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1. Introduction

Public art, in the most general definition, refers to “art placed in public places and spaces”\(^1\), where the places or spaces are publicly accessible and are opened to the public for enjoyment. Some of the conventional paradigms of public art include: 1) the works should be designed for larger audiences, and placed to attract their attention; 2) works of public art should be able to provide aesthetic experiences that commemorate, edify, or even entertain; 3) the messages delivered by works of public art should be comprehensible to the general public.\(^2\) However, the definition and meaning of public art have been constantly altering so as to suit the purposes and ideologies in different contexts and in different periods of time. In this research project, the practices of public art in the United States, Taiwan and Hong Kong will be discussed, analysed and compared so as to achieve a better understanding of how the three countries interpret and utilize works of public art differently with different purposes and intentions. The objectives of this research projects are to: 1) examine the role played by the government in developing and promoting public art in Taiwan and Hong Kong; 2) examine the evolution of functions and meanings of public art in Hong Kong and Taiwan by looking into the existing public art legislations, policies and projects in Taiwan and Hong Kong; 3) compare the development of public art in Hong Kong to that in Taiwan, and find out how the governments in these two places understand the concept of public art differently from the initiative concept of public art in the United States, as well as the reasons that cause the differences; and finally 4) compare the development of public art in Hong Kong to

---


that in Taiwan, and examine the reasons why there is a different level of public awareness of public art in Taiwan and Hong Kong.

The reason of choosing the United States is because it was the very first country in the world that initiated the concept of public art, while the reason of choosing Taiwan is because it was the first Asian country that launched public art projects. Finally, there are several reasons to explain why this project compares the abovementioned countries, where the practice and policies of public art are already well-established, with Hong Kong, a special administration where the practice of public art is still emerging. First of all, the development of public art is relatively slow and the number of works of public art is small in Hong Kong. Yet, more important, although there are some publications regarding the development of Hong Kong public art in the academic field, the discussions and investigations regarding the functions and meanings of public art as well as the intentions of the government in developing public art in Hong Kong were overlooked. Still not much research has been done from a broader perspective. Thus, this research project attempts to bring new findings to the understanding of the development of public art in Hong Kong by comparing its practices of public art with those in the United States and Taiwan. As this research is an indigenous Hong Kong case study, the goal of this project is to make a contribution toward advancing the understanding of the development of Hong Kong public art and the government cultural policy in promoting public art, as well as the understanding of the relationship between art, public space and society in the Hong Kong context.
2. Development of the Concept of Public Art

The concept of public art was first raised in the United States during the 1870s. The Fairmount Park Art Association (former Association for Public Art) was established in 1872 by a group of concerned citizens who wanted to beautify the urban landscape of Philadelphia with works of public art. The Association was the United States’ first private non-profit organization which focused on integrating public art and urban planning. Its initial aim was to enhance the Fairmount Park with outdoor sculpture, but the mission of the organization expanded in 1906 to include the rest of the Philadelphia city so as to “promote and foster the beautiful in Philadelphia, in its architecture, improvements, and the city plan.” Yet, with the turn of the twentieth century the short-lived yet influential City Beautiful Movement flourished throughout the United States, introducing beautification and monumental grandeur in cities. The proponents of the movement were “envious of European urbanism, contended that social responsibility and order would follow in the wake of meticulous planning.” Charles Mulford Robinson, a pioneering Urban Planning theorist in the early twentieth century, epitomized this mindset by conceiving the beatification of the cities as a “civic art” with pragmatic, moral and educational functions, which “exists not for its own sake, but mainly for the good of the community.”

In August 1929, the Great Depression began in the United States. Not only was the economic situation changed, but the meaning and function of public art were also

---

3 Cher Krause Knight, *Public art*, 2.
5 Cher Krause Knight, *Public art: theory, practice and populism* 2.
altered so as to better respond to the current social and political situation. The “New Deal”, which was a series of domestic programmes in response to the economic downturn, was initiated by President Franklin D. Roosevelt in 1933. The programmes focused on, as historians would call, the “3 Rs”: 1) relief for the unemployed and poor; 2) recovery of the economy to normal levels; and 3) reform of the financial system to prevent a repeat depression. A series of cultural initiatives and art projects were also launched by the Roosevelt administration, including two public art projects. The first one was the Public Works of Art Project (PWAP) which ran from December 1933 to June 1934. This Federal government’s project was organized by the Civil Works Administration, with the purpose to provide economic relief and to “give work to artists by arranging to have competent representatives of the profession embellish public buildings.” Although the art project lasted less than one year, it successfully provided employment for approximately 3,700 artists who created nearly 15,000 works of art. Moreover, artists of this project were told that the subject matter had to be related to the “American scene”, with the purpose to recover citizens’ confidence in the United States government, construct a nationalistic image as well as to enhance patriotism. After the PWAP, a similar project, the Federal Art Project (FAP), was established by the Works Progress Administration (WPA) in August 1935. The FAP was the most ambitious New Deal

---

8 Ibid, 630-2.
13 It was a New Deal agency that helped provide economic relief to the citizens.
visual arts initiative, aiming at conserving “the talent and skills of artists who, through no fault of their own, found themselves on the relief rolls and without means to continue their work.” Therefore, similar to the PWAP, the main purpose of FAP was to provide economic relief and “to employ out-of-work artists and to provide art for non-federal government buildings: schools, hospitals, libraries, etc.” In the FAP, more than 200,000 separate works were created, including posters, murals, paintings and sculptures. Some of the works created during this period are still standing among the most significant and notable pieces of public art in the United States, such as the exterior sculpture of the Louisiana State Capitol Building (Figure 1), which symbolizes the virtues of patriotism, was made by Lorado Taft in the 1930s, and the Quests of Mankind (1940) (Figure 2) made by Helen Lundeberg in still located in Canoga Park High School in California today. The FAP continued until 1943, when the beginning of World War II changed the priority from economic recovery to the war effort. Thus, the function of public art during the Great Depression focused mainly on the provision of employment for artists on relief as well as the enhancement of nationalism, which were very different from that during the late nineteenth century and the City Beautiful Movement in the beginning of the twentieth century when public art was used as a tool to beautify urban cities.

During the presidency of John F. Kennedy in the 1960s, the development of public art was further encouraged by the government with the purpose to stake an

---

ideological claim for public support of the arts in order to build up a foundation for the United States’ official art patronage. Thus, public art was finally officially institutionalized. In 1965, the National Endowment for the Arts was set up, serving as the principal independent agency to offer support and funding for art projects and development in the United States. Under the Endowment, policies for the development of public art were assertively legislated and implemented, and projects of public art were and are still continuously and constantly commissioned by the United States government. With the intervention of the government policy, the functions of public art can be divided up according to four different criteria: 1) art as propaganda; 2) art as beautification; 3) art as urban regeneration; and 4) art as revitalization of inner cities. Yet, these three categories are in fact far from mutually exclusive and can be applied quite generally. The table below lists the public art projects throughout the entire nation that are supported and/or funded by the States government:

---

18 Cher Krause Knight, Public art, 1.
21 Ibid.
22 Ibid.
23 Susanne Lacy, the pioneer of the “new genre public art” (which will be further discussed later in this paper), believed that works of public art have an ability to enhance public spaces such as plazas and parks so as to “revitalize inner cities, which were beginning to collapse under the burden of increasing social problem. Art in public places was seen as a mean of reclaiming and humanizing the urban environment.” Suzanne Lacy, “Introduction: Cultural Pilgrimages and Metaphoric Journeys,” in Mapping the terrain: new genre public art, ed. Suzanne Lacy (Seattle, Wash.: Bay Press, 1995), 21.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Name of Program</th>
<th>Year Program Began</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>Percent for Art</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>Art in Public Places</td>
<td>1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>Art in Public Places</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District of Columbia</td>
<td>DC Creates!</td>
<td>1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>Art in State Buildings</td>
<td>1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>Art in Public Places</td>
<td>1967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>Art-in-Architecture</td>
<td>1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>Art in State Buildings</td>
<td>1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>Percent for Art</td>
<td>1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>Public Art</td>
<td>1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>Commission on Public Art</td>
<td>2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>Percent for Art in Public Places</td>
<td>1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>Percent for Art</td>
<td>1983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>1% for Art</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>Percent for Art</td>
<td>1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>Arts Inclusion</td>
<td>1978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>Art in Public Places</td>
<td>1986</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>Percent for Art</td>
<td>1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>Art in Public Places</td>
<td>2004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>Public Art</td>
<td>1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>Public Art</td>
<td>1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>Percent for Art</td>
<td>1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>Public Art</td>
<td>1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>Public Art</td>
<td>1988</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>Art in Public Places</td>
<td>1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>Art in Public Buildings</td>
<td>1991</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Current as of September 2013*  

Since the 1980s, thousands of new memorials have been appearing and flourishing in the American landscape, and they have been termed as a form of public art. These new memorials (or one can call them “works of public art”) were built for commemorating victims of terrorism, dead soldiers and astronauts, people who paid tribute to civil rights, organ donors, as well as the end of Communism. As Erika Doss pointed out, the construction of all these new memorials reflected “a contemporary national obsession with issues of memory and history and an urgent desire to express and claim those issues in visibly public contexts.” Memorials bear a political and cultural power that can represent, mediate, and generate “public feelings”, and emotional attachments can be arisen in the contexts of commemoration. The Vietnam Veterans Memorial Wall (Figure 3), which was made by the American architect Maya Lin, is one of the most famous works of public art that bear commemorative function. The memorial was erected in 1982 for commemorating and honouring members of the United States Armed Forces who fought and died during the Vietnam War (1956-1975). It is now located in Washington D.C., United States. Another artistic memorial, To the Struggle Against World Terrorism (2006) (Figure 4), which was created by the Russian artist Zurab Tsereteli, depicts a steel teardrop suspended in a cracked stone column, commemorating the honour victims of 9/11. It is now located in New Jersey. Doss stated that, “Memorials are a way of claiming citizenship status, a part of the historical construction of citizenship.”

again, involving the cultural politics of emotion, the study of public affect and feeling, as well as the shaping of the form of the personal and national identity of the local people.

