*Originalveröffentlichung in: Dani Karavan: esencja miejsca = Dani Karavan: the essence of place, Kraków 5015, S. 56-67*
*Online-Veröffentlichung auf ART-Dok (2023), DOI: https://doi.org/10.11588/artdok.00008650*

Monika Rydiger

# Points of Reference

The output of Dani Karavan yields to no instantly recognisable classification and escapes any rigid definitions. Although so individual, it does not, however, originate in isolation from the phenomena taking place in contemporary art and humanities. The artist has long actively participated in important prestigious events such as the Venice Biennial, the Sculpture Biennial in Middelheim, Art Basel and Documenta in Kassel, and works to commissions both in Israel and abroad, which lets him keep up closely with new developments and phenomena in the field of global art. Karavan's works – despite the exceptionally strong and independent creative personality of the author – carry the mark of the important transformations that either have taken or are currently taking place in contemporary art. In his innovative actions and new formulae, the artist has frequently anticipated decisive transformations. Let us try to define the most important points of reference, to which Karavan's output makes links.

## Transgressions

'I have spent most of my life', Dani Karavan confessed, 'living in an artistic no-man's land; I moved across borders and disciplines and between minimalism and conceptualism, narration and abstraction, sculpture and architecture, earth art and landscape design. I have attempted to transgress all conceivable boundaries, to break down all restrictive walls. Over time, this no-man's land has been transformed; once a stone rejected by the builders, it is now a cornerstone.'[1]

Crossing the borders between genres, inculcation of new principles and properties, and also going beyond its traditional comprehension, all so characteristic of contemporary art, have become the grounds for both the avant-garde changes of the first half of the 20th century and its later post-modern transformations. Obviously, strategies of crossing the boundaries of the arts have changed during a century under the impact of cultural,

1 Quoted from: Dani Karavan, 'Thoughts about a Path', [in:] *Dani Karavan: Retrospective*, ed. by Mordechai Omer, vol. I, Tel Aviv 2007, p. 406.

political, and sociological reorientations. The artists of the avant-garde expanded the notion of art, made ever new annexations in the name of novelty, exceptionality, and unlimited creative freedom. When the persistently absorbed areas that had not previously belonged to the field of art made the artists aware that anything can turn into art, it seemed that the transgressive potential was hindered. And yet towards the end of the 1970s, when the art of the trans-avant-garde and later post-modernism questioned the categories of the avant-garde, the need for transgression and abolishing the borders between the arts was in no way suppressed. What changed were only the mechanisms and goals behind the penetration of other realms. As Hal Foster noted, this significant change was 'moving away from the logic of the avant-garde transgression to the model of deconstructive displacements'.[2] What became the goal was the portrayal of the relativity of all principles, the 'problematisation' of rules characteristic of deconstructivist practices, and the performance of a 'revaluation of all values'.[3] The beginning of the 21st century in art still meant an incessant expansion of its territory, especially through the new experiences drawn from the fields of digital technology and biotechnology.

## Space

'Most of my works create the space for this kind of performance where people act in the setting I offer them.'[4]

In all the artist's works from *Monument to the Negev Brigade* (1963–1968, Be'er Sheva, Israel) to *Axe Majeur* (from 1980 onwards, Cergy-Pontoise, France), which is still being developed, space – marking and articulating it, and the development of spatial sequences – has remained the key artistic question.

Without doubt, space has become the greatest fascination of contemporary artists. Looking for the origin of this obsession with space, one needs to go back to the watershed of great significance provided by the pursuits and experiments of the Cubists. A consequence of the 'opening of the solid' developed in the paintings of Georges Braque and Pablo Picasso was not only divorce from mimetic reproduction for the sake of its reconstruction/construction in an image, but also a new concept of 'transparent sculpture', which, to quote Kahnweiler, 'does not

---

2 Hal Foster, *The Return of the Real*, Cambridge, MA 1996, p. XII.

3 On 'problematisation' and 'revaluation of all values' characteristic of deconstructionism, see: Anna Burzyńska, 'Dekonstrukcja: próba krytycznego bilansu', [in:] *Po strukturalizmie – współczesne badania teoretycznoliterackie*, ed. by Ryszard Nycz, Wrocław 1992, p. 57; R. Nycz, *Tekstowy świat*, Warszawa 1993, p. 29.

