



Research Paper

Reception of Art in the Public Space - The Most Common Reasons for Non-acceptance and Their Causes¹

Tomáš Timko

Internal doctoral student

University of Prešov, Slovakia

Faculty of Arts, Institute of Aesthetics and Art Culture

ABSTRACT: *In the study we analyse the goals, reception and social impact of art in the public space. A potentially wide group of recipients has the opportunity to reciprocate the art located directly in an environment that usually serves the pragmatic needs of ordinary people. If the work catches the public's attention, many individuals usually distribute a reproduction of the work in the form of a photograph on the Internet via social networks. However, the mass availability of art presented in this way can also lead to the expression of negative reactions of its perceiver. The aim of the study is to name; and to some extent categorise the reasons for not accepting visual artistic expressions in public space. In principle, they can be categorised into: pragmatic (i.e. practical), subjective (i.e. reasons for non-acceptance based on the recipient's individual previous experiences) and reasons for non-acceptance given by the varying degree of sensitivity of the perceiver. We draw on specific extreme cases of non-acceptance of an artistic expression, the consequence of which was that it had to be removed from the public space or replaced by another work. The categorisation can serve as recommendations for practice, as based on the identification of shortcomings, artists can avoid them in their further work for public space, as well as the creators of this space themselves. This is also one of the paths to the durability, or rather to the temporary stability and wider reach of the presented artistic production.*

KEYWORDS: *Visual Art, Art in Public Space, Perceiver, Negative Reactions, Non-acceptance of Art*

Received 08 Dec, 2021; Revised 21 Dec, 2021; Accepted 23 Dec, 2021 © The author(s) 2021.

Published with open access at www.questjournals.org

I. INTRODUCTION

Unlike productions presented in the environment of art institutions, art in public space is presented to a much wider audience. It is not a homogeneous group of recipients interested in art, but an extremely heterogeneous group of people with different aesthetic and cultural preferences. At the same time, each of its members considers the public space to varying degrees as an environment in which the communications² should be represented in accordance with its value setting. It logically follows from this fact that the chance of not accepting the offered artistic production is relatively high and depends mainly on the composition of the mentioned heterogeneous group, i.e. the public that uses a particular space, or has an impact on its creation and regulation.

In the presented text, using the method of generalization on the basis of specific examples, we will suggest a possible categorization of the most common reasons that lead to the non-acceptance of art in the public space. Based on them, the lay (and in some cases professional) public initiates a discussion about the removal of problematic art or its replacement with other works. These extreme consequences confirm the mood of not accepting art in public space, so in the application part of the text, when creating categories, we exemplify precisely the artistic manifestations that this fate has befallen. We focus only on artistic productions that have a material, i.e. object form, even though the current trend in art in the public space is moving more from monumental objects to social, i.e. viewer-oriented artistic events. Our main reason is the greater durability of works with a material nature, thanks to which they can be re-evaluated by the public for a longer period of time.

¹ This essay is the result of the project VEGA no. 1/0051/19 *Music and dramatic art within 19th and 20th century aesthetic theory and aesthetic education in Slovakia*, realised at the University of Prešov, Faculty of Arts, Institute of Aesthetics and Art Culture.

² The most common visual communications, i.e. advertisements, decorations and objects of visual art.

II. PUBLIC SPACE AS A PLATFORM FOR THE EXHIBITION OF ART

We most often understand public space as a part of the urban environment that is owned by the state or local government. The definition of public space must also take into account the right of the public, the individual or the collective, to access it, as well as the right to participate in its use. Ideally, we consider a public space to be one that everyone has the right to enter without being excluded on grounds of social or economic means, and to be free to use it for any activity that does not conflict with the rights and regulations of the locality. In a broader sense, however, it can also include places such as a gallery, museum, or cinema where anyone can come if they pay and abide by certain regulations (PaPs, 2021). In the context of our text, we focus on art, placed in a freely accessible space, while it is mostly the exteriors of cities (street, square, etc.).

