected the subject of aesthetics from a cultural ‘value’ toward a personal ‘need’. Winnicott had for instance, on the basis of the transitional object theory, come to the conclusion that participation in cultural activities was in fact a further development of an earlier process of infant play.

None of the four mentioned psychoanalysts looked at the issue of sublimation as a relation between the artwork and the responder. Freud, Klein, Segal and Winnicott had all focused on the process of creation, whereas sculpture already placed in public spaces ‘worked’ differently. The exception could be the observations of Klein, but they were narrow in the sense of descriptive data only. Probably also André Breton, who according to Baker tried to achieve sublimation processes by surrealist sculptures with a crowd. But, in the psychological sense, his idea was a form of artistic inspiration. Therefore, research should focus on measuring sublimation in the context of attitude toward artwork, not in the context of a process of creation. With such an approach, the issue would bring not only knowledge about the perception of three-dimensional work of art, but also bring new knowledge to the theory of sublimation in general.

4.2.f Copying

In order to better understand the behavioural aspect of attitudes toward artwork, one needs to be aware that the homeostasis of the human psyche cannot be limited to defence mechanisms alone. As Cramer concluded, in the process of interaction on the intrapsychic level, both defence mechanisms and copying are ways of adaptation to reality. The

---

523 Ibid. p. 149.
524 Ibid. pp. 164-165.
relation between those two processes – two aspects of adaptation – were defined by Crameras:

(1) [defence mechanisms] to reduce negative affect/ward off disruptive negative effect and (2) [copying] to return to baseline functioning/restore a comfortable level of functioning. Therefore, ‘copying’ does not have the same type of effect of the psyche as defence.

“Copying involves purpose, choice, and a flexible shift, adheres to intersubjective reality and logic, and allows and enhances proportionate effective expression; defensiveness is compelled, negating, rigid, a distorting of intersubjective reality and logic, allows covert impulse expression, and embodies the expectancy that anxiety can be relieved without directly addressing the problem.”

In Cramer’s explanation, copying is a conscious reaction where the intention is to solve the recognised problem. For researchers, finding a clear distinction between copying and defence was an uneasy task. Cramer compared Endler (1997) to Vaillant (1977, 1994). Endler observed a drive to consider sublimation as a ‘copying activity’ in the writings of some researchers, only because of the awareness of the particular problem. For Cramer a similar problem brought the aspect of defining dumping (suppression) in the papers of Vaillant, who considered that activity as semiconscious, only because of the awareness of the suppressed feelings. Cramer found that under certain conditions, there could be no significant difference between defence and copying, if a hierarchy between immature and mature sets of defence could be abandoned. The researcher had to avoid the conclusion that a certain form of denial against the artwork was pathological. One should be aware that behaviour looking like a form of denial could in fact be a form of conscious strategy aiming to solve the problem. What could link but not divide defence and copying was the matter of the raised level of mental tension, which the person would deal with in a different way. What is more, many authors indicate that the distinction between anxiety and fear is parallel to the distinction between defence and coping: defence mechanisms are the way to handle an expected stimulus, and coping is the way to solve current problems.

4.2.g Distinction between copying and defence mechanisms

It should be considered that the implementation of sculpture in public spaces could create pressure within the responders. The viewer facing the artwork as a stimulus, at least initially, would go through the process of activating some defence mechanisms, and probably at least some copying processes. Therefore, in the saturation of the data from the questionnaire it is possible that the given answers could simultaneously be related to both copying processes and to certain level of defence mechanisms. In such cases, the

526 Ibid. p.924.
529 Ibid. p. 922.
530 Ibid. p. 932.
531 e.g. absolutely conscious unwillingness to hurt someone’s feelings.
reactions to sculpture would probably lead to the breakup of the group and decrease the impact of the artwork.

Another issue about defence or copying would be the reaction to the sculpture, considered as irrational (if based on defence), or partly rational (if based on copying). If defensive reactions could be confirmed, one may presume that what could be defined as the ‘impact’ of the sculpture in public space should be identified as a need to dissolve the conscious strategies of the responders. If most of the reactions could be recognised as defensive, then the process of commissioning sculptures for public spaces could be questioned as insufficient in not recognising the unconscious need to dissolve and therefore to emotional grow one’s own autonomy in contact with art. As the study of… shows, the defence may be dependent to age. Turning against the object and projection may get lower in the live time of the person, where reversal and principalization may become more often defence to occur.532

4.2.h The Group

In his critical work about Gustave Le Bon, by whom the whole issue of group dynamics was first classified, Prof. Stephen Reicher presented certain observations that could be influential in the study at hand.533

Reicher made an insight into ideological aspects which emerged around Le Bon’s work on the behaviour of crowds. A distinction between ‘crowd’ and ‘group’ should be made here. In an interview for the Youtube channel NeuroPsyEvents called After the Referendum534, Reicher spoke about the factors responsible for the group construct: taking risks, further strategies toward that risk535 and the further research for the leader who would take responsibility for that risk. What was significant was that the common understanding of a leader would not always mean a ‘powerful’ person, but rather a set of attributes that could be given by the members of the group to someone, i.e. his or her social role. Therefore, in context of leadership we should rather speak of a certain transcendental construct of the mind than a strict idea or features of a particular person. Following that line of reasoning, what defines a group would be a collection of similar attributes (covariates) that might be observed thanks to the constructed method. Those attributes (covariates) do not represent a private view, e.g. on sculpture. They are rather a collection of certain similarities that are replicable in actions of individuals. Certain attitudes are replicated among members, even

533 Two passages in Prof. Reicher’s work were critical to Le Bon. On an ideological level, Le Bon’s ideas serve several functions. Firstly, they act as a denial of voice. If crowds articulate grievances and alternative visions of society - if, in Martin Luther King’s resonant phrase, crowds are the voice of the oppressed - then Le Bonian psychology silences that voice by suggesting that there is nothing to hear. […] Le Bon’s work is thoroughly decontextualized. The crowd is lifted both from the distal and the proximal settings in which it arises and acts. If Le Bon’s concern was with the working-class crowds of late nineteenth century France, no sense is given of the grievances and social conflicts which led angry demonstrators to assemble. S. Reicher, The Psychology of Crowd Dynamics’, in: (eds.) G. J.O. Fletcher and M. S. Clarks, Blackwell Handbook of Social Psychology: Group Processes, Oxford, Blackwell, 2003, pp.186-187.
534 After the Referendum - Professor Stephen Reicher, NeuroPsyEvents, University of St. Andrews [online video] 2015,https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=W0umIYLTzY8(accessed 7 February 2016)
535 The ‘risk’ may not mean a real risk but a shared in the group information, that there was, or would be a risk. The risk could be imaginary but still influence decision processes.
when not knowing the primal source of the existing threat, which according to Cottrell and Neuberg was a source of conflict.536

An Evolutionary Approach to Emotions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived stimulus event classes</th>
<th>Discrete Emotion</th>
<th>Action tendency</th>
<th>Adaptive outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obstacles and barriers to desired</td>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>Aggression</td>
<td>Destruction/removal of obstacle; reacquisition of desired outcome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Removal of repulsive stimulus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contamination by unpalatable object or idea</td>
<td>Disgust</td>
<td>Active avoidance or rejection of object or idea</td>
<td>Safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immediate threat to physical safety</td>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>Escape</td>
<td>Remediation of other’s distress; creation of obligation in a potential ally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other distressed because of uncontrollable conditions</td>
<td>Pity</td>
<td>Prosocial behaviour</td>
<td>Pursuit of limited valuable resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other possesses desired object or opportunity that the perceiver lacks</td>
<td>Envy</td>
<td>Attempt to seize desired resources from other</td>
<td>Restoration of relationship with victimized individual; restoration of self-concept as moral person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other distressed because of actions of Guilt the perceiver</td>
<td>Guilt</td>
<td>Reconciliatory behaviour</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In the context of the research for attitudes toward sculpture in public spaces, the perceived stimulus event as a ‘contamination by unpalatable object or idea’ with an action tendency toward ‘active avoidance or rejection of the object or idea’ and with a final adaptive outcome as a ‘removal of repulsive stimulus’ could play a significant role in the sample.

The group would have a certain set of attitudes evoked for some period of time. According to Gibbs, who made his observations on small groups, there was a reference to Lewin’s observations on intra and extra types of relations. Gibbs presented categories where behaviour could be defensive (defensive climate) or supportive (supportive climate) toward relationships in the group. The model was focused on solving a threat or risk where cognition of the problem was limited. In case of an attitude toward artwork, the cognition of the object of art was understood as a process of a certain affiliation or rejection of the object recognized as ‘art’ by the responder. This could be helpful in the context of building a questionnaire with possible saturation of data from the projective questions. Gibb provided two starting points in understanding the attitude toward artwork. If a defensive climate process would start from the evaluation of the artwork, it could be hypothesised that further development of the attitude toward the artwork could be in need of control. Finally, a person could arrive at his own evaluation of the artwork; however, we could not simultaneously speak of an engagement process, but rather a position that could end up as a conflict with other responders.

In contrast, an attitude toward the artwork starting from the supportive climate as described could lead to provisionalism. That could be considered as a certain openness toward further engagement. Gibb’s concept would be rather related to those aspects of group behaviour which Lewin and Reicher considered as a search for leadership in the further stages of group dynamics.

4.2.i Group Dynamics

Kurt Lewin presented his concept of the force theory and its further implementation to explore the subject of group dynamics by means of a structured method. The author presented his line of reasoning that human relationships could be measured by the defensiveness toward changes. That paradigm could help to establish the strengths of relations and their directions. Next, Lewin presented findings that the strength of those relations could build new structures in the form of subgroups. Finally, those subgroups could interfere with each other (-intra relations), or dissolve (-extra relations). Lewin conceptualized that the process of interference of the relationships in the group could be categorized in three stages. Moreover, he presented a complete method to structuralise gathered information about the tested groups. The work contained a graphic model of the ‘force field’ as a visual representation of emotional changes in time. The model emerged thanks to Lewin’s research on racially based conflicts in communities in the USA in the mid-40s.

Lewin observed that there is a ‘tendency’, that a group, no matter what kind, has a similar procedure on an unconscious level. The process may vary in time but rather not be short

---


538 The reactions observed by Lewin were considered unconscious. When the group would already be in an ongoing chain of processes, the implementation of changes would probably distort the group, but not ‘change’ it. That would be a main difference between imaginations of the Breton about group dynamics and knowledge gained by researchers like Lewin.
and unique. The factors that could influence the processes in the group would be: a need to find a solution to the problem, defensiveness toward change, the approach to this problem at an ‘official’ and ‘hidden’ level, possible external indicators, and time. Lewin presented a thought that could be argued as not being academically objective, i.e. that a democratic society has the right to defend itself against destructive and intolerant social movements.

Although the subject of relations between artwork and non-individual reactions has been loosely referred to by artists and art theoreticians, there were no direct sources about Lewin’s work in the context of public sculpture. There was no direct link between the theoretical works about three-dimensional art and group processes, except an interest in describing an impact of sculpture on the crowd or community but without any deeper interest in group dynamics. In some cases, in Guattari’s and Deleuze’s writings, their criticism put them in opposition to psychotherapy, but did not leave the area of speculation. This type of literature was mostly focused on the analysis of the influence of some art objects on a public group by observing the factors responsible for the actions, but merely without any constructive synthesis for the solution. Therefore, we can take Lewin’s psychological observations of a group to extend our understanding in the case of sculpture in public spaces.

Lewin’s work was linked to the field of social psychology. It was mainly used in work regarding the change of actions and group process to achieve cooperation in groups. His work influenced Kariel’s concepts of a self-regulating democracy in the context of sociology. Kurt Lewin also had a strong influence on Gordon Willard Allport’s psychology of personality, which pointed to the importance of conscious motivation in social processes. However, Michael Billig pointed out abuse of Lewin’s work in the context of mixing ideology with science and called it ‘disciplinary ideology’. Lewin’s study about group processes would be the most accurate model to be used in the natural experiments,


540 Guattari and Deleuze influenced people like Hannah Ardent, criticising the post-war political shape of Western civilisation, which in an academic approach to the matter would fit the research on history of art. However, their writings did not left the field of descriptiveness. but not help in building the method. Source: S. M. McCullagh, Limit, Collectivity, and the capacity to Act: Reading Hannah Ardent with Giles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, PhD Thesis, Ontario, Canada, University of Guelph, 2004 p. 4.; V. Harwood and J. Alan, Psychopathology at School: Theorizing Mental Disorders in Education, London, Routledge, 2014, p.166. The abuse of science and pseudoscientific language of Deleuze and Guattari was exposed by Brickmont and Sokal: A. Sokal and J. Brickmont, A Fashionable Nonsense, Postmodern Intellectuals Abuse of Science, New York, Picador, 1998. pp.154-167.


543 Billig on Allport and others: ‘This topic is particularly interesting because it has been suggested that experimental psychologists and historians view human behaviour in opposing ways: experimental psychologists supposedly search for universal laws of behaviour, while historians analyse particular events; and experimentalists view historians as backward looking and unscientific, while seeing themselves as forward look scientists’ Observations by Billig on problem to explain ‘collective memory’ by generalisations on group behaviour exposed mythologizations around person of Lewin. M. Billig, The myth of Kurt Lewin and the rhetoric of collective memory in social psychology text books, in: Theory & Psychology, 25(6), 2015, p. 703.
as it is applicable within the use of sculpture as a ‘group member’. Lewin’s view on psychology was focused on democracy and reconciliation. For the author, democracy must be learned anew in every generation and therefore democracy and development of social sciences are mutually dependent. Lewin proposed ‘cultural diversity’ already in 1943 and perceived democracy as plural in its nature. Because public art commissions (not only sculpture) in the contemporary political process all over Europe were focused on finding balance between cultural identity and cultural diversity in the communities, the achievement of Lewin should be considered as the most accurate tool to be used in research.

A distinction should be made here: should sculpture be recognised as an element of social space of a person, or rather, at least some members of the group as another element of that group? A focus research on that insight could help better understand group mechanisms related to processes with interdependence.

The group dynamic processes were in focus on the research on human relations. Some of the visual codes of Lewin’s ‘Force field’ would not indicate all emotional aspects and could seem to be too mechanical to describe such a subtle phenomenon as art in public spaces. The criticism of Lewin was re-written in the past decade in a text of Bernard Burnes. Burnes made an overview on Lewin’s model and a most important element of its criticism: that model did not consider the possibility to measure chaotic, outside actions. It could be, for example, a new riot of eruption in the area where sculpture will be exposed. Another problem with Lewin’s model was described by Montessori and Edward. The authors pointed out, that Lewin noticed the people’s needs for change, but was not simultaneously focused on their eventual social entropy. Therefore, because of the simplicity of Lewin’s model, the researcher without large empathy and high standards of ethics may cause faults in his applications. On the hand, the authors wrote, that a ‘weaknesses’ of Lewin’s model was simultaneously its strongest point, by giving it a ubiquitous possibility for its use.

---

544 In the worldwide scale, sculpture was on the third place among financed public residency art programs in 2015 according to UNESCO. It had been noticed, that most of grants in general were generated on global North rather than global South. Source: M. van Graan and S. Sanan, Minding the gaps: promoting mobility, in: Re / Shaping Cultural Policies 2005 Convention Global Report A Decade Promoting the Diversity of Cultural Expressions for Development, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, Paris, UNESCO, Diversity of Cultural Expressions, 2015, p.118.


5. CONSTRUCTION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE AND ITS USE

The line of reasoning in construction of the questionnaire, method of saturation of the data from the sample and example of use of the questionnaire were presented. The subchapter included hypothetical problems and limitations in use of the method in its qualitative aspects.

5.1 Line of reasoning in construction of the method.

Would contemporary sculpture in the public space evoke a certain kind of the Group Dynamic processes? This subchapter presents a study of the social relation to contemporary public sculpture in Northern Ireland and Poland with the use of this model. The aesthetical experience could be measured as relation to the object of art seen as a kind of process which progress. The study could be planned thanks to adaptation of the model of force theory and design a qualitative method – a partly projective questionnaire used for lowering cognitive dissonance sand as a framework built on control covariates.\(^\text{547}\)

5.1.a Introduction.

Lewin’s model with its three stadiums was considered by researchers like Kanter, Stein and Jick\(^\text{548}\) to be too static and preferred for use in circumstances of isolation. Another problem with Lewin’s model was exposed by Peter Edward and Nicolina Montesano Montessori. The authors pointed out, that Lewin considered in his model only the need for people’s change, but did not relate to unexpected social circumstances which could occur during the study. The authors also observed that the weaknesses of Lewin model were also its strongest point: giving it ubiquitous possibilities for its use. Some of the visual codes of Lewin’s ‘Force theory’ would not indicate emotional aspects of attitude or behaviour and could seem to be too mechanical to describe such a subtle phenomenon as art in the public space.\(^\text{549}\)

Lewin’s work was more applicable for ‘open groups’ like people passing by the sculpture on the street. Therefore, the sculpture as the eventual ‘group member’ would not be ‘included’. In the Kotter’s model the approach of the researcher was focused on ‘follow to achieve’ approach to the diagnosed problem.\(^\text{550}\) Lewin left much more space for researcher’s interpretation by giving him in fact a simple tool: the possibility to present group changes with other factors in the form of a graph. Kullervo Rainio developed the subject of accessing the high standards of probability in Lewin’s work, but left the subject of causative factor open, whereas in this research the question what was that factor: the sculpture, or the group is fundamental issue.\(^\text{551}\)


\(^{549}\) P. Edward and N. M. Montessori, A critical return to Lewin: exposing discourse and identification in a Participative Action Research project’ Paper for Organizational Change and Critical Management Studies stream. Stream18 at CMS7, Naples. 2011, p. 3


\(^{551}\) Kullervo Rainio proposed Discrete Process Model (MPM) as ‘neo-lewinian’ theoretical framework used to derive estimates for the probability distributions. Rainio gave solutions for higher estimation of Lewin’s force field by the use of Monte-Carlo method, however the subject of causative factor become unaddressed. K. Rainio, Kurt Lewin’s
In Lewin's model, tested group had to be the same group researched in the distance of time to observe the occurring changes. Another problem lied in use of control covariates in the randomization of the outcome. Therefore, it become significant to test the validity of the method by set of pilot studies first, before taking the final sample.

Another issue which emerged during preparation to that study, was the question: what was the group and who was the member? Who was a possible leader theoreticians of group dynamics like Gustave Le Bon could look for? Finally, in the context of different approach to matter of transference with the ‘object’, what could be the replicable relation with the sculpture of different individuals, to give a characteristic of the group as a whole? The first stage of research was based on texts of artists and art theoreticians interested in those matters.

In case of this research within a local community and their participation in the process with the sculpture, it was impossible to look for the same people in the distance of several months to properly test literally 'the same' group. This brought a question of how we could test the 'open group' and observe the participation process with the use of Lewin's theory.

In Lewin’s model of the psychological field of the person we may observe the physical presence of the individual’s activity in different areas of life. The person was concentrated on building connections with the others like: person, group or perhaps an objects. Lewin pays attention to meaning of hesitation in the person’s behaviour, understood as a kind of manifestation of internal tensions: her possible need to link by mimesis toward ‘leader’ behaviour and its -intra or -extra further relations, to stay or to leave existing group.

5.2 Explanation of adapted method.

In the context of the main question asked I would like to present first conclusions of explored phenomena and explanation of the adopted methodology.

The aim of the questionnaire was basically to ask one question: How do you participate with this sculpture? hidden under five variants:

Do you like the artwork? Would you consider more artworks in this area? How you would describe this artwork with your words? Could you match one word for the feeling you have when you see this sculpture? Do you think this sculpture fits to the space?

---


552 In classical approach to the subject of covariates and variables, the control covariate is set before the experiment occurs. The qualitative randomization of the artwork could be defined by control covariates to find the phenomena in human behavior, because it should be logically assumed, that the artwork cannot be a variable in a physical meaning. However, the artwork as the variable could be derived from saturated phenomena if understood as the process of thinking. Therefore, there lies the question for validity of the control covariates use in this study. J. Brzeziński, Metodologia Badań Psychologicznych, Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN, Warszawa, 2004, p.186.


Those questions were divided into three sets:

- declarative/informative questions
- projective questions
- declarative/emotional questions

The answered question allowed to give contradictory, ambiguous answers by the viewer, therefore we could probably observe the relation to the artwork in the more profound, multifaceted way. The declarative questions are juxtaposed with projective questions, to highlight the process of emotional and naturally fluctuating relation to the object (sculpture). During the randomization of the data, the final correlation between those three aspects might give us full empirical study based on the scientific quality of gained information.

The aim of the Framework was to diagnose the question: *What sculpture does to you?*

Interpretation of that question was set into five variables to gain higher Resilience.

The Objective of Resilience was to avoid bias and saturate the aspect defensiveness in semiotic descriptiveness of the answers. I would present some concepts used to develop method described here:

**Bias.** In context of a judgment about any object – in that case, the sculpture – the problem would go beyond hypothesis stated by Mesquita and Karasawa about different cultural ‘selfways’\(^{556}\). In the experiment the methodology was designed for; the question was to observe the relation of the participants with sculpture. The object of art was not to be defined as ‘physical’ object, but the question was, could it be definable at all. That attitude lied in assumption to avoid response-bias and reference-group effect\(^{557}\). Furthermore, could the process of cognition with object if occurred, relate to observed group dynamic processes described e.g. by Gibb\(^{558}\), or reactions classified as Defence Mechanisms in psychoanalysis related to the subject\(^{559}\). As Kwiatkowska observed after van der Vijver and Leung, in taxonomy on cultural bias in the target for exploration, like in the case of that studies, the changing variables occurred in external validation studies\(^{560}\). Therefore, the questions had to be constructed in the way to extrapolate possible patterns between observed variations of behaviour minimising eventual bias problem.

**Defensiveness.** That should be considered in that model of study as the aspect of autonomy of judgment, or defensive reaction to own opinion, understood there as rejection

---

\(^{555}\) The control scale was adopted to compare the level of passive or active relation of the responder toward the sculpture or other members. The method used in the research was based on: J. W. Creswell, *Research Design, Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches*, II Edition, Sage Publications Inc. 2003 pp. 19 – 20.


\(^{557}\) A. Kwiatkowska, Methodological issues in cultural and cross-cultural research, in: *Psychologia Społeczna*, vol. 91 (28), 2014, pp.21-22.


of cognition. Such a behaviour in a group could influence the dynamic of relations, as it was observed by Christopher Lasch\textsuperscript{561}.

The defensiveness could be found in the saturated data from the conducted questionnaire - tested object was in the relation to observed by Kurt Lewin Constancy and Resistance to Change\textsuperscript{562}, which are important factors forming relationships in the group. Lack of relationships – what hypothetically could come into being in contact with art – naturally would mean lack of cognition. Art, in contrast to decoration, was always a kind of communication at least. Therefore, an \textit{impact} of the artwork simply could not happen without element of cognition.

**Descriptiveness.** The quality of descriptiveness could be related to a way of building the ‘relationship’ with art object. Furtherly in that text the word ‘relationship’ as inaccurate would be turned into term: attitude\textsuperscript{563} toward artwork. Therefore, descriptiveness should be measured in the context of accuracy of the answer to the question. It should be assumed, that the problem of descriptiveness and its further implications with the appeared contexts was related to the person verbalizing it, not to the artwork itself.\textsuperscript{564}

Therefore, it should be asked, was artwork in public space truly autonomic object?

5.3 Preliminary conclusions on phenomena and explanation of the adopted methodology.

**The projective questions\textsuperscript{565}.**

As a result of exploration and usage of concepts of bias, defensiveness and descriptiveness, the questions were divided and gained three collections of data: projective, declarative – informal, declarative – emotional.

Open questions, which allow to gain projective data were as follows:

- How you would describe this artwork with your words?
- Do you think this sculpture fits in the space?

Those two questions were based on model of Lindzey’s projective techniques\textsuperscript{566}. The categories used in the test were Associative Techniques, where the physical object of the


\textsuperscript{563} So called: ABC – Affective, Cognitive and Behavioural Components. In the research, they were considered as qualitative type of data.

\textsuperscript{564} Most of art theoreticians tried to turn that argument upside down. E.g. Boris Groys developed whole research around the problem of relation of the artwork to different contexts, however Groys simultaneously believed that art could be autonomic from the context of human cultural activities. B. Groys, \textit{Art Power}, Cambridge, Massachusetts, MIT Press, 2008, p.12.

\textsuperscript{565} \textit{Projective Question is an open-ended question which is answered in a few words or lines and which deals with unusual events or experiences likely to have emotional significance for the individual}. D. J. Levinson, Chapter 15: \textit{Projective Questions for the Study of Personality and Ideology the Authoritarian Personality}, Studies in Prejudice Series, Volume 1. (The 1950s), p.545.

sculpture was considered as a stimulus. The responder was asked to answer the very first thought (description) that came to his/her mind. Those questions in combination with quantitative questions from the study would also increase versality. Catternall and Ibbotson also observed, that projective question helped in increasing participation in the study by their involving aspect. Burns and Lennon had noticed that open questions based on Associative Techniques required higher intellectual involvement, what in the context of that study could help to measure impact of the artwork on the responder. The validity and reliability was based on division of the projective answers into five categories, called Object Descriptiveness:

Abstract Object – understood in the study not as ‘abstractive art’, but abstractive description of the non-materialistic state, or value, e.g. ‘freedom’, ‘pain’, ‘victory’ etc.

Materialistic Object – understood in the study as ‘descriptive and non-vital’, for example object of art described as ‘concrete’, ‘moneybox’, ‘vehicle’ etc.

Sexual Object – mostly related to quasi – figurative or gender descriptions given by responders.

Religious Object – directly declared relation to the artwork as religious symbol/icon.

Other/Unable to categorize and describe – answers where tested individuals declared lack of relation to the artwork, or grammatical structure of the answer was too chaotic to saturate any logical sense.

The categories were applied in policy research both as Contextual and Diagnostic. The division into categories of Abstract Object, Materialistic Object, Sexual Object, Religious Object and set of ‘Unable to Describe’ was developed in stages of experiment with sculpture ‘Vision’ placed in Derry/Londonderry in June of 2016, where a group of responders declared sculpture first time as ‘religious’. The typology was fully developed, when answers on projective questions were found clearly descriptive into those categories.

The question: How you would describe this artwork with your words? could not be evaluated due to uninformative state of the responder of his state of own autonomy. That question was not a ‘deep interview’ either, but an impulse for reconstruction of situation, where a responder described the artwork for own purposes. Differently, the question: Do you think

---

569 ‘Impact’ – understood here in artistic terms, not psychiatric. Generally, how strong the artwork influence the viewer.
571 Term ‘sexual’ has strong background in the sources from the field of psychology, where term like e.g. ‘emotive’ has not. The subject of the thesis is not to invent new classifications in terms of human sexuality. The innovation of this research is dedicated to raise our knowledge on the public art with the use of existing theories from the field of art, psychoanalysis, applied psychology and group dynamics. Therefore, researcher is bound to a scientific rigour in toto, and cannot deliberate on classifications on his own.
This sculpture fits in the space? could be considered as explanatory and could be evaluated. The proposed valuation was based on the three generally possible projections: Dependency, Lack of Dependency and Anti-Dependency between participant and the artwork. The set of projections was defined as Object Exploration (OE) (Table 10).

Table 10: Object Exploration (OE). Valuation of projective question How you would describe this artwork with your words?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projection</th>
<th>Example of the Answer</th>
<th>Valuation</th>
<th>Type of Dependency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>answers like: ‘Fits to the space’</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dependency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>answers like: ‘I don’t know’</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Lack of Dependency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>answers like: ‘It does not fit to the space’</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>Anti-Dependency</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The valuation of the question: Do you think this sculpture fits in the space? should be summed with other declarative questions.

The declarative questions.

The declarative questions were used to support the study and to better understand the values given by the participants. The declarative questions with informal attributes about the sculpture were given in the form of two questions:

- Do you like the artwork?
- Would you consider more artworks in this area?

The declarative questions were added to the construction of the method for two purposes. Firstly, to check if the questioned responder understood the expressed subject simultaneously being uninformative.573 Secondly, to gain basic control scale, where declarative answer could apply to projective questions as supportive to saturate eventual phenomena like: bias or defensiveness. The proportion of the variance was based on the Likert scale of five statements, however the method of scoring is different to Likert’s sigma method.574

Table 11: Valuation Scale for Declarative questions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Declared Score</th>
<th>Shortcut</th>
<th>Valuation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>SA</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Agree</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

574 Rensis Likert scale uses declarations: Strongly Approve, Approve, Undecided, Disapprove and Strongly Disapprove in five to one scoring system. Application of his method directly would cause losing aspect of defensiveness in the conducted research when the three declarative questions are only used. Likert himself pointed out the problem with defining firm borders for honesty, service and self-control area in psychological aspect of the research. R. Likert, ‘Technique for the measurement of attitudes’. Archives of Psychology, Columbia University Press 22 (140), 55, 1932-1933. pp. 36-37.
In difference to commonly used control scales, e.g. ACS\textsuperscript{575}, the valuation was not given from ‘0’ to ‘5’, but from ‘+2’ to ‘-2’ with relation of ‘0’ as Neutral. The purpose of such statement was to develop in form of a graph the Neighbourhood Range for the force theory between responder and the artwork. The scale was developed not to measure any ‘ratios’.\textsuperscript{576} It should be remembered, that the method was built not to observe eventual phenomena for Aggression or Anxiety. It was built to observe if the relation of the responder with sculpture was autonomic and what type of attitude probably occurred.