4 Quoted from: 'Interview: Dani Karavan Talking to Ingrid and Konrad Scheurmann', [in:] Ingrid and Konrad Scheurmann, *Dani Karavan, Homage to Walter Benjamin: "Passages", Place of Remembrance at Portbou*, Mainz 1995, p. 97.

respect the continuous epidermis of the solid bodies that it desires to recreate but finds visual signs that portray these bodies in an open state'.[5] The aerial – 'negative' – space present in the sculptures of Picasso and Alexander Archipenko attracted attention to the extraordinary values of operating with empty space. The problem of the 'aesthetic impact of the void' would still be taken up in the mid-20th century by Henry Moore, Alberto Giacometti and David Smith, and later the question of emptiness will be 'problematised' by others: Anthony Caro, Maya Lin, Rachel Whiteread, and Anish Kapoor.

For constructivists, space became a material on a par with mass. The conviction about the infinity of space and its homogeneous nature let Katarzyna Kobro put forth the concept of 'sculpture without borders'. In 1931, the artist wrote, 'sculpture has no borders that would stop its expansion. (...) Space is uniform and the same everywhere. Sculpture knows no natural borders. Sculpture grows in all directions.' [6]

The Cubist breakthrough implied also parallel changes in architecture. It digressed from the traditional articulation of space and the concept of the architecture shell for the sake of the open form and the idea of the continuity of space. Architects-modernists emphasised the melding of internal and external space, and their pièce de résistance and pioneering example was the architecture of the Fagus factory in Alfeld (1910–1925), designed by Walter Gropius and Adolf Meyer. Constructions ceased to be simply volumes and places and turned into spaces stimulating human behaviour and generating ways of moving within their premises.

Architects fell into a particular celebration of the idea of space 'without end', which developed over a longer period of time, in the 1970s. Excessively extruded into 'infinity', it gave the impression of disappearing at the horizon, which Charles Jencks dryly defined as 'the railroad perspective'.[7] A departure from that idea occurred together with the emergence of post-modernist architecture, proposing multi-layer, 'sensuous', mysterious, and 'mannerist' space. Deconstructivists went even further: by the maximum problematisation of spatial questions they offered architecture resulting in a spatial burst challenging our normal sense of space and time.

The alignment of fascinations and pursuits, the touching of similar questions, especially of a spatial nature, brought sculpture and architecture close to each other and opened a new chapter in mutual relations. This complex process of mixing the scopes of the two fields is a particular phenomenon of contemporary art. Today, from the perspective of over a century, we can clearly trace how – in its visible fascinations with contemporary space – contemporary art

---

5 Quoted from: Adam Kotula, Piotr Krakowski, *Rzeźba współczesna*, Warszawa 1980, p. 87.

6 Katarzyna Kobro, Władysław Strzemiński, *Kompozycja przestrzeni, obliczenia rytmu czasoprzestrzennego*, Łódź 1931, [reprint 1993], p. 7.

7 Charles Jencks, *Architektura późnego modernizmu*, transl. by Barbara Gadomska, Warszawa 1989, p. 60.

moved from the vision of homogeneous space to the awareness of heterogeneous nature, from defining the space to experiencing its 'here and now', from the visual to the temporal character of space, from the selection of space for its capacity for its most important medium to the examination of space as a function of art.
When in March 1967, Michel Foucault stated in his famous lecture that: 'The current period will probably be the era of space to a greater degree. We are in the time of simultaneity, in the time of juxtaposing, in the time of things near and far, one next to another, distributed',[8] he heralded a spatial shift that, beginning with the 1980s, took place not only in art but also in all the humanities, expanding and deepening the area of their research.