Art that is located in a public space should be freely accessible to the public. Therefore, in the following we also use the term *public art* to refer to these productions. These are often specific artistic realisations that the author creates for a specific place or audience and are therefore related to the context in which they are located. They can be permanent or temporary. Public art can include all forms of art and its parameters are constantly expanding. In the introduction we declared that we will deal only with art that has a material, i.e. tangible form. This is mainly due to its durability: auditory or dramatic art production in a public space always lasts a specific time, usually a maximum of several tens of minutes. If it is not accepted, the recipient should react immediately, or during the production itself, because after its completion, he can only object to its further implementation. It is also usually much easier to prevent the realisation of this kind of art than to remove a material object from public space.

A special type of art in public space is the production realized in such a form that it is even difficult for the recipient to recognise their artistic intention. These are mainly happenings or social, viewer-oriented events. They may be impermanent and incoherent, they may exist only for a moment or in multiple instances, they may be immaterially suspended and insubstantial, or they may even be realised exclusively in discrete mental spaces (Hein, 1996). As an example of such a production, we present a dramatic performance by students of the University of Prešov called *Redundance or the sea humming of Prešovská street*, which was realised in 2008 on the street in front of a cafe near the university campus of Prešov University in Prešov, Slovakia. As Eva Kušnířová (2019) writes, the authors tried to create an artifact at the busy pace of the university campus, while production initially looks like a normal event, taking place in an everyday space that fulfils a pragmatic function in the lives of its inhabitants. Students stage banal manifestations of civilian life (arrival and stay on the terrace of the cafe, refreshments, attempts at communication between guests, the bustle of a nearby road, etc.). These were sharpened in the form of a hysterical onslaught of attacks on the consciousness of the participants, ending with the paradoxical mental collapse of the waiter, who pours the ordered drinks on his head (Kušnířová, 2019). Although the overdramatic situation at the end of the performance suggests (among other indications) that it is an artistic production, the random recipient may not perceive its entire duration, so the author's intention may escape them. However, due to its banality and ephemerality, this type of art production in public space does not encounter the negative reactions of the audience to such an extent that they are on the same level as the removal of a tangible artistic objects from public space.

2.1 The impact of public art on the urban environment and its citizens

In terms of general cultural and social impacts, we are interested in the report of the American Public Art Network Advisory Council (2014), which distinguishes five areas of reasons why art in public space makes sense. These are:

1) Cultural value and community identity

Cities and towns strive to be places where people want to live and which they want to visit. Having a special community identity is becoming important. When we think of attractive places in cities, it is mostly architecture and works of visual art that captures our imagination. Art in public space co-creates the identity of cities, and thus our own, human identity.

2) The artist as a contributor to cultural value

Public art brings artists and their creative vision into the civic decision-making process. In addition to the aesthetic benefits that works of art have in public places, artists can also contribute to the proper planning of public spaces, as they bring a special interpretation and inspire creative solutions.

3) Social value and urban creation

Public art is a reflection of its place and time and activates the imagination. It encourages people to pay more attention to the environment in which they live. It also stimulates thinking about the social sphere as a whole. It is accessible and allows people to experience art throughout their daily lives. A work of art can also lead the viewer to self-reflection.

4) Social value and cooperation

Efforts to create art for public space are not alone: the process of public art requires the artist to collaborate with others (e.g. local government, possibly also citizens) throughout his development. As a result,

the work can be reflected throughout the community, promoting a sense of shared ownership and collective belonging.

5) Economic value and regeneration

Public art can be an essential element when a municipality wants to make economic progress and be viable for its current and potential citizens. The data clearly indicate that cities with an active and dynamic cultural scene are more attractive to individuals and businesses. Public art can be a key factor in creating a city's cultural activity.

The practice of the Canadian city of Toronto is proof of the above hypotheses about the importance of public art for cities and regions. In the autumn of 2021, the first "*Year of Public Art*" began in the city, with a total of ten years planned. The Toronto city government will support a total budget of \$4.5 million for the first year. The city is thus responding to the challenges of an improved public artistic strategy with a greater commitment to equality in the placement of installations, the level of involvement in the communities and the artists who create the works. Public art installations in the city have increased over the last 50 years, with more than 700 installations added between 1967 and 2015 (Cobb, 2021). The city thus creates a dignified space for domestic creatives interested in public art, but also attracts new, creative people who can also use public art to build community and promote social inclusion.