The scale was constructed in Lewin’s model of force theory and Group Dynamics (FT and GD)\textsuperscript{577}. Lewin concept of observed change could happen, if relation between Action and Projection of the observed Object occurred. In Lewin’s model, the possible variations were proposed in four equitation variables:

\[ f^*(L-n)L f^*(L+n)L f^*(L-m)-L f^*(L+m)-L \]

\( f = \text{force} \quad L = \text{level} \quad n = \text{amount of change} \quad m = \text{move beyond ‘neighbourhood range’}\textsuperscript{578}

The neighbourhood range in Lewin’s model was in relation to his observation, that quasi-stationary processes had fluctuations and were not constant.\textsuperscript{579} Therefore, the adaptation of his model required evaluative construction for Intra passive, Intra active, Extra Passive and Extra Active type of forces in the eventual group. Proposed classification assumes, that relations found between projective and declarative questions could refer to the subject of forces in Lewin’s model. In that sense, the attitude toward sculpture is measured under condition of force equal to projection on the artwork. However, that classification cannot be proven true, or false it should be considered as Futura Contingentia in Łukasiewicz’s trivalent logic.

### Table 12: The probability for the level for Kurt Lewin’s Force Field L/FT/ set with the type of forces in group based on classified projections toward artwork (Futura Contingentia)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Probability for GD</th>
<th>-Intra-passive</th>
<th>-intra-active</th>
<th>-extra-passive</th>
<th>-extra-active</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


\textsuperscript{579} Ibid. p. 16.
Differently to Lewin’s concept, the neighbourhood range required to define -intra or -extra relation was not developed by psychometric scoring. The search for the eventual FT and GD observation had to be made in relation to projective question:

- How would you describe this artwork with your words?

With declarative question about emotional status of the responder when he was stimulated with the sculpture:

- Could you match one word for the feeling you have when you see this sculpture?

The declarative question about emotional status of the responder was valuated in six variations:

Table 13: Valuation for the declarative question: Could you match one word for the feeling you have when you see this sculpture?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Excited(E)</th>
<th>Interested(I)</th>
<th>Neutral(N)</th>
<th>Uncomfortable(U)</th>
<th>Frightened(F)</th>
<th>Angry(Ar)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Declarative question about emotional state could give Low L if declared negatively or High L if declared positively compared with the context of Projective – descriptive question about the artwork. The outcome could be presented like Lewin’s model in the form of the graph.

5.4 Evaluation.

The sum of groups in their -intra or -extra relations should present the Level /L/ for the Force Field /FT/. The sum of all measured /FT/ will present the moment for observed Group Dynamics /GD/. After randomization answers from the question: “How you would describe this artwork with your words?” The sum of values classified into Intra passive, Intra active, Extra Passive and Extra Active relations, should present the level for the force.

Equitation for the sum of L/FT/ is the sum of all measured probabilities in the tested sample and will lead to the final observation for sculpture described not as ‘opinion’, but the GD:

$$\text{Negative(-n-p)+Negative(-i-a)+Positive(-n-p)+Positive(-n-p)= GD}$$

The equitation for valuation of the GD relation with the sculpture should be a sum of the ATAQ questions.

The declared level of attitude toward the sculpture would be considered as relevant to GD. The equitation for valuation of the GD relation with the sculpture should be a sum of questions:

DECLARATIVE – INFORMAL (Di1) - Do you like the artwork?

DECLARATIVE – INFORMAL (Di2) - Would you consider more artworks in this area?

DECLARATIVE – EMOTIONAL (De3) - Could you match one word for the feeling you have when you see this sculpture?
PROJECTIVE OBJECT EXPLORATION (OE) - Do you think this sculpture fits in the space?

PROJECTIVE OBJECT EXPLORATION (OE2) - How would you describe this artwork with your words?

The role of the question OE2 was to gain deeper understanding of the attitude toward sculpture expressed by the tested sample. If the object would give an answer contradictory to the declarative questions, then the defensiveness of the tested sample toward the sculpture could be considered. However, the question OE could be added to calculation because all answers could be limited to the three possibilities: acceptance, rejection or unable to define.

The valuation of one answer declared as ‘Neutral’ should be evaluated as ‘0’. If ‘Neutral’ answer would multiply, then the sum should be evaluated as -1. Therefore, one Neutral answer would mean (0), but two Neutral answers would be evaluated as (-1), three Neutral answers would be evaluated as (-2). Such a description on the scale came from two reasons:

In some cases, strongly negative (including projective answers) tested objects were not ‘visible’ as negative on the graph.

The graph played the projective role in saturation of the data. The ‘0’ line of the F - Force was a contractual value. Typology for "Neutral" status about the artwork in any case was questionable. Declaration of "Neutral" status about the sculpture, especially when it would be marked as emotion toward the object of art should be not considered as declarative, but a defensive answer.

The equitation for the value of L/FT/ for every single sample should be calculated as sum of the questions (see Table 1.) Di1, Di2, De3 and OE (without question OE2):

\[ \text{Di1} + \text{Di2} + \text{De3} + \text{OE} = \text{L/FT/} \]

The relation between L/FT/ and GD should present general change of force in the group, or sub-groups related to the Object Descriptiveness.

The deviations found in the systematized conduct of research; outcomes that present values beyond the neighbouring range in the recorded L/FT/ were marked as the phenomena. If the inconsistent answers to ATAQ, required further clarification then phenomena marked as 'not defined yet' probability. However, in the most cases the phenomena were classified, if the responders declared their answers on projective questions without comparable answers on the declarative questions used in the questionnaire. For example, one responder declared he liked the artwork, but simultaneously was unable to explain, what he experienced. Therefore, that application of the method focuses on the exploratory role of defense mechanisms in the process of bounding the relation with the object of art.  

---

5.5 Example of evaluation.

The researcher should be careful with randomization due to the fact, that answers on projective question: *How you would describe this artwork with your words?* might be a not accurate and subjective. For example:

1. Q: Do you like the artwork?
   A: Neutral \( (\text{Di1} = 0) \)

2. Q: Would you consider more artworks in this area?
   A: Strongly Agree \( (\text{Di2} = +2) \)

3. Q: How would you describe this artwork with your words?
   A: Like a concrete, a dump or some pussy. \( (\text{Covariate}: \text{SEXUAL}) \)

4. Q: Could you match one word for the feeling you have when you see this sculpture?
   A: Neutral \( (\text{De3} = 0) \)

5. Q: Do you think this sculpture fits to the space?
   A: Do not fits. I prefer something patriotic, Home Army, like in the Jordan park \( (\text{OE} = -1) \)

The responder declared Neutral emotional status toward the artwork. Because object no. 12 gave three different Classifications for the object (one Materialistic and two times Sexual), it was questionable if his declaration for ‘Neutral’ status of the emotion toward the sculpture could be confirmed. Answers of participant no. 12 could be considered as Negative reaction toward the artwork. Participant would probably present a tendency toward staying with the group of other, also negatively oriented toward the sculpture person. Participant no. 12 declared Neutral status toward the artwork, but also declared, that he would Strongly Agree if other sculptures with nationalistic themes would be on the site. Therefore, the NEGATIVE value was given after sum of all scored attributes. Participant no. 12 was marked as:

NEGATIVE \( (-\text{intra} – \text{passive}) \) attitude toward artwork F (experienced as SEXUAL Object) with value \( 0^{581} \)

Evaluation of responder no. 12 could be summed with other outcomes and gave full perspective for tested participants attitude toward artwork GD.

5.6 Critic of the method.

The presented method underwent several changes. The first factor which was rejected was ‘verbalization’ – as concept too blurred and not responding to the quality of the research. Another rejection from the study was assumption for ‘group dynamics’ definition used by sociologists, that ‘group’ related to human ‘objects’. In the context of the study, ‘group’ was in relation to declaratives diagnosed by possible phenomena which could occur.

The model of study was in fact, qualitative - projective. It requires high level of knowledge from the field of art and psychology as well. The understanding of differences between main creators of Object Theories and the problem of abusive (in context of psychology) language of art theorists was substantial to gain accuracy.

During the field study, the researcher had to declare his neutrality to the tested situation/object. It had been observed, that some participants were trying to avoid direct

\[^{581}\text{Di1} = 0, \text{Di2} = +2, \text{De3} = 0, \text{OE} = -1 \text{ gave final value ‘0’. Two ‘Neutral’ answer would sum as ‘-1’. Therefore: (-1)+(+2)+(-1)=0} \]
answers by trying to relate the researcher to the creator of the sculpture. That would naturally decrease the accuracy of the study. It would be requested from the researchers who use the model, to openly declare to the responders, that they could not answer neither positively nor negatively about any possible features, aspects or issues regarding the artwork.

Mixed methodology would have brought the best effects for the research. The saturated outcome between FT and GD could be compared with in-depth interviews and qualitatively diagnosed phenomena from the taken samples, which may bring more answers to the main question.

The outcome from the study was descriptive, but may give a good fundament for explanatory studies in relation to Neuroestetics.
6. RESEARCH PROCEDURES

In that part of research a plan for conduct the research was presented. The framework included the sculptures chosen for the pilot study to test the use of the questionnaire. Next, the plan for final experiments with the sample was presented. Chapter included the form of the questionnaire used in the research.

6.1 Research plan:

Valuation of the tested object should have divided into three aesthetical collections: figurative, history related (memorizing monuments)/abstract (space – related), quasi surreal (related with two other groups). Research will be focused on made in since 2015. Researched sample should be related to site specific conditions.

The set of samples should be taken to test the validity and possible obstacles in data saturation. One day pilot studies in several locations should help to achieve that goal. Next, a final research should be taken on at least two samples. Those samples should be specially designed sculptures placed in site specific conditions. Objects used in final part of research should not be doubled. The research on those objects should be repeated at least three times. The locations for pilot studies and final research should be taken in locations of Northern Ireland and Poland.

Proposed Locations of the Pilot Study:

- Bochnia, Poland – Rycho Paprocki sculpture ‘Garden of Salt and Art’
- Cracow, Poland – Tomasz Gornicki sculpture project
- Belfast, Northern Ireland – Ross Wilson sculpture Mother, Daughter, Sister in Sandy Row
- Belfast, Northern Ireland - Allan Heriot ‘Rinty Monhagan’ sculpture in Buoy Park
- Ballymena, Northern Ireland – Shiro Masuyama ‘Five Apples’
- Dundalk, Ireland – James L Hayes, sculpture in NI, Dundalk

Final sample research Locations:

- Nowa Huta – Cracow, Poland – Krzysztof Krzysztof
- Derry/Londonderry, Northern Ireland – Krzysztof Krzysztof

Preparation process for the conducted research:

Gain possible agreements if necessary from stakeholders. Preparation of documents, scripts, sheets and questionnaires. Send informal data to the Stakeholders by mail or phone.

---

582 The goal is to measure the attitude toward the sculpture in the context of group dynamic processes. Not to measure ‘likeness’ of sculpture by responders. If the same object in different locations would be used, then gathered data would show differences among populations, but not the reception on sculpture.
The assumptions to conduct the research on site:

- Start of the research on site should be taken from 10.00 AM to 03.30 PM during one day.
- Photo documentation taken during the research (without photos of participants of the research).
- Return from the location
- Photocopy of the papers. Digitalization and transmission to University Virtual Database.

Conditions of the contact with the tested sample:

1. The research will be proceeded after obtaining oral agreement from the sample.
2. The person who is taking the research should be in visual contact with the sculpture.
3. The Researcher shows his ID first and introduce himself. Next, orally, with help of information sheet explain the purpose of the study. Information sheet can be taken by the participant of the research.
4. The Researcher will present high esteem to the questioned person privacy. Anyone who would be not interested cannot be pulled by the Researcher to take part in the research.
5. No gifts, no information about other researched people, no information about the data analysis will be shared between Researcher and the responders. Data is gathered from anonymous participants (Therefore, no consent form needed).
6. On the questionnaire every next sample is counted by the number and the gender only. Questions are modeled with Gillick Competent\textsuperscript{583} mode.
7. Researcher willingly will answer all questions from the researched sample.
8. The Questionnaire will be conducted in one – to – one procedure. If there would be a small group of participants, then each person will be asked separately.
9. The questions will be taken in front of the sculpture.
10. The average time of research should not extend 10 minutes per sample.
11. In case of unusual circumstances like: weather breakdown (lack of participants), or strong social impact cases (e.g. political or religious related events) the research will be not made/continued and the whole process will be moved for next 2 weeks and started over.
12. Researcher and questioned person will be able to check the questionnaire for final approval from the side of the questioned person.

\textsuperscript{583} In case of the children, the underage should understand meaning of the asked questions.
7. INTERVIEWS – SUPPLEMENTARY METHOD

Subchapter contained information about a way how the in deep interviews would be conducted. The list of interviewed person was chosen by their relation to the functions their conducted. The purpose of the in deep interviews was to gain better understanding of the situation of the tested sculptures.

The research on tested samples could be not fully valid due to possible limitations. Therefore, a set of individual in-depth interviews could be a reasonable support in rising the quality of conducted research. The interviews should be taken with samples related to case studies or pilot studies. The questions asked should focus on the issue of the attitude toward the artwork. However, if the questioned sample would prefer to answer in an individual question & answer mode, that model of interview should be also taken under consideration as a value about possible conditions how the social space between responder and the artwork could to occur.

The interviews should be taken on a neutral ground, during the day time. The interviewed person should be informed about the purpose of the interview. After interview made, the copy of the document should be given to the interviewed person for authorization. Interviews could be recorded after agreement from the side of interviewed person or based on notes taken during the interview. Interviews in case of stakeholders who cannot meet with the researcher could be taken via internet.
8. PILOT STUDY WITH A USE OF NEW METHOD - case studies in Poland and in Northern Ireland

The subchapter contains descriptive information about the conducted research with the use of the designed method in temporal order. Two pilot studies from the initial plan were not conducted. In one case the artwork and location was replaced. One case involved Tomasz Górnicki’s non-realised sculpture project in Cracow. Earlier work of Górnicki created by him in Warsaw had been destroyed by unknown perpetrators. In this case the sample could not be taken for obvious reasons. Therefore, the only data about Górnicki’s work was the interview on 29 March 2016 in Cracow where questions about the destroyed works were added. In the context of David Czerny’s work ‘Golem from Poznań’, the basic problem was in the communication with the artist. Despite a short exchange of emails, there was no further response from the artist. The planned pilot studies with sculpture by James L Hayes in Dundalk, Louth in Ireland, were replaced with Anthony Gormley’s Sculpture for Derry Walls in Derry/Londonderry due to its significant place in the contemporary art history of Northern Ireland. Another object explored during the pilot study was the ‘Forget Me Not’ sculpture by Alex Pentek at the Falls City Cemetery in Belfast. Due to unexpected circumstances, the object was described separately in the appendix and was not included in the protocol due not fitting into the research.

The structure of this documentation contains the same protocol describing the pilot studies. The data include time and place of the pilot studies, purpose of the pilot study, a short descriptive overview of the artwork used as the stimulus, short descriptive information of how the sample was taken, exchange of information with stakeholders, phenomena, graph, and saturation.

The graph was made in PowerPoint; all mathematical equations were put directly to the Excel tabs in PowerPoint.

Ryho Paprocki Garden of Salt and Art sculptural installation

Time and place of the pilot study:

The attitude toward Paprocki’s artwork pilot study was investigated on 9 August 2015 on the grounds of Salinary Plants in Bochnia. The object was exposed as a temporary work of art. The experiment started close to 10 AM and finished around 2.15 PM.

Purpose of the research

It could be presumed that some conflict around the work existed, but the installation of the artist was not the actual target. That situation seemed interesting to research under the conditions of the growing conflict the installation could provoke.

585 The answers that stand out from the average. Phenomena could point the researcher to a new exploratory field of research.
The pilot study had to be tested under the validity of the proposed covariates: sexual, abstract, materialistic, religious or none (unable to define). The work of Paprocki was also chosen to check the reliability scale, and if the five question control scale-based questionnaire was properly constructed under conditions of validity.

**How the sample was taken**

In total, 27 participants took part in the experiment. They were divided into categories: local citizens walking to the park to relax, tourists visiting Bochnia for its attractions (a minority) and local citizens who interacted with the artwork.

The pilot study was made near the artwork, in the distance where the responder could have visual contact with the object. There was no time limit to answering the questions, but answers only given after long hesitations were omitted. The participants were informed about the subject of the study and information sheets were handed out.

The researcher informed about his own status without giving any additional information about his artistic background. That information could have increased the defensiveness in the answers and negatively influenced the validity.

The answers of the participants were immediately written down and shown for oral confirmation.

There was not suggestion that the researcher had previously been in contact with the artist Ryho Paprocki. There were no suggestions as to how the answers should be understood, or what should be thought about the artwork.

**Exchange of information with stakeholders**

There was no need to obtain any additional permits to process the pilot study.

**Phenomena**

The force of attitude toward artwork varied from -3 (No. 2) to +8 (No. 11)

Two participants (No 1 and No 12) described the artwork as the ‘butterfly’. Participant No 1 also described the object as the net. Seven participants described the artwork as the ‘net’ (Number 2,3,8,14,19,22,24). Four participants described the artwork in the relation to other works of art (Number 4,9,10,21), but not always describing them as abstract.

Nine participants (Number 1,2,3,8,9,12,19,22,24) answered to projective question No.3 that the artwork had MATERIALISTIC features. In that group, the most negative attitudes were found (no. 2).

There were no answers with RELIGIOUS features. Participant No.1 also gave an answer that could be considered SEXUAL. Six Participants (4,6,10,14,20,21) related to the artwork with ABSTRACT features. There were no negative (below ‘0’) attitudes toward the artwork.

Twelve participants (5,7,11,13,15,16,17,18,23,25,26,27) were unable to specify/verbalize what the artwork represents to them. They attitude was classified as UNABLE to DEFINE.
Responders from that group often used terms such as: ‘very nice, creative, or interesting’ without a deeper explanation of what they experienced. One responder presented a negative ‘-1’ force of attitude (No. 26) and one responder presented ‘0’ attitude level (No. 7).

Participant No. 7 used the term ‘specific’ to describe the artwork. His answer was classified as ‘unable to define’. He presented an attitude that was neither positive nor negative with force ‘0’, The outcome from his answer showed the next issue in reading the data from the sample. On the graph a further user of the method could have a problem in finding those outcomes presenting a purely neutral ‘0’ attitude. Therefore, all outcomes should be gathered simultaneously in the table to find such a phenomenon. In the case of participant No.7, the proper attitude and covariate could be found thanks to question No. 3. The paradox was that the lack of use of that projective question in measuring the force field helped to find the problem with responder No.7’s covariate.

Participant No.26 came closer to the artwork in the process of answering the questions, then quickly started running away from it. The experiment continued, and finished approximately 50 metres from the object. That person showed the most negative attitude toward the work from the participants.

**Graphs**

The graphs present the case study in Bochnia in 2D scales. The first responder is presented as number 1 on the graph; the last responder is number 27. Therefore, we could see a virtual time lapse with every next number. The negative aspect of a presentation of the force field that way is that the true presentation should be in the shape of an infinite spiral. Due to natural consequences, when the last responder was implemented onto the scale, his covariate had to connect with the very first covariate of the same type. The positive aspect of presenting the graph in that form was that the researcher could easy observe the graphical outcome as the force field. That would validate Lewin’s concept, who was searching for clear graphical presentation of the attitude. Therefore, it should be considered to use that form of graph for one-day studies only. In case of longer studies the graph with the usual force line of Lewin would be more valid.

The graph is presented in the full form including all covariates. The next three tables present graphs for three found covariates in that study: materialistic, abstract and unable to define. The graph with the abstract covariate was presented different to the other ones by PowerPoint due to the lack of attitudes below ‘0’. This should be considered as technical problem.
Graph 1.a: Attitudes: Materialistic (M), Sexual (S), Religious (R), Abstract (A) and Unable To Define (D) for Ryho Paprocki artwork: *Garden of Salt and Art*.

Graph 1.b: Attitude: Materialistic (M) for Ryho Paprocki artwork: *Garden of Salt and Art*. 
Graph 1.c: Attitude: Abstract (A) for Ryho Paprocki artwork: *Garden of Salt and Art*.

Graph 1.d: Attitude: Unable To Define (D) for Ryho Paprocki artwork: *Garden of Salt and Art*. 
Table 14: Attitudes: Materialistic (M), Sexual (S), Religious (R), Abstract (A) and Unable To Define (D) for Ryho Paprocki artwork: *Garden of Salt and Art*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Ab</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Saturation

If we could accept the force field of Lewin as the structure to the level of measured attitudes, we could consider the artwork of Paprocki was highly accepted by the participants, with the highest variation between the control covariates: Materialistic and Unable to Define.

It was found that some participants used several terms that could be put under multiple covariates in one sentence. Therefore, it was decided to use only one covariate, which could be most significant in use by the responder. The answers with multiple covariates could be related to the issue of defensiveness in the answer, or low dissonance toward the researcher during the experiment. This issue shows a weak point of the questionnaire. In the case of multiple covariates, when the responders were unable to choose the most significant description, their answers were classified as Unable to Define.
Mother, Daughter Sister sculpture on Sandy Row, Belfast by Ross Wilson

Time and place of the pilot study

The pilot study took place on 26 June 2015 between 10.45 AM and 14.15 PM. The bronze sculpture/statue is permanently placed on the small corner plaza on the crossing of Linfield Road and Sandy Row in front of the building of the tobacco factory owned by Murray&Sons that closed in 2004.  

Purpose of the pilot study

The data from the final report of the Department for Social Development, compared with the declarations of the stakeholders involved in the implementation of the sculpture, provided a certain theoretical background for the research.

The aspect of homage to famine culture of Sandy Row become a question to investigate. It seemed that the commissioners and the artist wished to create an aesthetical form for re-imaging the local identity.

How the sample was taken

Thirty responders took part in the pilot study. The experiment was done in the near distance to the artwork. It could be assumed that at the time of conducting the research around 60-100 people passed by the artwork.

There was no time limit to answering the questions, but participants were requested to answer the questions without long hesitations. The participants were informed about the matter of the experiment and information sheets were handed out.

The researcher provided no information about himself that could interrupt the validity of the research.

The answers of each participant were written down immediately and their correctness was orally confirmed.

Exchange of information with stakeholders

There was no need for a permit. The sculpture is placed in an openly accessible public space. The sculpture by Wilson was briefly mentioned during the interview with Deirdre Robb from the Northern Ireland Arts Council.

**Phenomena**

There were no attitudes toward the artwork that could be considered as Sexual or Religious Covariates.

The lowest force of attitude toward the artwork was gathered among responders No.25 with F(-1) who was classified under ‘Abstract’ covariate and No.12 F(-1) classified under ‘Unable to define’ covariate. It could be considered to add to the lowest parameter of attitude for responders: No.4 with F(1), No.22 with F(2) and No. 28 with F(1) who all were classified under ‘Sexual’ covariate. No. 5 F(2) and No. 6 with F(1) were classified under ‘Unable to define’ covariate.

In the whole pilot study, the highest force of attitude toward the artwork reached level F(7) among responders classified under ‘Sexual’ and ‘Abstract’ covariates.

The ‘Sexual’ covariate on level F(7) was classified among two responders No.2, and No. 29. The high level in that group gained No. 11 with F(6) and No.20 F(6). The highest F(7) in Abstract covariate was classified among two responders, No. 2 F(7) and No.9 F(7). Three responders from that group gathered high force on level (6): No.14, No. 18 and No. 27. In the group of responders who were unable to define what they experienced, there was one highest force level (6) classified on No. 24.

Twelve responders were classified under Sexual covariate. Their numbers were: 2,3,4,10,11,17,19,10,22,23,28,29.

Eleven responders were classified under Abstract. Theirs numbers were: 7,9,14,15,18,21,25,26,27,30.

Seven responders were classified under Unable to Define. Their numbers were: 5,6,8,12,13,16,24.
Graphs

The first graph presents a full 2D presentation of all covariates included for work of Willson. The next three graphs present the Sexual, Abstract and Unable to Define covariates.

Graph 2.a: Attitudes: Materialistic (M), Sexual (S), Religious (R), Abstract (A) and Unable To Define (D) for Ross Wilson artwork: **Mother, Daughter, Sister**.

Graph 2.b: Attitude: Sexual (S) for Ross Wilson artwork: **Mother, Daughter, Sister**.
Graph 2.c: Attitude: Abstract (A) for Ross Wilson artwork: Mother, Daughter, Sister.

Graph 2.d: Attitude: Unable To Define (D) for Ross Wilson artwork: Mother, Daughter, Sister.
Table 15: Attitude: Materialistic (M), Sexual (S), Religious (R), Abstract (A) and Unable To Define (D) for Ross Wilson artwork: *Mother, Daughter, Sister*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Ab</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Saturation

The outcome from the pilot study with the sculpture on Sandy Row revealed an issue in measuring the force of the attitude. It could be presumed that F(0) could not be considered as a constant value. In case of the sculpture by Wilson we should rather consider a very strong or very weak attitude toward sculpture, mostly classified by two covariates: sexual and abstract. Although the Sexual covariate was the largest in the whole study (twelve cases), it also contained the most number of low attitudes. It could be explained with rejected aesthetical quality of the artwork by the responders classified under Sexual covariate. Responders classified under that covariate often stated that the sculpture was wrongly placed and was not very visible due to its measurements. The attitude classified under Abstract covariate was stronger toward the sculpture in its own global force. The responders who were classified under the covariate Unable to Define felt the lowest impact. The most valuable phenomena worth further investigation could be responder No. 24 with F(6) Classified Unable to define, who described the object as ‘incestuous monument’ and finally declared that he was unable to cognate what he saw. He matched his emotional attitude toward artwork as ‘excited’. 
Five Apples by Shiro Matsuyama in Ballymena Peoples Park

Time and place of the sample

The experiment took place on 7 November 2015 between 10.15 AM and 16.45 PM on the grounds of Ballymena Peoples Park, in close range to the sculpture.

Purpose of the pilot study

The pilot studies around Shiro Matsuyama’s sculpture brought about a speculation about its impact on the local community, questioning what impact Five Apples has the local community and what could cause the attacks.

Methodology

Thirty-two responders took a part in the experiment, which started at 10.15 AM and finished at 16.45 PM. The pilot studies were made in the distance up to 40 meters from the sculpture. All responders had visual contact with the sculpture, although not all wanted to come closer. In some cases, mostly among elder people who were walking their dogs, the experiment started in close range to the sculptures.

Exchange of information with stakeholders

The experiment took place after interview with Shiro Matsuyama. Although the sculptures are located in an area of the park that is freely accessible, the researcher orally informed the office of the park authority about his intention to carry out the study in advance.

Phenomena

The F toward Artwork recorded during the pilot study varied from F(-5) in Unable to Define covariates up to F(7) in Abstract covariate.

There were seven responders classified under Materialistic covariate (numbers 1,4,6,7,8,31,32). Three responders classified under that covariate were recorded with F above (0). Four responders were recorded with F below (0). That covariate gathered the lowest F from the whole group of tested responders. No. 7, a female worker aged 47 with F(-3) said: ‘Nothing special. Just apples’. Responder No.8, a 54-year old male worker with F(-3) described the work negatively as artificial apples. No. 8 claimed the money could have been better spent. It should be noted that those responders devaluated art in their descriptive answers. No.6 with F(-1) a 34-year old male worker declared Strongly Agree for question No. 1, although he finally defined the artwork as “apple”. Initially he claimed he was unable to describe the artwork. No. 6 declared his emotional attitude toward artwork (question no.4) as ‘neutral’.

One responder classified under Religious covariate: No. 10 F(4) related the artwork to Adam and Eve.

There were nine responders classified under the Abstract covariate, (numbers 9,13,18,19,20,21,24,25,29). There was no F level below (0) classified under that covariate. The highest level recorded was F(7) with responder No. 13, who described the work of
Matsuyama as child memos and compared the artwork to his own childhood in Cornwall. No. 13 in his answer to question 3 included the information that he witnessed the destruction one of the sculptures by the children who were jumping on it during play.

Fourteen responders were classified under the Unable to Define covariate, (numbers 2,3,5,11,12,14,15,16,17,23,26,27,28,30). Three responders were classified with F level under (0). Under that covariate the lowest F(-5) was recorded with responder No.27, a 61-year old retired male. Responder No.27 declared that abstract art destroys the landscape. Public sculpture should not ruin the landscape. No. 27 did not match that emotion toward the sculpture (question no 4.) but only declared ‘Waste of time’. Responder No. 28 with F(2) declared he would prefer a Japanese garden or artificial lake in place of public art – ‘something else to look at’. Responder No.15, a 11-year old male student, declared he was ‘excited’ and marked ‘agree’ for question 1 and 2, although he was unable to define what he was experiencing. A similar attitude was presented by the responders: No. 14 with F(5), a male 12-year old student, and No.17 with F(6) a male 12-year old student.
Graphs

Graph 3.a: Attitudes: Materialistic (M), Sexual (S), Religious (R), Abstract (A) and Unable To Define (D) for Shiro Matsuyama artwork: *Five Apples*.

Graph 3.b: Attitude: Materialistic (M) for Shiro Matsuyama artwork: *Five Apples*. 
Graph 3.c: Attitude: Religious (R) for Shiro Matsuyama artwork: *Five Apples*.

Graph 3.d: Attitude: Abstract (A) for Shiro Matsuyama artwork: *Five Apples*. 
Graph 3.e: Attitude: Unable To Define (D) for Shiro Matsuyama artwork: *Five Apples.*
Table 16: Attitudes: Materialistic (M), Sexual (S), Religious (R), Abstract (A) and Unable To Define (D) for Shiro Matsuyama artwork: *Five Apples*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Ab</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Saturation**

The largest variation of $F$ toward the artwork was recorded in the group classified under the Unable to Define covariate. Most of the highest attitudes toward the artwork of Shiro Masyama were related to description of the food (the apple), or certain defensiveness in describing the sculpture. The lowest attitudes were related to description of the sculpture as an apple, or to the responders who declared an inability to describe their experience with art. The young responders who were classified under Unable to Define covariate with high $L$ attitude toward the artwork could react defensively when giving the answers because of the contact with interviewer. The lack of a very low attitude in the Abstract covariate could mean an impact of the artwork on those responders, who openly spoke about their memories, or relation to nature. The matter of location and use of the park as a public space was mentioned by those responders who were recorded with very low attitudes toward the artwork. It could be presumed that in those specific cases, the abstract borderline between ‘private space’ and ‘public space’ could be distorted.
The John ‘Rinty’ Monaghan sculpture in Cathedral Gardens, Belfast, by Alan Beattie Herriot

Time and place of the pilot study

The experiment was carried out on 14 September 2015 near the bronze sculpture on the area of Cathedral Gardens (actually, Buoy park) between 10.30 AM and 14.00 PM.