In 1988, Patricia Phillips suggested that public art, in the late twentieth century, became a field without “clear definitions”, “constructive theory” or “coherent objectives”. She also stated that the mission of public art was “profoundly unambitious”, which was to “make people feel good – about themselves and where they live”; and thus, public art seemed to be operating on a practical and pragmatic level rather than a philosophical level in the contemporary era. Furthermore, public art was often regarded as simple monuments and memorials that were too functional to be considered as “serious” art or a worthwhile art form. In the 1990s, the “new genre public art” was pioneered by Suzanne Lacy and Mary Jane Jacob, calling for alternative definitions of public art. By adopting the concept of “new genre”, which has been used since the late sixties to describe art that attacks traditional boundaries and traditional media, the artists of the “new genre public art” experiences in both traditional and nontraditional media and “add a developed sensibility about audience, social strategy, and effectiveness that is unique to visual art as we know it today.” Both Lacy and Jacob believed that public strategies of engagement were an important part of the aesthetic language of the “new genre public art”. Lacy once described:

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

---

29 Ibid.
30 Paul Clements, “Public art: radical, functional or democratic methodologies?”, 19.
communicate and interact with a broad and diversified audience about issues directly relevant to their lives – is based on engagement.”

The pioneers of the “new genre public art” emphasize the point that public art was arts that placed beyond the confined space of an institution such as an art museum or an art gallery, and thus the “ways of seeing” or the meanings of the works of public art are not conditioned or framed by the museum or gallery curators. In other words, the cultural and political meanings of the works of public art are not contextualized by the authority. Instead, the meanings of the work of public art are shaped by the community. As Lacy said, “The source of these artworks’ structure is not exclusively visual or political information, but rather an internal necessity perceived by the artist in collaboration with his or her audience.” Moreover, Marcel Duchamp, in his paper *The Creative Act* (1957), explored the power of the audiences in the judgment of an artwork, as well as raising the concept of “art coefficient” which describes the power-relationship between an artist and his audience. An artist gives up the control of his artwork to the public once the work is shared to the public, and the creative process is continued by his audiences. In the context of audience interaction, the “new genre public art” requires a high level of audience participation in the reading and deciphering of the intended meanings and messages presented by the artist. As Lacy said: “The inclusion of the public connects theories of art to the broader population: what exists in the space between the words public and art is an

---

33 Ibid, 19.
unknown relationship between artists and audience, a relationship that may itself become the artwork.”

Besides public engagement in the construction of the meanings of the works of art, the artists and works of “new genre public art” also stressed on the publicness of public art, and discussed the relationship between art, space and the public, challenging governmental and corporate motivations as well as presenting a larger historical frame of power relations. The pioneers of the “new genre public art” believed that the mere physical existence of a work of art placed in public did not render the work of art a public art. The most prominent assumption that has underwritten most of the manifestations of public art in the contemporary era is “the notion that this art derives its ‘publicness’ from where it is located” 35, emphasizing that art, while remaining publicly influential, can actually stay independent without being encapsulated by the hegemony of powerful institutional players. If a work of art succeeds in evoking a sense of publicness, it might create a public space among its audience. This is to say that art, in any case, has no obligation to entertain a political commitment.36 According to Chantal Mouffe, a Belgian political theorist, the prime function of art in public space is to “radicalize democracy, and to bring into the open the inherent power struggles of society.”37 Public art should challenge the hegemonic interests.38 This proposal arises from Mouffe’s basic belief that “any social objectivity is constituted through acts of power. This means that any social

36 Jeroen Boomgaard, Highrise and common ground: art and the Amsterdam Zuidas area (Amsterdam: Valiz, 2008), 11-14.
objectivity is ultimately political and has to show the traces of the acts of exclusion that govern its constitution”\textsuperscript{39}

The general worry of the “new genre public artists” was the disappearance of public space, be it in relation to artistic innovation, democratic legitimacy, or public morals.\textsuperscript{40} Under the strong influence of Michel Foucault and his thoughts on the relationship between power, knowledge and institution, the artists believed that it was vital to shake off the tarnished legacy of the Western bourgeois culture such as capitalism, universalism, and neo-colonialism. The concept of publicness was in fact used as long ago as during the ancient Greek period when publicness was a manifestation of individuality and particularity, a result of the belief that “man is capable of action and that the unexpected can be expected from him, that he is able to perform what is infinitively improbable.”\textsuperscript{41} The “new genre public artists” formulated their conception of “art in public space” as an alternative to the dominant liberal conception of public space, characterized by a technocratic idea of politics. New genre public art could thus be considered as a materialized understanding of interests and ideas that were being exchanged in public, and could also be regarded as a tool to challenge the power of institution, the ideas which the political elites aggregated and the false neutralization of the political status-quo.\textsuperscript{42} The public was made private deliberately as it were, being left out of making political decisions that surely were of its concern. As Gerard Drosterij said, “democratic politics could not be limited to the occasional voting of political

\textsuperscript{39} Chantal Mouffe, \textit{The democratic paradox}, 98.
\textsuperscript{41} Ibid., 178.
representatives. A strong democratization was called for which needed to take place through a political injection of public space.”

Within art criticism, the “new genre public art” has challenged the illusion of a universal art and introduced discussions on the nature of public – its frames of reference, its location within various constructs of society, and its varied cultural identities. The “art’s publicness rests in the quality and impact of its exchanges with the audience. These do not hinge on wide acceptance, but on the art’s ability to extend reasonable and fair opportunities for members of the public to understand and negotiate their own relationships with it.”

Thus, different from the features, functions and meanings of public art in previous decades, the defining character of public art in the 1990s was on its democratic feature and publicness on the extent of audience interaction as well as its function as a tool to challenge the institutional power and social hierarchies.

In 1997, Malcolm Miles further discussed, from the ethical perspective, the function of public art with reference to urban development and its relation with private sectors. He believed that an absence of a critical and ethical framework for the practice and implementation of public art projects will lead public art become a complicity in the shaping of urban dis-ease such as social conflicts between mainstream communities and “deviant” minorities, constant growth of corporate power, as well as cultural domination and hegemony.

---

45 Cher Krause Knight, Public art: theory, ix.
“Advocacy for public art has sought opportunities to integrate art in major capital schemes, often through the employment of artists in the design stage of buildings, but it conflates all types of development regardless of their social or environment impact, whilst there is no systematic evidence that public art has beneficial effects for urban communities, who may be marginalized rather than regenerated by development.”

Urban development, under the domination and control of government and profit-oriented private sectors, stimulated the market for the commission of public art projects in the late twentieth century. The agenda of public art in both the United States and the United Kingdom focused on “creating a city which looks good, feels good, and is accessible”.

Public art, therefore, officially became a tool for making the city a “better world”. Yet, public spaces that were selected by the abovementioned parties to exhibit works of public art indicated spatially a kind of cultural hegemony, manifesting the preferences of the government and private sectors. As Saskia Sassen argued, “The slippage is evident: the dominant culture can encompass only part of the city. And while corporate power inscribes these cultures and identities with ‘otherness’ thereby devaluing them, they are present everywhere.” This kind of binary opposition between the “chosen and preferred space” and the “declined space” led to the polarization of different communities: the wealthy/ elite/ bourgeoisie in the high-end living areas, and the working class in the marginalized areas. As Malcolm Miles stated:

---

47 Malcolm Miles, *Art, space and the city*, 104.
48 Dallas, *Visual Dallas* (Dallas: Division of Cultural Affairs, 1987), 1.7-1.10.
“Urban development, either futuristic towers of glass or homely vernacular, sets up an adversarial social model: ‘good’ affluence against ‘defiling’ deprivation, on a colonial model of ‘developed’ and ‘developing’ countries, the perception becoming a justification for the value-laden process which produces it, just as Burgess’ concentric ring model was re-coded from description to prescription. Art in development aids this socially divisive process by aestheticizing it – and a little controversy over art is sometimes not unwelcome if it distracts attention from social issues; but in ignoring the social impact of development, art is complicit in the consequent social fragmentation.”

Saskia Sassen also pointed out that, the government and private sectors “re-determine the city amidst its ruin, bypassing the residual (and immigrant) populations. One of the means they acquire to do this, if in a secondary role, is international modernist art.” It seemed that such “model of arts-led development detrimental to existing communities is the gentrification of areas through arts uses, leading to an increase in property values which drives out the residual community.” Public art, therefore, has a new meaning again in the late 1990s. Moreover, this time it became more related to the capitalist ideology. Some artists even suggested that public art during this period seemed to be getting trapped between commercialism and state patronage.

50 Malcolm Miles, Art, space and the city, 106.
52 Malcolm Miles, Art, space and the city, 107.
The functions and meanings of public art have been constantly altering in the United States, from the beautification of the city to the construction of a nationalistic image to the provision of job opportunities for unemployed artists to the shaping of a national memory, and finally public art became a tool to radicalize democracy and challenge the hegemonic interests. Cameron Cartiere once commented that, “The lack of a clear definition for public art is one of the greatest obstacles to fully understand public art’s place in the field.”

The functions, definition and meaning of public art have been constantly altering so as to suit the purposes and ideologies in different contexts and in different periods of time. Malcolm Miles once said that, “the history of art has sometimes been presented as a history of styles. The history of public art will more likely be seen as a history of intentions.”