Last but not least, the aesthetic experience that the recipient has in contact with art in public space is important. In order to fulfil its function as a work of art, an artistic realisation must become an aesthetic object (Zuska, 2001). In the process of conceiving the aesthetic object as the completion of the act of aesthetic reception, two basic problems arise in relation to art (and contemporary art in particular) in public space: 1. the recipient often has difficulty identifying whether it is art or not, both in the context of performative productions and those that have a material substance; 2. the casual viewer mostly does not have enough time for the reception itself, and since the aesthetic object is a temporal object, arising between the material work and the consciousness of the receiver during an aesthetic situation with a certain duration, it is almost impossible to conceive it qualitatively in usually only a few seconds of time (Zuska, 2001). The aesthetic situation thus does not remain complete and the result is an exceptionally superficial aesthetic perception, which results in insufficient appreciation in the public space of the offered artistic production. In our opinion, it is possible to make a significant contribution to solving the first problem, by authors, curators and producers informing the potential viewer as much as possible, using all available platforms and communication channels. The educated spectator can then devote more of his time to art, even though we believe that the demand for time investment will, unfortunately, remain unattainable for most current random recipients. However, if we look at works of art in public space with limited optics only as certain forms of decoration without an effort for a concentrated aesthetic reception, the crisis situations leading to the requirements for the removal of works will continue to increase.

III. POSSIBLE CATEGORIZATION OF IMPULSES FOR NEGATIVE ADMISSION OF ART IN PUBLIC SPACE

The years 2020 and 2021, also associated with the COVID-19 pandemic, confirm that we are in the midst of a widespread systematic failure: the failure of global healthcare systems and their ability to respond to a pandemic; the failure of our economic systems, which are unable to cope with the consequences of global lockdown; the failure of many government systems to respond to the civil call for social justice and anti-racism (Cartiere, 2020). So we are probably at the right time to start the difficult task of rethinking the systems that form the basis of our social structures. With the help of public art and responses to it, we can often gain an overview of our wider societal issues, fears, and controversies (Cartiere, 2020). In our opinion, we can learn a lot about today's society precisely thanks to artistic realisations that create controversy, stimulate public debate, or the "process" with them is already closed and confirmed that they are not able to succeed in the test of time.

Public art takes place in public space and must be accessible to the public. With each new project, awareness of it grows among contemporary artists and ordinary people alike, encouraging them to participate in how public space should be defined (Jagannath, 2018). This can also lead to some disputes over who has the right to design a public space: the public or art professionals? City residents, who live, work and travel to work in this area on a daily basis and have to put up with the art around them, increasingly feeling that they have the right to comment on what has been created in their city (Jagannath, 2018). Citizens can express their will or displeasure in various ways: through moderate commenting on various platforms³, but also through the extreme form of damaging and destroying works, which we collectively refer to as vandalism. Both types of manifestations can lead to extreme solutions, which are the removal of a work of art from public space, or its replacement by another work. We consider these reactions to be the culmination of the process of non-

³ Offline in face-to-face contact, e.g. by contributing to a meeting of local political bodies, or in the press, or also online on social networks, blogs, through videos, etc.

acceptance of art by the public, and as part of the exemplification we have therefore chosen works that have been affected by the fate of exclusion from public space.

Perhaps one of the most famous cases in modern art history when a work of art had to be removed from public space is the *Tilted Arc* installation affair by author Richard Serra. The controversial minimalist building was created by a custom artist in the Arts in Architecture program, Foley Federal Plaza in New York City Manhattan. It was installed here between 1981 and 1989. The statue consisted of a steel arch 120 meters long and about 12 meters high, and from these dimensions it is clear that it had a huge impact on the geographical environment. According to Serra, the sculpture was designed to give the viewer a special sense of the space and an appreciation for the changes the public feels as they walk past it (Jagannath, 2018). Despite its noble intentions, however, the statue was not much appreciated by the public: as a practical matter, it made it impossible for workers from surrounding buildings to go directly into the building; they had to walk around the statue, which they felt was just an inconvenience (Laneri, 2017). The public also accused it of being too dominant, which drew too much attention to itself at the expense of the surrounding architecture. Residents and businesses in the area have therefore signed a petition to have the statue removed. The author was offended by the public's comments, which even led to a lawsuit in which the public won (Jagannath, 2018). Eventually the statue was removed, giving the space a different meaning again. Based on this case, we identify the first category of reasons for not accepting art in public space, which is its *impracticality*.