Purpose of the pilot study

The 14 September of 2015 was the day of enrolment for new students on Arts, Design and Built Environment who during the day spent part of their time near the sculpture of Rinty Monaghan. Because the sculpture was implemented for the strict purpose of making an impact on the local community, the question was how a sculpture could work with a diverse group.

How the sample was taken

The participants were people spending time near the sculpture or sitting on the benches nearby. It could be presumed that there were two main groups of people who took part in the experiment, namely students who came to enrol that day and local citizens, mostly workers, who were asked to take part in their lunch break. The researcher always presented his ID and explained the purpose of the experiment. While taking the sample two cases were miscounted by the researcher. Twenty-eight responders took part in the pilot study. However, in the original questionnaire forms the last number on the sheet was ‘30’. While writing the outcome, it was found that two numbers were skipped while filling the questionnaires, number ‘19’ and ‘24’. Therefore, those numbers were not included on the graph and table with values of attitude toward sculpture.

Exchange of information with stakeholders

The access to the sculpture was open to the public. There was no necessity to inform anyone or ask for any permits to conduct the pilot study.

Phenomena

The highest attitude toward the artwork was recorded four times with F(6) among Materialistic, Religious and Abstract covariates. The lowest F(-2) was recorded with responder No.26 classified under the Unable to Define covariate.

Two responders were classified under the Materialistic covariate, responder No.3 with F(6) and responder No.20 with F(1). Responder No.20 answered that he had a neutral attitude toward the artwork, although he would like to see more art in that area. The sculpture was nothing special for him, although hesitated, could he accept its presence in the plaza.

Five responders were classified under the Sexual covariate (number 1,6,10,12,29). Responder No.6 had F(5). Three responders (1,12,29) were recorded with F(2) and responder No.10 with F(3). Responder No.1, a 26-year old student, answered that she had a neutral attitude toward the artwork. She was excited when experiencing the sculpture, although claimed that the place for the monument was wrong. Responder No.29 with F(2),
a 23-year old female student described the artwork as a boxer. No. 29 probably hesitated by declaring that she liked the object, was interested but also said the sculpture could be relocated.

Four responders were classified under the Religious covariate (number 4,23,28,30). The responder No. 4 with F(1), a female aged 19 answered that her relation to sculpture was neutral. She was not sure whether the monument stood too closely to the university building and about the function of the sculpture. Responders No. 4 and No.30 with F(5) described the sculpture of Monaghan as Rocky Balboa. Responders No.23 with F(6) and No.28 with F(6) compared the sculpture with a famous boxer, but without mentioning his name. Therefore, the Religious covariate was considered in these cases as the collection of common denominators such as iconic objects, fictional persons of cultural significance or an object of imaginary authority.

Ten responders were classified under the Abstract covariate (numbers 2,5,7,8,13,14,15,17,21,27). The responder No.8 with F(2), a male worker aged 45 was interested in the sculpture and declared a positive attitude toward artwork. He said that he was confused about why the sculpture of the boxer should stand alone. In his opinion, the sculpture should stand on the plaza, along with other sculptures of important personalities in Belfast’s history. The idea would only make some sense as a group of statues. No.8 did not describe the sculpture, but had an opinion about the significance of the idea for that type of artwork for the city of Belfast. Responder No. 27 with F(3), a 44-year old male worker, declared that he liked the sculpture and felt excited when experiencing the artwork. Although having a highly affective attitude toward the sculpture, responder No. 27 briefly declared that the place for the sculpture was wrong, even knowing the importance of the object for local people.

There were seven responders classified under the Unable to Define covariate (number 9,11,16,18,22,25,26). Responder No.11 with F(1) a 19-year old male student declared a neutral attitude toward artwork. No.11 had a neutral attitude toward any hypothetical presence of art on the plaza. Responder No.11 also stated that the sculpture fit the plaza, while simultaneously being unable to describe the artwork. Responder No.25 with F(-1) a 35-year old male worker, was unable to describe the artwork and had no idea if the sculpture should stand on the plaza. At the same time he said that there should be more sculptures on the plaza.

---

588 Rocky Balboa, a boxer, is the main character played by Sylvester Stallone in the movie Rocky from 1976. The script for the movie was also written by Stallone. Full script of the movie available here: S. Stallone, Rocky (Puncher’s face), 1976 [website] http://www.dailyscript.com/scripts/ROCKY.pdf (accessed 10 October 2015)
Graphs

Graph 4.a: Attitudes: Materialistic (M), Sexual (S), Religious (R), Abstract (A) and Unable To Define (D) for Alan Beattie Herriot artwork: *Rinty Monhagan*.

Graph 4.b: Attitude: Materialistic (M) for Alan Beattie Herriot artwork: *Rinty Monhagan*. 
Graph 4.c: Attitude: Sexual (S) for Alan Beattie Herriot artwork: *Rinty Monhagan*.

Graph 4.d: Attitude: Religious (R) for Alan Beattie Herriot artwork: *Rinty Monhagan*. 
Graph 4.e: Attitude: Abstract (A) for Alan Beattie Herriot artwork: *Rinty Monhagan*.

Graph 4.f: Attitude: Unable to Define (D) for Alan Beattie Herriot artwork: *Rinty Monhagan*. 
Table 17: Attitudes: Materialistic (M), Sexual (S), Religious (R), Abstract (A) and Unable To Define (D) for Alan Beattie Herriot artwork: *Rinty Monhagan*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Ab</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Saturation

The levels of attitude could expose the sculpture of Rinty Monaghan as an expensive object of art. Descriptiveness of the artwork under the Sexual covariate could be related to personal comparison of own physique with the sculpted body of the boxer. Generally, the attitude classified under the Sexual covariate was low when compared to other covariates. The lowest attitude of all was recorded under the Unable to Define covariate. Responders classified under that covariate often hesitated on the placement of the sculpture and its relation to the plaza. The largest number of responders was classified under the Abstract covariate, with generally the highest attitude toward the artwork. Responders classified under that covariate related the artwork to the issue of winning, or victory. Those who described the artwork in context of place and history of the city were generally recorded with low F toward artwork. Responders classified under the Unable to Define covariate generally presented the lowest attitude toward the artwork. Most of the responders from that group had a problem in classifying what they experienced and what the artwork represented. The very high attitude found under the Religious covariate could lead to the question whether the responders truly experienced the artwork, or rather expressed their imagination of some pop-cultural icon.

Although the range of L varied from F(-2) to F(6) in the group, it could be presumed that the general cognitive and affective attitude was just average. That paradox could be explained by the study on L in each covariate, where each set had high or low L. That could mean that hypothetically responders during the exchange of information about the sculpture among themselves could not come to the consensus what they had experienced.
Anthony Gormley’s Sculpture for Derry Walls (1987)

Time and place of the pilot study

The sample was taken on 4 June 2016 between 10.30 AM and 13.25 PM in the area of Derry/Londonderry’s historical city walls, close to Anthony Gormley’s sculpture.

Purpose of the pilot study

Theoretical data gathered from the case study and interviews with Brendan McMenamin and Declan McGonagle about Gormley’s sculpture for Derry Walls allowed to put a question: did the sculpture of Gormley become a temporal transformer for reconciliation of the local community?

How the sample was taken.

The sample was taken in close range to the sculpture standing near the entrance to the Millenium Forum theatre. Responders were informed about the aims and objectives of the experiment. There were 26 participants in the study. Around 50% of the passers-by were not interested in taking part, due to their interest in reaching the nearby shopping mall. It could be presumed that overall, between 50 to 70 people were in visual contact with Gormley’s sculpture between 10.30 A.M. and 13.25 P.M. Around 11.30 a loyalist parade moved close to the sculpture. The group of more than 200 men marched by with an orchestra from the direction of the Catholic quarter and moved in the direction of the Foyle River. The group was only marching within the area of Derry city walls. The last responder who took part in the pilot study before the group of loyalists arrived was No.13. After the group passed, the area of city walls was empty for the next five to seven minutes, with the exception of one Millenium Forum worker who was outside the building for a moment. The first responder who took a part in the pilot study after the parade of the loyalists was No.14. That sample was taken at 11.50 A.M. The march of the loyalists was documented on camera.

Exchange of information with stakeholders

The sculpture is located in a freely accessible public space. Therefore, there was no necessity for additional permits to conduct the pilot study.

Phenomena

The lowest recorded attitude (-6) toward the artwork was with participant no. 17 and the highest attitude (8) toward the artwork belonged to participant no.12. Both attitudes were classified under the Unable to Define covariate.

There were no responders classified under the Materialistic covariate.

Three responders were classified under the Sexual covariate (number 6,14,21). The range of F varied between (-3) to (3). Number 21 with F(-3), a 35-year old female in the first moment compared the sculpture to a medieval torture device but finally decided to compare it to a dead medieval knight. No.6 with F(3), an 18-year old male student declared a neutral
attitude toward the sculpture. He claimed to know that the sculpture had been in that place for many years. No.6 declared that sculpture was *two friends with abstraction*.

Four responders were classified under the Religious covariate (numbers 8,10, 22, 25). The range of F varied between (-2) to (3). Responder No. 10 with F(3) a 40-year old female stated she had a neutral attitude toward artwork. Initially she compared the artwork to Hannibal Lecter\(^589\), and later declared the object could be anything. In case of responder No.10 the classification under the Religious covariate was based on her use of a cultural icon to describe her own emotional status, which she declared as *Interested*. No.8 with F(8) a 78-old male, No.22 with F(-2) a 70-year old female and No.25 with F(2) all related the artwork to the passion of Christ. No.22 also related the artwork to medieval torture.

There were five responders classified under the Abstract covariate (numbers 15,18,23,24,26). The range of F varied from (1) to (8). Responder No.15 with F(8) a 38-year old male declared the highest attitude toward artwork. He gave a full description of the artwork in relation to the place. No.15 considered the artist’s process of the creation in his answer. He was aware about the previous placement of the sculpture. When No.15 answered the questions, he asked the researcher: ‘do you like me?’ No.15 was a tall man, precisely shaved, wearing red headphones, red jacket, red trousers and large golden shoes. No.23 with F(1), a 60-year old female declared that she felt uncomfortable, the sculpture was lacking finesse, was heavy and sinister. On the first question No.23 answered she liked the sculpture. To question No.5, No.23 answered that the sculpture of Gormley should not stand in front of the Millenium Forum theatre, because it was inappropriate for *place of culture*.

There were fourteen responders classified under the Unable to Define covariate (number 1,2,3,4,5,7,9,11,12,13,16,17,19,20). The range of F varied from (-6) to (8). Responder No.12 with F(8), a 43-year old male, declared he was working for the Millenium Forum theatre. He declared the highest attitude toward the sculpture. In answering question no.4, he declared that he was excited and interested when experiencing the sculpture. Simultaneously, No.12 did not express his own definition of what the sculpture was for him. He rather stated his opinion that the sculpture and its history should be common knowledge.

\(^{589}\) The main protagonist in a series of stories about a cannibalistic serial killer. According to Thomas Harris who created Hannibal Lecter, the character was based on real person: Dr. Alfredo Ballí Treviño. Source: U. Bacchi, *Real Hannibal Lecter was Murderous Gay Mexican Doctor Alfredo Ballí Treviño*, International Buissness Times, 2013, http://www.ibtimes.co.uk/hannibal-lecter-gay-mexican-doctor-alfredo-ball-495908(accessed 17 August 2016)
Graphs

Graph 5.a: Attitudes: Sexual (S), Religious (R), Abstract (A) and Unable to Define (D) for Antony Gormley artwork: *Sculpture for Derry Walls.*

Graph 5.b: Attitude: Sexual (S) for Antony Gormley artwork: *Sculpture for Derry Walls.*
Graph 5.c: Attitude: Religious (R) for Antony Gormley artwork: *Sculpture for Derry Walls*.

Graph 5.d: Attitude: Abstract (Ab) for Antony Gormley artwork: *Sculpture for Derry Walls*.
Graph 5.e: Attitude: Unable to Define (D) for Antony Gormley artwork: Sculpture for Derry Walls.
Table 18: Attitudes: Materialistic (M), Sexual (S), Religious (R), Abstract (A) and Unable to Define (D) for Antony Gormley artwork: *Sculpture for Derry Walls.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Ab</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Saturation**

The attitude toward Gormley’s sculpture had the highest variance, reaching 14 points of F when compared to other sculptures studied in one-day pilot studies. The largest group of responders was classified under the Unable to Define covariate. The sculpture was often described as an expression of pain, suffering or strength. Fourteen out of 26 answers by the responders to question No.3 were just a basic definition of sculpture. Those 14 responders did not express any extensive opinion of their own. The responders considered as phenomena gave more than one description of what they experienced. The answers from these respondents to question No.3 usually varied, from Materialistic toward Abstract or Religious covariates. It can be presumed that the responders were openly expressing their line of reasoning while dealing with their defences. Therefore, the classification proposed by the researcher in these specific cases could be still disputable due to insufficient data gathered. In several cases Gormley’s sculpture was considered as a site-specific object that did not require any explanation. No. 6 and No.12 claimed that sculpture was a part of the site, probably for that reason a further explanation of what they experienced was not important for them. It could be interesting to consider the relation of the Abstract and Unable to Define covariates recorded before and after 11.30 (in the context of the loyalist march). The attitude toward the artwork worsened after 11.30 among responders classified under the Unable to Define covariate and generally improved among responders classified under the Abstract covariate.
Final research in Nowa Huta and Derry/Londonderry.

The one-day pilot studies helped to adopt the Kurt Lewin concept of Force Field and the visual graph of the group dynamics onto the field of attitude toward the artwork. The project could be moved toward to the final stage: measuring the impact of the sculpture in the temporal study to find out, could if the sculpture start could new group dynamic process in the public space.

The outline of the research included:

Time and place of the sample taken, purpose of the research, concept of the sculpture, realisation of the sculpture and its implementation on site, exchange of information with stakeholders, a short descriptive information about how the sample was taken, phenomena, graph and tables, saturation.
Sculpture ‘Reason’ in Nowa Huta, Poland

Time and place of the sample taken:

The research focused on the sculpture Reason was completed in front of the PRL Museum in Nowa Huta, currently a quarter in Krakow, Poland. The samples were acquired three times to identify replicate phenomena within Lewin’s three stages model of observed changes in the group.

Date: Time of the sample taken: Number of participants:
05.12.2015 10.15 – 13.50 35
14.12.2015 10.00 – 12.45 29
09.01.2016 09.45 – 14.15 33

Purpose for the research

Nowa Huta was a purpose-planned, self-efficient hometown for the proletariat class, who were employed in Poland’s largest steel foundry. The complex was developed since the early 50’ of XX Century on the order of government. The architecture of Nowa Huta was designed: Tadeusz Ptaszycki, Boleslaw Skrzybalski, Tadeusz Rembiesa and Stanislaw Juchnowicz. The lead architect was Tadeusz Ptaszycki. The basic concepts for planning the city were socialist realism and Renaissance urbanist models. To begin with, the area was divided into 16 main sectors, after which renaissance-eclectic buildings were constructed on the plane of the squares. Interior spaces between buildings and transportation roads were sown with a large number of plants.

All of the city’s quarters meet at the central point of the main square, called ‘Rose Alley’, where the statue of Lenin by Marian Konieczny was placed on 24 April 1974. The statue was the subject of great dislike. On 19 April 1979, unknown dissidents attempted to destroy the sculpture with the use of explosives. The statue was demolished by foundry workers, local militia and members of the army on 10 December 1989.

591 Lewin conceptualized, that the process of interference of the relationships in the group could be categorized in three relations: Autocracy (A), Democracy (D), Laissez Faire (LF). Some of the members could leave the group and create other set of interdependences. Therefore, for Lewin the Group Dynamics was in ongoing process of changes. K. Lewin. The Dynamics of Group Action, Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1944, p. 196.
592 Nowa Huta in English means: New Foundry
594 Architects of Nowa Huta were under strong influence of utopian work of Tomasso Campanella, ’The City of the Sun’ edited for the first time in 1602.
to the city’s public spaces. Most of his sculptures were vandalised or silently dismantled. In 2016, the Krakow City Council allocated some budgetary resources to restoring sculptures in Nowa Huta.

From 2011 to 2013, sculptures placed in Nowa Huta’s public spaces as part of the ArtSesja programme were destroyed or removed. Another political attack was provided to the sculpture ‘Pissing Lenin’ by Batrosz Szydlowski. The artwork was exposed temporarily during the ArtBoom festival in 2015. The action against the sculpture was lead by the PIS (Law and Justice) party member Adam Kalita. Kalita ordered to put the giant condom on the sculpture. Shortly after the incident, the sculpture was moved out of Nowa Huta by the artist.

After synthesis of relevant cases and sources, it is reasonable to assume that issues around sculpture in Nowa Huta’s public spaces are significantly influenced by political motivations. The basic question to consider was: How wide is the range of interpretation for sculpture in an area seemingly highly negative toward any art?

**Concept of the sculpture**

The concept of the sculpture in its primal stage was based on gathered data about earlier incidents with vandalism against the already existing sculptures placed in Nowa Huta. The next issue to consider was political movements against earlier sculptures placed in Nowa Huta.

The damaged or removed sculptures were either abstract or related to the icon of Lenin in a site-specific context. Therefore, issues regarding specific history of the site, abstract form and the manner of destruction or damage became the basis for the concept of the sculpture. There were also formal issues related to the problem of transport and temporary implementation on the site: The sculpture needed to be easy to transport and simultaneously large enough to be seen from a distance in the public space. The basis of

---

600 It could be worthy to mention, that according to GUS (Central Statistical Office) in 2013 Polish Government spent 0,5% of its budget for art and culture. In the main scope of funding were museums and renovation of existing objects related to cultural issues (24.2% from the whole budget for culture). In Lesser Poland district, where the Nowa Huta lied, the city councils spend average 175,86 PLN per capita for culture and art (around 16 GBP). D. Maćkowska-Cichosz and B. Nowak, Wydatki na kulturę w 2013 r, Cracow, Ośrodek Statystyki Kultury, 2014, pp. 2-3.
the artwork required that it lay only on the ground. The sculpture needed to be made from high-resistance materials in consideration of earlier attacks on works in that area.

Therefore, the artwork needed to be a non-representative object with no ideological connotations to the icon of Lenin, Christ or any other historical event. With regard to the site-specific character of the sculpture, it was necessary for the work to be based on steel or iron materials due to the high chance of meeting responders who had worked in the foundry. The object needed to leave interpretation open to the responder as much as possible.

**Realisation of the sculpture and its implementation on site**

During the work on the project in the stage of drawings, the issue of rising the interpretation by the responder had been re-visited. After re-analysis of the text by Melanie Klein about transference\textsuperscript{601} it had been decided to re-model the concept for the sculpture.

The final form of the sculpture was based on the basic shape of a human head, built from repetitive collections of orbs. The object was open horizontally with a one-metre long cut. On the opposite part of the sculpture, there was another vertical cut of the same length. Both cuts ‘penetrated’ the form of the sculpture until they met in the central part of the work. It was decided to make the sculpture in epoxy resin mixed with iron powder. After pouring the citric acid on the surface of the sculpture, the object should quickly create the effect of rusted iron.

The final realisation of the sculpture was based on the idea of a simple, quasi-biological form that had been penetrated by a contradictory object. The ‘contradictory object’ in that case was a reference to the idea of open form by Hansen. The open and diagonal cuts penetrated the closed form of the orbs.

The object was realised by the researcher in the art studio\textsuperscript{602} and transported to the site in the night of 4 December 2015 with the help of two other people. A photographic documentation accompanied the realisation and implementation of the artwork.

**Exchange of information with stakeholders**

The first exchange of emails with the PRL Museum manager, Mr Ryszard Kozik took place on 22 May 2015. From then until 26 November 2015, more emails were sent with additional information about the project and its idea. Finally, the director of the museum allowed the sample in front of the museum, which was confirmed orally during an eye to eye meeting with the researcher on 12 October 2015. After placing the sculpture on site, Mr Kozik was informed about the start of the research.


\textsuperscript{602} Due to the extensive reconstruction process of Belfast campus in that time, the object was made outside the University facilities.
On 7 December 2015, Mr Kozik published some information about the project on Facebook and the website of the PRL Museum.  

On 22 December 2015, the Dziennik Polski newspaper published brief information about the project.  

After finding the sculpture damaged on 25 January 2016 the stakeholders were informed about moving the sculpture from the site. Police was informed about the act of vandalism the same day. The sculpture was moved from the site on 26 January 2016.  

After completion of the research, a short presentation about the project was made in the PRL Museum on 22 February 2016.  

**How the sample was taken**  

The sculpture was placed 20 metres away from the facade of the Museum and 20 metres from the street (Al. Solidarności). The front of the sculpture was oriented toward the centre of Nowa Huta. That placement allowed the sculpture to be seen from at least 80-60 metres distance. The sculpture was placed between three main transportation routes: the main pedestrian path passing by the museum, people heading to or from the museum, or to or from the music school behind the building of the museum.  

The research took place during the Polish winter. The average temperature during that time was five degrees below Celsius. That caused distortion in the sample on 14 December 2015, as the number of 29 responders was only due to the low temperature.  

The participants were informed about the idea of the research. The researcher did not confirm that he was the creator of the sculpture in order to avoid enhanced defensiveness or increasing cognitive dissonance from the responders. For the same reason the title of the sculpture was not revealed. In case of any questions from the responders regarding the ownership, the researcher said that an answer could disturb the quality of the outcome.  

The research was carried out close to the sculpture, and on three separate dates: 5 December 2015 (35 responders), 14 December 2015 (29 responders) and 9 January 2016 (33 responders). Most of the responders were people passing by. Those least interested in taking part were visitors to the museum, or students of the music school heading to or from the building.  

Over Christmas and new year the research was interrupted, due to possibility of incidents that could negatively affect the validity. After the last sample was taken, the sculpture remained on site until 22 January 2016.

---

605 English: National Music School of Mieczysław Karłowicz, Polish: Zespół Państwowych Szkół Muzycznych im. Mieczysława Karłowicza, address: Osiedle Centrum E 2, 30-001 Kraków
Phenomena and saturation

The aims and objectives of the study required a completely new approach to the problem of saturation and finding the phenomena from the data.

The study proceeded several times with the same artwork allowed to research for the first time -intra or -extra relations inside the group, firstly defined by Kurt Lewin.

The research on the phenomena found in the sample was the same as with the one-day pilot studies. Phenomena were defined when the answers given by the responders were not consistent in their grammatology, semiotics, or logic, when the behaviour of the responders was incompatible with their statements, and when the beliefs presented by the responders about the artwork seemed to be borrowed statements given without any profound explanation.

The new line of reasoning was necessary to classify phenomena in the case of attitudes toward the artwork for the whole group. To find a solution for that problem, the method of saturation from multiple answers in the one-day pilot studies was used. It was found that some responders did not hesitate, but made statements which were antithetic to each other. Such answers from the pilot study classified under only one covariate would always endanger the study’s validity.

Therefore, the new classification was given in the case of only those phenomena and named ‘in progress’. Those phenomena that were classified as ‘in progress’ could be related to the ‘neighbouring range concept’ of Lewin in classifications of -intra or -extra relations.

The research on -intra and -extra relations would make it possible to measure the F of the attitude in decision-making dynamics of the group.

---

606 This case was found for the first time during the classification of the data from the Ryho Paprocki artwork pilot study.
607 Lewin in his text about graphical exposition of Group Dynamics processes supported himself with terminology from the field of sets in mathematic. Lewin’s equation for evaluation of Neighbor Range was a result from: \( |f| = p + n \).
Sculpture Vision in Derry/Londonderry, Northern Ireland

Time and place of the sample taken

The research was conducted on six occasions between 27 May 2016 and 7 June 2016 in the area of Peace Flame Park with a purpose-designed sculpture. The Peace Flame Park is situated approximately 150m from Ebrington Square and 200m from Peace Bridge in Derry.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Time of the sample taken</th>
<th>Number of responders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27.05.2016</td>
<td>11.45 – 14.50</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.05.2016</td>
<td>10.35 – 15.15</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.05.2016</td>
<td>10.15 – 16.00</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03.06.2016</td>
<td>10.05 – 14.45</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.06.2016</td>
<td>10.15 – 12.30</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07.06.2016</td>
<td>11.10 – 13.50</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Purpose for the research

In the historical context, Derry/Londonderry was a place related to the most significant eruptions of conflict between republicans and loyalists. In the last three decades, the city developed toward reconciliation. Sculpture played a significant role in building a new image for the town, within the context of implication for cultural diversity during and after the Troubles. Derry/Londonderry was chosen as the first UK City of Culture in 2013. Up to that period, approximately 100 million GBP were invested in culture and infrastructure. The Derry-Londonderry Legacy Fund was established with the help of the Arts Council of Northern Ireland, and a three-year plan to manage art events and heritage-related topics was defined. The city in comparison to the rest of Northern Ireland had one of the highest numbers of young citizens under the age of 25, with a large population of students included.

---

608 The division among conflicted communities was simultaneously related to economic issues around employment, social position and sex. It would be a great misunderstanding to look on the conflict only in the context of loyalist ideology or religious sectarianism. In his work on trade unionism and sectarianism among Derry shirt workers, Andrew Robert Finlay found that a dichotomy was strengthened by the social roles between protestant factory owners and catholic workers. However, in the conclusion of his research, Finlay noted that the line of conflict among Unionist workers could be in relation to the functions of working women in Derry. A. R. Finlay, Trade Unionism and Sectarianism Among Derry Shirt Workers 1920-1968, With Special Reference to the National Union of Tailors and Garment Workers, [PHD Thesis] London, Department of Anthropology, University College London, 1989, pp.320-321.

609 In interviews with Prof. Declan McGonagle, Brendan McMenamin, Artur Tajber and Deirdre Robb the issues regarding Derry and its culture were raised. Declan McGonagle, Brendan McMenamin, Artur Tajber and Deirdre Robb interview by Krzysztof Krzysztof, Appendix A.

Simultaneously, Derry City and Strabane District Council faced high rates of unemployment.\textsuperscript{611}

Derry/Londonderry was chosen as the final location for gathering samples after the researcher visited in May 2015. The interviews and case studies on sculptures related to the city provided a theoretical background for consideration of Derry/Londonderry as an important hub for cultural changes, where public sculpture played a significant a role. As most of the city’s artworks were commissioned by public art programmes, significant attention was focused on creating an artwork that would not be related to any topic of reconciliation, heritage, diversity or peace.

**Concept of the sculpture**

A series of concept drawings were made after visiting Derry in May 2015. The final concept assumed that the site for the sculpture would be Peace Flame Park. In the main idea, object should be easy accessible to responders, groups of responders should have heterogeneous attributes and the site should be historically important to the local community.\textsuperscript{612}

The sculpture should be easy to construct and dismantle, resistant to attacks and safe to construct.

The concept evolved toward an art object constructed from two materials, representing two communities. However, the construction of the sculpture needed to lead to compositional fulfilment. The concept was based on Strzemiński’s theory of vision, where constructivist-behaviourist aspects of the artist act as a receptor toward nature. The stimulant was developed from the researcher’s findings regarding the works of Luria and Konarski in Strzeminski’s work.\textsuperscript{613} Grotowski’s method\textsuperscript{614} on sending communicates toward the responder brought a certain idea around the psychotic aspect of the cognitive processes in

\textsuperscript{611} Ibid.

\textsuperscript{612} The Old City Hotel previously stood on the site where the park was developed. The area of Foyle Street up to the Guildhall was a merchandise and small production area. Foyle Street – a true place apart, Derry Journal, 03 June 2011 et.al. The Peace Flame Park was part of the 2013 UK City of Culture project and was held under the auspices of the World Peace Flame Foundation as a symbol of reconciliation. Children from both communities that inhabit Derry were to light flames symbolizing peace in the park. D. Deeney, Derry Children United to Light Flame of Peace, Belfast Telegraph, last modified May 16, 2013 http://www.belfasttelegraph.co.uk/news/northern-ireland/derrys-children-united-to-light-flame-of-peace-29271479.html (accessed April 10 2016)


\textsuperscript{614} Jerzy Grotowski in his work about Poor Theatre shared his findings on the elimination of unimportant elements in active communication with the receiver during the indication of the messages. For Grotowski, the group process he was searching for, was possible to be unified with other art disciples, including sculpture. The synthesis, or, at least the enquiry for that synthesis was in opposition to what Grotowski called the Rich Theatre, full of delusions and dishonesty with the receiver. Therefore, the honesty - to stand open in front of the receiver - was lying in the fundaments of Grotowski’s approach to the responder in dynamical interactions. Grotowski also used example of processing the sculpture (in a classical way), to the method he worked out with Cieślak, to describe the elimination of unnecessary states of mind and work out the core of human identity, and to share/teach it. The key to achieve that state was the process of repetition of body movements with adding to that process, stages of behavioural indicators to achieve what Grotowski called: representations collectives. J. Grotowski, Toward a Poor Theatre, (ed.) E. Barba, pref. Peter Brook, London New York, Routledge, A Theatre Art Books, 2002, p.19 and pp. 39-43; Andre Gregory monologue about his experience with Grotowski: L. Malle, A. Gregory and W. Shawn, My Dinner with Andre, [online video] 1981, https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=9vGpBvJ5_6E (accessed 5 June 2016)
After application of Grotowski method by repetitive process of making sketches, the final project was achieved. The vision was: an impaled on three metal rods shape of a man.