Public art, thus, seems to have little to do with art at all. Public art serves more as a tool that participates in the production of meanings, uses, and forms for the city rather than delivering philosophical messages to its audience. The definition of public art is still under discussion and there is yet a definite definition for public art. As the functions and meanings of public art are constantly changing and evolving, other countries may understand and interpret public art differently so as to correspond to their own cultural and political contexts and situations. In the following sections of the paper, a comparative analysis of the functions and meanings of public art, from the government’s point of view, in Taiwan and Hong Kong will be conducted. Moreover, the government’s

55 Malcolm Miles, Art for Public Places: Critical Essays (Winchester: Winchester School of Arts Press, 1989), 39. It is interesting to note that the author deliberately separate “history of art” and “history of public art”, implying that “art” and “public art” are different and serve for different purposes, and most importantly, should be evaluated and defined differently.
selection policies are crucial factors in shaping the nature of public art in a community. Thus, the policies of the government in both Taiwan and Hong Kong will also be evaluated basing on the benefits, power and conflicts involved.
3. The Practice of Public Art in Taiwan

Taiwan is the first Asian country to lay regulations on public art by referencing to the “Percent-for-Art” regulation passed in the United States. Historically, the United States assisted the re-organization of economics in Taiwan after the Second World War and in 1954, the two nations signed the “Sino-American Mutual Defense Treaty” in which the United States provided economic aids to Taiwan\(^\text{57}\). Since then, the United States became the model for Taiwan to imitate in both economic and cultural settings. Owing to the enactment of public art regulations, Taiwan has successfully executed a large number of public art projects in its short history of public art development. The implementation of public art regulations has resulted in an impressive result of public art development in Taiwan, hence, our first case study is public art in Taiwan.

*History of the Practice of Public Art in Taiwan*

In 1959, the first “Percent-for-Art” legislation was passed in Philadelphia, United States. The legislation administers and regulates public art by law. Taiwan is the first Asian state in which a similar act, the “Culture and Arts Reward Act” (《文化藝術獎助條例》) was passed in 1992, stating that no less than one percent of all public work construction cost must be set aside for the purpose of public art, with the major aim to beautify the surroundings and space in Article 9. Lee Shienwen was the first to advocate the percent-for-art legislation in Taiwan through the publication *Simba Lion Art*

---

Magazine by dedicating a special edition on public art in the publication after his visit to the United States in 198658. The legislation has opened a window of dialogue between the government, artists and the public on the discussion of public art and has a great impact on the later development of public art in Taiwan.

The late 18th century to the early 19th century is the period in which public art in Taiwan started to develop. The “Implementation Rules for the Culture and Arts Reward Act” (《文化藝術獎助條例施行細則》) is implemented in 1993, defining public art in the context of Taiwan. The favorable political and economic environment at that time facilitated the legislation on public art as well as the public acquisition of public art objects59. In 1998, the “Regulations Governing the Installation of Public Artwork” (《公共藝術設置辦法》) was drafted by the Council for Cultural Affairs (CCA). In 2002, the Ministry of Culture further amended the “Regulations Governing the Installation of Public Artwork”, which defined public art as projects approved by the Public Art Review Committee (公共藝術評審委員會).

Three Phases of Public Art Development in Taiwan

The development of public art projects in Taiwan can be categorized into three phases according to their functionalities: as monumental devices, as beautifying devices, and as devices to create community cohesion. Public art as monumental device appear before the implementation of regulations in Taiwan. These devices, usually of grand

58 Ni Tsai Chin, Probing into Public Art (Taipei: Artist Publishing, 2008), 15
59 Ibid.
sculptures and monuments, bear missions to recognize deeds of national heroes and to instill specific ideologies such as nationalism. After the implementation of public art regulations in the early 1990s, public art projects incline to act as beautifying devices to harmonize communities as well as to create landmarks. As the development of public art furthers, the projects further transform into devices to create community identities and to foster cohesion among the communities. The pursuit of publicness in public art projects heightened as public art is increasingly treated as a cultural policy initiated by the government with aims to foster a sense of community cohesiveness and to enhance public consciousness in the environment.

In the “Culture and Arts Reward Act” published in 1992, it is clearly stated that the aims of setting up the statute are to 1) nurture arts and cultural industries, 2) guide cultural activities, 3) safeguard and protect arts and cultural practitioners, 4) promote national culture, and 5) enhance the level of national culture. The following table shows the major government initiatives in developing public art in Taiwan:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Relevant Regulations, Proposals, or Measures</th>
<th>Aim(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>The implementation of “Culture and Arts Reward Act”</td>
<td>To beautify the environment and to provide opportunities for the public to appreciate art, the regulation stipulates that any public construction must entail one percent of the total construction fee to the installation of public art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>The implementation of “Implementation Rules for the Culture and Arts Reward Act” (《文化藝術獎助條例施行細則》)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Proposal of nine pilot sites for the installation of public art projects</td>
<td>The official launch of public art projects in Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>The implementation of “Regulations Governing the Installation of Public Artwork”</td>
<td>Specifies the operating mechanism, review system, and the process of public art implementation in Taiwan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999 - 2002</td>
<td>Reviewed the art works placed in public spaces in Taipei</td>
<td>Replacing the works that are incompatible with the environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1st Taipei Public Art Festival</td>
<td>Advocate public participation in public art and to educate the public on aesthetic and art admiration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Revised “Regulations Governing the Installation of Public Artwork”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Promotion of “public aesthetics” (公民美學) as cultural policy</td>
<td>To enhance the aesthetic taste of life of the public, create a healthy artistic ecology in Taiwan, strengthen community identity and to raise the civic consciousness in the society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1st Public Art Awards</td>
<td>To recognizes local public arts projects that are creative, environmentally compatible and involved with public participation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

From the regulations laid by the government, one can see that the Taiwan government has established a standard in the rules of the execution of public art projects in the early years of public art development. In the beginning, public art was regarded as an “essential” element in any public constructions regardless of the publicness or aesthetic elements which were to be embedded in the public art works. Nonetheless, the situation altered in the late 1990s in the sense that beautifying the community is no longer the sole intention for public art projects, but also the inclusion of public in the creation of public art projects.

The second phase of the public art development began in the mid-1980s when Taiwan underwent democratic transformation and at the same time, people desired for a better living environment after war. Public art hence became a tool to beautify the environment. This phase of the development sees public art projects as devices to beautify the community and to create landmarks. Some major development during this period include the implementation of “Culture and Arts Reward Act”, “Implementation Rules for the Culture and Arts Reward Act”, the proposal of nine pilot sites for the installation of public art projects and the implementation of “Regulations Governing the Installation of Public Artwork”.

The implementation of the “Culture and Arts Reward Act” signifies the first official step for the Taiwan government to initiate public art projects. The regulation opens a window of dialogue between the government, artists and the public on the discussion of public art. It states that No less than one percent of all public work construction cost must be set aside for the purpose of public art, and the overall aims of the regulation are to
nurture arts and cultural industries, guide cultural activities, safeguard and protect arts and cultural practitioners, promote national culture, and enhancement the level of national culture. During this period in the 1990s, Regional Public Art Review Committees were also set up in different counties to manage their respective public art projects, in addition to the Council for Cultural Affairs, the Ministry of Transportation and Communications, and the National Science Council, under the management of the Ministry of Culture.

The recent phase of development refers to the period of late 1990s to the present. Public art is employed to create community identities and to foster cohesion among the communities. Public art projects are reviewed and festivals and art awards were organized for the first time in Taiwan, reflecting the intention of the Taiwan government to enhance the degree of public engagement in the context of public art development in this phase of public art development. Thus, public art in Taiwan is not only merely visual arts but also bear functionality in engaging the community and to arouse public consciousness.

The Taipei Public Art Festival is organized by the Department of Cultural Affairs of the Taipei City Government to advocate public participation in public art and to educate the public on aesthetic and art admiration; and the public art awards is organized by the Ministry of Culture to recognize local public arts projects that are creative, environmentally compatible and with involvement in public participation. Even though
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the Taipei public art festival ceased after two years, these events prove that the government did take an initiative in further addressing public art and we can see that that Taiwan government has taken a great initiative in developing public art. The implementation of public art projects have become major public works of the Taiwan government. In 2013 alone, 400 million new Taiwanese dollars were injected for public art projects and cultural matters.\(^{66}\) The major motive of public art in Taiwan in its recent development is to create a better place for the Taiwan population, which can be defined as the beautification of community, raising a sense of community belonging and consciousness and the democratic practice in public engagement.

In the context of Taiwan, public art can be referred to the art projects set up in public spaces with public funds while encouraging the participation of the public under the regulations published by the government. The public art projects in Taiwan demonstrate a social movement of art, life and culture with the participation of artists and the public with the initiative of the government in public spaces.\(^{67}\) It can be observed that public art projects have transformed into major public works of the government. Evidently, the public art projects in Taiwan have exceeded the functionality of public art to beautify the community, and the missions as stated in the “Culture and Arts Reward Act”, but also the formation of a new artistic and aesthetic conception within the communities in Taiwan.\(^{68}\)

Such conception coincides with the official launch of the “Comprehensive Community Development” (「社區總體營造」) policies in the promotion of local

---


\(^{68}\) Ibid.
consciousness\(^6^9\). Hence, public art in Taiwan can be rendered as products resulting from regulations. “Comprehensive Community Development” was advocated by Shen Hsueh-yung, the then Chairman of the Council for Cultural Affairs, to the Legislative Yuan of Taiwan in 1993. The concept was to emphasize local culture and public participation and to create a cultural image for the local community. The conception of “Comprehensive Community Development” coincides with the essence of public art in terms of public engagement and public empowerment. Both public art and the policies of “Comprehensive Community Development” emphasize the collective participation and spontaneity of the people in the construction of a collective community aesthetics and identity.