The case of removing the work of the Slovak author Tomáš Džadoň is also related to practicality, but extended by other attributes. His installation *Monument of Folk Architecture* consisted of three original historic wooden houses, which were placed on the roof of a tall residential block of flats in the Slovak city of Košice in the period between 2013 and 2016. The work represents a combination of several realities, current and past, while the "lifting" of wooden houses on the block of flats determines their hierarchy, i.e. the definition of the relationships between the two elements (Büngerová, 2013). The prefabricated house becomes the foundation of the original, archaic architecture, which refers to ancestors, roots and human history in general. However, this example is specific because even if it is a placement of a work in a public space with (due to height) a huge impact, the roof of the house is considered the private property of its inhabitants. They approved the location of the installation, but due to the fears of the inhabitants of the top floor, they later insisted on its removal. An extension of impracticality in this case is therefore a *safety concern*, which may also be a reason to remove art. A sad example of the consequences of neglect is the case of the temporary installation of *Dreamspace V* by British author Maurice Agis. At first glance, the PVC-based work had the shape of a womb, and visitors could imagine what they felt before birth. Since all visitors wore colourful cloaks, the space was to be a haven for fun, illusion, and liveliness (Public Delivery, 2021). The work was created in 1996, but its installation in a park in Liverpool during the summer of 2006 became tragic. The very next day after the opening, the entire structure flew about 10 meters into the air and killed two people and injured many others in the crash. This case is also proof of the need to comply with security measures in the visual arts, which are installed in public spaces.

The reason for removing a work of art from a public space may also have a political undertone. However, we deliberately avoid cases where the work was removed by the ruling political regime, as was the case in Czechoslovakia, for example, during the period of totalitarianism. These were political decisions over which the public had only minimal influence. Closely related to politics, however, is the category of *political correctness*, which in our understanding in relation to art means that a work of art is more or less likely to offend a certain group of the public. Although this category also has subcategories, which we will mention later, we have chosen an example that nevertheless goes beyond the political level, but makes it general. In 2009, Czech artist David Černý exhibited his work *Entropa* at the Council of the European Union headquarters in Brussels. He did so on the occasion of the Czech Presidency of the European Union. Although it is a semi-public area to which entry is regulated, the Council of the European Union building is the imaginary political centre of Europe, and it is a small part of every member state. Therefore, the work also had an impact on each of these states, which got into a massive social discourse. In *Entropa*, a 16-meter-high installation, according to the author, each EU country is represented by a certain stereotype that other Europeans have allegedly experienced about it. At first glance, the work looks like a jigsaw puzzle, made up of extremely diverse pieces. According to Černý, "Europe and its thinking include self-reflection, a critical spirit and the ability to perceive oneself and the world around me with a sense of irony" (Artalk, 2009). Despite the noble intention, which was, among other things, to celebrate diversity in Europe with a dose of humour and irony (Černý, 2009), the work was prematurely uninstalled at the request of some countries who were offended by its depiction⁴. However, this is not a political decision, because in this case the politicians were mainly representatives of the nations whose members called for the work to be withdrawn from the environment of a common European public space.

Political correctness is followed by two other categories of reasons for not accepting art in the public sphere, which mostly only concern certain groups in society: *racism* and *sexism*. The issue of racism in public

⁴ In particular, the representatives of Bulgaria, which was portrayed as a Turkish toilet, reacted critically.

art has become more prominent in global public discourse, along with the Black Lives Matter campaign in response to the ongoing wave of violence against African Americans in the second decade of the 21st century. Largely anti-racist protests across the US and Europe have also been part of the particularly intense response. These were not without attacks on art in public space, which were linked to the historical oppression of groups of people based upon the colour of their skin. Some statues were destroyed during the protests, most often painted or sprayed painted. Others were removed from the area by the demonstrators themselves. One of the most famous cases took place in the English city of Bristol, where protesters pulled down a historic statue in the harbour of the 18th-century British slave trader Edward Colston (Grovier, 2020). This is an extremely insensitive approach to works of art, which can be considered vandalism. On the other hand, thanks to the BLM initiative, there has been a general reassessment of artefacts in the public sphere at the political level in view of their historical legacy, which is an extremely important step in our view. Under the influence of anti-racist protests, legal proceedings were also launched, which resulted in the removal of several controversial statues from public space. These were mostly historical statues referring to the past. In London, Mayor Sadiq Khan announced the convening of a special commission to discuss the dismantling of the controversial city statues. For example, the statue of Robert Milligan, a prominent slaver who owned 526 slaves in Jamaica at the time of his death in 1809, was legally removed in London under the influence of anti-racist protests (Museum of London, 2020). In the US, Speaker of the House of Representatives Nancy Pelosi, hoping to prevent further violent looting, called for the speedy removal of 11 statues that commemorate Confederate leaders from the Capitol's National Statuary Hall Collection (Grovier, 2020). But we could find many more such examples of historical statues legally removed from public spaces in the US and Europe during the 21st century because of various references to racism.