The final concept of the sculpture included the use of two materials: steel profiles and oak wood. The steel profiles symbolised the industrial history of the area, while oak wood was used to sculpt the shape of the body as a symbolic reference to Derry itself. The simplified shape of the human body was to be raised on three metal profiles above the level of the ground. The body was to be sculpted in a ‘figura serpentinata’ composition from the legs upward to the middle part of the corpus, where the metal profiles were to be placed. Above the level of metal profiles, the shape of the body was to be unified and lead to abstract structuration. The sculpture’s composition was based on the law of contradiction: the set of materials used were in opposition to each other (metal and wood), and the suspension of the wooden element on metal profiles should present the object as one, while the object would not be complete if any element were removed. The composition of the metal profiles was to be close to pyramidal (geometrical) form. At the meeting point of those three profiles, the oak element would be mounted. Therefore, the sculpture would be built from its own contradictions: [soft (wood)] versus [hard (metal)], [once alive nature (wood)] versus [always inanimate nature (metal)], [carved figure (wood)] versus [industrial construction (metal)], and [static vertical element mimesis flesh (wood)] versus [dynamic geometrical rhythm (metal)].

The concept was accurate to the interpretation of contradiction by Jan Łukasiewicz in all three aspects: ontological, logical and psychological. The critic of Łukasiewicz’s model of logic was taken under consideration in the theoretical framework.

Realisation of the sculpture and its implementation on site

The wooden element of the sculpture measured 225cm. The metal profiles that formed part of the base were 165cm long and the three profiles that joined with the wooden section to create the triangular base were approximately 145cm long. The height of the completed sculpture was 250cm.
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617 In contradiction with determinism, the work of Łukasiewicz presented the third law of logic, where sentences could be both false or true if they belonged to the set of futura contingenta. In the place of classical junction on true or false sentences, Łukasiewicz proposed distinction for: already true, already false or not yet determinate. That trivalent logic became a construct for Multivalued logic. Among the critiques of Łukasiewicz’s Multivalued logic, Susan Haack presented a thought: that necessity for sequent does not result in the need for apodosis. In defence of Łukasiewicz against Haack, Dariusz Łukasiewicz outlined Haack’s inaccuracies. For Darius Łukasiewicz, Haack’s argument was a case of modal paradox and did not belong to incompatible thesis (IT), which claimed that the future is alethic only if it is set by the cause. M. Tkaczyk, Logika, Wykład Kurzoryczny: Geneza Logik Nieklasycznych, Lublin, Katedra Logiki KUL, 2010, pp. 106-107. ; and: D. Łukasiewicz, O krytyce determinizmu i logice wielowartościowej Jana Łukasiewicza, in: (eds.) M. Rembisz, K. Śleziński, Bielsko-Biała Cracow, Studia z Filozofii Polskiej, Vol. 6, 2011, pp.14-15.
At approximately 8:30 a.m. on the day of assembly of the sculpture, 26 May 2016, the researcher located pro-refugee posters at the site. Following a short discussion with the City Council, the posters were removed on behalf of the researcher. The decision was made due to the following: The site and time had been previously agreed with the City Council and when the site was under the responsibility of the researcher, any distortion of a political nature could damage the quality of the research. Although the researcher had no personal issues against the action with the posters, a connection between the sculpture and posters could be made, which might influence the validity of the projective questions.

At around 9:00 a.m., the posters were removed. The process of assembly of the sculpture required approximately 30 minutes. A group of gardeners working nearby provided impromptu assistance during the assembly stage, which shortened the process considerably.

The sculpture was placed on the green area of the park approximately 10m from the street, between the park and the Guildhall, and approximately 10m from the central area of the park. The artwork was oriented toward the Peace Bridge.

**Exchange of information with stakeholders**

The person contacted on the beginning of the research in Derry was Mr. Brendan McMenamin. After second meeting in June 2015 the three locations were proposed for the experiment. On 04.15.2016 researcher sent the letter to Mr. McMenamin which included the framework for the further actions.

In the further stage of preparations in the period of April 2016 the person dedicated for further contact and liabilities was Mrs. Dolores McAnena. On that stage the process of legalization by issuing the license for the research was proceeded with involvement of the University of Ulster. The researcher was informed on 04.04.2016 by Mrs. McAnena, that the procedure will be conducted from the side of the Department of Communities on behalf of the North West Development who owned the site. The requirements from the side of stakeholders included time and location of assembly and disassembly of the sculpture, liability insurance held by the researcher, University ID of the researcher, classification of the responsibilities by the included parties, technical Drawings including construction of the artwork, visualizations and the site map, the research had to be hold to the University of Ulster insurance policies and Derry City Council insurance policies as well.

In the consequence to those requirements, the researcher had contacted the University of Ulster in case of the liability insurance. After achieving the confirmation from Mr. Alan Boal about his legal status as the student, the documents about the insurance were sent on 04.05.2016.

On 11.05.2016 Mrs. Dolores McAnena had sent the draft version of the License to the researcher. It had been decided, that the license had to be signed before the assembly of
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the sculpture. The License was signed in the building of Department of Communities by researcher around 8.15 A.M. on 26.05.2016 after his arrival to Derry/Londonderry.

The supervisors were informed about the legal status of the operation and conduct of the research on the site by telephone.

**How the research was conducted**

The Research was made close to the sculpture, with responders who entered the park and had contact with the sculpture. Samples were taken every two days on six occasions. On the weekend of 3 June 2016 a sports event took place near the guildhall. The event did not influence the research. The responders were informed about the purpose of the research and their rights.

**Phenomena**

**Date: 27 May 2016**

In the sample taken on 27 May 2016, nine phenomena were found among a total of 35 participants.

No.3, a 65-year old female with F(0) was unable to define what the sculpture was. A mixture of short sentences were given to answer question No3: *It's got to be a head, I don't know. So I see it's a foot, no arms on it I don't know only two legs.*

It could be presumed that the answer was highly defensive. Although using parts of the body to describe the artwork, No.3 could not join those statements into one coherent declaration. Hypothetical *Futura Contingentia* for No.3 was recorded as: Negative -extra - active

No.4, a 53-year old male with F(6) was unable to define what the sculpture was. The answer for question No3 was: *Does it include plinth? I have health problems, It's lonely, lack of arms, suggest something, personal struggle. This is beautiful.*

The responder was recorded with a high attitude toward the artwork and was focused on personal experience of the sculpture. It could be presumed that defence was low – after giving the answers No.4 gave the researcher an unexpected handshake. Hypothetical *Futura Contingentia* for No.4 was Positive -intra – active.

No.10, a 65-year old female with F(4) was classified with the Sexual covariate. The answer for question No3 was: *3. It looks like a dancer to me. It's distorted by that supplying steel. Maybe better without it.*

The responder was recorded with an average attitude toward the artwork. The responder did not recognise the sculpture as one object, but divided the object into two parts: an object of art – the dancer, and the steel construction. Hypothetical *Futura Contingentia* for No.10 was Positive -intra – active.

No.11, a 42-year old male with F(3) was classified with the Sexual covariate. The answer for question No3 was: *To me it is like branches slowly growing up from the ground.*
No.11 was recorded with an average attitude toward the artwork. The responder recognised the sculpture as an object of nature in the process of growth. No.11 declared a positive attitude toward the artwork. For No.11 the sculpture was relevant to the history of Derry because of the material used (oak), but he declared a neutral feeling about the sculpture. Hypothetical *Futura Contingentia* for No.11 was Positive -extra – passive.

No.20, a 70-year old male with F(0) was classified with the Religious covariate. The answer to question No 3 was: *From knee of bottom I see feet, do I see feet, something wrestling, without no arms – like a body of Christ because of feet.*

The responder was recorded with a low attitude toward the artwork. He probably recognised the sculpture as Christ. No.20 declared a neutral state of emotion toward the artwork. Hypothetical *Futura Contingentia* for No.20 was Negative -extra – active.

No.22, a 57-year old female with F(-3) was classified with the Materialistic covariate. The answer to question No 3 was: *Piece of scrap wood.*

The responder was recorded with a very low attitude toward the artwork. She recognised the sculpture as an inanimate matter. No.22 declared a neutral state of emotion toward the artwork. For No.22 the sculpture could be not even recognised as art, but a material element distracting the beauty of the guildhall. She told the researcher that she was mentally disabled. Although declaring a neutral status of emotion toward the artwork, her other answer did not match that opinion. Hypothetical *Futura Contingentia* for No.22 was Negative -extra – active.

No.26, a 70-year old female with F(-2) was classified with the Sexual covariate. The answer to question No 3 was: *It’s a very regular shape. A person of some description. I don’t have knowledge on this modern art.*

The responder was recorded with a very low attitude toward the artwork and high defensiveness. She recognised the sculpture as kind of a human being, while almost simultaneously expressing that it was impossible to define, because it was a kind of modern art. No.26 declared a neutral state of emotion toward the artwork. The responder human emotions to the sculpture in her last answer: lonely, isolated. Hypothetical *Futura Contingentia* for No.26 was Negative -extra – active.

No.32, a 54-year old female with F(7) was classified with the Unable to Define covariate. The answer to question No 3 was: *It is very interesting. I met somebody else here yesterday who said the same thing.*

The responder was recorded with a very high attitude toward the artwork. She referred in her opinion to another person she had met the day before. Although declaring the artwork as very positive, she could not explain her opinion. Hypothetical *Futura Contingentia* for No.32 was Positive -intra – active.

No.33, a 22-year old male with F(-2) was classified with the Sexual covariate. The answer to question No 3 was: *Looks like someone hanged. On the neck or rope. Dead. Limp body.*
The responder was recorded with a very low attitude toward the artwork. He described the sculpture as a dead person. No.33 considered himself angry when experiencing sculpture and did not want more artwork of that type, because of its reference to death. Simultaneously No. 33 declared that the sculpture should be in the park, because there was no other artwork there. Hypothetical *Futura Contingentia* for No.33 was Negative -intra – active.

**Date: 29 May 2016**

In the sample taken on 29 May 2016, seven phenomena were found among a total of 35 participants.

No.3, a 69-year old male with F(6) was classified with the Abstract covariate. The answer to question No3 was: *I think maybe it represents human pain.*

The responder was recorded with a very high attitude toward the artwork. He recognised the sculpture as suffering, and related his answer to the history of factory girls in the answer to question No.2. No.3 defined his emotional state as ‘thoughtful’ toward the artwork. Hypothetical *Futura Contingentia* for No.3 was Positive -intra – active.

No.4, a 60-year old female with F(1) was classified with the Abstract covariate. The answer to question No3 was: *A side the way we cut the grass in home*

The responder was recorded with a low attitude toward the artwork. She recognised the sculpture by digression. No.4 declared a neutral liking toward the artwork and being interested in it. The responder also answered that the sculpture fits the site. Hypothetical *Futura Contingentia* for No.4 was Negative -extra – active.

No.8, a 60-year old male with F(4) was classified with the Abstract covariate. The answer to question No3 was: *I have to circulate again. There is a line in a middle that crosses the figure.*

The responder was recorded with an average attitude toward the artwork. He spent a long time before giving the answer. The abstract language used for the description was descriptive. No.8 was not concerned about if the sculpture should stand in that space, although he declared he liked it very much. Hypothetical *Futura Contingentia* for No.8 was Positive -extra – passive.

No.10, a 42-year old male with F(2) was classified with the Sexual covariate. The answer to question No3 was: *It’s a person; I can see a leg and a foot.*

The responder was recorded with a low attitude toward the artwork. He recognised the sculpture by digression. No.10 declared a neutral liking toward the artwork and being relaxed. The responder answered that the sculpture fits the site. Hypothetical *Futura Contingentia* for No.10 was Positive -intra – passive.

No.14, a 48-year old male with F(4) was classified with the Religious covariate. The answer to question No3 was: *It reminds me of the Lord on the Cross. Its look like a male, I don’t know.*
The responder was recorded with an average attitude toward the artwork. He recognised the sculpture as Christ, although he was not sure at the end what he had experienced. No.14 very much liked the sculpture, although he declared a neutral state of emotion. He did not recognise the sculpture as one piece, but divided the wooden part from the steel profiles. Hypothetical *Futura Contingentia* for No.14 was Positive - intra – active.

No.15, a 46-year old female with F(6) was classified with the Sexual covariate. The answer to question No3 was: *I don’t know. I think it’s beautiful. I try to.. I love artwork. I thought about our land, but the more you look at it, it looks like a female.*

The responder was recorded with a very high attitude toward the artwork. She recognised the sculpture as a female. That judgment came through a process of abstraction (our land) toward sexual (female). No.15 declared being interested in the sculpture. She answered that the sculpture fits the site, although she would like to see it without the metal profiles. Hypothetical *Futura Contingentia* for No.15 was Positive - intra – active.

No.20, a 71-year old male with F(4) was classified with the Abstract covariate. The answer to question No3 was: *This sculpture reminds me the feeling of suffering. Simply because if the person in this sculpture would be relaxing, the feet wouldn’t be this way. The position is against the person’s will.*

The responder was recorded with an average attitude toward the artwork. He used basic Platonic dialectics to come to the conclusion that sculpture expressed an idea of suffering and pain, or a struggle with an oppressor. No.20 very much liked the sculpture, although he declared an uncomfortable state of emotion. For the responder the sculpture did not fit the area because it was related to a different, painful topic. Hypothetical *Futura Contingentia* for No.20 was Positive - extra – passive.

**Date: 31 May 2016**

In the sample taken on 31 May 2016, eight phenomena were found among a total number of 35 participants.

No.2, a 73-year old male with F(4) was classified with the Unable to Define covariate. The answer to question No3 was: *It looks to me as an armless suspended figure. I don’t know what it’s made of. If I can look more closely. It’s a wooden figure nicely shaped. Was carefully done. It’s a sculpture. Usual features (like) the arms are not there, but that is not disturbing. It is beautifully carved. I think it is good. I am glad I met you.*

The responder was recorded with an average attitude toward the artwork. He expressed his process of thinking about the sculpture. No.2 declared being interested in the sculpture. He answered that the sculpture fits the site. Hypothetical *Futura Contingentia* for No.2 was Positive - intra – active.

No.4, a 43-year old male with F(4) was classified with the Sexual covariate. The answer to question No3 was: *Interesting. Accomplished. But it is well sculpted. But I have no idea how to explain what it is. It’s obviously a person, with no arms or apparent head. I am not sure what it should symbolize but maybe that is the part of intrigue. But it is very nice.*
The responder was recorded with an average attitude toward the artwork. He was sure that the artwork he experienced was a person, although he could not explain his opinion. No.4 declared being interested in the sculpture. He answered that the sculpture would look better if moved in front of the guildhall. Hypothetical *Futura Contingentia* for No.4 was Positive - intra – active.

No.7, a 51-year old male with F(4) was classified with the Religious covariate. The answer to question No3 was: *My initial thought was a Christ on the Cross but when you examine it closer it has no gender. I don’t like the base but I like the actual wood sculpture.*

The responder was recorded with an average attitude toward the artwork. He declared the sculpture as Christ in the first sentence, therefore that classification was used. He separated the wooden part from the metal profiles as two different objects. No.7 could not declare his emotional status toward the sculpture. He accepted the sculpture on the site as an act of opposition toward the Peace Flame monument in the centre of the park. For the responder, the subject of ‘Peace’ in Derry had become abused and was used insincerely. Hypothetical *Futura Contingentia* for No.4 was Positive - intra – active.

No.21, a 47-year old female with F(0) was classified with the Sexual covariate. The answer to question No3 was: *The woman. Hanged. Legs hanged.*

The responder was recorded with a low attitude toward the artwork. She declared a neutral attitude toward the artwork, although she claimed it fits the space. Hypothetical *Futura Contingentia* for No.21 was Negative - extra – passive.

No.22, a 51-year old male with F(5) was classified with the Sexual covariate. The answer to question No3 was: *It looks like a human form to me. Two people bound together. Lots of representations. Jesus on the Cross – too much religion in this country. Just one negative thing (regarding the sculpture – the religious aspect seen by the tested object).*

The responder was recorded with a high attitude toward the artwork. No.22 expressed his joy that the sculpture in his opinion was not a religious one. He declared his emotional status toward the artwork as ‘peaceful’. Hypothetical *Futura Contingentia* for No.22 was Positive - intra – active.

No.30, a 63-year old female with F(4) was classified with the Sexual covariate. The answer to question No3 was: *A female figure. She is dancing. But maybe dancing, because she is on her toes.*

The responder was recorded with an average attitude toward the artwork. She declared a positive attitude toward the artwork. In her answer to question No.5 she separated the wooden and metal parts of the sculpture. The responder did not answer if the sculpture fit the site or not. Hypothetical *Futura Contingentia* for No.30 was Positive - extra - passive.

No.31, a 28-year old female with F(3) was classified with the Sexual covariate. The answer to question No3 was: *It looks like a person but I don’t know really, it’s hard to tell.*

The responder was recorded with a low attitude toward the artwork. In her answer to question No.5 she called the metal profiles ‘framework’. She did not answer if the sculpture
fit the site or not. The responder declared her emotional experience as neutral, although she liked the artwork. Hypothetical *Futura Contingentia* for No.30 was Positive -extra -passive.

No.35, a seven-year old female with F(-1) was classified with the Unable to Define covariate. The answer to question No3 was: *I don't know. It doesn't fix to anything*

The responder was recorded with a low attitude toward the artwork. No.35 declared neutral experience with sculpture, however, that the sculpture fits the site. Hypothetical *Futura Contingentia* for No.35 was Negative -intra -passive.

**Date: 3 June 2016**

In the sample taken on 3 June 2016, six phenomena were found among a total number of 35 participants.

No.10, a 65-year old male with F(4) was classified with the Sexual covariate. The answer to question No3 was: *I see like a person with two legs. But I don't know what it is supposed to symbolize. It's nice.*

The responder was recorded with an average attitude toward the artwork. No.10 declared neutral experience with sculpture, however, that that sculpture fits the site. Hypothetical *Futura Contingentia* for No.10 was Positive -intra -passive.

No.13, a 17-year old male with F(5) was classified with the Unable to Define covariate. The answer to question No3 was: *I don't know how to describe it.*

The responder was recorded with a high attitude toward the artwork. No.13 declared neutral experience with sculpture, however, that the sculpture fits the site. He experienced the sculpture most positively and would like to see more sculptures in the area. Hypothetical *Futura Contingentia* for No.13 was Positive -intra -active.

No.19, a 23-year old male with F(2) was classified with the Sexual covariate. The answer to question No3 was: *It looks like it meant to be a human form. More female than male.*

The responder was recorded with a low attitude toward the artwork. No.19 expressed his own classification of his emotional experience with the sculpture: abstract. He did not directly answer if the sculpture was good for the site, however, he did answer that the sculpture was lonely. Hypothetical *Futura Contingentia* for No.19 was Positive -intra -passive.

No.22, a 53-year old female with F(4) was classified with the Sexual covariate. The answer to question No3 was: *Someone is hanging. It’s a thought provoking piece. It’s a sort of faceless personification of a people who were tortured.*

The responder was recorded with an average attitude toward the artwork. No.22 declared she was interested but simultaneously uncomfortable when thinking about the suffering of the person hanged. However, she liked the sculpture very much and accepted the object on the site. Hypothetical *Futura Contingentia* for No.22 was Positive -intra -active.
No.26, a 78-year old female with F(5) was classified with the Sexual covariate. The answer to question No3 was: *It might be a man, judging by the feet. A religious sculpture, not necessarily? Maybe because of the triangle.*

The responder was recorded with a high attitude toward the artwork. She liked the sculpture and accepted it on the site. However, it gave her a neutral emotional experience. Hypothetical *Futura Contingentia* for No.26 was Positive -intra-passive.

No.32, a 61-year old male with F(4) was classified with the Abstract covariate. The answer to question No3 was: *It is like a hanging on a hanging sculpture. Hanging free. I thought about suicide. A great shape but wood. Very relevant to the suicide rate in this city. It can be sad looking. It is a beautiful piece of work. The body. This is another professional piece of work. Lots of significance. When you think sculpture, because the feet just above the ground plus reality very well carved. I liked looking around what happened.*

The responder was recorded with an average attitude toward the artwork. No.32 declared feeling uncomfortable, and further provided his own classification for the experience with the sculpture: disturbed. As to question no.4, the responder asked himself: *lots of emotions, hanging and sad. How person come to this? It’s like sorrow anger. Why body would talk about it?* For No.32 the sculpture would fit any space because of its pleasing aesthetics. As evidence the responder pointed out the behaviour of doves, who were descending on the sculpture at that moment. The responder shared his opinion that there should be an pathway with more art in Derry. Hypothetical *Futura Contingentia* for No.32 was Positive -intra-active.

**Date: 5 June 2016**

In the sample taken on 5 June 2016, four phenomena were found among a total number of 35 participants.

No.9, a 61-year old female with F(6) was classified with the Religious covariate. The answer to question No3 was: *Headless crucifixion.*

The responder was recorded with a very high attitude toward the artwork. No.9 declared she liked the sculpture and in her opinion it fits the site. She was interested in the object. However, she did not explain her opinion why headless crucifixion should be exposed in a park. Hypothetical *Futura Contingentia* for No.9 was Positive -intra-active.

No.18, a 53-year old female (a catholic nun) with F(3) was classified with the Sexual covariate. The answer to question No3 was: *It looks to me like it has no head and no arms. The head and the feet are going in opposite directions. The torso looks as if it’s dancing. Dance – the significance. I don’t know, it is almost a cadaver part of the body. Its free but also it is not free.*

The responder declared on question No1. *I wouldn’t dislike it. It’s well done. It takes me a while to get used to it. I like sculptures, they are really works of art.* For No.18 the sculpture fits the space. However, she could not match the emotional experience with the sculpture and gave her own classification: *a bit disconnected.* Hypothetical *Futura Contingentia* for No.18 was Positive -intra-active.
No.21, a 66-year old female with F(3) was classified with the Abstract covariate. The answer to question No3 was: *It's something that's been disfigured. Probably a symbol of war, damage maybe?*

The responder was recorded with an average attitude toward the artwork. No.21 declared she liked the sculpture and in her opinion it fits the site. However, she said she felt uncomfortable with the sculpture. Hypothetical *Futura Contingentia* for No.21 was Positive -intra -passive.

No.25, a 65-year old male with F(4) was classified with the Sexual covariate. The answer to question No3 was: *I feel it is a person. I could say it is a man and a woman. I think is a man somehow. Cut in something.*

The responder was recorded with an average attitude toward the artwork. No.25 liked the sculpture and would like to see more of them in the area. He gave his own classification for the emotional experience with the sculpture: *Isolation. Suffering.* For No.25 any sculpture that represents something would fit the space. Hypothetical *Futura Contingentia* for No.25 was Positive -extra -passive.

**Date: 7 June 2016**

In the sample taken on 7 June 2016, five phenomena were found among a total number of 35 participants.

No.10, a 56-year old female with F(2) was classified with the Sexual covariate. The answer to question No3 was: *It looks like a sort of hanging. Somebody hanging because the feet are above the floor.*

The responder was recorded with a low attitude toward the artwork. No.10 felt uncomfortable when experiencing the sculpture. However, she claimed the sculpture fits the space, as something looking good on the grass. Hypothetical *Futura Contingentia* for No.10 was Positive -intra -passive.

No.12, a 68-year old female with F(2) was classified with the Unable to Define covariate. The answer to question No3 was: *Maybe a bit challenging. Doesn’t look very joyful.*

The responder was recorded with a low attitude toward the artwork. No.12 felt uncomfortable when experiencing the sculpture. The responder declared that she had not noticed the sculpture at the first glance. However, she claimed that sculpture could be exposed even if not liked. Hypothetical *Futura Contingentia* for No.12 was Negative -intra -passive.

No.18, a 28-year old male with F(2) was classified with the Unable to Define covariate. The answer to question No3 was: *I wouldn’t notice it. I don’t know what is it. Semi – natural.*

The responder was recorded with a low attitude toward the artwork. No.18 did not like the sculpture, although he would strongly agree to seeing more *easy to understand* art in the area. The responder declared neutral experience with sculpture. However, he said the
object generally fits the site. Hypothetical Futura Contingentia for No.18 was Positive-extra-active.

No.31, a 45-year old female with F(-2) was classified with the Unable to Define covariate. The answer to question No3 was: It’s a lady’s body to be not the best. Obviously art is very subjective, I just think. Much do not great. Not look its finished. I don’t know it is a lady body. Not good position could be bigger. Non creative. Very boring. Very blunt. Not attractive. Form is horrible. It could be… position is not good.

The responder was recorded with a very low attitude toward the artwork. It was noted on the questionnaire sheet of this responder: probably psychotic, or hysterical. Asking me all the time, did I made the sculpture and trying impose the questions for me declaring that she: ‘didn’t want to hurt me’. However, simultaneously all her reactions were the opposite to what she said. E.g. saying she has no time for an interview, but talking to me all the time.

The responder declared that she had not noticed the sculpture. However, she claimed that anybody would notice the artwork. She separated the wooden part from the metal profiles in her evaluation. For No.31 people should be grabbed by sculpture, However, she did not explain exactly how that should happen. Despite marking ‘neutral’ state of feelings toward the artwork, No.31 acted emotionally and was very talkative during the experiment. Hypothetical Futura Contingentia for No.31 was Negative-extra-active.

No.33, a 33-year old male with F(4) was classified with the Unable to Define covariate. The answer to question No3 was: It’s abstract. I think it fits the nature of the park.

The responder was recorded with an average attitude toward the artwork. No.33 declared he liked the sculpture. However, his emotional experience toward the artwork was neutral. No.33 claimed the sculpture fit the site, although was not thoughtful. After taking part in the experiment, he stated that he put up the pro-refugee posters He was wondering what happened to his posters. When the experiment with all 35 participants was over, the researcher decided to inform No.33 about the situation and to apologise. A short discussion was established. No.33 explained that he did not ask for permission to hung the posters, as he said: it’s better ask for forgiveness than for permission. Hypothetical Futura Contingentia for No.33 was Positive-intra-passive.
10. OUTCOMES

Nowa Huta – Sculpture Reason

During the gathering of the first sample, attitude toward sculpture ‘Reason’ recorded low force within the research group. The low level of force may suggest that the artwork was recognised as an alien element in the area. The attitude among responders were low in the number of dense projections about the sculpture. However, the process of setting the structure for interdependence had started. This may reflect Lewin and Tuckmann’s observations: In the first stage of creating the group, the members will stay in a ‘neutral’ position, described by Lewin as the ‘Change’ stage.

Another symptomatically prominent issue within the sample was the relationship between four groups: the responders who saw the sculpture as a ‘materialistic’ object, most commonly describing it as a head or moneybox, were almost equal in number (8 to 10 responders) with the group who saw the object in relation to ‘sexual’ terms (such as body, body organs, nature, or excrements). Meanwhile, the group who saw the object as an abstract image, related to the history of Museum of PRL or a fantasy creature (e.g. monster), were in the minority (six responders). It is important to note that the members of the ‘abstract-related’ group of thinkers were mostly positive about the sculpture, while those from the last and strongest group of 11 responders were largely negative toward the sculpture.

In the sample taken on 14 December 2015, the number of 10 phenomena from the tested sample of 29 demonstrated a powerful force able to influence the surroundings. As the positively oriented responders were in the minority compared with the negatively oriented responders, it was reasonable to assume that throughout the course of the research that part of the group would be in strong opposition to the rest of the sample. Hypothetically, they could be in conflict with the of responders who had strong attitude towards the artwork.

Within that group of 29 responders, the size of the group describing the artwork as ‘materialistic’ was the largest of all, with 12 members. The group comprised of those with mainly negative responses or an inability to describe the artwork was the second largest, with eight members. The smallest groups were those that described the sculpture as a ‘sexual’ object (five members) and other, abstractive forms (four members).

These results show a strong circulation of dynamics between the sculpture and its responders, similar to the description of the ‘storming’ process in Lewin and Tuckmann’s models of group dynamics. The study was completed 10 days after the sample was taken on 5 December 2015. The strongest force/change impact between intra- and extra-relations in the group occurred within the same 10-day period.

The outcome showed that the force of intra- and extra-relations within the subgroup that had difficulty declaring their status toward the sculpture was likely positive, yet not as strong as the dynamics of the group tested earlier, on 14 December 2015.
The number of 'neutral' answers increased consistently throughout the research period, though the number of responders who had issues verbalising their inability to describe the artwork did not increase. Only four responders out of 33 declared they were unable to describe the sculpture. It was noted that none of these four hesitated to claim this status.

The group who accepted the sculpture generally declined in Force during the research. The group who positively described the artwork also decreased: 48.57% on 5 December 2015, 31.03% on 14 December 2015 and 33.33% on 9 January 2016. Simultaneously, the subgroups improved their attitude toward the sculpture. Between 14 December 2015 and 1 September 2016 the different interdependences with the sculpture had been structuralised. In that sense, the implementation of the sculpture lead to evoke differently structuralised groups. In the groups with low and defensive attitude towards the object most of the members recognised sculpture as another member of the group. In the groups with the high attitude towards the artwork, the object evoked more individual reactions. In that groups the artwork was recognised as a stimulus for sublimation.

It was reasonable to assume that the process of dynamic change in the area of non-verbal communication within the group would continue, due to the high number of 'Neutral' declared responders towards increase of positive reactions.

Another principal issue that emerged from the research was fluctuation between the 'Materialistic' and 'Sexual' subgroups. Recognition of the sculpture as a 'Sexual' object was observed at a level of 28.57% on 5 December 2015, then decreased to 17.24% on 14 December 2015 and finally increased to 36.36% on 9 January 2016. Meanwhile, descriptions of the sculpture as 'Materialistic' largely remained on similar levels throughout the whole period of the conducted experiment: 22.85% on 5 December 2015, 41.37% on 14 December 2015 and finally 33.3% on 9 January 2016. The period around 14 December 2015 saw the most significant changes in the group of responders.