\textit{The First MRT Public Art Project (1993)}

Public art is to enhance the visual quality in a specific space. Apart from the provision of pleasant art works for the public, the execution of public art also aims to narrow the distance between the public and the art so as to produce interactivity. The earliest public art projects in Taiwan started with the Department of Rapid Transit Systems (DORTS) of the Taipei City Government. DORTS implemented the “MRT Public Art Project” (「捷運公共藝術專案」) in 1992 and in the subsequent year, setting up the “Public Art Evaluation Committee” which comprises of experts and scholars from the fields of art, architecture, landscaping and art media\(^7^0\). The mission of public art

\(^{6^9}\) Ibid.

projects in the Mass Railway Transit (MRT) aims to “enhance the quality of MRT space, strengthen the local context of stations, and encourage a feeling of intimacy towards MRT construction” (DORTS, 2013). Hence, public art projects in MRT stations can be seen as the earliest model in this phase of development. The example of public art project at the Shuanglian MRT station demonstrates the transformation of public art in Taiwan from beautifying the environment to a device in creating a community identity.

Shuanglian station of the Tamsui line is one of the first stations to have public art executed. An open competition was held in 1993 to select an art work for the station. The work chosen among the 53 submitted works is “Dawning Sail” (「雙連、行遠」), which was executed in the medium of porcelain enamel by Wanting Ching and Pi-Fang Yang. The open competition was assigned with the theme of “Historical Changes of Shuangliang”, emphasizing that the Shuanglian area was originally a lagoon which later transformed into two large irrigation ponds used for agriculture. As the city developed, the ponds further transformed into a transfer hub as they connect with Tamsui river. However, the prosperity of Shuanglian soon faded as the river transport declined. It is not until the late 1980s when the Mackay Memorial Hospital and the Shuanglian MRT station established in the area that the area regains its prosperity.

“Dawning Sail” showcases a series of events in chronological order, reflecting the history and changes occurred in the Shuanglian area. The layout of the work presents an
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73 楊子葆, 藝術進站－捷運公共藝術 Public Art in MRT (台北: 行政院文化建設委員會, 2005), 16-17
overall coherence and can be viewed as a whole or independently. Besides, the work is a combination of pictures and textual descriptions, allowing the public to learn the history of the Shuanglian area as well as to see the changes, and outlook of the area. Similar mural art can also be found in metro stations in London, Lisbon and Seoul.

![“Dawning Sail” in Shuanglian MRT Station.](image)

The mural art displays publicness as the site is located in a public space, with a theme closely related to the historical background of the community, in which residents and viewers can engage in the exploration of the Shuanglian area by appreciating the art work, inspiring the viewers of new thoughts on the area. Aesthetically, the art work is mounted on the wall of the passageway to the tickets gate. The work presents a metaphorical pathway in the historical evolution of the area as viewers stroll along the passageway. The work is in harmony with the MRT station as well as the Shuanglian area. With visual and textual materials, the art work presents a pleasant journey for the viewers and a creation of public consciousness in the Shuanglian area.
Procedure of Public Art Selection in Taiwan

Regional Public Art Review Committees were established in 1999 in different counties, after the passing of the “Regulations Governing the Installation of Public Artwork” regulation in 1998. Public art implementation manuals were established, marking the institutionalization of public art development in Taiwan. The process of appraising public art in Taiwan is to first evaluate the public art proposal by an executive team, then approve the public art selection result report by a selection team, and lastly to review the public art project completion report by the committee.

The role of each county government in Taiwan in the development of public art is to make use of public art to highlight the local characteristics, complement public art development by issuing and handling work projects including urban design appraisals and construction licenses, and to reinforce and improve the quality of the appraising function of the county. A Regional Public Art Review Committee is set up by the county governmental body with the responsibilities to the overall planning and appraisal of public art in a county. The specific responsibilities of a Regional Public Art Review Committee is to appraise public art proposals, public art selection result report, public art completion report, plan and review the setting of public art.

75 Ibid.
76 Ibid.
handle public art as gifts, provide professional advice and consultation on public art settings, and to guide public engagement as well as to promote public art\textsuperscript{77}.

Each committee is comprised of thirteen to seventeen persons. The county mayor or magistrate is concurrently the convener of the committee, the head of the county Cultural Bureau as the deputy convener, and the rest of the committee members selected by the county government. The members in a committee must include at least one person from the arts profession, and a representative from the community, a law consultant, and an executive from the municipal urban planning department\textsuperscript{78}.

For instance, the 3\textsuperscript{rd} Taipei City Public Art Review Committee comprises of 15 committee members\textsuperscript{79}:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Education Background</th>
<th>Current Post</th>
<th>Represented Profession</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tim TING (丁庭宇)</td>
<td>Master of Sociology at University of Michigan; Bachelor in Sociology at National Taiwan University</td>
<td>Deputy Mayor of Taipei City</td>
<td>Representative of the government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIU Wei-gong (劉維公)</td>
<td>Ph. D. in Economic and Social Sciences Sociology at Universität Trier; Master in Sociology at National Taiwan University; Bachelor of Social Science, National Taiwan University</td>
<td>Commissioner of Department of Cultural Affairs, Taipei City</td>
<td>Representative of governmental authorities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{77} Ibid.

(一)藝術行政、藝術評論、應用藝術、藝術教育、藝術創作之專業人士五人至七人，其中各類至少一人。
(二)都市設計、建築設計、景觀造園之專業人士三人至五人，其中各類至少一人。
(三)社區或公益團體代表、法律專家、地方政府建築或都市計畫業務主管各一人。審委會委員任期二年，期滿得續派（聘）之。”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Degree/Position</th>
<th>Position/Agency</th>
<th>Representative of related government agencies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KAO Wen-t’ing</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Chief Engineer of Department of Urban Development, Taipei City Government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAUNG Shun-ming</td>
<td>Master of Architecture, National Taiwan University of Science and Technology</td>
<td>Deputy Director of Taipei City Construction Management Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HUNG Che-i</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Committee Member of Department of Education, Taipei City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WANG Jun-jieh</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>Director of Center for Art and Technology, Taipei National University of the Arts</td>
<td>Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SU Yao-hua</td>
<td>Ph.D. in Arts Administration and Management, National Taiwan Normal University; M.A. in Arts Administration, Columbia University; Bachelor of Political Theory, National Taiwan University</td>
<td>Assistant Professor at Department of Creative Product Design, Asia University</td>
<td>Art criticism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YAO Cheng-chung</td>
<td>Master of Architecture, Pratt Institute; Domus Academy; Bachelor of Architecture, Tamkang University</td>
<td>President of Chinese Society of Interior Designers (CSID)</td>
<td>Applied arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEI Ting-yen</td>
<td>M.F.A, Pratt Institute; Bachelor of Fine Arts, Chinese Culture University</td>
<td>Professor at Graduate School of Printmaking, National Taiwan University of Arts</td>
<td>Arts education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HO Cheng-kuang</td>
<td>Bachelor of Fine Arts, National Taiwan Normal University</td>
<td>Issuer of art magazines, art collections and design journals</td>
<td>Arts administration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHENG Huang-er</td>
<td>Ph. D., Delft University of Technology; Master of Architecture, University of Texas at Austin; Bachelor of Architecture, Tamkang University</td>
<td>Associate Professor at Architecture Department, Tamkang University</td>
<td>Urban design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zeng Cheng-de</td>
<td>Master in Architecture, Harvard University</td>
<td>Professor at Graduate Institute of Architecture, National Chiao Tung University</td>
<td>Architectural design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIN Ching-chuan</td>
<td>MA in Architecture and Urbanism, University of Manchester; Master of Architecture, National Cheng Kung University; Bachelor of Architecture, Feng Chia University</td>
<td>Assistant Professor at Department of Architecture, National Taipei University of Technology</td>
<td>Landscape</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
From the committee members, one can see that most of the committee members have arts-, architectural- or sociology-related educational background. According to Chapter two of “Regulations Governing the Installation of Public Artwork”, the public art review committees have the responsibilities to integrate the geographical landscapes of the respective counties, strengthen the local characteristics of the area, and to strengthen the reviewing functions of the public art installation system in Taiwan in order to improve the quality of public art. The power of each public art review committee stems from the county mayor, who also acts as the convener of the committee. The mayor has the authority to select the members of the committee in regard to the requirements laid by the regulation\(^\text{80}\). The composition of public art review committees reveals that the policies on public art in Taiwan is dominated by a relatively small number of specialists from the public sector, visual arts field, and architectural and space professionals.

\(^{80}\) “台南縣公共藝術審議委員會設置要點,” 臺南市政府, accessed May 3, 2014, http://web1.tainan.gov.tw/adm/download/tainanlaw/%E6%96%87%E5%8C%96%E5%81%80/%E8%A1%8C%E6%94%BF%E8%A6%8F%E5%89%87/%E8%87%BA%E5%8D%97%E7%88%A3%E5%85%AC%E5%85%B1%E8%97%9D%E8%A1%93%E5%AF%A9%E8%AD%B0%E5%A7%94%E5%93%A1%E6%9C%83%E8%A8%AD%E7%BD%AE%E8%A6%81%E9%BB%9E.doc.
Evaluation on the Public Art in Taiwan

In 2004, a total of 496 public art projects have been executed in Taiwan, taking the lead in the world in the development of public art\(^{81}\). Indeed, the intensive growth and the impressive number of public art in Taiwan are due to the laws, regardless of the quality of the public art. This reflects the need for the constant revision on the regulations as the development of public art is closely related to the development of its site location and the surroundings\(^{82}\).