## Place

'I subsequently had to cover only the short distance before I arrived at my conception of place; of art made for a specific place and of art as a place; and of the connection between painting, sculpture and architecture.'[9]

The first work to embody that intention most fully was *Monument to the Negev Brigade*, in which Karavan anticipated the later current of site-specific sculpture. The fact that the artist had the possibility of selecting an appropriate location for his work himself was of capital importance. This from the very beginning let him consider the monument, its form and content, in the integral context of the topography of his selected site, its insolation, directions of wind, visual axes, and the acacia growing there. Now, creating all his subsequent works, Karavan would begin with becoming familiar with the properties of a given site and its history, and the insight into his own emotions that the place stimulates. This is how *Passages* (1990–1994) – a work commemorating Walter Benjamin – was designed in the Spanish city of Portbou. As the artist himself reminisced:
'Only during the second visit did I discover the phenomenon of the turbulent sea. And I thought: that's it. And then I said to myself: Now that we've found this, we should look for other possibilities – and we discovered them. That's how the "Passage" project came into existence. This work was truly born on the spot, not in my head in the studio.'[10]

---

8 Michel Foucault, 'Inne przestrzenie', excerpt from a lecture delivered in March 1967, transl. by Agnieszka Rejniak-Majewska, *Teksty Drugie*, no. 6, 2005, p. 117.

9 Quoted from: Dani Karavan, 'Thoughts about a Path', op. cit., p. 406.

10 Quoted from: *Interview: Dani Karavan Talking to Ingrid and Konrad Scheurmann*, op. cit., p. 77.

Artistic works developed in the context of space are defined – according to the terminology accepted in literature on art – as 'site-specific'. They let themselves be subjugated to the parameters of the location, they are imagined with the location in mind, and are intrinsically connected to it, and yet they neither embellish, nor describe, nor illustrate the place, but become a part of it.[11]

Development of this category of work was without doubt an aftermath of a number of phenomena that came into being in the first half of the 20th century, including the absorption or rejection of the pedestal and the 'homelessness' of sculpture resulting from fact (as proved by Rosalind Krauss in her famous essay *Sculpture in the Expanded Field* from 1979).[12] Bereft of its traditional support and permanent site, sculpture yielded to a scattering in space, which was possible also thanks to the rejection of the monolithic form in favour of an open structure resulting from the discontinuation of classical modelling techniques or casting for the sake of the building, construction, and the juxtaposition of forms. When early in the 1960s Anthony Caro ascertained that he was 'not interested in monuments' and explained that he had 'enough of objects on pedestals'[13], it was already a reaction to modernist sculpture being a timeless, abstract, pure work of art which – despite the artists' conviction of the homogenity of space, declared in the 'openness' of form, fascination in the flow of space and its infinity – nonetheless retained its autonomy in the actual environment. In turn, Caro's sculptures, set directly on the ground, limited, divided, and defined a selected area. Activating the surrounding space, they created a site. For Richard Serra, Beverly Pepper, and Daniel Buren, this specific place – whether in an urban or natural context – and its properties determined the scale, size, and placement of the works.

As Miwon Kwon remarked, by continuous evolution, site-centred art became enriched with successive site-specific permutations, defined with new terms: site-determined, site-conscious, site-responsive, and site-related.[14] In turn, the critics who today believe the notion of site-specific to be imprecise and inadequate for new artistic practices, proffer new terms, including context-specific, debate-specific, audience-specific, and community-specific.[15] They address more complex relations between art and the site in which, rather than being just a physical and topographical place of reference, the site is a complex, semantic context of multiple meanings: social, political,

---

11 See: 'Richard Serra from the Yale Lecture', [in:] *Art in Theory 1900–1990: An Anthology of Changing Ideas*, ed. by Charles Harrison, Paul Wood, Oxford 1993, p. 1125.