Before the final sample taken on 9 January 2016, the sculpture had been damaged with what appeared from the resulting marks to be a hammer. Just after New Year's Eve, remains of fireworks were found inside the sculpture. These occurrences raise the question: Had the process of dynamics reached a polarised level, or did something that could be described as an organic process of change occur? Due to the lack of more in-depth data, the researcher can only assume that in the case of the sculpture ‘Reason’, it is the ongoing chain of reaction that should be considered, rather than a closed and polarised moment of ‘performing’ to the group of responders. If this assumption is correct, then it can also be assumed that the sculpture’s aesthetical form and placement continuously influenced the local communities. Logically, another question follows: If that act of organic changes was in fact the process of ‘performing’ described by Lewin as a final form of the group or, as he assumed in the context of public space, became an ongoing chain of reactions.
Graph 6.a: Attitudes: Materialistic (M), Sexual (S), Religious (R), Abstract (A) and Unable to Define (D) for artwork: *Reason* recorded on 05.12.2015 with 35 responders.
Table 19: Attitudes: Materialistic (M), Sexual (S), Religious (R), Abstract (A) and Unable to Define (D) for artwork: *Reason* recorded on 05.12.2015 with 35 responders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Ab</th>
<th>Un</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Responders with F = (0) were classified under covariates:
No.12 - Sexual
Graph 6.b: Attitudes: Materialistic (M), Sexual (S), Religious (R), Abstract (A) and Unable to Define (D) for artwork: *Reason* recorded on 14.12.2015 with 29 responders.
Table 20: Attitudes: Materialistic (M), Sexual (S), Religious (R), Abstract (A) and Unable to Define (D) for artwork: *Reason* recorded on 05.12.2015 with 29 responders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Ab</th>
<th>Un</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Responders with F = (0) were classified under covariates:
- No.1 – Materialistic
- No. 20 – Sexual
- No. 22 – Abstract
- No. 28 – Sexual
Graph 6.c: Attitudes: Materialistic (M), Sexual (S), Religious (R), Abstract (A) and Unable to Define (D) for artwork: *Reason* recorded on 09.01.2016 with 33 responders.
Table 21: Attitudes: Materialistic (M), Sexual (S), Religious (R), Abstract (A) and Unable to Define (D) for artwork: *Reason* recorded on 09.01.2016 with 33 responders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Ab</th>
<th>Un</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>-5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Responders with F = (0) were classified under covariates:

No.19 – Unable to Define

Number ‘9’ was not recorded.
The Graph 6.c, presents the force fluctuation within the group that verbalised problems with the artwork, and the possible relations between that group and the fluctuation. Such a relation should be understood in the abstract sense – i.e. those objects probably did not meet each other, but a general behavior could project certain ‘patterns’ within a larger collective. The group of people without of high force of the attitude towards the sculpture grew in numbers during the experiment. In analogy, their force to intra dynamical changes had decreased. It is a reasonable assumption that members of that group gained a defensive opinion about the sculpture and did not form a connection with the object.

The Graph 6.d, presents all the covariates of responders. The least common of the classified covariate was Abstract. The most dynamic change was observed under the Unable to Describe covariate, with simultaneous growth in the Materialistic and Sexual covariates. The Religious covariate was not classified. The low number of responders classified under the Abstract covariate could mean that there were some whose attitude toward the artwork was based on cognition or feelings. The decreasing number of responders classified under the Unable to Define covariate over time does not necessarily
mean rise of attitude toward the artwork. Most of responders classified under that covariate gave negative answers to the declarative questions like: Do you like the artwork? Would you consider more artworks in this area? Could you match one word for the feeling you have when you see this sculpture? As the force of the attitude toward the artwork among those phenomena lowered in time, it could be rather presumed, that those responders were in the process of extra interdependence with the sculpture. Simultaneously, the attitude toward the artwork under the Sexual and Materialistic covariates increased over time. Responders classified under those covariates often described the artwork with negative synonyms or even curse words, in the case of the Sexual covariate. In cases where responses were classified under the Materialistic covariate, the words used to describe the artwork were usually the terms for everyday objects, such as: money box, bunker, helmet.

Graph 6.f: Number of covariates classified among the phenomena for artwork Reason.

Graph 6.e, shows the number of responders classified as the phenomena only. It can be observed that the strongest change is evident amongst the Materialistic, Sexual and Abstract covariates. In case of the Unable to Define covariate, the number of responders fell to ‘0’ in the tested group on 9 January 2016. The dynamic of the responders within that covariate was comparable with the dynamic of the attitude amongst all responders – not only those who were classified as phenomena. Therefore, the number of all responders classified in the Unable to Define covariate decreased during the time the sample was taken. However, the changes among those phenomena were most dynamic. The declining number of responders classified under the Materialist covariate could mean that the object was recognised as a sexual or inspirational artwork.
Graph 6.g: Number of answers on question: ‘Do you like the sculpture?’ for artwork Reason.

Graph 6.f, present the Likert scale answers on question No. 1. An increase of the 'neutral' declaration on attitude toward the artwork was recorded. The definitive declarations of strong disagreement or strong acceptance were both low during the entire process of the conducted research. The average of those who declared agreement began to decline, while the average of those in disagreement remained in the middle of the scale. Although the graph did not show the relation between declared likeness for the sculpture in comparison with projective answers, it was observed that the general attitude toward the artwork was strongly defensive. When compared with the covariates, it is a reasonable assumption that the strongest dynamic changes were recorded around the Sexual covariate with dynamic growth of negation. This could mean the sculpture had an impact on responders, which led to increasing rejection toward the object as 'morally inappropriate' in the public space.
Derry/Londonderry – sculpture Vision.

The outcome from the samples with the sculpture Vision showed that, among the responders classified under the covariates: Unable to Define, Abstract, Materialistic or Sexual, the words most commonly used to describe the artwork were:

-fluid, original, abstract, minimal, natural, oak, different, cultural, unique, firewood vogue, pure, will, tactile, beautiful, evocative, modern, spectacular, incredible, proud, I love it, wooden sculpture, beautiful, simplified, elegant, freaky mysterious, majestic interesting, impressive, weird abstract, stimulated, nice, authentic, like a person, dead animals, piece of wood, strong lines, curvy, a woman, simple, like it’s carved, wouldn’t be artwork, good, creative, person, lovely, unusual look, reversed, I like lines, simple, funny, interesting, strong, semi-natural, subjective, bit challenging, not joyful, easy to the eye, fascinating, not sure.

Responders classified under the Religious covariate usually declared the sculpture to be Christ or an icon of culture.

Interpretation of the outcome for that classified group can be done in the reference to the study made by Radoń and Głaz in the context of their findings on motivational-emotional contingent of the attitude toward God and the Mysticism Scale. Regarding findings of Radoń and Głaz it could be presumed, that declared opinion on the sculpture as religious object was not highly sensual and low in euphory level. Indeed, most of the declared opinions on sculpture as the religious object, were low in attitude level. Radoń and Głaz concluded, that youth could not be sure of the own experiences. However, all defined phenomena were elder adult. The only exception from that group was 61-year old female with F(6), who described the artwork as “Headless crucifixion”. Her reaction would be valid to observations done by Radoń and Głaz on behavior of woman on religious feelings in the Fear and Fascination Scale. A very high attitude F(6) toward the sculpture in relation to the description could mean a personal interpretation of the Passion of the Christ by the responder. In that sense, the sculpture was an indicator for the mature defenses in her case.

The findings on four other recorded phenomena would stand as the question in the context of cognitive motivation processes. According to Tokarz, in the dynamic of the creativity processes the active stimulants should include a necessity to resolve some problems. When Collins and Robb assumed, that the sculpture in the public space should play the role in the cognitive processes, then “problem solution process” would be the initial condition. Meanwhile, for that part of the found phenomena, the recognition of the

---

622 Ibid. p. 136
625 Interview with Deirdre Robb and Jim Collins by K. Krzysztof, Appendix A.
sculpture as the religious figure was rather a statement on solution, what details of the sculpture could mean to the responder (e.g., feet, figure of the Lord on the Cross). It seems that the sculpture was a kind of an intriguing “puzzle” with the solution for those responders and they approach it more intellectually than emotionally.

Therefore, 78-year old female with F(5) was finally classified with Sexual covariate, although mentioning religious subjects in her answer.

Going further, the declaration of the phenomena classified under Religious covariate, had generally low attitudes if compared with the responders classified under the Sexual covariate. That outcome could be compared with observations of Socha on consciousness and non-consciousness in the context of Wierzchoń’s theory of the radical plasticity; where the metarepresentations do not multiply if not necessary. If the Wierzchoń’ model would be confirmative with Maslow’s observation on experiences among highly intellectual people (as Socha pointed out later), then the sculpture Vision could not evoke the mystical states. However, if we could follow the critics of Wierzchoń’s theory by Socha, who saw mystical function of self-control of consciousness, then we could look for mystical states among those responders, who declared the sculpture as an abstract, unable to define object or the sexual object. One can conclude that a psychotic “loss of control” is the key to control the spiritual experience with the artistic object. Socha concluded on two possible relations toward spirituality: centrifugal – with allowance of unconscious control mechanisms, and centripetal – based on the denial of the unconscious in extenso. Perhaps, that denial could be in fact relocation of the spiritual experiences by the use of "non-religious" language structures among some citizens of Derry?

The sculpture significantly affected the responders. The gathered data appeared to confirm Lewin’s theory on the three stages of human behaviour in a group. This could mean that the object, or reactions among people who had contact with the sculpture, may cause similar reactions to those created by dynamic changes in the group.

A minor group among the responders recognized the sculpture as human body raised on the pedestal. The triangular metal construction dedicated to be an element of the sculpture was divided from the rest of the composition. All responders who declared division of the wooden part of the sculpture from the metal part were recorded with average or low attitudes toward the artwork.

Most of the phenomena observed were elderly people. Most of the females who participated in the research described the artwork with strong relation to their own judgement of public space. Male responders often related their answers to abstract terminology.

A large group of responders who declared that they experienced a representation of a person being hanged or an act of human suffering recorded at least an average or elevated attitude toward the artwork.

Most of the responders with the least attitude toward the artwork were classified under the Materialistic covariate. Next, subgroups of responders with an attitude recorded below F(0)

627 Ibid. p. 124
were classified in the Unable to Define and Sexual covariates. One responder with F below (0) related the artwork to religious issues and made a political statement for it. These results could mean that defensiveness towards the artwork was high among those responders due to their lack of interest in cognition.

Most of the responders accepted the sculpture in Peace Flame Park. No one asked the researcher whether the money spent on the creation of the sculpture came from a public source. The object was likely accepted by most of the responders because they found it did not distract them, and initiated their own private reflections. Responders expressed their own theories as to why the object was in the park and its relation to the history of Derry, religion, or other transcendental matters. An important issue raised by responders was the quality of woodwork and distinction of the wooden part of the sculpture from the metal profiles.

Two important issues raised by the responders was the quality of the woodwork, and the distinction of the wooden part of the sculpture from the metal profiles.

The most significant change in the dynamic of the group was recorded on 5 June 2016, on which day the covariates Sexual and Unable to Define experienced the greatest disparities. The number of phenomena started to decline on 3 June 2016. The intra- and extra-relations among those phenomena were continuously in the process of decline. On 27 May 2016 the F(-2) was recorded among phenomena intra- and extra- relations. Compared to the range of attitudes observed that day (between -3 to 7) and the largest number of phenomena, that might mean the sculpture was recognised as an ‘alien’ object. Responders could treat it as a factor unknown to them.

During the period of research, it was found that the object stopped being recognised in the conscious area of cognition among some responders, but the processes between the sculpture and responders were dynamic on an unconscious level.
Graph 7.a: Attitudes: Materialistic (M), Sexual (S), Religious (R), Abstract (A) and Unable to Define (D) for artwork: Vision recorded on 27.05.2016 with 35 responders.
Table 22: Attitudes: Materialistic (M), Sexual (S), Religious (R), Abstract (A) and Unable to Define (D) for artwork: Vision recorded on 27.05.2016 with 35 responders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Ab</th>
<th>Un</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Some responders were classified with F = (0), therefore there is a necessity to note which covariates the responders with F = (0) were classified under:

No.3 – Unable to Define

No.20 – Religious

No.27 – Sexual
Graph 7.b: Attitudes: Materialistic (M), Sexual (S), Religious (R), Abstract (A) and Unable to Define (D) for artwork: Vision recorded on 29.05.2016 with 35 responders.
Table 23: Attitudes: Materialistic (M), Sexual (S), Religious (R), Abstract (A) and Unable to Define (D) for artwork: Vision recorded on 29.05.2016 with 35 responders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Ab</th>
<th>Un</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Responders with F = (0) were classified under covariates:

No.32 – Unable to Define
Graph 7.c: Attitudes: Materialistic (M), Sexual (S), Religious (R), Abstract (A) and Unable to Define (D) for artwork: Vision recorded on 31.05.2016 with 35 responders.
Table 24: Attitudes: Materialistic (M), Sexual (S), Religious (R), Abstract (A) and Unable to Define (D) for artwork: Vision recorded on 31.05.2016 with 35 responders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Ab</th>
<th>Un</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Responders with F = (0) were classified under covariates:

No.21 – Sexual
Graph 7.d: Attitudes: Materialistic (M), Sexual (S), Religious (R), Abstract (A) and Unable to Define (D) for artwork: Vision recorded on 03.06.2016 with 35 responders.
Table 25: Attitudes: Materialistic (M), Sexual (S), Religious (R), Abstract (A) and Unable to Define (D) for artwork: *Vision* recorded on 03.06.2016 with 35 responders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Ab</th>
<th>Un</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Responders with $F = (0)$ were classified under covariates:

No.2 – Materialistic

No.31 – Materialistic
Graph 7.e: Attitudes: Materialistic (M), Sexual (S), Religious (R), Abstract (A) and Unable to Define (D) for artwork: Vision recorded on 05.06.2016 with 35 responders.
Table 26: Attitudes: Materialistic (M), Sexual (S), Religious (R), Abstract (A) and Unable to Define (D) for artwork: *Vision* recorded on 05.06.2016 with 35 responders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Ab</th>
<th>Un</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Responders with F = (0) were classified under covariates:

No.24 – Sexual
Graph 7.f: Attitudes: Materialistic (M), Sexual (S), Religious (R), Abstract (A) and Unable to Define (D) for artwork: *Vision* recorded on 07.06.2016 with 35 responders.
Table 27: Attitudes: Materialistic (M), Sexual (S), Religious (R), Abstract (A) and Unable to Define (D) for artwork: *Vision* recorded on 05.06.2016 with 35 responders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>Ab</th>
<th>Un</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graph 8, presents the number of phenomena found among 210 responders (blue line) with the extracted Force line found among those phenomena. In the period from 27 May 2016 to 7 June 2016, the value of Force decreased after a dynamic rise within an eight-day period. The number of classified phenomena also declined, with the lowest number recorded on 5 June 2016.

Table 28: Force of change in the comparison to the number of Phenomena for artwork Vision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Force</th>
<th>Number of Phenomena</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27.05.2016</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.05.2016</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.05.2016</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03.06.2016</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.06.2016</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07.06.2016</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graph 8.b. presents the whole number of covariates classified in the sample. The green line presents the number of phenomena classified during the experiment. The most significant changes were recorded on 5 June 2016, when the dynamic rise in number of responders classified under the Sexual covariate was found simultaneously with a dynamic decline of responders classified in the Unable to Define covariate. The number of responders classified under the Religious covariate declined steadily between 29 May 2016 and 7 June 2016.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Materialistic</th>
<th>Sexual</th>
<th>Religious</th>
<th>Abstract</th>
<th>Unable to Define</th>
<th>Phenomena</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27.05.2016</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.05.2016</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.05.2016</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03.06.2016</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.06.2016</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07.06.2016</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 13. presents a number of declarative answers provided by all responders in the period from 27 May 2016 to 7 June 2016. The most common declarations were given for the answers: ‘strongly agree’ and ‘agree’. The number of answers belonging to the categories with limited response toward the artwork did not change significantly during the entire period of the research. The most notable change in the number of answers was recorded on 5 June 2016.

Table 30: Number of all declarative answers classified for artwork Vision.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>strongly agree</th>
<th>agree</th>
<th>neutral</th>
<th>not agree</th>
<th>strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27.05.2016</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.05.2016</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.05.2016</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03.06.2016</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.06.2016</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07.06.2016</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. CONCLUSIONS, DOUBTS AND NEW RESEARCH DIRECTIONS

The research on the attitude toward artwork in the public space was based on the question whether sculpture could evoke a certain type of group dynamic process. That question was based on the enquiry into theories of public space, art theories focused on subject of public art, sculpture typology and psychological theories focused on group relations, the subject of transference and defence mechanisms. The core of the main question was the problem of whether sculpture can be cognized as social space of a person, or as another member of a group.

Summary

The research was conducted in stages. In the beginning of 2015 the investigation into the subject of public space included a literature review of works by Juergen Habermas, Karl Popper, Leszek Kolakowski, Christopher Lasch, Jacques Ranciere and some concepts of Oskar Hansen and Richard Serra. In the context of the role of sculpture in the public space, the first steps in the literature review included works by Prof. Rosalind E. Krauss, Simon Baker (in the context of André Breton) and Susan Lacy. The researcher travelled to Rybnik, Bochnia, Poznań, Nowa Huta, Derry, Ballymena, and Grand Rapids. Many meetings with stakeholders were held: with the artist Shiro Matsuyama, Mrs. Deirdre Robb, from the Visual Arts department of Belfast Arts Council, Mrs. Hanna Wieczorek, a head in Rybnik Department of Landscape, Mr. Brendan McMenamin, officer in the art department in the City Council of Derry, the Head of Rasmus Foundation Grażyna Szymańska-Wolyńska and Martin Schonefeld, manager in KIOER Berlin office. Simultaneously, insight into the subject of group dynamics and Kurt Lewin’s theory was provided. Moreover, the work of Gustave Le Bon was examined. After In the middle of 2015 the review into art literature was extended with authors such as Sol LeWitt, Miwon Kwoon, Anatol Lunaczarski, Lenin, Malevich, Tatlin, Ossip Birk, Władysław Strzemiński, Katarzyna Kobro, Leon Koyovan, Grzegorz Dziamański (in the context of Diarmuid Costello, Joseph Kossuth and Donald Kuspit’s views on conceptualism), Boris Groys, Claire Bishop, Faye Carey, Gheorghe Cătălin, Malcolm Miles, and Shelly Wills to extend the number of sources that could be helpful in the further research on evoked group dynamic processes with sculpture in the public space. In the context of sources from the field of psychology, the review was expanded to include sources such as Marie Walsh in the context of how artists deal with their understanding of psychoanalysis, and more extended reviews on the works of Rosalind Krauss focused on the same subject.

The analysis of commissioning processes in Northern Ireland and Poland was based in the first instance on legislative sources in the context of historical changes in those areas since the mid-1990s until the establishment of the Peace thru Arts programme run by Arts Council of Northern Ireland and the Visual Arts Programme run by the Ministry of Culture and National Heritage in Poland. At that stage of the investigation, it seemed that the deciding bodies in commissioning programs requested the artists to resolve some social issues. In case of Northern Ireland, it seemed that the most frequently raised issue was community engagement and promotion of the area. In Poland, it looked as if promotion of heritage by visual arts was considered as the most suitable model. Besides those most significant differences, certain similarities could be noticed between the areas: in both areas artists...
were asked to achieve an impact on the communities by their work, where the process of creation was controlled by the third parties. The methodologies used in evaluation of the commissioned sculptures were focused on achieving strict social goals, however they were based on abstractive language without maintaining scientific strictness. It could be suggested that artists were asked to exchange places with social scientists through their work on communities with a strict plan based on earlier on-site research. Moreover, the commissioners assumed that the reaction to the sculptures would be predictable.

A set of case studies was chosen, based on the relation to the conditions of Lewin’s theory in the context of interdependence with reciprocity. The case studies included historical sources significant to the case with one of the following characteristics: sculptures that could evoke dynamic changes in the public space between responders in the context of their reception on an aesthetical basis, sculptures that caused conflicts in the public space between responders in the context of their reception on a political or ideological basis, sculptures that caused conflicts in the public space between responders in the context of their reception on an undetermined basis and that were destroyed or damaged, and sculptures that probably did not cause conflicts in the public space between responders in the context of their reception but could have influenced social changes.


The case studies and the analysis of commissioning processes were supported by interviews with Prof. Declan McGonagle, Prof. Artur Tajber, the artist Tomasz Górczycki and the art manager Rina Whyte.

The further steps on theoretical research regarding artistic sources and case studies exposed a problem with the correspondence between psychological and artistic sources used in the thesis. It was found that sources from the area of art were using a certain typology with loose references to the subject of psychology, mostly some Freudian concepts regarding neuroses. Therefore, it become significant to extend the research to the field of psychological terms in order to look for a method to measure the possible attitude toward sculpture in the public space. The research into psychological theories included, among others, focus on works of Gordon Allan Allport, Daniel Katz, Frank Spooncer in the context of attitude, Leon Festinger in the context of cognitive dissonance, Melanie Klein, Sigmund Freud, Anna Segal, Donald Woods Winnicott in the context of transference and sublimation, George Eman Vaillant in the context of defence mechanisms, Phebe Cramer in the context of copying and the distinction between copying and defences, Gustave Le

When writing the literature review, several sources were investigated without further development into exploratory practice. Those sources include works of Christopher Alexander, Carl Gustav Jung, Joseph Beuys, Le Corbusier, Michel Foucault, Walter Benjamin, Daniel McClean, Paul Virillo, Prof. Alosza Awdiejew, Jerzy Grotowski, Clement Greenberg or Marina Abramovich’s email hoax case. The main reason for limiting their inclusion was the insufficient number of helpful sources for the main field of the study. However, a certain knowledge regarding the approach to human relations and attitudes toward art objects presented by those authors was supportive in the conducted experiments.

In the initial research concept, the experiments were to be carried out in two locations to test the basic question of the thesis. However, limiting the samples to only support the main question would be not enough, without a blank probe or set of pilot studies to test the validity of the method. Therefore, it become important to maintain the validation of the used terms and prepare a set of pilot studies. The decision to include a clear distinction between speculative descriptiveness of art theories and empirically tested psychological sources led to focusing on properly adapted method of research, based on Kurt Lewin’s force field theory.

The development of the method used in measuring the attitude toward artwork was divided into the construction of the questionnaire, the procedures to use that tool in research, and the line of reasoning in data saturation. The questionnaire used five questions with two projective and three Linkert-scale declarative questions. The method of saturation was based on measurement defences in the answers, by use of the questionnaire as an additional stimulus to lower the cognitive dissonance of the sample. Therefore, the method was not a survey, but a qualitative type of conducted research. However, the model of saturation developed directly from Kurt Lewin’s empirically tested concepts allowed for a certain strictness in measuring the force field.

A set of pilot studies were made after obtaining the ethical committee’s approval. The choice of location was based on earlier reviewed case studies. The sculptures included in the pilot studies were: Antony Gormley – Sculpture for Derry Walls in Derry/Londonderry, Shiro Matsuyama – Five Apples in Ballymena, Allan Beattie Herriot – Rinty Monaghan in Belfast, Ross Wilson – Mother Daughter Sister in Belfast, Ryho Paprocki – Garden of Salt and Art in Bochnia, Poland.

The pilot studies meant to be used as test areas for the validity of the method and for its further use, with final experiments with two sculptures specifically designed for that occasion, were set in two locations: PRL Museum, Nowa Huta in Poland and Peace Flame Park, Derry/Londonderry in Northern Ireland.

At first the development of the method was focused on measurement verbalization and the classification of messages. In the process of gathering more data from psychological sources and experiments made during pilot studies, it was found that research based on complexity of verbalization could not be transported onto the abstract values that were necessary to measure the force field. However, the data gathered in pilot studies allowed
to find the covariates sexual, abstract, materialistic, religious and unable to define, as proper attributes. That discovery helped to investigate more complex problems in the final set of experiments: -intra or -extra interdependences with reciprocity – caused by the sculpture, hypothetic change of force in researched groups during the time lapse, and change of attitudes toward sculpture in the time lapse. At that point, the method was complete for further use in the final experiments.

Two different sculptures were used in the final stage of the study: an abstract sculpture called ‘Reason’ for Nowa Huta and a transfigurative sculpture called ‘Vision’ for Derry/Londonderry. After agreements with the stakeholders Ryszard Kozik from the PRL Museum and Dolores McAnnena from Derry City Council, the experiments were conducted in 2015 and 2016. The experiment in Nowa Huta was set in three stages and in Derry in six stages.


Irrespective of that introduction of scientific methodology to the field of the theory of art, the contribution to knowledge raised from the research based on the conferences taken and publications could be shortlisted in the following paragraph:

**Contribution to knowledge**

The evocation of the highly dynamic group process with the artwork in the public space could confirm high quality of that artwork in the context of art theories by Serra, Benjamin, LeWitt, Kwoon and Lacy. However, that would also mean a divergence from Platonic understanding of aesthetics which would bring us closer to the non-aesthetic understanding of artistic impact by Ranciere. Moreover, that would mean to divergence the use of classical logic of Aristo in the future construction of research methodologies used in art theories in favor of the multivalued logic of Łukasiewicz and other non-classical logic models (Gödel, Belnap, Bochvar, Kleene and others). Furthermore, such a contribution moves art language
from speculation towards determined future event. That means, it becomes a measurable probability. By that act, the artwork with low evocation of the dynamics in the group process would mean no-art in the sense of low impact and suggest merely decorative character of an object as Walter Benjamin called it.

Moreover, in the publication ‘Object of art as religious symbol in the public space’, the outcome raised the knowledge useful on pragmatic approach to spirituality among responders from Derry. It could change the approach to peace process in the area, which seems to move toward higher openness for fully developed democratic/loosen-control' processes. In the paper ‘The Influence of Sculpture on Public Spaces where there is Higher Tendency for Conflict to Arise: Attitudes towards Artwork in Public Space’, the outcome contributes to the answer to Michael Billig question for scientific evidence in group dynamic research. Thanks to Kleinain theory of the object incorporated to Lewin’s concept of the Force Field it become possible, by the experiment in Nowa Huta and Derry to respond the question of Billig about the falsifiability in the research on group dynamics. The cause is to find the phenomena by marking the force of defensiveness toward the artwork. The object of art is understood there not as the physical object, but an object already existing in the mind of the responder who confronts his own defenses with a physical form of the artwork. The critics of Billing on Lewin’s followers on dynamic group processes finds there is a linking area of knowledge thanks to the support of psychoanalytic theory of object and confirmative outcome from the experiments (when the contradictory groups in Nowa Huta were formed, then the sculpture was damaged).

Consequently, subsequent outcome presented during the conferences ‘Que font les images dans l’espace public – What do images in public space do?’ and ‘Neurocultures, Brain Imaging and Imaging the Mind’, were focused on quality of the research. The method showed, that object of art may structuralize groups during their contact with that artwork. That finding gives contribution to Lewin’s theory in the context of research and knowledge’s limits on open groups in public space. Lewin’s theory was developed rather for quantitative methodologies, where ATAQ method allows to gather data with qualitative method by structuralisation of the outcomes into algorithms.

During the conference II International Conference ‘Aesthetic Energy of the City. Ideas-Forms-Places’ it was presented, that ATAQ method may bring the contribution to thought of Habermas, Hansen and Strzemiński. The method allows to analyze processes in public space usually designated to raise the control. Therefore, the researcher may prepare strategies based on the outcome, to raise public space awareness, or investigate level of democratization in the commissioning processes. In that sense, the research develops Open Form theory, Habermas theory on structuralisation of the public space and Strzemiński’s concept of self-awareness in process of art creation.

**Discussion**

The outcomes from the experiments in Nowa Huta and Derry/Londonderry could both be considered as confirmative that a sculpture can evoke group dynamic processes.

For the sculpture ‘Reason’ the increase of -intra and -extra interdependences was observed through saturation of the data from the questionnaires. A few days after the last sample was taken, somebody attacked the sculpture with a hammer or axe and damaged it. For the sculpture ‘Vision’, a dynamic change in the declared attitudes toward the artwork was observed while the last three samples were taken. The outcome showed similar changes
of the force field to those one presented by Lewin in his description of the three-stage model of dynamic changes in the group.

The experiments of Kurt Lewin on the decrease of defences and aggression level in democratic groups in that context shed more light on the outcome from the tested sample. Thanks to the series of pilot studies, it became possible to find different covariates in the group classification. The relation between the force of the attitude and classification given to the sculpture by the responder allowed for observations on the increase or decrease of attitude. That process could be considered as an exploratory field for researchers on the issue of cognition as impact factor for the public space.

The outcome from Derry and Nowa Huta showed a different approach to the sculpture by older women and men. It was observed that women above the age of 50 often declared their opinion about the sculpture in the site-specific context in comparison to their own private space, where older males were focused on detailed aspects of sculptures in the context of the material or method used in the creation of the artwork.

Especially in the context of the research in Derry, some strong attitudes were found among males who, in their projective questions, noticed the aspect of the wood as the material used. Simultaneously, low attitudes for that sculpture were often found among those who saw wood as a negative element of that artwork.

The responders who saw the sculpture only in its wooden part simultaneously rejected the metal part as the element of the composition. For that minor group it seemed to be obvious, that pedestal is obligatory thing in case of the public sculpture. The average level of attitudes among that group of responders may be read as neurotic type of defenses against ‘unknown’ represented by that work of art.