However, the topic of racism in public art is not just about historical sculptures. An example of a controversial installation can also be found in the period of postmodern art. In 1988, American artist David Hammons' installation *How Ya Like Me Now?* caused a stir. In charge of the Washington Project of the Arts (WPA), he created the work in the form of an outdoor billboard measuring approximately 4 x 5 meters, the only motif of which was a photograph of an American politician and human rights activist, Rev. Jesse Jackson. An African American politician was depicted in the photo with dyed blond hair and blue eyes. The title of the work directly referred to the chorus of a 1987 hip-hop song by rapper Kool Moe Dee (Cohen, 2018). Hammons argued that a comparison of a modified black politician alongside rap texts would show how popular culture co-opted a black identity (Stanley, 2016). Hammons offered an ironic look at a prominent black character, criticised popular perceptions of him, and did not try to ridicule Jackson himself. Locals, however, interpreted the work differently. A group of about ten men started shouting at WPA members who assembled the work, and then smashed it with hammers. They believed that the image itself was racist (Cohen, 2018). The work was subsequently withdrawn from public space and is usually exhibited in the premises of art institutions, while hammers became part of its presentation.

Sexism, i.e. discrimination on the basis of sex or gender, is a huge social problem that the postmodern era has been trying to deal with for a long time, as evidenced by the many reactions from the contemporary art world: the orientation towards feminism and gender equality. However, at the centre of our current interest are works of art in public space which, on the contrary, stimulate the atmosphere of sexism. The paradoxical situation occurred in London in 2020, when a statue dedicated to Mary Wollstonecraft, an English writer, philosopher and advocate of women's rights from the 18th century, provoked controversy over sexism. The work of the author Maggi Hambling contains a completely naked woman figure on top of an abstract silver bronze form. Bee Rowlatt, chair of the Mary on the Green campaign, who raised money to make the statue, said Wollstonecraft "was a rebel and a pioneer and deserves a pioneering work of art. This work is an attempt to celebrate its contribution to society with something beyond the Victorian tradition of building people on pedestals." (Selvin, 2020) On the contrary, the negative reactions in this case were presented in large numbers, especially online on social media, where a number of (mainly) women, often well-known in public life, spoke out against female nudity in contemporary public art, arguing that we don't see statues of naked male bodies with exposed private parts in the streets either.

The Italian artist Emanuele Stifano, who created a bronze sculpture called *La Spigolatrice* for the Italian town of Sapri in 2021, also caused a similar stir, not only in artistic circles. The statue depicts a young, scantily clad woman and is to be a tribute to the poem *La Spigolatrice di Sapri* (The Gleaner of Sapri) by the poet Luigi Mercantini. The 1857 poem features a corn picker who leaves to join the revolutionaries fighting for freedom (Solomon, 2021). Several residents of the city have spoken out against the statue, which depicts a woman in a way that could at least be described as a cliché, but also politicians, according to whom the statue insults women and it is unacceptable that the authorities allowed her. Its supporters, on the other hand, are men, the mayor of the town and the author himself, who unanimously claim that it is a quality work of art that is definitely not meant to be erotic or sexist.

In both cases, the statues are still in place at the time of publication, which in our view confirms to some extent the criticized sexism in the sense that voices calling for redress are unheard and allegations of sexism are downplayed. The depiction of the naked human body, regardless of gender, should, in our view, meet the criteria of respect and decency in public space, should not be explicit, and should certainly be justified to support the author's artistic intent.