12 Rosalind E. Krauss, 'Sculpture in the Expanded Field', [in:] eadem, *The Originality of the Avant-Garde and Others Modernists Myths*, Cambridge (USA) 1985, p. 280.

13 Quoted from: David Mellor, *The Sixties Art: Scene in London*, London 1993, p. 95.

14 Miwon Kwon, *One Place after Another:* Site-Specific *Art and Locational Identity*, Cambridge, MA 2002, p. 1.

15 Ibidem, p. 2.

historical, and symbolic. Moreover, they emphasise the difference between site-specific works from the 1970s and 1980s, and the products of the last two decades, whose characteristic feature is a greater sensitivity to the psychological context of the site.
Such a complex context is characteristic of all Dani Karavan's site-specific works that become the product of the artistic vision and the particular dialogue that the artist enters when negotiating with those commissioning the work, local authorities, the local community, its needs, and its shared memory.[16]

## Here and Now

'I think that in some respect my work is figurative since without people it doesn't exist. These individual creations are not there to be looked at. You have to be inside them and become part of them. And it's good if someone who enters these places sees other visitors moving around. Sometimes many, sometimes few.'[17]

This property is characteristic of all of the artist's site-specific works. In *Monument to the Negev Brigade*, *Passages*, *Way of Light* (1987–1988, Seoul, Korea), *Art Forest* (1998–2006, Murou, Japan), the visitor becomes a necessary component, and his or her individual spatial experience – both physical and psychological – becomes the proper reading of the work.
The fact that the actual space is not only the context of a work, but at the same time also its content, places the spectator (or, rather, the participant) in an entirely new situation. It forces him into a particular confrontation with the structure of the work, into moving within its scope, and into active experience in the place of passive contemplation.
Such a clear shift of accent – from the passive viewing of a work being an autonomous object to the definition and experiencing of its space by the spectator, was disclosed with full power by the minimal art sculpture of the 1960s. What Robert Morris, Donald Judd, and Carl Andre found significant was the actual spatial context of the works. For Robert Morris, the geometrical forms of grey-painted plywood set up at the exhibition at New York's Green Gallery (1964) and the area of space developed between them were compositionally equal elements of his sculpture. The huge grey 'beams' lay directly on the floor, with 'corners' resting on the walls. The sculpture became an actual element of an actual space, the same space in which the spectator now had to move. The forms

---

16 See: Idith Zertal, 'Tikkun Olam – Mending the World: On Art and Politics in the Work of Dani Karavan', [in:] *Dani Karavan: Retrospective*, op. cit., pp. 393–392.

17 Quoted from: 'Interview: Dani Karavan Talking to Ingrid and Konrad Scheurmann', op. cit., p. 97.

stood in his or her way, forcing him or her to go around them, step over them, and situate himself or herself behind or in front of them, so communing with the work 'here and now'.
This is precisely what Michael Fried criticised in his essay *Art and Objecthood* published in 1967, charging the sculpture of minimal art with 'theatricity', carrying the symptoms of 'drama' conditioned by the presence of a spectator and his or her perception continuing in time.[18]

## Way, Passage

Recalling working on *Monument to the Negev Brigade*, Karavan admits that he wanted it to be 'a sculpture that could be climbed, stepped on, touched, listened to, smelt, seen. A sculpture that engages all the senses, and which directs the visitor's movement through space.'[19]

Stimulating the spectator/onlooker to negotiate the successive spatial sequences of the work – covering a specific path – also became the key question in the artist's later projects, to mention *Linea 1-2-3* (1982–2000, garden of sculpture Fattoria di Celle near Pistoia, Italy), *Axe Majeur*, *Way of Human Rights* (1989–1993, Nuremberg, Germany), and Way of Peace (1996–2000, Niccana, Israel), for example.

