

Oona Tikkaaja
 Research Plan
 12.7.2011

AT THE MOMENT OF DISTRACTION Nonart and Invisible Art as Working Methods

In the canteen I choose a mixed salad, which has some dark, round lumps in it. At the first glance I assume the dark lumps to be olives. When I bite into one, a completely wrong taste spreads in my mouth: it was not an olive at all, but a grape.

It has just been snowing for the first time for the winter. I have a hyperactive puppy dog at home. I come home from school, open the front door and *wonder* how it is possible that there is snow inside, too. After a moment I understand that the white fluff is the filling from my pillow and blanket, which the dog has ripped to pieces.

Abstract

The dissertation discusses the possibilities offered by *nonart* and *invisible art*, two overlapping phenomena located in the border areas of the fine arts field. These two approaches offer interesting viewpoints considering, for instance, the relations between artist/spectator and reality/fiction. According to the Fluxus artist Allan Kaprow (1996, 98), a nonart piece is created when an artist accounts as an artwork something which is not meant as an art object. Therefore, a nonart piece does not have a proper artist-author apart from the observer. A nonart piece will, however, change into an art work at the very moment it is, one way or another, brought to art context (Kaprow 1996, 98).

I define art imitating the nonart effect, but made on purpose, as invisible art (cf. Augusto Boal's concept invisible theater / Boal 2000, 143-147). From the spectators' viewpoint, the art status of both nonart and invisible pieces is equally ambiguous compared to *artart*, which is easily identified as art (Kaprow 1996, 101). The ambiguous status emancipates the spectators from the role of the receiver and transforms them into (co-)authors of the art work. The basis of this study lies on the Situationist and Boal-minded understanding of people as active modifiers of their environment instead of passive consumers or public.

In the dissertation I focus on tiny *moments of distraction* that break our everyday routines. I collect experiences of distraction and produce them by means of invisible art. A moment of distraction arises when we encounter a phenomenon which does not fit the classification system we have constructed based on our previous experience. Modern, urban people classify the stimuli they encounter with incredible speed. A sudden distraction, refusing to conform to this rapid classification, demands extra attention and concentration. The influence often lasts only a split second, but it is enough to reveal the unstable and constructed nature of our "reality" and thus the multiplicity of possible realities. In addition, the experience of distraction is often emotionally strong enough to arouse an interest in the viewer.

My research questions are: *What kind of possibilities could nonart and invisible art offer for understanding the roles of the artist and the spectator? What could art based in moments of distraction be like and how could nonart pieces be brought into the art context in a way that would not completely destroy them?*

Definitions

Nonart is "no-one's art" that has no actual author. Therefore, the one who observes the phenomenon and brings it to the art field can be perceived as the author of a nonart piece. The spectator transforms into an author the moment she/he registers an artistically interesting phenomenon. Because of this border-breaking quality, nonart is a particularly equal form of art – although it has to be admitted that all people do not share equal sensibility when it comes to recognizing artistic experiences and thus playing with them. On the other hand, the observer does not have to think she/he is experiencing precisely *art* – the significance of the interesting aesthetic or cognitive experience lies in the power to enrich everyday life. I consider the moments of distraction as art, but it is the nature of nonart that this viewpoint is not necessarily shared by everybody. Augusto Boal is one particularly interested in joining together the roles of the author and the spectator. He sees it very important to get rid of the unequal relations of the active author and the passive spectator because these repeat the power relations of society (Boal 2000, 155). Also The Situationist International group pursued to dissolve the boundaries between art and life (Pyhtilä 2005, 21). Kaprow (1996, 99) emphasizes the difference between nonart and *antiart*, which originates from Dada and pursues to ridicule bourgeois values and attitudes: the nature of nonart does not necessarily include rebellious aspirations.

Invisible art utilizes many techniques often called as *new genre public art* – an approach of public works related to installation, street art and performance – striving to reach (also) the people outside the art scene. It is essentially site- and situation-specific, because the works are usually never experienced in neutral spaces detached from everyday life. Invisible art works can be permanent or temporary, material or performative, handmade or industrial objects, and can be easy or difficult to detect. Thus, the word "invisible" refers more to the label of art work and the status it offers than the actual work. For instance, the web art piece *Black People Love Us!* (www.blackpeopleloveus.com, 2002) by Jonah and Chelsea Peretti, Josh Kinberg and Andrea Harner do not offer the viewer any information about the purpose or author of the site (I know it is art only because I have read an article about it in *art* publication). This work can thus be considered as "invisible" compared to those visual web art pieces that are easy to recognize as art. Therefore, technical solutions are not in the main interest when defining invisible art – more revealing is the conceptual approach. Augusto Boal (2000, 144) emphasizes that the viewers meeting an invisible piece must never be informed about the performative nature of the act because the information would force them back to the role of a mere spectator – the role from which the approach attempts to break them free in the first place.