It could be presumed that the responders from Nowa Huta, Derry/Londonderry and Belfast were more aware of the in-site conditions in which the sculptures were placed, and thus built coherent semiotic structures in describing what they had experienced during the experiments. Responders from Sandy Row were highly aware of the orientation of the sculpture ‘Mother, Daughter, Sister’, pointing out the insufficient scale of the work. The sculptures ‘Reason’ and ‘Vision’ were compared to the surrounding architecture. The attitudes toward those objects were related to the attitudes declared toward historical buildings. This could mean that certain expectations how the site should be arranged with the sculpture were in strong relation to personal imaginations of the history of the site. In that sense, the observations by Malcolm Miles or Prof. Declan McGonagle could provide empirical confirmation.

**Discussion on the outcome in consideration of the theoretical sources**

The multivalued enquiry into the classification of public space based on the work of Juergen Habermas, Oskar Hansen, Leszek Kołakowski, Christopher Lasch and Karl Popper in the context of possible types of interdependences with sculpture brought the following conclusions:

Public space was a loose term to investigate, rather than an explanatory source of knowledge. The historiosophic observations of Habermas put art as the element of communicative processes in the public space. However, his findings were only focused on the transformation of public space in three countries: Great Britain, Germany and France. In that sense, someone who lives in one of those three countries may gain the false
impression that their transformations of public space could be adopted as a global scheme. Moreover, research in the context of this thesis produced quite different results.

The outcomes from both experiments, in Nowa Huta and Derry/Londonderry, can be considered as confirmative that sculpture is able to evoke group dynamic processes. However, the levels of defence and their structure in samples taken in Poland were different to those taken in Northern Ireland. In the context of the findings from the experiment in Derry/Londonderry, the process was rather based on the relation between questions based on the Likert scale and projective questions. In comparison, during the experiment in Nowa Huta, defences were observed in the multiple definitions given for the art object in the projective questions. However, most defensive attitudes toward the artwork were observed among teenagers, no matter in which area the sample was taken. Another thought-provoking issue regarding the younger participants was their high cognitive dissonance toward the sculpture placed in Nowa Huta. The students from the Music School of Mieczysław Karłowicz, which is located 250 metres from the PRL Museum, all had very low attitudes toward the sculpture. Another group with a homogenous structure with a low attitude toward that sculpture were members of nationalist organisations. However, in that group defences could also be a form of copying. Most of the young students who took part in the research in Derry were recorded with low attitudes, but for a different reason. Their descriptive language used in answers on projective questions was limited to short sentences, sometimes even a single word. Another intriguing aspect was their range of vocabulary. Terms such as unique, special, or different could not be considered as mature defences. During the pilot study with the sculpture of Rinty Monaghan located near the entrance to the Belfast Campus of the University of Ulster, the high attitudes toward the artwork were related to a certain simultaneous ambivalence of what the object represented. Although that sculpture was considered to idolize the boxer, a few participants in the pilot study declared the object was iconic. In that context, the ideas of Habermas to provoke structural changes by educated members of the public pace who are willing to cognate turned out to be questionable.

Perhaps the issue lies in the assumption of Habermas, Hansen, or even maybe Popper, that members of the public space were naturally focused on conscious cognition and willing to decide their own fate. All those theories dealt with issues around individualism established in public space as something natural. The most direct approach was perhaps by Popper, who saw historicism as a tool used by leaders to maintain the tribal form of the state. However, Kołakowski in his criticism of the Popperian approach stated that not all members of the public space would be openly interested in that process. Christopher Lasch went further: narcissistic personalities in the public space would not be interested in cognition. Furthermore, they would unconsciously influence other members of the space to devaluate pluralism.

In the chapter: 2.2 Sculpture in public space as a socially engineered activity, question was raised: how could sculpture be created to gain the highest level of impact on the group of responders with a high probability of success? In the context of gathered outcomes there could be several issues raised to help to answer that question. It seems, that the subject of ‘successful’ impact does not lie in the processed defenses the sculpture as the physical object could to indicate on the responder. Furthermore, that is not the subject of individuality or individual perception either. All those processes are related to risk taking and probabilistic procedures conducted by the responder’s unconsciousness. Therefore, the impact of sculpture (or any art in a wider sense) is experience the object as the temporal
probability. The art as Łukasiewiczian *Futura Contingentia* would structuralize group dynamic processes. Therefore, the object of art created to stronghold human relations by forcing the level of attitudes may be achieved be searching not the ‘art’ or ‘sculpture’ as the object or the action, but to focus on the research of the human identity *in toto*. The process of creation by Richard Serra could be a good example here. The key lies in the process of thinking on art as the probability of the another Self. In a way, that is a paradox: to create the impact, the artist in the process of his work should research the non-existing and non-defined probability for another consciousness (Self). That paradox could be explained on the sample from Derry and Nowa Huta. The personal identifications with the sculptures raised the force of the attitudes. However, those sculptures were not designed to be the personifications of the human body. The responders, who found that they were incapable to identify with the object presented highest force of -extra-relations with the sculptures. Simultaneously, those responders who identified themselves with the artworks, sublimated their presence with the site. Similar observations could be theoretized on the sources taken from case studies: Tilted Arc by Richard Serra, Sculpture for Derry Walls by Antony Gormley or sculpture/monument by Włodzisław Hasior standing on Snożka Pass. In that context, the ATAQ method may raise the process of gaining the highest impact for the artist by allowing him to analyze the probability for group dynamic processes already on the stage of working with the project.

The sources gathered in the chapter 4. A New Method – Attitude Toward Sculpture Questionnaire give an insight into the issue, that research based on declarative opinions will not support the quality of the experiment. During the pilot studies and sampling, the researcher was often asked was he an author of the tested object. According to the sources about the Bias, Defense Mechanisms and Cognitive Dissonance, linking the relation between the researcher and the artwork in any way would negatively involve the outcome. The use of questionnaire allows the researcher as an artist to raise the standards of research in terms of ethics. Therefore, the use of the questionnaire gives the researcher more objective position and better insight into the process of dynamic changes toward the artwork.

**Limitations of the developed method**

The method used in the study had limitations: the samples taken were limited in number as well in time. Each sample had to be treated as an individual case; otherwise the whole process could be abused by the assumption that the sample is a study on the psychic condition of the responders. The questionnaire used as stimulus in the research on human personality could not be considered as valid in such a complex task.

Another limitation was the interdisciplinary language used in the development of the method. Researchers willing to use the method for their own purposes should consider a critical approach to the method by choosing a line of reasoning in the context of the respective field of philosophy or science. The method requires an academic level of knowledge to saturate the data from the field of group dynamics and art.

The method could not be used to predict human behaviour in a temporal dimension. Although the outcomes from Nowa Huta and Derry/Londonderry could be considered as confirmative with three stages of group dynamic changes in Kurt Lewin’s theory, the experiments should be replicated by other researchers in independent sets of experiments with other objects.
Confusions

The study raised certain questions. Why did the writers Rosalind Krauss, Suzan Lacy and Juergen Habermas use the Freudian approach to transference to support their concepts, without deeper insight into whole area of the object theory? Why was art discussed by the conceptualists Diarmuid Costello, Joseph Kossuth and Donald Kuspit in the framework of dualist logic (Hegel vs. Kant), where the trivalent logic developed by Łukasiewicz (e.g. used in the field of cybernetics today) solved that problem?

Considerations for future development

A certain matter worth considering in Kurt Lewin’s observations on democratic groups was his findings on the low level of force in these groups.

In that context, the outcome from the sample in Derry/Londonderry leaves the question as to what should be considered as the impact. The declaration that attitude toward sculpture had increased in the short period of two weeks (however, the force in the group decreased)? In the case of the sculpture in Nowa Huta the process was the opposite. Was the sculpture itself the main factor?

The outcome could raise a question for the commissioners: should commissioned sculpture for public space include channeling of aggression as one of the factors of impact?

The core of the main question was the problem of whether sculpture can be cognized as social space of a person, or as another member of a group. Thanks to the development of the object theory by Melanie Klein, it could be presumed that the transference of a person to an object could be possible, and therefore the assumption that attitude toward sculpture was same for all members of the group. However, that could not mean that the concept of Freudian fetishism (and all that was related to the Marxist concept of commodities) should gain scientific validity. It rather seemed that the Kleinian approach would exclude such a possibility.

The outcome from both samples could put some light on the question, how interdependences in the group could be evoked in process of appearance of defenses and other object relation processes. It seems, that part of the responders recognized the sculpture as physical object which belonged to their personal definition of the ‘public space’, where another group of responders presented highly personal attitude toward the sculpture. Perhaps those diagonally different attitudes toward the object could be causative factors in the core of dynamic changes.

The potential of the ATAQ method lies in its high reliability related with the simplicity of its use. Parametrization of attitudes toward the object of art has multiple applications dedicated mostly for artists, public art activists and commissioners. The artists may use the ATAQ to incorporate the method with their strategies. That’s mean work with the local communities to gain objectivity and higher accuracy in achieving impact for the artwork. The public art activist may gain the new analytical tool. ATAQ moves the discussion about public art from the field of descriptive hypothesis toward exploratory theory. Especially, in the conflicted areas where multiple factors are included, ATAQ allows to observe dynamic changes. The commissioners could use ATAQ in the process of valuation of the projects. In that case that would also mean democratization of the commissioning process with inclusion of all interested parties.
The outcome from the study raised the question about a new approach to classification for sculpture in the public space. And, consequently, raised the issue, is the artwork recognised as homogeneous or heterogeneous object? In the conclusion, sculpture is no longer a physical object but a communication, a thought, in the fully transcendental sense of its own meaning. Therefore, perhaps areas of social psychology and psychoanalysis should be re-visited, with sculpture seen as a psychoanalytical object. It could be important to mention the system theory as useful in application process of sculpture in the public space. The problem of the ‘context’ of the artwork ‘on site’ could be more specified by insight into the theorem, and move the problem from a descriptive line of reasoning toward explanatory fields of knowledge.
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Interview with a group of 6 men in a park who were in interaction with the sculpture Vision.
Deirdre Robb Interview

Mrs. Deirdre Robb, works in Visual Arts Department in Arts Council of Northern Ireland. She was involved in establishing Building Peace Thru the Arts Program: Re-Imaging Communities in Northern Ireland and near borderline area of Ireland. One of the fundamental concepts of he program was to use public sculpture in place of murals.

Interview made by Krzysztof Krzysztof on: 27 March 2015, between 11.00 and 12.00
Address: MacNeice House, 77 Malone Road, Belfast, BT9 6AQ

The reason for the Arts Council involvement in commissioning sculptures was a natural consequence of the earlier program called ‘Re-imagining Communities’ whose main idea was to replace existing murals with more pro-community messages. Although the project with repainting/reimaging the murals was still active in that period, it was noticed around 2011, that the Ulster area needed new cultural qualities. That meant that the implementation of new cultural qualities could not be solved only by visual and ideological changes in the form of aesthetics of the murals. Sculpture was chosen to play a social indicator due to its more developmental qualities. It could be designed, to involve the receiver in the creation process, or to try to reconstruct the whole aesthetic of the area. Sculpture could give more alternatives in the community engagement process. The three dimensional artworks can be more visible from various radius in the environment. The involvement in three dimensional art for local groups, like republicans or loyalists can be a good start for cooperation. It was possible, because sculpture was a new mark in the cultural landscape of Ulster. Therefore, publicly commissioned sculpture had no earlier connotations to the existing local culture, like the political murals had. It is automatically free from any militia, political or religious prejudice - where art in the form of murals has that scheme. Arts Council officials were aware that the process of bonding the communities in Ulster had started and it will need at least more than a generation to bring success. The first commissioned public sculpture by the Arts Council involvement was a sculpture ‘Rise’ by Wolfgang Buttress in 2011. The artwork budget was estimated at 420.000 GBP. The localization for the art piece was the Broadway roundabout in Belfast. Till the 2015, it was considered the largest art object in Belfast (37.5 meters high). 40 artists had participated in the commission, including artists from outside of Northern Ireland and the first winning idea by artist Ed Carpenter had to be abandoned due to the growing costs of steel from 400.000 up to 600.000 GBP in 2009. That project was not surveyed before its implementation. After the presentation of the ‘Rise’ to the public, After erection of the art piece there was a negative voice of some people from communities living close to the sculpture. The main subject of the plea was regarding social issues like: ‘why do we spent money on arts, but not on schools/hospitals?’. After some months the opinion about the sculpture had drastically changed for a positive drive. There was a correlation between the first culturally formed subjects of rejection with social issues, with the decrease of such pleas in the period of a couple of months.

The commissioned sculpture should be site specific. The budget was set up to 50.000 British Pounds per realization. The money for the Arts Council was given by the National Lottery fund and government funding. The Arts Council scoped about local history or cultural background in the sense of the generally understood term ‘heritage’, eventually to suggest by the work of art future possibilities for its communities. The sculpture should have long term exposition features. That would mean indestructible materials and strong construction resistant to acts of vandalism. Sculpture should engage the local communities. The issue around the definition of ‘engagement’ was left open. It could mean co – operation with local communities during the realization of the object, or engagement understood by
the aesthetic form of the object which could indicate specific types of behavior. The communities should be surveyed before the final process of the commissioning starts. The surveys could be made by hired artists whose role was to reach large amount of stakeholders like inhabitants, local organizations of public interest, or school students, etc. and prepare a brief for participating artists. The surveys could be also prepared by other groups, like co-operating culture institutions. The issue for the surveys were to give an artist as much data possible about the subject he would deal with. Artists who decided to take a part in the realization of the sculpture should had obtained earlier experience with similar art projects. The goals for Arts Council were to raise up the quality of the artworks in the public commissions sector. The assessment framework for the commissioned project was divided into four specific parts. The most important for the commissioner is Artistic Quality (50%), Approach (30%), Community engagement (10%) and Stakeholder engagement (10%). The Artists Council did not explain more deeply, how, and what kind of methodology was used by the jury to achieve these estimations.
Jim Collins Interview

Jim is a Derry arts activist, social worker, and involved in the Free Derry Wall art and social actions. He was involved in work with local working youth from Derry. Mr. Collins was asked about his activities in the public spaces of Derry, his views on public art, the involvement of artists and commissioners. Mr. Collins was responding in a ‘free speech’ mode. The notes from the interview were written half an hour after the meeting. The interview took place after my main research regarding the process of surveys with the sculpture Vision in Derry. Mr. Collins wanted to share his opinions in a broader view and I realized that I caught a rare opportunity to include the views of a local social worker from Derry into my research.

Interview made by Krzysztof Krzysztof on: 31 May 2016, between 10.45 and 11.30 Address: Derry, Foyle St., in the distance of 100 meters from the Guild Hall.

The artists were not involved enough in the commissioning process of new public art objects in Northern Ireland. The ongoing commissions, or commissioned artworks were being chosen about the 'compromise' to 'please all sides', which, in the opinion of Mr. Collins led to nowhere. Public art should be open to the subject of conflict in the context of the history of Northern Ireland. There was no need to escape from the burning aspects of the history of Derry. Near the Free Derry Wall, the tourists were making photos, and changing by that way the true nature of the spot. The Free Derry Wall should be kept alive as a form of artistic expression, where artists still should be able to access and expose their opinions. There were some communicative problems with messages coming from contemporary art derived by the local community. The youth taken to the exhibitions of contemporary art in Derry always reject contact with art objects. They require some verbal explanation, for the reason of semiotics used in the critical language about those exhibited objects. For the contemporary art, that the factor which moves young people towards studying art today is making their social position better. The ‘talent’ plays no more than 10% of the importance in the processes related to the creation of art today. The situation which would explain why the new generation does so, is the bad education system, where the subject of art had been replaced with teaching youth. To put the right mechanism into place and not to think. They don’t want us to think. Sculpture should engage the group by touching difficult subjects and not to be afraid to talk about the problematic past. The ‘Peace Flame’ monument in Peace Park in Derry was an example of bad art in public space. The word ‘peace’ used there was meaningless, and being overused, like in case of ‘Peace’ bridge. That led to the mediocratic use of that word in the context of the history of Northern Ireland. The subject of ‘peace’ should be opened in the expression of sculptural form, but not be directly verbalized.
Brendan McMenamin Interview

Brendan McMenamin, the City of Derry officer responsible for the Arts Council Department. He took an active role in commissions related to sculpture in the public spaces of Derry-Londonderry.

Interview made by Krzysztof Krzysztof on: 28 May 2015, between 10.00 and 11.30 Address: Derry City Hall and Strabane District Council Derry Council Offices, 98 Strand Road, Derry, BT48 7NN

The City Derry Arts Council took an active role in the commissioning of new sculptures in the area of the city. The high issue for commissioned works was to track the identification of the space and search for cultural integrity. A good example of such a work was the work by Maurice Harron called ‘Hands Across the Divide’ which is situated at the Craigavon Bridge in Derry. The work had been installed in Carlisle Square in 1991, seven years before the Good Friday Agreement and four years before running the ‘1 percenter’ program for public art in Northern Ireland. The artwork found a large group of positively attracted viewers from the beginning of its presence in the square. The artwork represented two males standing half-front to each other and stretching their arms in the gesture to make simultaneous hand contact. The composition was static and the accumulating point in the sculpture was actually the spatial space between the hands of the figures, magnified optically by the open space under the statues. There was no base, but a stone brick architectural composition resembling two banks of the River Foyle. Therefore, factual divisions of both communities in Derry found symbolic reminiscence in the artwork. The artist left no symbolical traces on the sculpture to define which person could be declared as a ‘loyalist’, or ‘republican’ and left the appreciation for the viewer. Different situation occurred with the three-part sculpture of Antony Gormley from 1987 titled Sculpture for Derry Walls as a part of the TSWA-3D project. The author intended to derive, or distract the local communities from the old Derry walls, where anti–government political communicates were often painted. The authors of that communicates represented Republican groups in the Derry. The sculpture was cast in iron and placed in three locations close to the city walls: east from the Foyle River, close to the remains of the Walker Monument and on the Bastion. Each sculpture had the same, simplified, human-like form. Two person standing back to back with widely stretched arms. The culminating point in the composition of the artwork focused in the openwork space in the place of the ‘eyes’, where viewers could try to see thru the artwork surroundings around the sculpture. At the time the sculpture had been erected, important situations had taken place. Those actions could point out the problem of transference and the complexity of group processes in the case of publicly erected sculptures. The work of Gormley had been placed in the night and some parts of the construction work around the sculpture were left. In the next days, shortly after the erection of the sculpture, a large group of citizens who represented the loyalists expressed their negative feelings about the sculptures. The group had gathered around the Diamond War Memorial erected in 1927 in the center of the old town of Londonderry. When asked, they answered that they were in fear for the monument. That group came to the idea, that the remaining elements of construction around the Gormley sculpture left by the Memorial, would be used to remove the old monument and replace it with works of the contemporary artist. After an explanation, the group dismantled itself. Later, another collection of incidents occurred. The group of sculptures by Gormley had been continuously found with tires dropped on their necks. Those actions happened shortly after a series of deadly attacks on police officers in the Republic of South Africa. In the distance of time, the sculptures become significant elements of Derry history. Although it might be thought that the republican community could prefer more figurative forms in arts and where loyalists may
look for more abstract forms, in practice, the way public sculpture could be communicated was mostly individual. As an example, he talked about the sculpture standing close to the Derry City Hall and nearby the Strand Road, called Atlantic Drift by Locky Morris from 1998. The artist intention was to refer his work to the cultural history of Derry. Not thru the eyes of conflict, but to focus on the subject of work and emigration. To create the artwork, the old huge timber piles from the Old American Jetty at Lisahally along the River Foyle were used. The sculpture was one of the largest in Derry and has a height of 10.4 meters. The artist joined the piles in vertical, rhythmical construction, exposing the natural wood of the material. The artwork has complex, build-up compositions, where all elements are closely connected to each other. The work had strong architectural resemblance with American sky-scapers build in the 30’s in New York – the place where many Northern Irish had found their new home. The artwork is on its new place near the Derry City Council since 2009. There was a chance to discuss the artwork with the community. The artwork found good perception in both communities, followed with good understanding of the subject. The viewers admired the ‘strength’ of wood piles and the ‘energy’ of the sculpture. Public art projects in Derry were factor for changes in the recognition of the city in the eyes of local youth, newcomers and visitors. In his words, the city was no longer an important hub in ship construction, but the second largest city in Northern Ireland attracts many people – not only because of its contemporary tourist context, but simply as a work place. Derry become an active, cultural place and a sort of counterweight to Belfast. The city council was always open for artist’s proposals. The role was to discuss the matters regarding the public art sector and help in communication processes between artists and communities, rather than to influence the responders or give direct purposes for erection of the artworks. The useful information about the needs of communities living in Derry were gathered by open panels and radio discussions. The subject of social issues was the most common form of unwillingness among communities towards public art. It was important to express the role of public art in a wider context among those communities. Those discussions were to focus on the future of Derry and the development for all.
Prof. Declan McGonagle Interview

Prof. Declan McGonagle was involved TSWA 3D project in 1987 and helped to establish Antony Gormley sculpture for Derry Walls. In years 1978 – 1990 was the director at the Orchard Gallery in Derry. Since 1990 McGonagle become appointed as the director for the Irish Museum of Modern Arts and hold that position until 2001. In years 2001-2008 hold the position of the director at City Arts Centre and University of Ulster. In years 2008-2015 held the position of the director at National College of Art and Design, Dublin.

Interview made by Krzysztof Krzysztof on: : 09 June 2016 between 12.00 and 13.00 Address: Dublin, 41 William St. S., Dublin, County Dublin.

In the perception on the sculpture in public space, there were observed certain problems. For a long time, the sculpture was used to mark, or to change the localization of the space from the position of the gallery or institution. However, it did not serve to change the ideology of the ‘purpose for art’. Most of the sculptures in public spaces in Ireland and Northern Ireland were just another version of art, which could be met in the gallery space, but they did not refer to ideology.

The fundamental problems from the other side, were assumptions like the question: ‘what good does art do?’, rather than: ‘what does art do?’. What should be concerned as the effect of that last question, should be understood as the answer to is art good, or bad. Unfortunately, the assumption that art ‘should be good’ led to the situation where the public was diagnosed, does it like art. That situation leads to negotiate what the public ‘liked’. In that moment, that the term ‘public space’ was delusive and the term 'social space' would be rather more correct. Social space as the term allowed to involve a wider collection of terms like: transaction, negotiation, bargain and involvement of the other. Formal art in the context of public sculpture do not include engagement and negotiation with the responders; with the consumers. It didn’t fully diagnose the nature of the project. For example, the Sculpture for Derry Walls by Anthony Gormley in the production of which he was involved. The elementary conflict around the walls of that historical part of the town divided the citizens in the past, where nowadays it should be rather spoken about as a tourist attraction. Although, in the context of the past it was an extremely sensitive place. There were three types of completely different reactions to the sculptures of Gormley by the local citizens in the time of their implementation and months after. The idea of public art should be linked with the idea of transaction, where art would not only be considered as coherent of value for itself, but: ‘art is the agent in the creation of the value’. There was the question, where an agency would lie: in situations, or practices, or in processes? Probably, instead of interrupting the process and presenting, as a curator, the ‘values’, it should be firstly taken under consideration, that the artist and the public as well did not know what those ‘values’ were. When that situation occurred, we should talk about a very bad relation. It would come to no surprise then, how the public could react, or, did not react against something which did not lie in addressing them, or even perhaps was for them. From the position of the person working in the Ministry of Arts there is a responsibility to ask questions regarding the art commissioning process: who is it for? And, what is it for? And the answer is: ‘for them, not for us’. There was often argumentation, that beneficiary should be the artist rather a relationship between the artist and non-artist group. Such a condition would not be profitable in the context of public art. The most important value declared in the context of public art would be ‘relationship'. The work of the artist seen thru his talent, education or skills should be in relation to that value during his work with social
space. In the contemporary times, the person responsible for public art commissioning should be aware, that a simultaneously ‘run institutional model into the future’ was redundant. I have that conviction from the time when working as the director of the Irish Museum of Modern Arts. Work was in a certain dichotomy. From one side, there was work to trace art ‘to the future’ and simultaneously the model of the idolized institution and artist within, was redundant. A similar situation occurred in the artwork in public spaces. The same questions occurred: For whom? For what? What was the intention? In the context of higher art education, the standard question should be asked: what do you want? Question was often not responded by students of art. Requested from the interviewer, if he could explain it more profoundly, the professor stated that students often use borrowed ideas. They were not able to be assisted from their assumptions. Students had also problems to understand their future responsibilities of working in public spaces. The problem was that students pretend to ‘stay innocent’ and had problems to understand that purpose was more important than form. From the experience of the professor, public space was not ‘innocent’ but already inhabited. To came up with new thinking, students should back off from their assumed conditions. Sculpture in public spaces was not a solo basis art object, but a crowd related object where the artwork and the context existed simultaneously. The work of Anthony Gormely; the Sculpture for Derry Walls met very aggressive reactions also before its implementation. The works of Gormley had a problem with their own identity. Although the artist told the responders during work on the project about the crucified figure, it didn’t confirm their story. After the growth of strong reactions to the sculptures of Gormley, around six to eight weeks later, politicians reacted. One of the Union Party members re-enforced the identity of the sculptures calling the artwork th Iron Man of Derry, the defender of the city – by a reference to the XVII history of the city. Because the identity was changed, the context was changed, too. That story was an example, to prove that the public domain was occupied by negotiable factors. Artists in public space were the negotiators but not the producers. If the artist decided to work directly in public spaces, he should be ready to relate the form of artwork to the negotiation process. The problem lied in the way of thinking. Instead of researching the situation, the artist was locked in the areas of the departments in the art academy. Meanwhile, it should be first asked what fits to the situation and to speak about the ‘situated practice’. The language of aesthetics used in public spaces should be related to that type of art practice. The museums in our culture were privatized, due to the fact that the State could not guarantee sustaining culture. Therefore, the discourse to guarantee culture turned to a guarantee transaction. The fundamental factor in that processed transaction would be the issue of empathy, empathy, understood as a ‘sense of other’. Without empathy, there would be no community, no community would lead to a lack of art and a lack of art would mean no civilization. For the moment, these arguments were not seen one onto another. Something exposed broke down. Loss of empathy by divided cities, loss of empathy by sectarian politics, loss of empathy by an era of the Troubles. The culture plea was to create empathy as a sector of life. Empathy was a key to experience, which was essential for doing art. The encounter as a value should emerge from that process. The professor presented the relation between empathy, encounter and experience as a triatic power. After Beuys, it should be understood that he did not claim that everybody was an artist, but everybody was capable to take part in creating a value and concept of art. Beuys termed it "art of the process". Today, the art market praised the ‘solo genius’ as the model of art. It could be presumed by the example of Damien Hirst and the relation to his investors. Another issue is the relation of the media to that model. But public responders felt ahead of it. Trust in the public space is really a crucial factor and artists, due to the art
market model, were not trusted. Because a factor of the art market corrupted the public art sector, public responders did not care. We – the artists, the public art curators did not persuade the public responders to be carried about. Therefore, we had to brake the barriers: the assumptions. The final question lay in the hands of the artist. How would he link mediation, communication, building trust and empathy? How could those factors be related to the basic question about what artists want?
Shiro Matsuyama Interview

Mr. Matsuyama (Jap: Matsuyama-San, Shiro) was the artist who won the commission for the public sculpture in Ballymena. The winning project ‘Five Apples’ was continuously vandalized several weeks after implementation in the period of the summer of 2015.

The interview was recorded on 11. November 2015, between 17.00 to 18.30, by Krzysztof Krzysztof

Address: Flax Art Studios, 44-46 Corporation St, Belfast BT1 3DE

The artist communicated with the responders thru his projects, as a part of the whole process of the realization of the commission. The artists works often with materials common and recognized in local cultures as essential, e.g. wool of the camel. Therefore, materials used by the artist had transcendental meaning. The artist by his work, tries to use materials in such a way, to start a remembrance process between people. By that, art should be for helping in the communication between the responders of his art. In the example of the disaster in Fukushima, art could interact with people who did not want to use nuclear power anymore, but for now they had no choice.

In the particular case of a group of sculptures called Five Apples, it was for the first time a public sculpture project. Earlier domain of artistic expression were artworks from the area of conceptualism and performance. I found myself interested in the commission for Ballymena with the encouragement from the side of other people. The project considered work on Five Apples in the context of a political job. There would be a possibility to find some ways for communication between groups who inhabited that urban area. When shortlisted, I presented the project to the commission. That project was site – specific. The community of Ballymena was deeply divided, therefore, the artist become self-engaged to create the highest quality artwork. The work was going to be related to architecture by form and with the local people by the idea. In the first concept, the group of the sculptures were going to be exposed in front of a school. Each apple was related to a different story or individual. Steve Jobs, the Beatles, Wilhelm Tell, Adam and Eve and Newton. Every shape of each apple was different. The history of each object was different and not related. It was considered by the artist as an object of everyday use – e.g. ‘children ate apples in school.’. The responders were going to find out by themselves the meaning of the sculptures and to create their own stories from contact with the objects. My earlier artistic practice was often related to the provocative actions to confront the responder. In the case of the commission for Ballymena, I rather wanted to create an object which would unite the community. I didn’t consider himself as a type of ‘public artist’ then. That commission was a challenge. I felt, I had to create a masterpiece. After ongoing acts of vandalism, around 90% of people met during the multiple restorations of the apples were very friendly. The process of realization of the artwork become influenced by occasional meetings with passing – by responders during the restoration of the damaged sculpture. During those occasional meetings, most of the responders were interested in sculpture. Restoration brought more positive attention. Some negative reaction came mostly from elderly people. The problem with acts of vandalism towards the sculpture was an effect of the lack of empathy. That factor caused a lack of conscious decision processing, aggression and finally, racism. Each time after attack, I visited Ballymena to restore damaged sculpture. My intention was to re-construct the damaged work to make it durable and damage – resisted. With time, that process become an element of the history of the artwork. In a certain way, that object of art turned
into a medium to communicate between people. The Five Apples sculpture had three possible locations to be used. Finally, the factor of a secure terrain was considered as the most important. Part of the sculpted apples were invented to be used to sit on them. I considered, that with time the sculptures could be damaged in a natural way. I saw his artwork in a universal context. That form could be presented not only in Ballymena, but could work in different, unrelated locations.
Hanna Wieczorek Interview

Mrs. Wieczorek was responsible for commissioning sculptures for the roundabouts in the city of Rybnik. Contemporary art objects in Rybnik are being funded and commissioned from the initiative of the City Council. The person directly responsible for the realization and process of commissioning the sculptures of art is Mrs. Hanna Wieczorek. She worked in the position of the main city architect in Rybnik’s Department of Landscape. Her efforts since beginning the commissioner were supported by the President of Rybnik, Mr. Piotr Kuczer, a historian and Civic Platform politician and the vice – president Mr. Wojciech Student, privately an architect.