The development of public art in Taiwan is mostly pushed by the enactment of laws instead of a natural process. In many of the public art projects, the works tend to be unimaginative with the aim to create “eternal” objects in order to comply with the institutional policies\(^{83}\). Public art is not only a manifestation of individual creativity, but bear responsibilities on aesthetics, education, democracy in the consideration of the surrounding environment, public interests, social issues, and local collective memories\(^{84}\).

Public art combines “art” with “the public”. In this fundamental understanding of public art, what distinguish public art from other forms of art are the “publicness”, and the aesthetic welfare that a public art project brings about. “Publicness” in public art can be generally defined as the use of public funds to cohere a community by raising the consensus of public participation in a given public space in the joint completion of a


\(^{82}\) Tsai Chin Ni, *Probing into Public Art* (Taipei: Artist Publishing, 2008), 42


\(^{84}\) Ibid.
A successful public art project can highlight the distinctive features of the area. The ideal execution of public art is of a bottom-up approach: the public engages in discussions and integrate with the artistic concept of the artist. The amendment of the law in 2000 by the Taiwan government emphasized the consensus of diversity and the strengthening of community group participations, as well as the development of the Regional Public Art Review Committees, reflect a high degree of publicness in public art projects in Taiwan.

Aesthetic welfare refers to the aesthetic experience that members of the society feel within a specific time and space. Public art is a site-specific project and owing to the nature of public art, the execution of a public art must consider the harmony between the art, culture, space and environment as well as the overall quality of the space, environment and visual landscape. Public art, hence, carries another function to beautify the society and to improve deteriorating living environment caused by rapid urban development.

The selection procedure of the installation of public art in Taiwan is to a certain extent public, meaning that the public has the opportunity to voice their opinion and to engage in the selection and admiration of the works. However, it is the regulations laid by the government that make the implementation of public art projects in Taiwan rigid, with strict rules and procedures to follow. It is often that the public art projects in Taiwan are rigid in implementation.

---


86 Ibid.


88 Ibid.
viewed as formative or decorative devices instead of works that are done in accordance to the specific characteristics of the community.

However, there is still a general false conception on the equivalence of public art and grand visual arts in Taiwan as most public art installations are of sculptures and grand visual installations. To alter such conception, the Public Art Consulting Committee of the Council for Cultural Affairs advocated that performing arts should be included as public art. On the other hand, there is a phenomenon of “oversupply” of public art in Taiwan due to the enactment of the regulations. Sometimes, public art works fail to create positive addition to public spaces while they can only be removed after five years. This phenomenon questions the sustainability of public art regulations in Taiwan. In the view of it, the idea of “negative aesthetics” was suggested by Lung Ying-tai to review the present projects in the country and to consider the removal of the ones that are incompatible with the environment.89

89 蔡惠萍. 龍應台當官：一位記者的三年採訪實錄 (臺北市: 聯經出版, 2002), 211
4. Comparative Analysis of the Practices of Public Art in Taiwan and Hong Kong

Development of Public Art in Hong Kong

The early development of public art in Hong Kong was similar to that in Taiwan, most of the public art works were sculptures or monuments, for examples, Queen Victoria Statue (1897, 1957) and the Cenotaph (1923)\(^90\), both commissioned by the government. Some were commissioned by the private sector, examples include the Double Ova (1977) in Connaught Place\(^91\). The two major purposes of public artworks in this period were for beautification and memorial.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Taiwan</th>
<th>Hong Kong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1986</td>
<td><em>Lee Shienwen</em> initiated the percent-for-art legislation</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>The implementation of “Culture and Arts Reward Act”</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>The implementation of “Implementation Rules for the Culture and Arts Reward Act”</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Proposal of nine pilot sites for the installation of public art projects</td>
<td>The term “Public art” first used in Hong Kong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>/</td>
<td><em>Public art Plan</em> suggested by Regional Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>The implementation of “Measures for the Implementation of Public Art”</td>
<td>/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>/</td>
<td>First Public art project launched in Hong Kong</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2001-2002 | /                         | - “Cultural Clause” suggested by Arts Development Council  
- Art Promotion Office established |

\(^90\)張嘉莉, 羅嘉欣, 香港的公共藝術和公共藝術政策, 1.  
\(^91\)許焯權, 公共藝術研究報告(香港: 香港大學文化政策研究中心／建築學系, 2003), 7.
The development of public art in Hong Kong is relatively slow comparing to that in Taiwan. The term “public art” was first used in Hong Kong in 1995 when Taiwan has already implemented the “Culture and Arts Reward Act” in 1992 and has discussed the percent-for-art legislation for several years. The enactment of regulations marked a milestone in promoting public art in Taiwan. Owing to the legal framework, the amount of public artworks in Taiwan increases rapidly; many discussions and events have also been carried out (refer to the chapter of Public Art in Taiwan). The implementation of law regarding public art marks the biggest difference between the development of public art in Hong Kong and that in Taiwan.

The following is a table showing three main and only documents that directly refer to the development of public art in Hong Kong. All of them simply suggested “to develop public art”, with neither explanation nor direction for the development. There was no definition of public art. It reveals that there is a lack of in-depth discussion on the meaning, purpose, strategy and development of public art in Hong Kong; public art is thus not an important agenda for the government.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Key Points</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Hong Kong Arts Development Council Strategic Plan 1996-2001 Consultative Document</td>
<td>“Facilitate the introduction of public art and community art activities “</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Regional Council Arts development proposal</td>
<td>“Public art Plan”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2001</td>
<td>3 Years Plan Consultative Document</td>
<td>“Develop public art”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Suggestion of Cultural Clause

The existing studies on public art in Hong Kong ignore the fact that there was once a chance to discuss cultural regulation during 2001 and 2002. However, this should be mentioned in order to show a full picture of public art development in Hong Kong.

In 2001, the Hong Kong Arts Development Council (HKADC) suggested to encourage land developers to plan their projects with a cultural perspective via transferring plot ratio or setting up a Cultural Clause. The HKADC did not explain the idea of Cultural Clause in details; however, the HKADC suggested three examples of cultural perspective in planning: to adopt artistic design, to provide cultural facilities and to place public art. One year later, the HKADC again mentioned Cultural Clause as an incentive measure promoting public art in the document “Suggestions on Cultural Regulation”, in which more information was put forth, for example, the 5% floor area concession for the Cultural Clause. It also pointed out that public art in Hong Kong is not suitable to be promoted by legislation because Hong Kong is a free market economy; legislation may cause conflicts and litigations. Since the documents released in 2001 and 2002 respectively, no further discussions have been carried out among the society. And after 2002, the HKADC has not mentioned any about the Cultural Clause or cultural regulation.

It is justified to say that public art was no longer an agenda to the HKADC after the establishment of Art Promotion Office (APO), which marked a new era of the development of public art in Hong Kong.
The establishment of Art Promotion Office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>25 Public Art Councils (公共藝術審議會)</th>
<th>Art Promotion Office</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department</td>
<td>Ministry of Culture</td>
<td>Leisure and Cultural Services Department-Museum section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structure</td>
<td>Each council has 13-17 members including at least one from each of the following fields: art creation, art administration, art critic, art education, urban design, landscape, applied arts, architecture, culture and law.</td>
<td>Consisted of two teams: the team of Public Art and the team of Community Art; No special policy on the recruitment of staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Function</td>
<td>According to the “Measures for the Implementation of Public Art”, to preform consultation, draw up policy, revise regulations and examine public art proposals</td>
<td>To organize public and community art projects (with other departments or cultural organizations)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Established in 2001, APO is a division under Leisure and Cultural Services Department (LCSD). It is consisted of two teams, Public Art team and Community Art team. It aims to “enrich cultural life and promote art appreciation among the public through community and public art projects”92. Since 2001, it has launched a number of regular and temporary programmes with an aim to bring arts into the communities, for example “Artists in the Neighborhood Scheme”, “Public Art Scheme”, “Artalive@Park” and “Art@Government Buildings”. It also collaborated with the Housing Department on the public art project in Yat Tung Public Housing Estate during 2000-2003, which was the first public art project organized by the Art Promotion Office.93 The APO is now the

---


only specialized unit in LCSD promoting public art and is one of the most active
governmental organizations promoting public and community art. However, it is in the
section of museum under the structure of the LCSD. Though it has around 110,000
million budget per year, it has no authority to consult or draw policies upon the
development of public art. Thus, working with a project-based approach, APO has no
policies to follow. It functions merely as a department to execute public art projects. In
Taiwan, each city has a Public Art Review Committee, which is under the Ministry of
Culture. The members of these committees, according to the Taiwan regulations, should
be consisted of professionals from different fields including arts, architecture, urban
planning and law. The legal framework “Measures for the Implementation of Public Art”
also offer these councils a greater authority to perform consultation and revision of
regulations, and examination of public art proposals.

From the positioning of Art Promotion office under the museum section of
Leisure and Cultural Services Department, it reveals that the Hong Kong government
does not have a clear understanding of public art. APO has not defined and discussed
what public art is in any of their documents. The only definition of public art was
mentioned in 2004 by Ms. Lesley Lau, the curator of APO, in an international
symposium on art and public space. She defined the term “public art” as “artworks
created specifically for installation and display in public places”95. After 10 years, the
understanding of public art of APO has slightly changed. During the interview with Mr.
Ng Kalun, also a curator of APO, he contrasted public artworks with exhibits in museum.
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94 張嘉莉, 羅嘉欣, 香港的公共藝術和公共藝術政策, 6.
95 Desmond Hui, Proceedings of soul of the city: International Symposium on Art and Public Space (Hong Kong: Hong Kong Arts centre, 2004), 62.
He suggested that public art should be artworks in the public space that can communicate with communities, and people do not have to pay a visit purposely to appreciate them.