In the research I concentrate on the tiny moments of uncertainty that occur frequently in the course of our everyday life when our attention is weakened. I am interested in the *psychological experience* associated with these moments of distraction – crystallized in the feeling of uncertainty and eventually laughter. Strange experiences

are often shared with friends afterwards and laughed together at. Although a moment of uncertainty can make us feel embarrassed, the laughter has a healing social effect. It is possible to recognize nonart in any part of human life, but I concentrate on the moments of distraction because I perceive them as clearly similar to art in their power to abruptly expose surprising aspects of life. Because of their strong emotive way of operation, they have special power to inspire thoughts – and thus I believe they work as particularly fertile ground for considering the nature and possibilities of nonart. Similarly, the idea of producing a distraction is the core idea of invisible art – *elevating thus the concept of distraction in the center of my research and art.*

Why Nonart and the Moments of Distraction Are Worth of Studying

In the Finnish trotting courses the horses are fastened in long shed-like stables next to each other for harnessing. Once, about 20 years ago, I was a curious horse riding girl walking past the stable with my friend. I noticed a particularly beautiful Finnhorse and praised it to my friend. When we turned around and walked back by the side of the shed I saw the other side of the beautiful horse. It was one-eyed having only an empty hole in its head on the other side. Beautiful changed to ugly and ideal to dreadful within one moment.

I believe that *uncertainty* is a fruitful starting point for perceiving the world differently. It gives us a glimpse of the multitude of possible worlds, reminding us how volatile, constructed and strange our "reality" is. Why is this particular "reality" "real" compared to countless other possibilities? It is important to enable and highlight the cracking of reality by art because by doing so it is possible to reveal the power everyone has to influence the construction of our shared reality.

I admire children's skill for precise and free observation, originating from their fresh and exposing relationship with their environment. Nevertheless, as a mother I have learned how important *practical routines* are when striving to make everyday life smoother and trying to spare some of the limited capacity of mind and body above basic activities. Moments of distraction often emerge in routine situations when our focus and thoughts are not in our action. Topi Äikäs (2010, 213) considers the relationship of an individual to her/his own life and arrives to the opinion that we lead double roles: we can occasionally choose to act, in our own lives, in spectator-like roles (when performing routines in autopilot mode) and some other times in author-like roles. Äikäs (2010, 13) further emphasizes the difference between the audience of an art piece and someone simply wrapped up everyday routines. He sees the outsider position of a spectator as an intentional choice, while routines are a form of oblivion making our lives simultaneously both tolerable and numb (Äikäs 2010, 213). I agree with Äikäs about the two-way nature of routines. From the viewpoint of my research, most important is the concept of an active individual who is capable of making this choice between an active or a passive way of existing in the world at a given moment.

Allan Kaprow (1996, 125) refers nonart as the *empire of play*, which is an important fundamental of artistic work for me. Realistically, the artist's career still resembles more a competition than free play – struggling for funding and attention. The vague and out-of-institutions nature of invisible art fits well in the framework of play. In contrast, the invisible nature of work is often temporary: many times the works have to be exhibited in the art scene at some point, in order to get feedback and funding. As an artist, I am not against the institutionalized art world as such; I am very aware that

it is essential grounds also for the art that counteracts it. My enthusiasm to enlarge the venue of my works outside conventional art spaces stems from my desire to make art (also) for people who simply do not go to museums and galleries. I also want to avoid the "art gaze" that takes effect immediately when we recognize an object as a piece of art. Through the art gaze, we treat the object only as an art work: observe its form and content. Nonart and invisible art have wider means to engage the viewer when e.g. questions about site, frame and nature of the object have been left open. From the spectators' perspective, encounters with nonart and invisible art cannot be controlled beforehand: one can only keep all senses awake. Meeting an invisible art work is always a surprise.

According to Kaprow (1996, 103-109) artists should quit working in the detached sandbox of art and unite with real life as *un-artists*. The art world is, nevertheless, one of the few institutions in our society giving value and funds to full-time free play – and because of that, it is the sweet home of many artists. In this research, I will discuss the possibilities for artists to find their role somewhere between the extremities of being of a tame actor of the uncritical art scene and being an *un-artist*. Michel de Certeau divides everyday activities to *strategic* and *tactical*. Strategies are actions which are made according to the structures defined by powerful institutions. Tactics are situation-specific actions which adjust or alter official conventions (Kantonen 2000, 133). We can consider *artart*, the structures supporting it and producing the privileged status of professional artist, as a strategy. Conversely, invisible working appears a tactical approach, taking the role of the artist a few steps towards the un-artist. The viewer's rebirth as an author of a nonart piece democratizes the role of the artist. I want to work for expanding the right to be an artist for everyone. Yet, I am perfectly aware of the paradoxical nature of this striving – that after passing a long education to initiate as an artist, I am ready to abandon my position. I also understand that because of my education I cannot reach the out-of-the-art-world viewpoint anymore. Consequently, I am asking: could an un-artist or a nonartist be somebody, who waives her/his superiority over the receiver/public and how can this be achieved?