'Contemporary sculpture is haunted with the concept of passage', claims Rosalind Krauss in her *Passages in Modern Sculpture* published in 1977.[20] This specific property surfaced not only in the works created for gallery spaces (e.g. Bruce Nauman's Corridor), but primarily in the first projects by land art artists. Robert Smithson, Michael Heizer, Nancy Holt, and James Turrell moved away from using abstract art for the sake of exploring specific places in a natural landscape. Land art made artists realise that sculpting pursuits may acquire an absolutely new scale, and with the change of parameters of the works, the principles of the functioning of sculptures in space change as well. The vast sizes of works by artists of this current confronted the spectator with them in an entirely different, highly active manner. To become familiar with its form, structure, and 'content', he or she had to walk into the space of a work and perform a range of activities, for example 'run, walk, examine, pass, wait, encounter...' (as listed by Robert Morris in a long list of the activities envisaged of a recipient who would like to become familiar with Observatory, his work dating from 1971–1977).[21]

---

18 See: Maria Hussakowska, *Minimalizm*, Kraków 2003, pp. 34–35.

19 Quoted from: Mordechai Omer, 'Early and Late in Dani Karavan's Oeuvre', [in:] *Dani Karavan: Retrospective*, op. cit., p. 403.

20 R.E. Krauss, *Passages in Modern Sculpture*, New York 1977, p. 282.

21 See: John Beardsley, *Earthworks and beyond*, New York 1989, p. 29.

The timespace formula of communing with a work of sculpture, watching it and experiencing 'on the road' became a valid feature of art, not only of land art, but of minimalist art as well. Donald Judd's Eight Boxes set in the row, or the bricks placed by Carl Andre, one behind another, directly on the floor of the gallery, provoked the onlooker with their horizontal layout to penetrate the spatial context of the work, to cover a certain distance, a path. Rosalind Krauss believes that what had a significant impact on the American artists of minimalist art was the book: *Phenomenology of Perception* by Maurice Merleau-Ponty, published in English in 1962. The French philosopher argued that 'our body is not set in space in the same manner as objects are; it inhabits or visits it, and adjusts to it like a hand does to a tool – and that is why when you want to change places, you do not have to move it as one moves an object. You move it, doing without tools, in a way that to a certain extent is magic, as it belongs to us and endows us with a direct access to space.'[22]

Such a manifested digression from the traditional logic of sculpture as an object for the sake of the active experiencing of the space of the work was reinforced by Joseph Beuys, in whose artistic pursuits the action and the triggering of a reaction were always more important than the final product that is a material work of art is. Thus, the activity of the spectator became a significant element, as if a part of the work itself. The role of the spectator ceased to be limited to passive contemplation, and the decoding of the impressions and personal experiences of the artist. The profound relations were to run between the work itself and its recipient.

## Redefinition of a Monument

Eran Neuman writes thus about Karavan's work:

'Passage through *Monument to the Negev Brigade*, which generates the narrative, enables spectators to transpire between the abstract and the concrete, between the private and the public, thereby enlivening memory. The encounter with the Monument does not distinguish between the visual-symbolic and the tectonic facets, but rather leads the visitors to the act of memory as performers who give form to memory and commemoration beyond its symbolisation.'[23]

---

22 Maurice Merleau-Ponty, *Wyznanie wiary*, transl. by Stanisław Cichowicz, [in:] Jacek Migasiński, *Merleau-Ponty*, Warszawa 1995, pp. 160–161.

23 Eran Neuman, *The Dialectical Meaning of Form*, [in:] *Dani Karavan: Retrospective*, op. cit., vol. II, p. 847.

The fact that space became the goal of sculpture had significant consequences for working out new forms of a monument. In an essay from 1995, Michael North stated that 'most distinctive public sculpture of the last 30 years was the disappearance of the sculpture itself.'[24]

It is nothing else but public sculpture, developing dynamically from the early 1980s, that clearly pointed to the change in the role of the recipient – from a passive onlooker to an active participant.