Public Art Project: Artalive@Park

Artalive@Park is chosen as an example to examine the function of public art project done by the APO in order to find out the true understanding of public art of the Hong Kong government. The project is worth mentioning because it is an annual project initiated in 2010 by APO. In the Policy Address of 2010-2011, the government suggested “to allow arts and culture to reach out to the community, we will display in our parks, open spaces and government offices buildings visual art pieces created by budding artists, students or teams, and improve the image, facilities and services of our public museums.”96 It was under this background, ArtAlive@Park was launched. Therefore, it reveals the ideology of the government towards public art and also the role of APO in executing public art projects.

Student Wong Ka Wing craved words on the fallen leaves and spread them on the park bench. She intended to create rooms for park visitors to think about their memories and personal encounter, instead of merely passing by the park. This is one part of the project “wishPark” presented by School of Visual Arts of Baptist University at Hong Kong Park.

In 2010, four local universities collaborated with APO on this project, namely The School of Visual Arts of Hong Kong Baptist University, The Department of Fine Art of the Chinese University of Hong Kong, the School of Design of the Hong Kong Polytechnic University and the Faculty of Architecture of the University of Hong Kong. Students from these 4 universities created public installation works for 4 different parks in Hong Kong (Hong Kong Park, Sha Tin Park, Kowloon Park, and Tuen Mun Park) with the theme of “City-Community-Nature”. Through these works, visitors would generate imaginations and thinking on public space and introspect on the environmental issues.

According to the official project introduction, these tailor-made public installation works would “speak to the very unique spatial design and styles of the different parks”.

---


The exhibition of the installation was held during December and February. In this period, free-guided tours and shuttle buses were provided to the public. Three performance groups, namely Community Art Network, City Contemporary Dance Company and Fringe Club, were invited to have performances and creative activities in those parks in order to “cheer up the visitors by bringing them into a leisure environment full of art and nature.”

“Twilight”, created by Max Hui, Albert Lo and Bonnie Wong from City University of Hong Kong, represents the high-density buildings in the city. A frame for the natural vista of Stanley Bay was created by bamboo; at the same time it provokes the visitors to think about the relationship between the city and the nature.

In 2012, the Artalive@park project adopted another approach for its exhibition. The public installations were divided into three phases. The first one was “Beyond the curtain • Envision the city” presented by the Faculty of Architecture of The University of Hong Kong at the Tsim Sha Tsui East Waterfront Podium Garden during March and May.


The second phase was presented by the School of Architecture of the Chinese University of Hong Kong with their project “Sensing Horizons: Five Excursions into Intimate Immensity” at Tai Po Waterfront Park from July to August. Finally the Division of Building Science and Technology of City University of Hong Kong presented the “Grasping City Lights - Focusing Nature’s Beauty” at Stanley Promenade in the third phase during November and December.

The project had extended to a 10-month-long event this year. Comparing to the previous year, Artalive@park 2012 offered more creative and artistic activities for the public to participate in. Each park offered 6 to 8 activities including guided tours, music performance, multimedia show, and percussion workshop.¹⁰³

Executing with a top-down approach, APO first chooses certain parks for exhibition, then they hold an open call for proposals, finally the panel will select and commission artworks. Therefore, the theme of the project, venue of exhibition, and the length of the exhibition period are determined by APO. The public can take part in the project only after the artworks are installed in those parks; and the “publicness” in this project only means that the artworks are visible and touchable in the public space but not the engagement of the project. Moreover, artworks of Artalive@Park were “custom-made for four public parks”¹⁰⁴ only in the sense of making use of the spatial environment of the park. In other words, the artworks were designed for the exhibition in the park, but did


not necessarily devote to the community or to the park itself. However, the “Measures for the Implementation of Public Art” in Taiwan requires all public art project to consider the public engagement before and after the selection and installation of the artworks, which emphasized the public engagement in the process of project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Publicness as demonstrated in “Measures for the Implementation of Public Art”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>● All public art project proposal should include a “Public Engagement Plan” (before selection and installation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● All public art selection result proposal should include “Public Engagement Record” (after selection)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>● All public art project report should include a “Feedbacks from Different Sectors” (after installation)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, the project Artalive@Park, to a certain extent, cannot illustrate the understanding of Mr. Ng Kalun in which the public artworks can communicate with communities when compare to the artworks in Taiwan, which need to go through a process of negotiation and public engagement.

The Function and Understanding of Public Art

The aim of Artalive@Park is an epitome of all other projects; features of public art projects done by APO can be found from this project. According to the official website of APO, Artalive@Park aims to 1. Provide an opportunity for students from the fine arts, design and architecture departments of local universities to show their artistic talents; 2. Give an artistic touch to these public parks; and 3. Make art accessible to all sectors of the community and to bring people to the arts. These three objectives show the common purpose of all public art project carried out by APO (as some of them shown in
the table), which can be concluded as (1) To beautify the public space; (2) To encourage local artistic creation, and (3) To promote art to the public.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Aims</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2000-2003  | Artworks at Yat Tung Estate, Tung Chung Stage One                         | - Form an aesthetically beautiful and leisurely art walk (1)  
- Give Yat Tung a very special look that is unique among Hong Kong's public housing estates (1) |
| 2002       | Public Art Scheme                                                        | Bring artistic elements into public space around us (1) (3)                                                                         |
| 2009       | Sai Kung District Council Public Art Project                             | Enhance district-wide appreciation of art through the erection of art pieces in the open space of public parks (3)                 |
| 2010-2014  |                                                                         | - To give an artistic touch to these public parks (1)  
- To provide an opportunity for students from the fine arts, design and architecture departments of local universities to show their artistic talents (2)  
- To make art accessible to all sectors of the community and to bring people to the arts (3) |
| 2012-2013  | Public Art Scheme of the Town Park, Indoor Velodrome-cum-Sports Centre, Tseung Kwan O | - Expose the public to art while they engage in their leisure and recreational activities (3)  
- Highlight the sporting culture brought about by the venue  
- Raise the profile of the town park (1) |
| 2013-2014  | Art @Government Building                                                | - Brings works of art into government buildings to stimulate delight in the appreciation and enjoyment of the arts (3)  
- Encourage the public to participate in and promote public art creation (2)  
- Offer visitors to the buildings a new experience (1)  
- Broaden the artistic horizons of the public (3) |
From the above analysis, it shows that the understanding of public art in Hong Kong had not change much since the 90s, in which the primary function of public art was to decorate the public space. Whereas public art in Taiwan has developed in various stages and has acuminated different contexts in their public art, for example the value of community identity and cohesion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Understanding of Public Art in Taiwan and Hong Kong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Taiwan</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public art works:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painting, calligraphy, photography, sculpture, crafts; any 2D or 3D artworks, monuments, outdoor furniture, aquascape, hanging installation, installation and other artistic creation created by any methods and media.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meaning:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create community identities and to foster cohesion among the communities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5. Conclusion

The definition and meaning of public art have been constantly altering so as to suit the purposes and ideologies in different contexts and in different periods of time. This project examines the differences in meanings of public art among the US, where the public art initiated; Taiwan, where the first place in Asia promote public art; and Hong Kong. The usage of public art in the US and in Taiwan are varied, including the functions in beautifying the city, constructing national and cultural identity, and assisting in the promotion of the art industry, while in Hong Kong, public art has less functions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function</th>
<th>The United States</th>
<th>Taiwan</th>
<th>Hong Kong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Beautification of the City</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Construction of a nationalistic image</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Enhancement of patriotism</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Construction of a civilized and cultural image for the city/nation</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Promotion of local/national culture</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. To provide job opportunities for artists</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. To arouse the public awareness of art</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Radicalization of democracy</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. To encourage public engagement</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Construction of the national identity</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Construction of the national memory</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Creation of community identity</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. To foster cohesion between communities</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Commemoration/Memorial</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In conclusion, to respond to the objectives of this research project, Taiwan government is an active facilitator; she implemented regulations as well as facilitated discussions and raised awareness of the public art among the citizens. Whereas the Hong Kong government’s main role is to offer funding to the Art promotion Office to executing public art projects. The evolution of functions and meanings of public art in Taiwan changed from monumental devices to the engagement of the community. While In Hong Kong, it changed from the monumental and decorative intentions to mainly decorative purpose.