The last two categories that we suggest in the context of classifying negative reactions to public art are *vulgarity* and *aesthetic reasons*, simply said like or dislikes. Sensitivity to the art, taste and value setting of the viewer play an important role in the process of reciprocation and subsequent reassessment of the presented art. This is true for public works in all categories, but we think that sensitivity and the setting of moral values play the biggest role in evaluating the reception of works that we can classify in the last two categories.

As an example of vulgar art, realized in public space, we mention the installation *Tree* by the controversial American author Paul McCarthy. It was first exhibited in a square in central Paris in October 2014. It is an inflatable statue, about 25 meters high. Despite the title and the green colour, which directly refer to a tree, or more specifically to a Christmas tree, this work evokes the sexual device of an anal plug. The author himself admitted it, and according to him it was a joke. Reactions from a mostly random audience did not take long: the work was destroyed, disconnected from the pump, blown out and finally removed from the square. The artist was even allegedly attacked by a man who hit him in the face three times and escaped (Steer, 2017). The intense response to this hated work points to the different limits of sensitivity and taste that fans of contemporary art and gallery visitors and those who are not interested in contemporary art but are random recipients in public space.

The last category is *aesthetic reasons*, i.e. especially the dislike of the work of art in public space. The subjectivity of taste is as commonplace as the disputes over the recognition of the qualities of the works of contemporary art to which it leads. However, some artistic expressions, which are also found in public space, do not reflect the generally accepted "social" taste, and must be removed or modified by the will of the public. The bust of the famous football player Cristiano Ronaldo was placed at the airport of his native Portuguese island of Madeira. Emanuel Santos, also a native of Madeira, created the sculpture in 2017, and shortly thereafter it became extremely well-known (Schumacher, 2018) due to its strange rendition of a smile and lack of resemblance to the model, but the butt of jokes and ridicule in most quarters. Sixteen months after its unveiling, the original bust was replaced by a new, much more realistic one by an unnamed Spanish professional sculptor. This, partly smiling incident confirms that even aesthetic reasons, most often associated with the form of a work of art, can be a reason to remove it from public space.

IV. CONCLUSION

Based on examples from artistic practice, we have identified seven basic categories of reasons why art in public space may not be accepted by recipients. The individual categories are *impracticality*, *security concerns*, *political incorrectness*, *racism*, *sexism*, *vulgarity* and *aesthetic reasons*. In the most general terms, these reasons could be divided into pragmatic ones, which limit practicality in relation to moving and staying in public space (impracticality and safety concerns), subjective ones, which are based on previous, usually bad experiences of the recipient or a group of recipients (political incorrectness, racism and sexism), and reasons for non-acceptance given by the varying degrees of sensitivity and taste and the value settings of the recipients of art in a particular locality (vulgarity and aesthetic reasons).

Controversy and the idea that ordinary people should have some power over public space can be unsettling for some artists. However, public space also offers creative authors many benefits, such as interaction with the world of "real" ordinary people, which, thanks to art, can be explored by the artist as well as the viewer. Through public art, we can also think about how we work, who we are and where we want to go as a society. But we must be willing to examine with an unbiased critical eye the entire public procurement process (Cartiere, 2020). Because if we understand this process correctly, are clear about the contextual reasons for choosing a particular artist and work, give the subsequent reception a chance, and sacrifice both our time and our attention for the sake of the aesthetic situation, we can collectively develop as a society, because public art should be offered to all of us equally, regardless of our social or economic situation.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Artlak, 2009. TZ: Entropa v DOX. *artalk.cz*. [online]. [2021-12-04]. Available at: <https://artalk.cz/2009/06/06/tz-entropa-v-dox>
- [2]. BÜNGEROVÁ, V., 2013. Tomáš Džadoň - Památník ľudovej architektúry. *artdispečing.sk*. [online]. [2021-11-28]. Available at: <https://www.artdispecing.sk/recenzenti/vladimira-bungerova/tomas-dzadon-pamatnik-ludovej-architektury>
- [3]. CARTIERE, C. and J. WINGATE, 2020. The Failure of Public Art. *Public Art Dialogue*, 10(2) 111-113. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1080/21502552.2020.1794473>
- [4]. ČERNÝ, D., 2009. *Entropa*. [online]. [2021-12-04]. Available at: <http://www.davidcerny.cz/CZ/entropa.html>
- [5]. COBB, R., 2021. *Bringing art into public spaces can improve the social fabric of a city*. [online]. [2021-11-28]. Available at: <https://theconversation.com/bringing-art-into-public-spaces-can-improve-the-social-fabric-of-a-city-162991>