An expression of these changes in commemorative art was the Vietnam Veterans Memorial in Washington, designed by Maya Lin in 1981. The form of the monument is a 'crack in the ground' – two converging pedestrian paths in the shape of the letter V, gradually falling below the level of the ground. Visitors follow them at their individual pace, and stopping they read the names of the nearly sixty thousand killed, chiselled into the wall lining one side of the 'crack'. In this work, the emphasis is not on the shape of the monument, but of the reactions of the visitor who – reading the names of the soldiers – sees his or her reflection in the polished stone, being a particular memento.

The case of Peter Eisenman's *Memorial to the Murdered Jews of Europe in Berlin* (1998–2005) is similar: the abstract and stark structure of the work operates not as a form of commemoration but as a catalyser of memory.

Surrounded on all sides by straight concrete blocks of identical width and length, but varying in height (from 0.2 to 4.8 m), the visitor moves along narrow passages, walking on an undulating floor, with every step experiencing an ever more profound sense of isolation, being hunted, and alienation. The point of gravity is shifted from the material layer of the work to the experiencing of its 'metaphysical void'. What in this case becomes the more important part of the commemorative function is the act of rememoration (or recollection: Paul Ricoeur's *remémoration*).

Of breakthrough significance for the new approach to monument design were the international competitions in the middle of the 20th century and the winning projects.

In 1953, the Institute of Contemporary Arts (ICA) in London announced a competition for the Monument to the Unknown Political Prisoner. The composition of the jury was certainly a decisive factor in the victory of Reg Butler's innovative project, with a majority championing abstract art, notably Herbert Read, Roland Penrose, and Henry Moore. Butler rejected the concept of a monumental sculpture, and replaced the solid with 'a drawing in space', rejecting at the same time traditional materials and the figurative nature of the form. He created an abstract spatial and architectonic structure that requires that the onlooker enters the work and moves within its space.[25] The

---

24 Michael North, 'Sfera publiczna jako rzeźba. Od *Civitas Dei* do ornamentu z ludzkiej masy', *Magazyn Sztuki*, no. 6/7,1995, pp. 179–180.

25 See: Robert Burstow, 'Projekt Rega Butlera w konkursie na Pomnik Nieznanego Więźnia Politycznego: Abstrakcja a polityka zimnej wojny', *Rzeźba Polska* 1989, pp. 81–90.

subject of the following international competition, announced in 1957 by the International Auschwitz Committee, was a monument commemorating the victims of the Nazi Concentration Camp in Auschwitz. The jury, presided over by Henry Moore, selected the design of the Monument – The Road presented by the Polish team Oskar and Zofia Hansen, Jerzy Jarnuszkiewicz, Julian Pałka, Edmund Kupiecki, and Lechosław Rosiński. In their design, the monument was treated as a spatial assignment. The essence of innovation was the rejection of the concept of the figurative monument: the authors turned the entire space of the camp, intersected by a diagonally running road – a straight line of black asphalt: the symbol of crossing out the nightmare – into a monument. Everything that was situated on both sides of the road was to remain preserved unchanged and undergo deconstruction with time. The gate of the camp, through which the inmates entered, was to be locked once and for ever so that now no one else walked through it. The designers made the element of time a significant component of the project: the compositional whole monument could be deciphered only thanks to the visitor's movement within its space in a specific time. Although never carried out, both the competition entries described above significantly influenced the redefinition of a contemporary monument. What actualised and developed these important transformations was *Monument to the Negev Brigade* by Dani Karavan, which – entirely independently of contemporary pursuits – developed a new language of artistic creation of important places of memory, where the natural spatial context becomes at the same time the message of the monument. The abstract, quasi architectonic forms created together with the visitor passing among them build a particular, live narrative of memory.
Karavan also developed this specific language of expression in other commemorative works: in Passages, in the place of memory in the French camp, Gurs (1993–1994), in the *Memorial to the Sinti and Roma Victims of the National Socialist Regime* (1992–2012) in Berlin. Their time-space formula, the creation of various levels of perception, and the stimulation of the visitor to activity results in an extraordinary amalgam of emotions: physical experience, artistic impressions, individual projection, and collective memory.