Taiwan and Hong Kong have a different understanding and practice public art differently from the initiative one in the United States. In Taiwan, the concept of public art is similar to the concept in the United State, but the outcome is that some public art projects do not integrate well with the community and the surrounding environment in their implementations. In Hong Kong, the public art concept is similar to the concept of the United States during the period in 1870s-1900s; however, the concept has not been further developed. Taiwan has a higher level of public awareness on public art comparing to Hong Kong owing to the fact that Taiwan has specified government departments in administering public art projects and there are regulations to follow; whereas in Hong Kong, although we the Art Promotion Office is specifically established for public art, there are no policies to support the execution of projects. The most important thing is that there are no in-depth discussions on public art in Hong Kong, the government and the related departments also do not have a clear understanding of public art as it is not regarded as an important agenda for both the government and the local society.
| Figure 1 | Lorado Taft  
 Untitled  
 1930s  
 An exterior sculpture of the Louisiana State Capitol Building, which symbolizes the virtues of patriotism. |
|---|---|
| Figure 2 | Helen Lundeberg  
 Quests of Mankind  
 1940  
 Located in Canoga Park High School, California |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Figure 3</strong></th>
<th><strong>Figure 4</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maya Lin</td>
<td>Zurab Tsereteli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Vietnam Veterans Memorial</em></td>
<td><em>To the Struggle Against World Terrorism</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Located in Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>Located in New Jersey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Documents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>Arts Policy Review Report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>Hong Kong Arts Development Council Strategic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plan 1996-2001 Consultative Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Regional Council Arts development proposal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Leisure and Culture Serves Department Consultative Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Policy Programme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000-2001</td>
<td>三年計劃諮詢文件</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 2001   | 香港藝術發展局對《香港藝術發展局                      | 香港藝術發展局                      | “建議政府在批地時鼓勵土地發展商容納文化角度的規劃，例如採用有建築藝術
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>年份</th>
<th>背景</th>
<th>内容</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2002 | 香港藝術發展局就文化藝術條款的建議 | “所謂 Percent for Art 的法例，港府沒有相關法例，國外有地區的議會有類似立 法；台灣地區則有「文化藝術獎助條例」（1992年7月立法院通過），強制公  
有建築物須至少撥出造價的1%來購置藝術品，另「公共藝術設置辦法」（1998  
年1月行政院文化建設委員會頒佈）則屬於獎勵性措施。有關公共藝術（public  
art）的強制立法或者以法令形式的獎勵辦法，審批繁複，效果亦甚具爭議性，假  
若政府或建築商購置的藝術品被評為平庸、俗艷或抵觸風俗，而要求替換或移去  
，恐怕引起社區衝突或公訴。  
“若以本港自由經濟的環境及普通法的一貫精神，則公共藝術似乎不宜在香港以  
立法形式推行，適宜由建築地權的持有人自由選擇，政府擁有及管理的建築物，  
則可與社區磋商後，按具體情況進行公共藝術” |
<p>| 2007-2008 | Policy Address | - <strong>District Administration</strong> -104: To improve the work at the district level and further the development of district administration, the Government will enhance the roles of the District Councils (DCs) and the District Officers (DOs). In light of the experience gained from the pilot scheme launched early this year in four selected districts, we have decided to fully implement the recommendations for enhancing the functions of all 18 DCs with effect from January 2008 when the next DC term begins. The DCs will be involved in the management of designated district facilities. The annual funding for the DCs to conduct community involvement activities will be increased to $300 million, and a dedicated block vote for district minor works proposed by the DCs will be increased to $300 million per year. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>年份</th>
<th>政策 hausge</th>
<th>-</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2009-2010</td>
<td>Policy Address</td>
<td>Working closely with the URA on area improvement schemes in Wan Chai and Mong Kok aimed at preserving local characteristics as well as beautifying the area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>Policy Address</td>
<td>Cultural Development (No.127). “To allow arts and culture to reach out to the community, we will display in our parks, open spaces and government offices buildings visual art pieces created by budding artists, students or teams, and improve the image, facilities and services of our public museums.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April 2013</td>
<td>立法會財務委員會特別會議 民政事務局局長普德成發言稿 民政事務局</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>購藏本地藝術家作品 6. 在推動藝術發展方面，在今年的財政預算中，政府額外撥款 5 千萬元予康樂及文化事務署(康文署)，專門用於購藏本地藝術家的優秀作品，在公共博物館內展示，以及委約他們創作藝術品，在公共藝術項目中展出。我相信這將提高本地視覺藝術家的知名度，並且為年輕和新進的視覺藝術家提供展示藝術才能和建立観眾群的機會，有助支持本地藝術的發展。為保留彈性，撥款的使用不設特定期限。博物館購藏方面，康文署會徵詢專家顧問的意見，才決定購藏；委約藝術家創作藝術品方面，數量上須視乎作品的形式及設計。現時我們並未預設博物館購藏及委約藝術家製作藝術品的固定金額。</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Project/Programme/Event</td>
<td>Organizer(s)/Commissioning Agency</td>
<td>Collaborator(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Art in MTR- Art in Station Architecture</td>
<td>• MTR Corporation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>Artworks at Yat Tung Estate, Tung Chung Stage One</td>
<td>• Housing Department • Leisure And Cultural Services Department • Art Promotion Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Artwalk tour in Swire Island East (1) &amp; (2)</td>
<td>• Swire Properties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>Public Art Scheme</td>
<td>• Art Promotion Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Artworks at Yat Tung Estate, Tung Chung Stage Two</td>
<td>• Housing Department • Leisure And Cultural Services Department • Art Promotion Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003-2004</td>
<td>Public Art Scheme</td>
<td>• Art Promotion Office</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Found Item No.1</td>
<td>• Hong Kong Arts Centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Leisure Slice</td>
<td>• Hong Kong Arts Centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Yuen Long Subway Art Project</td>
<td>• Art Promotion Office • Highways Department</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Found Item No.2</td>
<td>• Hong Kong Arts Centre</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Event</td>
<td>Organizers</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>A Society That is Yet to Become Green</td>
<td>• Hong Kong Arts Centre</td>
<td>• Open Gallery of Hong Kong Arts Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>New. Reading. Space at Wan Chai</td>
<td>• Wan Chai Distract Council</td>
<td>• Wan Chai footbridges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005-2006</td>
<td>Spatial Wisdom in Hong Kong</td>
<td>• Hong Kong Arts Centre</td>
<td>• Main Entrance of Hong Kong Arts Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Public Art Scheme</td>
<td>• Art Promotion Office</td>
<td>• Hong Kong Discovery Centre, Kowloon Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Ko Shan Road Park, To Kwa Wan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Po Hong Park, Tseung Kwan O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Stalkshow</td>
<td>• Hong Kong Arts Centre</td>
<td>• Public Space of Hong Kong Art Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Body Movies in Hong Kong</td>
<td>• Home Affairs Bureau</td>
<td>• Hong Kong Museum of Art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Leisure And Cultural Services Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Hong Kong Arts Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Avenue of Stars, Tsim Sha Tsui</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>City Art Square</td>
<td>• Leisure And Cultural Services Department</td>
<td>• Sun Hung Kai Properties Charitable Fund Limited (donor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Sha Tin Town Hall Plaza</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr.2007</td>
<td>&quot;My Soil, My Land&quot; Ceramic Works Exhibition</td>
<td>• Agriculture, Fisheries and Conservation Department</td>
<td>• Hong Kong Wetland Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>The Cascade at the Centrium</td>
<td>• Sino Group</td>
<td>• The Centrium, Central</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr.2008</td>
<td>Hooves on the Move</td>
<td>• Hong Kong Arts Centre</td>
<td>• Main Entrance of Hong Kong Arts Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Organizers/Projects</td>
<td>Locations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan.2009 - Apr.2009</td>
<td>“Art-Marking-Boundaries” Central and Western District Public Art Project</td>
<td>• Public Art Hong Kong • Working Group on Greening and Beautification Works in the Central and Western District</td>
<td>• Hong Kong Arts Centre • Public Art Hong Kong • Whitty Street Tram Depot and along the tram routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May 2009</td>
<td>Sai Kung District Council Public Art Project</td>
<td>• Art Promotion Office • Leisure And Cultural Services Department • Sai Kung District Council</td>
<td>• Man Yee Playground in Sai Kung • Po Tsui Park, Tseung Kwan O • Po Hong Park, Tseung Kwan O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>“Everybody’s Art? Public Engagement in Public Art” Roundtable Discussion</td>
<td>• Hong Kong Arts Centre • Public Art Hong Kong • Hong Kong Art School</td>
<td>• Hong Kong Art School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>Public Art Project-Tamar</td>
<td>• Administration Wing, Chief Secretary for Administration's Office</td>
<td>• Art Promotion Office • Tamar Park, Admiralty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apr.2010-Apr.2012</td>
<td>Taking Off</td>
<td>• Hong Kong Arts Centre • Cultural and Leisure Services Committee of Wan Chai District Council • Public Art Hong Kong</td>
<td>• 3/F, Hong Kong Arts Centre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dec.2010-Feb.2011</td>
<td>Artalive@Park 2010-2011</td>
<td>• Art Promotion Office • Leisure And Cultural Services Department</td>
<td>• Education Bureau • Tourism Commission • Hong Kong Tourism Board • Academy of Visual Arts, Hong Kong Baptist • Hong Kong Park • Sha Tin Park • Kowloon Park • Tuen Mun Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Event Description</td>
<td>Organizers</td>
<td>Location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
• Art Promotion Office  
• Leisure And Cultural Services Department | • Hong Kong Arts Centre  
• Public Art Hong Kong  
• Tsuen Wan Government Offices  
• Cheung Sha Wan Government Offices  
• Wan Chai Revenue Tower |
| May 2011-Sep. 2011 | Park Déco                                | • Art Promotion Office  
• Leisure And Cultural Services Department | • Hong Kong Arts Centre and Public Art Hong Kong  
• Quarry Bay Park  
• Cornwall Street Park |
| Dec.2011      | Sunday Afternoon                          | • Hong Kong Arts Centre  
• Public Art Hong Kong                                                      | • Penfold Park, Sha Tin                                                  |
| Jan.2012      | Urban Waterscape                          | • Hong Kong Arts Centre  
• Public Art Hong Kong                                                      | • Main Entrance of Hong Kong Arts Centre                                 |
| May 2012-Aug. 2012 | Eolus                                    | • Hong Kong Arts Centre  
• Public Art Hong Kong                                                      | • Main Entrance of Hong Kong Arts Centre                                 |
| 2012          | Comics@Central–Lee Chi-ching              | • Urban Renewal Authority                                                   | • Exterior Marquee of Central Market, Central                            |
| 2012          | MTR New Railway Lines Art in Station 2012 (Call for Proposals) | • MTR Corporation  
• Art Promotion Office                                                      | • West Island Line  
• Kun Tong Line Extension  
• South Island Line (East)                                                  |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event Name</th>
<th>Organizers</th>
<th>Locations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 2012-2013| Art@Government Buildings 2012-2013 | • Home Fairs Bureau  
• Art Promotion Office  
• Leisure And Cultural Services Department | • Community Art Network  
• Sai Kung Tseung Kwan O Government Complex  
• To Kwa Wan Market and Government Offices  
• Sha Tin Government Offices  
• Queensway Government Offices  
• Lai Chi Kok Government Offices  
• North Point Government Offices |
| Mar.2012-Jan.2013 | Artalive@Park 2012 | • Art Promotion Office  
• Leisure And Cultural Services Department | • HULU Culture  
• Faculty of Architecture, The University of Hong Kong  
• School of Architecture, The Chinese University of Hong Kong  
• Division of Building Science and Technology, City University of Hong Kong  
• Don’t believe in style  
• Studio de Dimension de Tofu  
• Lung and Lam Company Limited  
• Horizonte  
• Arts with the Disabled Association Hong Kong | • Tsim Sha Tsui East Waterfront Podium Garden  
• Tai Po Waterfront Park  
• Stanley Promenade |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dec 2013</th>
<th>Dialogue Conference on Publicly Engaged Art Practices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Art Promotion Office and Cultural Services Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hong Kong Baptist University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Chinese University of Hong Kong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hong Kong Polytechnic University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Academy of Visual Arts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hong Kong Visual Arts Centre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Interview with Curator of Art Promotion Office (Public Art)