- [6]. COHEN, A., 2018. This Painting of Jesse Jackson as a White Man Provoked a Sledgehammer Attack. *artsy.net*. [online]. [2021-12-05]. Available at: <https://www.artsy.net/article/artsy-editorial-painting-jesse-jackson-white-man-provoked-sledgehammer-attack>
- [7]. DORLEY-BROWN, C., 2020. *Empty London. Pictures during coronavirus lockdown*. [online]. [2021-12-04]. Available at: <https://www.flickr.com/photos/chrisdb1/albums/72157714037295836>
- [8]. GROVIER, K., 2020. Black Lives Matter protests: Why are statues so powerful? *bbc.com*. [online]. [2021-12-05]. Available at: <https://www.bbc.com/culture/article/20200612-black-lives-matter-protests-why-are-statues-so-powerful>
- [9]. HEIN, H., 1996. What Is Public Art?: Time, Place, and Meaning. *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, 54(1) 1-7. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2307/431675>
- [10]. JAGANNATH, T., 2018. *The significance of public art to its space: people's spaces, people's choices*. [online]. [2021-11-18]. Available at: <http://www.newgeography.com/content/005916-the-significance-public-art-its-space-people-s-spaces-people-s-choices>
- [11]. KUŠNÍROVÁ, E., 2019. Creative Workshop – Creative Activity of Undergraduate Students in The Process of Theatre Creation. *Review of Artistic Education*, 17(1) 159-170. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.2478/rae-2019-0017>
- [12]. LANERI, R., 2017. Inside NYC's most explosive public-art controversies. *New York Post*. [online]. [2021-12-10]. Available at: <https://nypost.com/2017/11/08/inside-nycs-most-explosive-public-art-controversies>
- [13]. Museum of London, 2020. *Why was the Robert Milligan statue removed?* [online]. [2021-12-05]. Available at: <https://www.museumoflondon.org.uk/application/files/2915/9827/8333/lr-misc-docks-milligan-statue.pdf>
- [14]. PaPs, 2021. *Public Art & Public Space: Vision & theoretical framework*. [online]. [2021-11-28]. Available at: <https://www.publicart-publicspace.org/about/vision-theoretical-framework>
- [15]. Public Art Network Advisory Council, 2014. *Report: Why Public Art Matters: Green Paper*. [online]. [2021-11-14]. Available at: https://www.americansforthearts.org/sites/default/files/PublicArtNetwork_GreenPaper.pdf
- [16]. Public Delivery, 2021. Maurice Agis' Dreamspace tragically killed two people – This is why. *publicdelivery.org*. [online]. [2021-12-10]. Available at: <https://publicdelivery.org/maurice-agis-dreamspace>
- [17]. SCHUMACHER, E., 2018. Maligned Ronaldo statue replaced at Madeira airport. *dw.com*. [online]. [2021-12-12]. Available at: <https://www.dw.com/en/maligned-ronaldo-statue-replaced-at-madeira-airport/a-44279114>
- [18]. SELVIN, C., 2020. Mary Wollstonecraft Monument in London Generates Controversy. *artnews.com*. [online]. [2021-12-10]. Available at: <https://www.artnews.com/art-news/news/mary-wollstonecraft-sculpture-london-controversy-1234576167>
- [19]. SOLOMON, T., 2021. Italian Statue of Scantly Clad Worker Draws Controversy: An 'Offense to Women'. *artnews.com*. [online]. [2021-12-10]. Available at: <https://www.artnews.com/art-news/news/sapri-italy-monument-sexism-allegations-1234605053>
- [20]. STANLEY, C., 2016. The 10 Most Controversial Works Of Public Art. *theculturetrip.com*. [online]. [2021-11-28]. Available at: <https://theculturetrip.com/north-america/usa/articles/the-10-most-controversial-works-of-public-art>
- [21]. STEER, E., 2017. Paul McCarthy's Tree. *elephant.art*. [online]. [2021-12-12]. Available at: <https://elephant.art/paul-mccarthys-tree>
- [22]. ZUSKA, V., 2001. *Estetika. Úvod do současné tradiční disciplíny*. Praha: Triton.