The interview was recorded on 11. November 2015, between 17.00 to 18.30, by Krzysztof

Place: Pod Lasem 64, 44-210 Rybnik, Poland.

The first contemporary sculpture erected in Rybnik was the ‘Transience’ in 2013 by Tomasz Koclęga. The sculpture is placed near the local airport on a roundabout, on the road 44 between Żory and Rybnik. The sculpture was created without any consultation with local communities.

The ‘Transience’ commission was a kind of ‘social experiment’. Firstly, the City Council considered to commemorate the history of the local airport by a full – time exposition of aviation engines on the roundabout. That idea was abandoned later because of concerns about the connotations with the Smolensk presidential airplane catastrophe! The possibility of eventual riots was too strong to risk in the first years after the catastrophe in Smolensk. The alternative for a politically neutral idea for the public sculpture become the best solution. After the implementation of Koclęga,s sculpture, the City of Rybnik had decided the case of the next commissions: The budget for the commissioned sculptures cannot extend over 60.000 PLN [around 10.895 GBP for May 2015]. A minimum of three different artists, or organizations with an artistic background, had to propose their projects to call the judgement panel to vote. The sculpture soothes savage manners. The costs of commissioning the sculpture were less expensive than taking care of plants in a 10 years’ period. Rybnik’s Department of Landscape was looking for new artists for a cooperation. The department become gathering documentation of the artists shortlisted and not listed artists for future commissions. A part of the realized art works had been made by a design company and not the artists themselves. It was called: ‘Cactuses’ and ‘Tree’. The art objects placed by the decision of the Department on the roundabouts were not to represent memorial functions. The task was rather to build or reconsolidate the local spaces with an impact build on neutral contexts. The themes for the sculptures were chosen together by artists and the Department and often referred to the local community. None of the realized objects tried to present a so called international art trend like abstraction or minimalism. It could be stated, that most of the commissioned works represented some denominations of quasi – surrealistc art styles. Most of the materials used in the construction of the sculptures were materials like steel and epoxy resins. Therefore, not all sculptures were durable to occasional acts of vandalism. One of the realized projects: ‘The Pikes’ will be removed and transported to another localization due to the fatal opinions by the locals on it’s unclear form and lack of control over the subject by the artist. The artwork was not destroyed but deconstructed and exposed in the city park. Art commissions for public spaces in comparison to other types of public commissions were the most difficult ones.
The reason was a pressure from different civic powers. Another issue was a badly constructed law: compulsion to choose the cheapest offer. The tax system working against the person who will create the artwork.
Tomasz Górnicki Interview

Sculptor Tomasz Górnicki was involved in independent art actions with his own sculptures which he implemented in carefully chosen public spaces, mostly in the area of Warsaw. By his work in urban areas, the sculptor wanted to influence local communities. Górnicki defined his actions directly as a form of political actionism. His public art was often vandalized, as it happened with his group of sculptures: Listen/Look/Scream in 2016 on MDM plaza in Warsaw.

The interview was recorded on 29 March 2016, between 11.00 to 12.30, by Krzysztof Krzysztog

Address: Marii Konopnickiej 28, 30-001 Cracow, Poland

Q: When could one talk about the success of sculpture in public spaces?
A: When the idea is transposed into the real space. I am interested in... renaissance, aesthetics first. Looking for spaces for my works I call for something I named ‘architecture by mistake’. Not abandoned spaces, but places - situations where most of people would not notice. I got influenced by the surroundings: light, visual state of the wall, closed space. I use architectonical details to help me re-scale my own sculptural objects. The interaction with people I treat as an experiment which may occur, or not, by its own. I am happy if a couple of people would say something nice, but truly I am mostly interested, when someone’s commentaries are way different from my own imagination.

Q: Would you recognize any impact of investors / audience on your creative process? If yes, how does it looked like?
A: Certainly that is different situations than my own art actions. My father has a foundry and I am a sculptor related to his business. I rather do not take part in competitions. They are usually a set up. The commissioner knows what he wants, usually they come with historical related ideas. The deciding factor is the money. I have very limited space for my own interpretation. I treat that kind of work as a form of a challenge, for example when I had to sculpt a horse monument of Czarnecki. I had also noticed different reactions from the clients (T.G. started calling public responders ‘clients’ not ‘viewers’ during his answer on this question) when speaking about their reaction to my private sculptures I set up by myself. Usually they used social issues, or economical, as an argument when speaking about my art.

Q: Is it important for you to make your sculptures interactive with the environment?
That is the most important part of my work. I rather try to highlight the existing architectural and aesthetical situation, which occurred already, and to which I am convinced. I am interested in the historical origins of the place, where my sculpture could not only transform but scope people’s attentions. I am never sure how that contributes to my work. I do not prepare local community for cooperation. Sometimes it comes from the first involvement with locals when I mount the object to the wall.

Q: Would you put a frontier between social interest and cultural interest?
A: I see it rather as symbiosis. There should be no conflict. By arranging the sculpture, we naturally change the space around it. That includes: benches, pavements, sometimes car
spaces, or local economy: tourism, or education. There is a social issue related to public sculpture, maybe they are simply not so obvious.

Q: Has the historical universalism used as criticism of sculpture brought some development to contemporary art?

A: I am not quite sure how to answer that one. I don’t see that the unification of ideology would bring something positive to art. I try to be a simple man, related to what I do. There is a group of commissioners related to their unchangeable opinions which I cannot influence, and there are my own public projects I relate to on my own spectrum of social relations.
Grażyna Szymańska -Wołyńska Interview

Mrs. Szymała – Wołyńska is a sculptor and art event organizer with the Rasmus Foundation. The Foundation is collecting and commissioning sculptures for public spaces in the Wielkopolska region, Poland.

The interview was recorded on 19 August 2015, between 14.00 to 15.00, by Krzysztof Krzysztof

Address: Skype session

Q: When can we speak about successful sculpture projects in public spaces?

If we could call it that way, it is the moment when something what has been projected starts to gain followers, who can see more and agree for that idea. The installation does not exist in the present, but there are people who already start to believe, and actually see what I can see, they gain „perspective”.

Q: Do you feel a large impact of the investors/public on your creation process?

About the impact of the investors, or engaged companies on my recent creation process - I can only say that in that case with my last commission there was none. They agreed on my idea, I could say, with applause. But did they have an influence? Partly. The workers from the botanic garden made some inference, more around the surroundings of the sculpture, more that it should be, but that (case) has been clarified and now the sculpture was implemented as I wanted. Sometimes there is too much excessive zeal, which could cause harm. This is what characterize our society – we know the best and we do not like to listen, listen to others, or actually try to understand and discuss.

Q:Is it important for you that your sculptures should interact with surroundings?

It is very important. Therefore, in that case I used clear plates of glass not to cover what in the garden is most significant – nature, but to harmonize with it. Even the birds tried to „walk thru’ the glass, but I prevented that and now they can „see” it.

Continuation of the question: If yes, how do you realize such an idea?

Q: The appropriate choice for the place for sculpture, nothing by force. You should walk with the sculpture (as an idea) inside you, you should rearrange it, sort out and to take the sculpture for a walk with you for an interior (mental) walk.

Continuation of the question: If not, how do you accomplish to communicate by the sculpture with the surroundings?

Sometimes you have to invite, or even force the viewer, the surroundings to see the sculpture, to be with her and then the sculpture starts to fit the surroundings, assimilates with it, it is noticed in a positive sense. Often the form has the importance, but most important for me is the facture in my works, which encourages the viewer to make contact. By smoothing the surfaces, I implement to „befriend” the viewer with my artwork. Even when an invisible movement was used, it causes the contact, a type of astonishment. I try to implement a sort of hidden mobility.
Q: Can we put the interest of the culture – understood as investment in art – above the social interest?

It would be good that one should not disturb the other.
Prof. Artur Tajber Interview

Prof. Artur Tajber, is a conceptual artist and performer. Head of the Media Department of Cracow’s Art Academy (Akademia Sztuk Pięknych im. Jana Matejki). Tajber was involved in art actions both in Poland and Northern Ireland for the period of the last three decades. He had witnessed not only democratic changes in Poland and their impact on the situation around sculpture in public space, but also the changes in Northern Ireland. Tajber was involved in the cooperation with sculptor and performer Jerzy Bereś.

The interview was recorded on 20 October 2015, between 14.00 to 15.30, by Krzysztof Krzysztof

Address: Bunkier Sztuki, plac Szczepański 3A, 33-332, Cracow, Poland,

The written down material is a synthesized synopsis from the interview and has a form of a ‘stream of consciousness’. The questions to Mr. Tajber were oscillating around: his role as an artist and academic educator who currently works in the Academy of Fine Arts in Cracow, how he saw public space and its use by other contemporary artists in Cracow. Did the possibilities, or maybe limitations fully used by artists or city planners cause any unusual situations? Had sculpture in public space evolved in Cracow in recent decades? Who was responsible for the current situation in the context of public sculpture?

The questions were related with the questionnaire which was sent earlier to Mr. Tajber by mail.

At the beginning of our interview a few words about his current situation:

Local Cracow sculptors often declared their interest in the public space, but somehow, they still saw their role only in the participation of the concept of ‘classical’ monuments. My research as an academic was turned onto a phenomena of the language of sculpture in relation to so called small architecture. In case of art in public space, I experienced many processes. All exist in global and detail subjects, but art as object of its own – is the most interesting subject. In the early 80’s the term of performance art was not yet commonly used. The climate of the 80s’ and the early 90s’ in Poland was driving artists not to look for the function but for pure action of art. In the era of the 80’s-90’s the action art in the public space was derived from the contemplation of subject into questions of the nature of action. The art is: a process equal to the succession of an action. In the 80,s and early 90’s it was easy to notice tendencies of group behavior in public spaces. It was easier to see the times as quasi revolutionary times, different generations, but bound by complex ideas in the group. Even when travelling beyond the Iron Curtain to the ‘West’, I was able to find ‘own’ group very easily. There were similar cultural codes from both sides of the Iron Curtain those days. Therefore, an identification of a group was easy. By the ‘group’ I defined the generation which did not remember the II World War. There were at least two types of groups in that period: one of older people, who saw social status quo, knowing it was stagnation – as a remedy for the war. The next group was mostly young people: those ones with their own understanding of freedom and who stood against the muzzle of culture. Therefore, strong iconic differences were easily to notice between youth groups exposed by e.g. type of clothing or music. There is a comparison between the role of the artist and academics with public spaces in recent decades. There was no radical change in the approach to public space by those groups. I have observed only some minimal changes. The younger and older generation of academics had a memory of the same
historical facts. The group of younger and older artists related to the Academy in an ongoing process of an exchange of information. Artistic studies always were influenced by a specific part of the society. Therefore, there always existed a special code of communication inside academics related to art departments. Artists could sublimate their efforts by determinate public space and to observe their own later relations with the processed areas. Artists were observers and critics. Although we should ask the question regarding that word - author. Who is an author, what makes us an author? There was a significant problem with sculpture in Cracow. The city public area the hatchery of the monument’s producers since the 50’s. The significant was the year 1956, when the ‘monument producers’ were the only group not changed mentally and politically. Other art departments of the Academy, like painting or graphic came back to the old avant-garde. In the same historical period, in the sculpture department in the Academy till 80’ all sculptors were active PZPR members. The most significant person from the Party was then Prof. Marian Konieczny, who was the author among his other works, Lenin in Nowa Huta. That group was created for supporting State politics but not for the community’s needs. Cracow with its own history was burdened with poor aesthetically and politically involved types of monuments. As an example, Tajber spoke about another monument by Marian Konieczny, that of the painter and poet Wyspiański. Nobody wanted to finance its creation in 81’. The first place for the monument was planned to be on Szczepanski plaza in Cracow. I was the one, who belong to the group against the implementation of the monument in that place. Finally, the National Museum took that monument and placed it in front of its own entrance. Another monument with significant political connotations stands now on the crossroads of streets Retoryka - Legionów Piłudusdzkiego. It was a modern pastige from another project proposed in 20’. The monument was made by Czesław Dzwigaj, too. It looks like the bathroom of Janukowycz. The political approach had changed only slightly, for example, some monuments were dismounted in Nowa Huta. There was a group of sculptures in Park Jordana, which since the 80s’, was a pantheon of important for culture people. Currently the newly added works to that group of sculptures have bad aesthetic quality and the primal idea was destroyed. The contemporary monuments erected in the park were a mixture of kitsch and scariness. During the philanthropist Mr. Jordan’s life time, the portraits were erected for importance for cultured people. Kochanowski, Rej or Rejtan were sculpted in one, classical convention. Contemporarily, a nationalism promoting local societies have built icons like John Paul II, or the Expelled. If the new sculptures could keep earlier aesthetic conventions it could be still acceptable. Meanwhile, new art forms are represented in an Aesthetical nightmare. There is no convention. For example: bronze tears falling onto a marble base. Another example: from the bronze caste arm came another arm holding a thorn. A Nightmare. And all in that pompous patriotic scenery. the new nationalists put four times more monuments than what was there before. My question in that moment was: a mass production of fear? And my answer is yes. There is still an importance of the Grupa Krakowska and their role after 56’ against Socrealism. Their confections brought effects in art today. They were a point of resistance. The avant-garde existed even though the communists were against them. Therefore, for Jaremianka or Kantor the first realized ideas were to declassify politics in public space. That politics in public space was named: We poles love monuments. The form of personal and peaceful idolatry does not exist in contemporary Poland. Socrealism had just simply transmuted into culture. The key problem was the lack of good education. Lack of education about arts leads to Aesthetical corruption. Contemporarily, the vector of social power moved towards fascism. Meeting totalitarianism with democracy would lead to the stimulation of each other. Both factors
were easy for the degradation of any values, if linked. In the art market there was production and reproduction. Reproduction was even more important. Even the most mercantile approach of critics always was focused on higher goals. In fact, reproduction or production of art were not so important. Reproduction was one of a natural mechanisms of art. Currently, I do not care much about newly implemented monuments in Cracow. Although artists claim that the present situation is not good. In the beginning of the 90s', all people I knew believed into large changes. People thought then, that relations like politics and power would quickly change the world. Such assumptions came from a rush of adrenaline after 80’. When that adrenaline level had lowered down, emotions also had fallen. Many people who had great expectations for change had quite quickly lost that belief. That depended on their physical situation. Then they ‘broke’ or changed their goals. For last 15 years I was very active in the creation of societies and individualized art movements. I believed then, that organizations would structuralize society as it happened in the West. The non-functional institutions may change into new values, but finally, I was ruined. I decided to leave my position of curator. I was very disappointed. But I do not regret what I did. After my experience in teaching a new wave of curators I state, that I become very negative about the reform in curator studies in universities or academies, like the Jagiellonian University. The Universities produced people who had no idea about it, and without experience. The decision to open curator studies was made too hastily, in the effect young curators blocked all art movements. Many people who declared their interest in art curator work simply wanted power. Its a political bag. The kind of force simply moved by politics. A Perfect dummy and a horrible mistake. I was involved in FORT Sztuki which was created in 1994 and formally registered in 1996. Finally, in 1997 I decided to dismantle the institution. I had to change my relation to the world. I cannot change the relation during my live, so I cannot be a guerrilla all of my live. I saw that absurdity and looked for another strategy. Then I realized, that as an academic we could build a concept to make changes, a kind of conscious social mechanism. That was my choice. Due to my complications with obtaining a passport during the Martial Law which influenced me to start working at the Fine Arts Academy. Coincidentally, I found that decision to be positive with time. There are differences between art students and exterior cultural communities in Cracow. The biggest problem laid in the mentality of local societies connected to different city associations. Cracow as an old Hansa city had associations like ‘Bractwo Kurkowe – The Fowler Brotherhood’, Merchants Association, a strong position of church – what in the case of artists like Czesław Dźwigaj was a great advantage in the commission process. From one hand the tight connections inside the city gave more freedom. From the other hand, the groups were in relation of self-destructive egoism and coteries. Especially today the strong influence of those societies which were very good in playing on human emotions provide them with political control and power. Cracow had characteristics similar to cities with Catholic backgrounds. Similar to the south of France, Italy, Spain, where local priests and local lawyers were more significant than statutory laws. I am obsessed in creation a contra-institution to the existing structures in Cracow. Those institutions could change because of a great relation to technologies and communication. Today anyone could become an institution, if he might find a recipe for it. Most of the institutions today were not much omnipotent, therefore, artists could use them for their own target and to make the change. The destruction of the institution should not be the target, but a focus. I would describe a problem between a place for sculpture and official politics around monuments on my cooperation with Jerzy Bereś. In a work of Bereś his body become a living monument. In the early 80’ Bereś was finally able to produce his idea of a Romantic Wagon
in the center of Cracow. It was a kind of ceremony of consternation of the idea of a monument. In a performance in 1981 he burned five bonfires. There was a lot of different reactions, strange reactions, including the behavior of some of the presidents of Cracow. Bereś with my help made a reedition of the 'Romantic Wagon' in 2000 which ended up with an intervention of the Municipal Police of Cracow. In the next years I helped Bereś in the organization of performances, until his death in 2012. Bereś gave a testament recorded on video to me, where he asked to reedit the performance of Romantic Wagon. Currently the action was made every two years. The reason was to give every set of new students of the Fine Arts Academy a chance to celebrate it. The performance was set as a symbol of social excitement. Bereś wanted to make a situation beyond art to give another answer for the pressure to build monuments. Therefore, the work of Bereś became a form of social ritual and maybe a kind of aesthetic antidote. I have a complex against sculpture. I do not like sculpture or theatre. That is a form of depravation. The entanglement of institution of sculpture and theater between society and power. They both were monuments of power but not monuments of society. If there would be no great money for that form of art from the government, their aesthetic would be different. The same thing could be said about architecture. Many museums which present great architecture as buildings simultaneously do not present the possibility to show this art inside a great museum..
Martin Schoefeld Interview

Martin Schonefeld is a manager in Office for Artist Consulting in Berlin, involved in commissioning processes on public sculptures.

The interview was recorded on 9 November 2015, between 13.00 to 14.00, by Krzysztof Krzysztof

Address: Köthener Straße 44, 10963 Berlin, Germany,

In practical sense, the role of KIOER manager is on the first stage of his work to contact the public institutions like schools, administration office or corporation buildings with question does this facility had invested 1% from their investment into art. If the institution has no art, then KIOER will propose own participation in the process of commissioning the artwork. Artists and possible commissioners may contact independently. KIOER is continually updating own database of this sources. KIOER stands in the first place as presenter of the artists and their work. Therefore, KIOER management will be focused on the artwork quality and artist presence over commissioners will. It is taken under strong consideration, that the process of commissioning the artwork will be possibly hold in its practical sense. KIOER will pay attention that both artists and commissioners will be in close contact thru the whole process of realization. On that stage, the organization plays the role of the worker. KIOER acts with a predetermined plan. This plan is official and can be obtained from the KIOER website and catalogue of this institution. This plan is worked on 9 stages and it is represented in 9 days period process of commissioning of the artwork. The institution proposes the part for the commissioning panel. That will include two types of judges: art specialists and specialists from objects where the artwork will be placed. If the project will be realized for the school, then KIOER will ask for two students from the school to represent the voice of youth. The first discussion taken in the process is in the open group where every participant can express his or hers opinion. The KIOER management takes under strong consideration during that period not to neglect artist vision or ideas. Especially on that stage, there is the tendency to attack the artist by the group is high. The most pressure is taken usually between architects and sculptors. The usual costs declared for the art by the commissions vary between 17.000 to 44.000 Euro.
Rina Whyte Interview

INTERNET Questionnaire for professional stakeholders:

Challenges of Sculpture in the Public Spaces Today

Krzysztof Krzysztof

Supervisors:
Mr. Ralf Sander, Mr. Brian Conolly
Advisor:
Dr Alastair Herron

Faculty of Art & Design, University of Ulster, Belfast Campus,
25-51 York St, Belfast, County Antrim BT15 1ED

Please respond for the questions written in that questionnaire under the asked questions. You don’t have to answer all the questions, if you find any of them irrelevant for you. In case for assistance please contact with the Chief Investigator:

Please also indicate:

Age: _______ Occupation: Curator and Project Manager   Localization: Ireland    Date: January, 2017

Questions:

1. When can we speak about a successful sculpture project in the public space?

answer: Get in touch and we can arrange a time.

2. Do you think that sculpture in public space should have to be more relevant to social problems?

answer: Not necessarily but it should respond and be relevant to it’s audience. Site specific.

3. What do you think is a good piece of public art and why?

answer: Perpetual Motion in Naas, Kildare, Ireland by Remco De Fouw and Rachel Joint is a great piece of Public Art. It has resonated with it’s audience since it was sited for various different reasons, both positive and negative. To the people of Naas, it means ‘home’ to many others it means the daily commute. It also featured in Guinness adverts and is mentioned in traffic reports every evening!

4. What do you think art can achieve and what could art not do?

answer: This is to large a question to answer in a questionnaire!

5. Did you found some examples from sculpture commissions you would consider not art at all?
answer: Yes, some are more design led with less relevance, others are directly commissioned by commissioners who are not aware of what ‘public art’ is and take it to be very functional.

6. How do you think the commissioning process could be made better?

answer: The Per Cent for Art process is quite a good one but there are small changes that could be changed. Also, I believe decommissioning or re-siting should also be considered where artworks fail to remain relevant.

8. How could quality be maintained within contemporary commissioning processes?

answer: It is always best to have contemporary professional artists sitting on selection panels to aid this process.

9. What is your personal background and relation to art?

answer: My primary degree is from Ireland’s main art college NCAD and I have worked in Public Art for over 10 years with 10 years based in design project management and Universal Design.

10. Is art a promise of happiness?

answer: No.

11. Pierre Bourdieu stated that” taste classifies, it classifies the classifier.”

What do you think about this statement? I think it could possibly be a little elitist or be considered that way. People are entitled to their own taste without being judged for it!
Interview with a group of 6 men in a park who were in interaction with the sculpture *Vision*.

Interview made by Krzysztof Krzysztof on 02 June 2016, between 13.00 and 14.00.

Address: Peace Flame Park between Guild Hall and Foyle Street in Derry.

Situation:

During taking the sample in Derry in between 26.05.2016 – 09.06.2016 a group of men in the average age from 28 to 40 sat closely to the sculpture in the park. They were making open training with different acrobatic tools. One of them put a cloths and a hat on the sculpture during the time they spent in the park.

The interview was anonymous. Because of unusualness of situation, during the interview only notes were made and reprinted later into this file.

According to a young man, sitting on the sculpture:

“it supposed to be a man, we thought. We dressed him because it looks cool. We thought, that some clothes for it (will be good) to hide its modesty”

Another man added:

“we told our friend that we build it, and she believed us” he also added that sculpture was a: ‘sexual – metrosexual being”

During the short interview, men started discussion between themselves about, why the sculpture has no arms.

Next, other man had said that: “Figure as it was, in my head need to be dressed. It was not a solution but we also hood it up to look dangerous”

Men were also interested; how long the sculpture be there. They decided to do their exercises and spend their time interacting (in that case: literary), because they found a sculpture ‘natural spot’ to work with as: ‘it was here when we came’.

In the short discussion between man, one pointed out that the sculpture reminded him Anthony Gormley’s sculptures who stand in Derry.

A man who earlier said, that he told that he was an author of the sculpture for a joke, added that he enjoys famine curves pf the body in the sculptures. All man agreed that the sculpture was a greatly carved in wood and presented high standards of construction.
Appendix II - Figures

This Appendix includes documentation on sculptures used in the research.

Table of Context:

1. Figures of sculptures used in the Pilot Study
   1.a Ryho Paprocki – Garden of Salt and Art
   1.b Ross Wilson – Mother, Daughter, Sister
   1.c Allan Heriot - Rinty Monhagan
   1.d Shiro Masuyama – Five Apples
   1.e Antony Gormley – Sculpture for Derry Walls
2. Figures of sculpture Reason used for the Sample
   2.a Project
   2.b Realisation
   2.c Exposition
   2.d Documentation of damages
3. Figures of sculpture Vision used for the Sample
   3.a Project
   3.b Realisation
   3.c Exposition
Figures of sculptures used in the Pilot Study

Figure 1: Ryho Paprocki object: Garden of Salt and Art, Bochnia, 2015
Source: Krzysztof Krzysztof 2015

Figure 2: Allan Heriot sculpture: Rinty Monhagan, Cathedral Gardens, Belfast, 2015
Source: Krzysztof Krzysztof 2015
Figure 3: Ross Wilson sculpture Mother, Daughter, Sister, Sandy Row, Belfast, 2015
Source: Krzysztof Krzysztof 2015

Figure 4: Shiro Masuyama, Five Apples, People’s Park, Ballymena, 2015
Source: Krzysztof Krzysztof 2015
Figure 5: Antony Gormley, Sculpture foe Derry Walls, Derry, 1987
Source: Krzysztof Krzysztof 2016
2. Figures of sculpture ‘Reason’ used for the Sample

2.a Project:

Figure 6: Model for sculpture Reason, front, painted plaster, 20 cm x 11 cm x 12 cm, 2015
Source: Krzysztof Krzysztof 2015

Figure 7: Model for sculpture Reason, back, painted plaster, 20 cm x 11 cm x 12 cm, 2015
Source: Krzysztof Krzysztof 2015
2.b Realisation

Figure 8: Sculpture Reason, in process, 2015
Source: Krzysztof Krzysztof 2015

Figure 9: Sculpture Reason, in process 2015
Source: Krzysztof Krzysztof 2015
2.c Exposition

Figure 10: Sculpture Reason, Nowa Huta, Poland 2015
Source: Krzysztof Krzysztof 2015
Figure 11: Sculpture Reason, Nowa Huta 2015
Source: Krzysztof 2015

Figure 12: Sculpture Reason, Nowa Huta, 2015
Source: Krzysztof 2015
2.d Documentation of damages

Figure 13: Sculpture Reason, Documentation of the damages, Nowa Huta, 2016
Source: Krzysztof Krzysztof 2016
3. Figures of sculpture Vision used for the Sample

3.a Project

Figure 14: Technical drawings for sculpture Vision, 2016
Source: Krzysztof Krzysztof 2016
3. b Realisation

Figure 15: Realization of sculpture Vision, 2016
Source: Krzysztof Krzysztof 2016

Figure 16: Realization of sculpture Vision, 2016
Source: Krzysztof Krzysztof 2016
3.c Exposition

Figure 17: Sculpture Vision, Peace Flame Park, Derry, 2016
Source: Krzysztof Krzysztof 2016

Figure 18: Sculpture Vision, Peace Flame Park, Derry, 2016
Source: Krzysztof Krzysztof 2016
Figure 19: Sculpture Vision, Peace Flame Park, Derry, 2016
Source: Krzysztof Krzysztof 2016
Appendix III – questionnaires forms and information sheet.

Questionnaire:

Questionnaire for professional bodies and audiences.
Please respond to the questions below. Please write your answers under the questions.

Please indicate:

Age: ______ Date:______ Place:______ Occupation:_______

1. Do you like the artwork?
Strongly agree – agree – Neutral - Not agree – Strongly disagree

2. Would you consider more artworks in this area?
Strongly agree – agree – Neutral - Not agree – Strongly disagree

3. How you would describe this artwork with your words?

4. Could you match one word for the feeling you have when you see this sculpture?
/ excited, interested, neutral, uncomfortable, frightened, angry/

5. Do you think this sculpture fits to the space?
Information Sheet:

You don’t have to answer all the questions, if you find any of them irrelevant for you. This is a qualitative method, what means you may answer in the way best for you, although please keep your answers to the subject. Your answers will be used to measure the possible phenomena on the field of public sculpture. The information taken from this research can be used only for academic purposes and is held under the Code of Ethics of the University of Ulster. This questionnaire is anonymous, so there is no data which could be used to personalize the information you may provide.

The aims of the research are:

- To check the range of cultural bias (the phenomenon of interpreting and judging phenomena by standards inherent to one’s own culture. The phenomenon is sometimes considered a problem central to social and human sciences, such as economics, psychology, anthropology, and sociology) in public art.
- Investigate the problems and conflicts of the sculpture in the public space.
- Highlight awareness about sculpture on the field of psychology.
- Expose problems with public sculpture in the area of law and art legislation.
- Scope better awareness on group process in the area of public sculpture.