## Between Individual Expression and Public Function

'I wanted to work for society, for people, to be in the middle of things and to react to human existence.'[26]

The works of the artist cannot be examined only and solely as autonomous works of art. Both the physical location in a selected natural or urban spatial context, and the historic, humanist, social, and political messages

26 Quoted from: Ch. Jencks, *Architektura późnego modernizmu*, op. cit., p. 81.

they contain make them a particular dialogue between individual expression and the sensitivity of the artist and multiple aspects of collective existence. A significant element complementing the significance and expression of Karavan's works is the unforeseeable and spontaneous reaction of the community that they may trigger. *Kikar Levana* (1977–1988) and *Kikar HaBima* (2005–2015), another Square in Tel Aviv, clearly imply positive interactions with the locals who visit them and treat them as meeting places. *Axe Majeur* is the favourite destination of walkers and joggers. In turn, the sculpture entitled *Mizrach* – the *Monument of the Regensburg Synagogue* (2005, Germany) commemorating a temple destroyed in the 16th century, is a site of meetings, children's games, and relaxation for tourists. Such a resonance within a community does not have to be fully consistent with the artist's expectations. Although the dichotomy between public and private functions in theory functions together with the assumption that the public is to be universal and based on consensus: 'for everyone', yet experience teaches that one cannot hope that public art could express values that are precious and actually understandable to everyone. The civil context of its functioning is broad, incoherent, and to a great extent unforeseeable.

The first determined efforts aimed at bringing art close to everyday life were made by pop art artists, who Clement Greenberg, afraid of this marriage of high art with mass culture, warned against a few years earlier in his famous essay on *Avant-Garde and Kitsch* (1939).[27]

A true turning point in the opening of art to everyday existence was provided by the views and works of Joseph Beuys. In his theory of 'community sculpture', Beuys postulated that art penetrated various aspects of life and that its functions are expanded by tasks lying beyond aesthetics. He believed that art going beyond art itself, imbuing the everyday, stands a chance of abolishing the hiatus between the work and the observer. The artists of post-modernism displayed a clear weariness with art torn away from reality. To a certain extent, that was a reaction to conceptualism and tautological investigations of art about art, and partially it resulted from the programme of practising 'aesthetic populism' (in line with the diagnosis of Fredric Jameson) and the full opening of post-modernism to mass culture. Today, after years of experience and transformation, public art becomes liberated from the aesthetising function. In the place of integration with the site, it proposes artistic interventions, creates unexpected situations, and is eager to knock people out from the obvious. These are activities not so much designed for a community that already exists but rather eager to create and co-develop that community.[28]

---

27 See: Jonathan Harris, 'Modernism and Culture in the USA, 1930–1960', [in:] *Modernism in Dispute: Art since the Forties*, ed. by Paul Wood, Francis Frascina, Jonathan Harris, Charles Harrison, New Haven and London 1993, pp. 53–62.

28 See: http://publicartnow.com/2013/12/12/the-new-rules-of-public-art, accessed on 6 April 2015, and M. Kwon, *One Place after Another...*, op. cit., p. 60.

Analysing the works of Dani Karavan, Christoph Brockhaus wrote:

'The unique character of his sculptural work lies in the incomparable combination of site-specific environment and public commission. Karavan is not only one of the inventors of social, site-specific sculpture, but also a strenuous advocate of all it stands for. No other contemporary artist adopted such a radical democratic public stance. Without the backing of collectors of gallery owners, without saleable works for interior display, he embarked on the greatest existential risk that an artist can take – and this at a time of crises in public space and public art. In this sense he occupies a contrarian position.'[29]

While the artist himself openly admits:

'I work for people in order to invite them to communicate with the environment, materials, memory, and themselves.'[30]

29 Christoph Brockhaus, 'Public Commissions: Dani Karavan's Specific Environments', [in:] *Dani Karavan: Retrospective*, op. cit., vol. II, p. 842.

30 Quoted from: Pierre Restany, *Dani Karavan*, Munich 1992, p. 125.