Mr. Ng Kalun

Interviewer: Our Project is about the development of public art in Hong Kong,

We are doing some cases studies of public art projects in Hong Kong. We would like to know how Art Promotion Office helps promoting public art.

Mr. Ng Kalun: Sure, I hope I can give you useful information. Art Promotion Office is divided into two teams; one is working on public art and the other one, community art. And I’m working in the public art team. The team of community art not only organizes art activities but also manages two venues, one is Visual Art Centre (VAC) and another one is Oil Street. VAC is actually a studio; it has an exhibition space, and also some studios for artists to rent. (VAC). We also provide some workshops and courses for those who would like to learn Arts. We are now in the space where we sometimes organize activities with artists and art organizations. We are now here doing some projects with some curators.

The Public Art team’s office is situated here, but what we are working on are those projects outside the office. We have some regular art projects, for example Artalive@Park, Art@Governement Building. Besides, we have public art programme, they are not held in a specific place like museum, but public space.

Interviewer: How does APO define public art?

Mr. Ng Kalun: Public art, from this term we can tell that, it should contain the qualities of “public” and “art”. It should be something happen in the public space, it can communicate with communities. It is different from those arts happen in museums, which people pay a visit to them purposely. In public space, everyone can access to the artworks. Maybe they are just passing by the park or doing their own activities, but they will have opportunity to find interesting artworks.
Interviewer: How does the public respond to the public art projects?

Mr. Ng Kalun: These projects are welcome in the community. That’s why we continue this kind of project and bring this to other different districts. As I know, most of these activities are quite popular in the communities. As I said, people are not coming to see the artworks purposely, they can see those artworks easily, if they do not like them, then the programme may lose its meaning. We hope the public can accept those artworks. Therefore, we have to consider the environment, the venue, and the community when we practice this programme. We don’t call the public “audience” or “visitor” like those targeted in the museum, but they are general public and park users, which we hope we can give them positive impacts through the public art programme.

Interviewer: How does APO choose artworks for the project Artalive@park?

Mr. Ng Kalun: The main method is “open call” for artworks. For the other project Art@Government Building, we also use this way to recruit proposals. We first choose some venues for the projects, and then we have an open call. Participants will submit their proposals, after that, the panel will select and commission the artworks. For Artalive@Park, we collaborate with local universities; this is not a competition. We will have a new round in Central and Western district in this May, Polytechnic University of Hong Kong and some other departments of design will join the programme. We will first discuss with those professors of the universities to see if they are interested in taking part in it. Since this is a good opportunity for the students to practice and present their design work, usually the universities are glad to take part in this project. The students have to do research, negotiation and field study to consider the safety problem and the practicality of the artworks. University will also invite artists and professionals to give them advices. Therefore, this is a very good chance to learn. We hold this project in park because there are many people in parks. However, we don’t want to disturb the park goers and users. We want to beautify the park and to offer something that they can participate in. When we bring more artistic elements to the parks, people can have more chances to appreciate artworks. This may also trigger creativity and surprise.
Interviewer: How do you choose the proposals?

Mr. Ng Kalun: We will only give comments to the proposal because their professors will lead the student teams throughout the project. This is a project collaborated with universities, the professors will decide which teams to submit proposals. But if we have a bigger space, we are glad to install more artworks. For example, Polytechnic University, in this round, has chosen 6 works to display. However, if the work is too large, due to the budget, we have to negotiate.

Interviewer: Is there any political message in those artworks?

Mr. Ng Kalun: We can interpret an artwork in many ways. You may see it politically, or merely appreciate it aesthetically. I mean, politics exists wherever there’s man and community. We are more concerned about its creativity and we do respect the freedom of art creation. Students usually choose social issues to be themes of their works, this shows that they concern about the sociality and I think this is a good thing. For example, they might concern about the stressful life of citizen. Through finding out what is happening in Hong Kong, they create their own works. You can say this is also about politics. Therefore, I think the “Publicness”, the political concern, aesthetics are also important.

Interviewer: Which one is more important, publicness or aesthetics?

Mr. Ng Kalun: I think they are both needed when you create a public artwork.

Maybe the aesthetic value is more important for those artworks in museums. But we hope these two qualities both exist in the public artworks. I would say, it depends on different works. We can calculate the percentages of these two qualities.
Interviewer: Before launching a public art project, would you make reference to any other cases of other countries?

Mr. Ng Kalun: Yes we have to do this in order to see the way other countries work on public art. Sometimes the other’s experiences are helpful, but sometimes they are not necessarily useful to us due to the different situations.

Interviewer: Do you think it is more difficult to do public art in Hong Kong when many lands become private?

Mr. Ng Kalun: In these ten years, public art in Hong Kong has gained more concerns. Actually public art exists, more or less, for long, when there are spaces, people and development. Even many years ago, we have public art, say in Cityplaza and Mei Foo Sun Chuen. They were not necessarily done by the government but the private sector. Before, not many people concern about public art, they don’t think there is a need for it, but now people aware it and have higher acceptance and expectation. Therefore, more public art project appear.

Interviewer: How do you decide which districts should the public art project be conducted in?

Mr. Ng Kalun: There are different considerations. We will talk to the District Council Members of different districts. If they think their district has a need or they find that people in that district would like to have public artworks, we will consider their ideas. We actually would like to do the project in more different districts, so that more communities can access to it. One thing we should realize is that not everyone likes what we like, but we hope we can introduce to him or her and they will accept it eventually. Some people might think public art is not necessary, but after the promotion of public art, they may think if their life is improved. This is also one of our purposes to promote public art. Artalive@Park is an event that can promote public art in different layers. First, for artwork creation, this project gives young artists chances to create their own works. Second,
for education, we provide some activities for students to know more about public art, for example, tours, music concerts and art fair, so that more people can participate in this project and appreciate the artworks.

Interviewer: Why all the artworks in Artalive@Park are temporarily displayed? Why not commission permanent artworks?

Mr. Ng Kalun: The initial idea of this project is not commissioning permanent artworks. The artworks will be displayed for a few months to one year, so the material of the works is not fragile. We will see if the work is popular in the community, or it causes problems. If the work is good enough, we can extend the display time. But we don’t see this as a permanent artwork to exhibit. Even though “permanent” still have time limit, because unlike in the museum, the artworks outdoor may have wear and tear.

Interviewer: There are more organizations doing public art projects, what do you think?

Mr. Ng Kalun: Yes, and this is good for sure. Different organizations have different approaches and purposes, thus the development of public art will be more diversified. If resources are allocated to different organizations, there will be more different aspects and results. That’s why we APO have many partnerships, so that we can have more varieties.

Interviewer: What do you think about the “Inflation” organized by M+? Was it a successful exhibition to you?

Mr. Ng Kalun: Usually not many people discuss what is contemporary art and public art in Hong Kong but I think the Inflation project triggered a great discussion on these topics. This is not necessarily their aim to stir up the heated discussion, but it indeed happened. Even though there might be no answer to the question of what is contemporary art and public art, but through discussion, the public learns more about them. In this sense, the project was successful. Of course there are different views on what is good
or bad, but it is important that the project introduce art to the public. As I said, each organization has its way to work, and we have different considerations, for example the venue and the weather. They are also facing different problems, say the inflatable sculptures leaked. For us, we concern more about the condition and safety of the artworks.

Interviewer: Why Hong Kong does not implement the percentage policy like that in Taiwan?

Mr. Ng Kalun: I think implementing a policy requires consent of the general public. Do most of us think public art is necessary and important or just a few people? I believe that it will happen if it is the time. If the time is not ripe, maybe artists think this should happen, but others do not agree, then if is impossible to implement policy or even a law. Therefore, it needs more discussion. As we said, people now have more concerns towards public art and every city has different speed of its development. I think the whole cultural ecosystem is changing in Hong Kong, for example, many years ago cultural activities were quite limited, but now is numerous. There were not many full time artists at that time, however, maybe the society is changing, not only more artists but art-related careers and programmes merge.

Interviewer: Thank you very much for answering our questions, they are very useful.

Mr. Ng Kalun: I hope today’s conversations can help your project.

(End)
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