In case for assistance please contact with the Chief investigator:

Mr. Ralf Sander

📞 +44 (0)28 95367359
✉️ r.sander@ulster.ac.uk

Room BB-06-002
Faculty of Art, Design & Built Environment,
Art and Design Research Institute
University of Ulster,
Belfast Campus,
25-51 York St,
Belfast,
County Antrim
BT15 1ED
Questionnaire for professional stakeholders used as a basis for in-depth interviews:

Challenges of Sculpture in the Public Spaces Today

Krzysztof Krzysztof

Supervisors:
Mr. Ralf Sander, Mr. Brian Conolly
Advisor:
Dr Alastair Herron

Faculty of Art & Design, University of Ulster, Belfast Campus,
25-51 York St, Belfast, County Antrim BT15 1ED

Please respond for the questions written in that questionnaire under the asked questions. You don’t have to answer all the questions, if you find any of them irrelevant for you. In case for assistance please contact with the Chief Investigator:

Please also indicate:

Age: ______ Occupation: Localization: Date:

Questions:

1. When can we speak about a successful sculpture project in the public space?

2. Do you think that sculpture in public space should have to be more relevant to social problems?

3. What do you think is a good piece of public art and why?

4. What do you think art can achieve and what could art not do?

5. Did you found some examples from sculpture commissions you would consider not art at all?

6. How do you think the commissioning process could be made better?

8. How could quality be maintained within contemporary commissioning processes?

9. What is your personal background and relation to art?

10. Is art a promise of happiness?

11. Pierre Bourdieu stated that” taste classifies, it classifies the classifier.”
Appendix IV - Calculations

Calculations used in research for sculpture Reason:

Phenomena found on 05/12/2015

Number of phenomena classified under all covariates

Eleven phenomena found among 35 participants.

The responders classified as phenomena were found under covariates:

Materialistic object: 4 (21 N/I, 24 NA/U, 25 NA/U, 26 N/I)

Sexual object: 2 (12 N/N, 28 N/I)

Abstract/other object: 1 (3 A/I)

Disability to describe the object/denial: 4 (7 SD/U, 8 SD/N, 29 NA/I, 32 N/I)

Force change in the subgroup of all phenomena:

Materialistic object: 2 objects NEGATIVE (- extra -active) toward leaving the group (24,25) and 2 NEGATIVE (-intra - passive) toward staying in the group (21,26)

Sexual object: 1 NEGATIVE (-extra -passive) toward leaving the group (12) 1 NEGATIVE (-intra – passive) toward staying in the group

Abstract/other object: 1 POSITIVE (-intra - active) relation toward influencing the group

Disability to describe the object/denial: 3 NEGATIVE (-extra - active) (7,8,29) 1 NEGATIVE (-intra - passive) (32)

The table of -intra and -extra relations in the subgroup of phenomena:

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{NEGATIVE} & \text{-intra -passive} & \text{-intra -active} & \text{-extra -passive} & \text{-extra -active} \\
3 & 1 & 1 & 5 \\
\text{POSITIVE} & \text{-intra -passive} & \text{-intra -active} & \text{-extra -passive} & \text{-extra -active} \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
\text{FORCE LINE} & \text{-intra -passive} & \text{-intra -active} & \text{-extra -passive} & \text{-extra -active} \\
+3 & 0 & -1 & -5
\end{array}
\]

A total Force impact was most likely:

- intra passive (+) for N, (+) for P = +3 + 0 = +3
- intra active (-) for N, (+) for P = -1 +1 = 0
- extra passive (-) for N, (+) for P = 0 – 1 = -1
- extra active (-) for N, (-) for P = -5 - 0 = -5

Final: +3 – 6 = -3
Phenomena found on 14/12/2015

Number of phenomena classified under all covariates: 10 from 29

The responders classified as phenomena were found under covariates:
Materialistic object: 6 (5 A/I, 6 A/I, 9 NA/I, 11 SD/N, 13 A/F/Ar, 16 D/N)
Sexual object: 1 (20 N/N)
Abstract/other object: 1 (21 N/N)
Disability to describe the object/denial: 2 (25 NA/N, 27 N/N)

Force change in the subgroup of all phenomena:
Materialistic object: 3 objects NEGATIVE (– extra - active) toward leaving the group (9, 11, 16) and 3 POSITIVE (-intra - active) toward staying in the group (5, 6, 13)
Sexual object: 1 NEGATIVE (-extra -passive) toward leaving the group (20)
Abstract/other object: 1 NEGATIVE (-extra - passive) relation toward leaving the group (21)
Disability to describe the object/denial: 2 NEGATIVE (-extra -passive) (25, 27)

The table of -intra and -extra relations in the subgroup of phenomena:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>intra-passive</th>
<th>intra-active</th>
<th>extra-passive</th>
<th>extra-active</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEGATIVE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSITIVE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORCE LINE</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-4</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A total Force impact was most likely:
- intra passive (+) for N, (+) for P = +0 + 0 = 0
- intra active (-) for N, (+) for P = 0 +3 = +3
- extra passive (-) for N, (+) for P = -4 + 0 = -4
- extra active (-) for N, (-) for P = -3 - 0 = -3
Final: 3+ (-4-3) = 3+7 = +10f

Phenomena found on 09/01/2016

Number of phenomena classified under all covariates: 13 from 33

The responders classified as phenomena were found under covariates:
Materialistic object: 3 (14 A/I, 19 N/I, 31 N/I)
Sexual object: 6 (1 NA/N, 4 SA/I, 13 A/I, 15 N/I, 30 A/I, 33 N/F)
Abstract/other object: 4 (12 A/I, 16 N/I, 25 N/I, 34 N/I)
Disability to describe the object/denial: 0

**Force change in the subgroup of all phenomena:**

Materialistic object: 2 objects NEGATIVE (– intra - passive) toward staying in the group (19,31) and 1 POSITIVE (-intra - active) toward staying in the group (14)

Sexual object: 1 NEGATIVE (-extra -active) toward leaving the group (1), 1 NEGATIVE (-intra -passive) toward staying in the group (15), 1 NEGATIVE (-intra -active) toward staying in the group (33) and 3 POSITIVE (-intra – active) (4,13,30)

Abstract/other object: 3 NEGATIVE (-intra - passive) relation toward staying the group (16,25,34) and 1 POSITIVE (-intra -active) relation toward staying in the group (12)

Disability to describe the object/denial: 0

**The table of -intra and -extra relations in the subgroup of phenomena:**

| NEGATIVE -intra -passive / -intra -active/ -extra -passive/ -extra -active | 6 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| POSITIVE -intra -passive / -intra -active/ -extra -passive/ -extra -active | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| FORCE LINE -intra -passive / -intra -active/ -extra -passive/ -extra -active | +6 | +4 | -1 | -4 |

**A total Force impact was most likely:**

- intra passive (+) for N, (+) for P = +6 + 0 = +6
- intra active (-) for N, (+) for P = -1 + 5 = +4
- extra passive (-) for N, (+) for P = 0 – 0 = 0
- extra active (-) for N, (-) for P = -1 - 0 = -4

Final: +6 + 4 - 4 = +6f
27 May 2016

The values of -intra and -extra forces of attitudes were:

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{-Intra – passive} & \text{-intra -active} & \text{-extra -passive} & \text{-extra -active} \\
\text{NEGATIVE} & + & -2 & -4 \\
\text{POSITIVE} & + & +3 & +1 \\
\text{FORCE LINE} & -intra -passive & -intra -active & -extra -passive & -extra -active \\
& 0 & +1 & +1 & -4
\end{array}
\]

Hypothetical Neighbor Range for Force -intra and -extra relations based on measured *Futura Contingentia* among phenomena:

- intra passive (+) for N, (+) for P = 0 + 0 = +0
- intra active (-) for N, (+) for P = -2 + 3 = +1
- extra passive (-) for N, (+) for P = 0 +1 = 1
- extra active (-) for N, (-) for P = -4 - 0 = -4

Final: 1 + 1 - 4 = -2F

29 May 2016

The values of -intra and -extra forces of attitudes were:

\[
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{-Intra – passive} & \text{-intra -active} & \text{-extra -passive} & \text{-extra -active} \\
\text{NEGATIVE} & + & - & -1 \\
\text{POSITIVE} & +1 & +3 & +2 \\
\text{FORCE LINE} & -intra -passive & -intra -active & -extra -passive & -extra -active \\
& 1 & +3 & +2 & -1
\end{array}
\]

Hypothetical Neighbor Range for Force -intra and -extra relations based on measured *Futura Contingentia* among phenomena:

- intra passive (+) for N, (+) for P = 0 + 1 = +1
- intra active (-) for N, (+) for P = 0 + 3 = +3
- extra passive (-) for N, (+) for P = 0 +2 = 2
- extra active (-) for N, (-) for P = -1 - 0 = -1
Final: 1 + 3 +2 - 1= 5F

31 May 2016

The values of -intra and -extra forces of attitudes were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>-Intra – passive</th>
<th>-intra -active</th>
<th>-extra -passive</th>
<th>-extra -active</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEGATIVE</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSITIVE</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+6</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORCE LINE</td>
<td>-intra -passive</td>
<td>-intra -active</td>
<td>-extra -passive</td>
<td>-extra -active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>+6</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothetical Neighbor Range for Force -intra and -extra relations based on measured Futura Contingentia among phenomena:

- intra passive (+) for N, (+) for P = 0 + 0 = 0
- intra active (-) for N, (+) for P = 0 + 6 = +6
- extra passive (-) for N, (+) for P = 0 -2 = -2
- extra active (-) for N, (-) for P = 0 - 0 = 0

Final: 6 - 2 = 4F

3 June 2016

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>-Intra – passive</th>
<th>-intra -active</th>
<th>-extra -passive</th>
<th>-extra -active</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEGATIVE</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSITIVE</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+4</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORCE LINE</td>
<td>-intra -passive</td>
<td>-intra -active</td>
<td>-extra -passive</td>
<td>-extra -active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothetical Neighbor Range for Force -intra and -extra relations based on measured Futura Contingentia among phenomena:

- intra passive (+) for N, (+) for P = 0 + 2 = 2
- intra active (-) for N, (+) for P = 0 + 4 = +4
- extra passive (-) for N, (+) for P = 0 -0 = 0
- extra active (-) for N, (-) for P = 0 - 0 = 0

Final: 2+4= 6F

5 June 2016
The values of -intra and -extra forces of attitudes were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>-Intra – passive</th>
<th>-intra -active</th>
<th>-extra -passive</th>
<th>-extra -active</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEGATIVE</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSITIVE</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORCE LINE</td>
<td>-intra -passive</td>
<td>-intra -active</td>
<td>-extra -passive</td>
<td>-extra -active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothetical Neighbor Range for Force -intra and -extra relations based on measured Futura Contingentia among phenomena:

- intra passive (+) for N, (+) for P = 0 + 2 = 2
- intra active (-) for N, (+) for P = 0 + 2 = +4
- extra passive (-) for N, (+) for P = 0 -0 = 0
- extra active (-) for N, (-) for P = 0 - 0 = 0

Final: 2+2= 2F

7 June 2016

The values of -intra and -extra forces of attitudes were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>-Intra – passive</th>
<th>-intra -active</th>
<th>-extra -passive</th>
<th>-extra -active</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEGATIVE</td>
<td>+1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>POSITIVE</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FORCE LINE</td>
<td>-intra -passive</td>
<td>-intra -active</td>
<td>-extra -passive</td>
<td>-extra -active</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothetical Neighbor Range for Force -intra and -extra relations based on measured Futura Contingentia among phenomena:

- intra passive (+) for N, (+) for P = 1 + 2 = 3
- intra active (-) for N, (+) for P = 0 + 0 = 0
- extra passive (-) for N, (+) for P = 0 - 0 = 0
- extra active (-) for N, (-) for P = (-1) - 1 = -2

Final: 3-2= 1F
Reliability test based on number of 10 responders taken from Pilot Study on *Garden of Salt and Art* by Ryho Paprocki. Simulation was done with SPSS program on 16 January 2016.

**Reliability**

**Scale: ALL VARIABLES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Processing Summary</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cases</td>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Excluded*</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a: Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.*

**Reliability Statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.707</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

```
RELIABILITY
/VARIABLES=Artwork Moreart Projective1 Projective1reaction Projective2reaction Projective2reaction Projective2
/SCALE('ALL VARIABLES') ALL
/MODEL=ALPHA.
```
Appendix V – Agreements, Forms and Letters

UNIVERSITY OF ULSTER

RESEARCH GOVERNANCE

RG3 Filter Committee Report Form

Project Title
Challenges of contemporary sculpture in the public spaces today (Study on Public Sculptures in the Group Dynamics Model)

Chief Investigator
Ralf Sander (PhD student Krzysztof Krzysztof)

Filter Committee
Faculty of Art Design and the Built Environment RGFC

This form should be completed by Filter Committees or equivalent for all research project applications in categories A to D (*for categories A and B, the University’s own application form – RG1 – will have been submitted; for categories C and D, the national, or ORECNI, application form will have been submitted).

Filter Committees should satisfy themselves that all applications meet the criteria on Page 2 of this form.

The Filter Committee can return an application to the Chief Investigator for clarification/amendment and can also reject an application if it is thought to be unethical, inappropriate, incomplete or not valid/viable.

If satisfied that the criteria have been met, the Filter Committee should make one of the following recommendations:

The research is in

☐ category A and the study may proceed

X ☐ category B and the study must be submitted to the University’s Research Ethics Committee

☐ category C and the study must be submitted to ORECNI along with the necessary supporting materials from the Research Governance Section

☐ category D and the study must be submitted to ORECNI or SPECNI along with the necessary supporting materials from the research Governance Section

Signed:  
Chairperson/Administrator of Filter Committee
Date: 11th April 2016

The application form and this assessment should now be returned to the Chief Investigator. The Filter Committee should retain a copy of the complete set of forms and forward a copy of this form (RG3), RG2 and pages 1 and 2 of from RG1 to the Research Governance Section.
If the answer to any of the following is ‘No’, please use the box to add comments where appropriate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The application is accompanied by an appropriate and favourable Peer Review Report Form (if not, the Filter Committee should be prepared to address this as part of its review)</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All component parts of the application are present including questionnaires, interview schedules or outline areas for group discussion/unstructured interviews</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An appropriate consent form and information sheet in plain, accessible language are provided</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Chief and other Investigators are qualified and appropriate to conduct the study</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All risks present in conducting the study have been identified and addressed</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical issues have been identified and addressed</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The subjects are appropriate to the study and the inclusion/exclusion criteria have been identified and listed</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Projekt badawczy: Wyzwania rzeźby współczesnej w przestrzeni publicznej.**

**Challenges of contemporary sculpture in public spaces today.**

Krzysztof Krzysztof

Faculty of Art & Design, University of Ulster, Belfast Campus, 25-51 York St, Belfast, County Antrim BT15 1ED

E-mail: Krzysztof-k@email.ulster.ac.uk

Superwizja: Mr. Ralf Sander, Mr. Brian Conolly

Doradzca: Dr Alastair Herron

**Jak może przebiegać proces partycypacji pomiędzy odbiorcą a rzeźbą w przestrzeni publicznej w kontekście dynamiki grupy?**

Problem pojęcia partycypacji może być rozwinięty o doświadczenia grupowe, mające częściowo nieświadomy charakter. Należałoby wziąć pod rozważę, czy model dynamiki grupy proponowany przez Kurta Lewina (Frontiers in Group Dynamics: Concept, Method and Reality in Social Science; Social Equilibria and Social Change (Human Relations 1947, The Tavistock Institute) mógłby mieć zastosowanie w badaniu relacji pomiędzy odbiorcą a rzeźbą w przestrzeni publicznej. Jak należałoby zatem zdefiniować obszar takiej relacji w kontekście pojęcia ‘reżimu estetycznego’ proponowanego przez Ranciere’a?628

**Proces przebiegu badań:**

1. 22.05.2015 Nawiązano emailowy kontakt pomiędzy badającym a Panem Ryszardem Kozikiem, pracownikiem Muzeum PRL (Wydział Marketingu i PR)


---

628 The Politics of Aesthetics The Distribution of the Sensible JACQUES RANCIERE, Continuum, 2004
5. Obiekt został postawiony 5.12.2015. w okolicach godziny 20.30
7. W okresie pomiędzy 13.01.2016 a 25.01.2016 obiekt badawczy został uszkodzony prawdopodobnie młotkiem (jeden ślad), oraz ostrym narzędziem (jedno uderzenie, 40 cm poniżej pierwszego).
8. 25.01.2016 obiekt został zdemontowany i usunięty z placu przed Muzeum PRL.

Materiały badawcze zostały przekazane do University of Ulster.

Notatkę sporządził:

Krzysztof Krzysztof
01.02.2016 Kraków
FROM:

KRZYSZTOF KRZYSZTOF
PhD Student II year University of Ulster
Supervisor: Mr. Ralf Sander
13b Blakeley terrace
BT12 5HR
Phone: 0044 744 843 2162
Second Phone: 0048 608 092 811
Mail: pegaz9@gmail.com

TO:

Mr. Brendan McMenamin
Derry City and Strabane District Council
Derry Office Council Offices 98 Strand Road,
Derry, BT48 7NN
Strabane Office Council Offices
47 Derry Road Strabane,
BT82 8DY Co Tyrone

Declaration of sculpture placement and
Public research

This document is a declaration of PhD researcher Mr. Krzysztof Krzysztof on his methods, aims and responsibilities during his research to be held in days: **26.05.2016 – 09.06.2016** in between Foyle St and Whittaker Street, on the green area of the plaza located in front of the Guildhall and West from the Peace Bridge.

The research had been accepted by the Ethical Committee of The University of Ulster.

Short overview:

The researcher will place his own sculpture in the open, public space of the park. In the period of 14 days when the art object will be exposed, he will ask passing by people about their reactions to the temporary sculpture. The gathered data will be used in his PhD research: ‘Challenges of contemporary sculpture in the public space today’\(^{629}\) to help answer the question: how the sculpture may impact on the dynamic changes in a group. The outcome of that study will help to build an final answer to the question: Could we adopt another arrangement processes with sculpture in public space, if we

---

\(^{629}\) The title of the thesis was changed in February 2017 on a former title: Attitude towards Contemporary Sculpture in a public space measured with a method based on Kurt Lewin theory of Force Field.
consider the study on group dynamics with contemporary sculpture as the new paradigm?

Mr. Krzysztof declares that:

- The artwork is fully insured, the researcher is liability insured
- Researcher had made health and safety training
- The artwork does not need any fundaments to be installed. It is a lightweight construction (less than 100 kg) specially designed for this occasion. It is non-overturn composition made from 4 elements which will be assembled together on site.
- The materials used for the sculpture are nature friendly (do not contain any toxic components).
- Any possible damage, including desolation of the grass will be repaired by the researcher in the time of less than 3 days.
- The protocol will be made and sent to the City Council after the disclosure of the project.

The assembly and disassembly of the sculpture:

- The assembly will take place on: 07.00 – 08.00 on 26.05.2016 (Thursday)
- The disassembly will take place on: 09.06.2016 (Wednesday), in the afternoon hours (16.00 – 17.00).
- The sculpture will be assembled on site. The operation should not take longer than an hour.
- There will be no necessity to use third parties to assembly or disassembly the artwork.
- After the disassembly of the sculpture all possible damages (e.g. grass damage) will be removed in the time shorter than 3 working days.
- The researcher would like to ask to open the entrance to the park/plaza from the South – East side in the hours when the sculpture will be assembled and disassembled

Location of the sculpture:

- The sculpture will be placed on the grass near to the North – East entrance to the plaza, around 2-3 meters from the sidewalk. For more data please look into attachment with map of placement of the object.

The research procedures:

- The research will be made on site
- The research will be made in three stages. The first sample will take place on 26.05.2016, next 02.06.2016 and last 09.06.2016 during the daytime.
The participants of the experiment will be asked about their relation to the artwork.
- The information sheet will be provided.
- Research is fully anonymous.
- Questions used in the questionnaire are Gillick Competent and are not related to any personal (harmful) issues.

Technical specimens of the sculpture:
- The full size of the sculpture will not extend 300 x 300 x 250 cm
- The weight of the sculpture will not extend 100 kg
- The materials used are constructive (hard to damage): oak wood and steel
- Sculpture will be prepared to gain FR by covered by incombustible substances. The wood will be Euroclass B and C FR, when assembled.
- The sculpture could be additionally assembled with ground by application of pegs, if necessary.
- Any risks, costs and liable responsibility lies on the side of the Researcher Institution and the Researcher himself (University of Ulster).
- The Chief Investigator of the Research is Mr. Ralf Sander. The contact details to Mr. Sander are:
  Art and Design Research Institute
  r.sander@ulster.ac.uk
  Room BB-06-002
  Belfast School of Art
  University of Ulster
  Belfast campus
tel.:+442895367359

Attachments:
- 1. Map of the placement of the sculpture
- 2. Information sheet
- 3. Copy of the questionnaire
- 4. Timetable
- 6. CV of the researcher
- 7. Letter of Intent
DEPARTMENT FOR COMMUNITIES

and

KRZYSZTOF KRZYSZTOF

LICENCE

DEPARTMENTAL SOLICITORS OFFICE
ORCHARD HOUSE
40 FOYLE STREET
LONDONDERRY
BT48 8AT
THIS LICENCE is made the day of Two Thousand and Sixteen BETWEEN the DEPARTMENT FOR COMMUNITIES of Orchard House, 40 Foyle Street, Derry, BT48 6AT (hereinafter called “the Licensor”) of the one part and KRZYSZTOF KRZYSZTOF PhD Researcher, Arts, Design & Build Environment, of the Research Institute, University of Ulster, Belfast Campus, 25-51 York Street, Belfast, BT15 1ED (hereinafter called “the Licensee”) of the other part WHEREBY IT IS AGREED AND DECLARED as follows:-

1. Subject as hereinafter contained the Licensor will permit the Licensee to occupy ALL THAT plot of ground situate at Foyle Street Urban Park (also known as Foyle Street Peace Park), Foyle Street, Derry more particularly shown on Drawing No 1 attached hereto and thereon hatched red (hereinafter called “the Premises”) for the purpose of the erection and siting of a temporary wood and steel sculpture (more particularly shown on Drawing No 2 attached hereto), to gather data from the public to be used in the Licensee’s PhD research entitled “Challenges of contemporary sculpture in the public space today” and for no other purposes whatsoever.

2. This Licence shall be exclusive to the Licensee and shall subsist (unless previously determined in the manner hereinafter mentioned) from 7.00am on Thursday 26 May 2016 to 17.00pm on Thursday 9 June 2016.

3. The Licence hereby created may be terminated at any time by the Licensor if the Licensee is in breach of any terms of the Licence or by either party giving to the other a minimum of 24 hours notice in writing of their intention so to do and the premises shall be returned to its original state as per clause (7) of this Agreement.

4. THE LICENSEE HEREBY AGREES WITH THE LICENSOR as follows:-

(1) Not to do or permit to be done upon the Premises or any part thereof any act or thing which may be or become a nuisance, damage, annoyance or inconvenience to the Licensor or the occupiers of any adjoining or neighbouring property or the neighbourhood or to the public and on receiving notice from the Licensor of any such act, matter or thing as aforesaid forthwith
to discontinue or remove the same and to take to the satisfaction of the Licenser all steps necessary and practical to prevent any recurrence of the same.

(2) Diligently to use and occupy the Premises for the purpose of the erection and siting of a temporary sculpture as detailed in clause (1) and for no other purposes whatsoever.

(3) Not to affix or exhibit or permit or suffer to be affixed or exhibited to or upon any part of the Premises any placard, poster, electric sign or other advertisement sign whatsoever without the previous written consent in writing of the Licenser.

(4) Not to do any matter or thing which would or might constitute a breach of any Statutory requirement affecting the premises.

(5) Not to deposit or permit to be deposited on the premises or any part thereof any litter.

(7) That as soon as the erection of the sculpture shall be completed at the Licensee's expense forthwith to remove from the premises all construction materials, plant and rubbish and to return the premises to its original ground contours and top soil and sow in grass and within 3 days to make good any damage caused to the grass, to the satisfaction of the Licenser.

(8) Not to assign, charge, underlet or otherwise part with the whole or any part of their interest or possession under this Agreement without the consent of the Department such consent not to be unreasonably withheld SAVE that the Licensee shall be entitled to licence any contractor or sub-contractor approved by the Department such approval not to be unreasonably withheld or delayed to enter onto the Premises to carry out works permitted under this Licence.

(9) To indemnify and keep indemnified the Licenser from and against all legal liability in respect of loss, damage, actions, proceedings, suits, claims, demands, costs, damages, liabilities or expenses in respect of any injury to or the death of any person, the damage to any property whether moveable or immoveable, the infringement or destruction of any rights,
easements or privileges or otherwise by reason of or arising in any way directly or indirectly out of the repair, state of repair, condition, existence or use of the Premises or works for which the Licensee, (its contractor, sub-contractors and persons under their control) are liable and to effect or cause to be effected the necessary insurance with a good and solvent insurance company to cover this indemnity upon written request and to produce such insurance policy or a sufficient extract therefrom and all renewal receipts on demand to the Department and to procure that the interest of the Department is noted in the said policy PROVIDED THAT the said indemnity is given on condition that no claim shall be settled without the written approval of the Licensee [and its insurers who or whose insurers shall have the conduct of any negotiations or litigation in respect of any matter to which the said indemnity applies].

(10) This Licence is personal to the Licensee and shall not be capable of being assigned or otherwise disposed of other than by way of surrender to the Licensor.

(11) This Agreement constitutes a Licence and confers no tenancy, or right or interest upon the Licensee and possession of the premises is retained by the Licensor except only insofar as may be necessary for the exercise of the rights hereby expressly conferred on it AND the Licensor reserves the power of entry and inspection of the premises at all times during the continuance of this Licence.

(12) The Licensee on determination of this Agreement by either party hereto shall have no claim against the Licensor for improvements disturbance or inconvenience or compensation of any sort or kind under any heading whatsoever.

AND IT IS ALSO AGREED between the parties hereto as follows:-

5. The Licensee agrees with the Licensor to pay and to indemnify the Licensor against all rates, taxes, assessments, duties, charges impositions and outgoings of an annual or other periodically recurring
nature payable in respect of the premises during the currency of the Licence.

6. The Licensor shall not be responsible to the Licensee or the Licensee's servants or agents or other persons on the premises or calling upon the Licensee for any accident, happening or injury suffered or damage to or loss of any chattels or property sustained on the premises unless same is caused by the act, neglect or fault of the Licensor.

7. The Licensor does not give any undertaking or warranty expressed or implied that the premises are suitable for the purpose of the Licensee's use thereof.

8. Any notice to be given or served hereunder upon the Licensee shall be sufficiently given or served if it is sent by registered post or recorded delivery service addressed to the Licensee at its last known place of business or by being left at the premises and shall if posted be deemed to have been received on the day following the date of such posting.

9. Nothing herein contained shall in any way render the Licensor responsible for the security, safekeeping, insurance, storage or preservation of any of the Licensee's goods, products or merchandise or other property left on the premises at any time and that all such items shall during the currency of this agreement be at the Licensee's sole risk.

10. Forthwith at the Licensee's own expense to take such steps as shall be necessary to obtain the consent of the proper Authority (other than the Department for Communities) before the commencement of the works.

11. If at any time hereafter a dispute, doubt or question shall arise between the parties concerning the construction, meaning or effect of this Licence or any provision herein contained or the respective rights or liabilities hereunder or otherwise in respect of the premises in every such dispute, doubt or question shall at the request of either party hereto be referred to a single arbitrator to be agreed upon by the parties or in default of such agreement to be appointed by the Chairman for the time being of the Northern Ireland branch or the Royal Institution of Chartered Surveyors in accordance with the Arbitration Act 1996 or any Statutory modification or re-enactment
thereof for the time being in force and the costs of such reference shall be borne equally by the parties hereto.

IN WITNESS whereof the parties hereto have executed this Agreement as hereinafter appears.

SIGNED on behalf of the DEPARTMENT for COMMUNITIES

Witnessed by

SIGNED by KRZYSZTOF KRZYSZTOF

Witnessed by
ATTACHMENT NO. 1 SCULPTURE PLACEMENT

Circa 5 meters from North-East entrance to the plaza and 2-3 meters from the sidewalk.
Red sign: symbolizes the sculpture on the map.
Szanowny Panie!

Nawiązując do Pana wystąpienia do Ministra Bogdana Zdrojewskiego pragnę na wstępie wyjaśnić, że wszelkie kwestie wynikające z umieszczenia Pana pracy w przestrzeni publicznej Krakowa może rozstrzygnąć tylko dysonent tejże przestrzeni (co sądząc z prasowych doniesień już się stało).

Odpowiadając na dalsze Pana pytania pragnę poinformować, że ani instytucje kultury, ani MKiDN nie sprawują wobec artystów, ani ich twórczości niechłubnej roli cenzora. Urząd ministra nie jest też powołany do uprawiania filozofii sztuki i estetyki (to zadanie krytyków sztuki). Funkcjonujące w aktach prawnych pojęcia dotyczące różnych obszarów twórczej aktywności (od prawa autorskiego – po przepisy emerytalne) mają na celu określenie zakresu regulowanego obszaru, a nie wartościowanie przedmiotu regulacji. Wielość miejsc i form organizacyjnych prezentacji pozwala na pokazanie każdego rodzaju twórczości. Bez wątpienia o kształcie twórczości decyduje sam artysta (inną sprawą jest społeczne zapotrzebowanie i odbiór jego dzieł oraz wszelkie prawne implikacje).

Trudno mi odnieść się do Pana pytania o wolną od cytatów kulturowych przestrzeń dla rzeźby – nie tylko miejsca, ale i każdy z nas jest „nosicielem” licznych wątków kulturowych, „wolność od nich” lub ich twórcze wykorzystanie jest kwestią indywidualnego wyboru. Instytucjonalnie programowane „otwarcie” lub „zamknięcie” w dzisiejszej rzeczywistości byłoby działaniem i nieskutecznym, i czysto propagandowym.

Pragnę dodać, że miejscem, gdzie młody artysta może znaleźć bardzo bogate materiały naukowe (opracowania, archiwalia, katalogi, periodyki) dotyczące współczesnej rzeźby oraz przyjazne miejsce do pracy z fachową obsługą jest Centrum Rzeźby Polskiej w Oronsku. W MKiDN zaś można ubiegać się o stypendium na realizację konkretnego programu artystycznego.

Doceniając wartość twórczych poszukiwań, łączę wyrazy szacunku.

Zenon Butkiewicz
Dyrektor
Departamentu Narodowych Instytucji Kultury
MKiDN
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