A man was walking on a railway bridge and heard interesting sounds, which he first believed to originate from the brakes of the trains. After listening for a while, he noticed that it was, instead, a sound art piece prepared for the bridge. He was very disappointed because the interesting phenomenon *he* noticed – and in a way made to his personal artwork – was suddenly transformed to somebody else's artwork. The sound already had an owner, which did not give space for the listener to make it his own anymore.

The Significance of the Research

Mary Ann Jacob (1995, 50-59) asks why the relationship between fine arts and their audience is nowadays so uneasy. Most people simply are not interested in institutionalized fine arts. Art museums have been established as places where the visitor is welcomed as a consumer of art experiences, which makes many people coming from outside the art scene feel uncomfortable. That is why artists striving to make art for a wider audience may want to find new venues and starting points for their art. According to Jacob (1995, 50-59), the ability that new genre public art has for seducing wider and more versatile audiences, exactly what makes the approach "new".

According to Nicolas Bourriaud (2002, 16-17) the social situations of everyday life (and the surprises they provide) are continuously decreasing when machines are replacing humans in many tasks. Many relations between people have rapidly developed towards the capitalistic producer-consumer model. We still need encounters outside the economic exchange, and that is why art that problematizes everyday social sites and situations is imperative. It is possible to use art for creating intermediate spaces, situations that have different logic from the capitalistic laws of interchange (Bourriaud 2002, 16-17).

In my opinion, invisible art can be a very strong actor with respect to the problems presented by Jacob and Bourriaud – and could offer some solutions. I see the social significance of this research in the opportunity to articulate the power of nonart experiences and the possibilities offered by the invisible way of working. By doing this I want to take part in *increasing the presence of art in our everyday lives*. My insight is that art is both valuable as such and as a functioning instrument for contemplating humanity and the world surrounding us. Therefore, I see the increment of art experiences solely as a positive phenomenon. In the research, I will discuss the roles of Kaprow's *un-artist* and the active citizen spontaneously building *situations* – highlighting the *role of the artist as common property*. The commercial visual flood flows continually over us through several media, which makes it even more important to highlight everyone's possibilities to affect the construction of one's environment. The competition-based society and the environment suffering of climate change give us *practical reasons to survey alternative ways of operation* in relation to i.a. the consumption of materials and an institution-based way of exhibiting art. There are nowadays plenty of artists working with invisible methods, which means that there is an urgent need to discuss the nature, starting points and reception of the approach.

Theoretical Starting Points

I was building an exhibition of miniature sculptures in a glass showcase in a shopping mall. Two showcases were located back to back, so that one could not see through them to the other side. I was working with the first showcase when I heard a surprised shout from the other showcase. Two women had stopped to see the sculptures. One of the women did not notice the ongoing construction, and supposed automatically the showcase would have a glass on the front. When she pointed some of the sculptures to her friend, she suddenly noticed her finger passing through the "glass".

I approach the phenomena of nonart and invisible art by exploring their *historical, cultural and physical backgrounds and conditions*. Conscious or not, an invisible work always comments on questions concerning public space, institutions of art and the viewer's insight of art. Our insight of art and the visual or conceptual phenomena near it form the mental environment of the artwork. The visual appearance or idea of an invisible work can come close to vandalism, practical jokes, advertising or activism.

One of the important starting points is *the philosophy of everyday* (e.g. Michel de Certeau), because both nonart and invisible art function essentially in everyday sites and situations, simultaneously stretching the boundaries of our shared reality. Invisible theater, a method developed by the Brazilian theater director Augusto Boal (as a part of the Theatre of the Oppressed approach) aims to present social dilemmas and evoke discussion (Boal 2000, 143-147). The audience of an invisible play does not know they are taking part in a theater play, so they are easy to provoke. Invisibility, independence from institutions and the spirit of counter-culture make Boal's method an important platform for my research. Since it is impossible for the spectators to know who has caused the event or made the object, and for what reason, they can not either be sure whether it is "real" or not. Reality is, thus, a question of definition: take the case of Pilvi Takala's work *The Trainee*, which created one kind of reality for several days. The artist raised eyebrows by playing a peculiarly behaving trainee in a large office. Another example could be Ahmet Ogut's *Hitchhiking General*, a performative work presenting a hitchhiker in general's uniform. These events have been (at least momentarily) reality for the people who encountered them. Accordingly, I will explore the psychological interpretations of experiences of uncertainty and embarrassment in order to gain a stronger understanding of how the moment of distraction functions.

Because presentation constitutes such an important part of a work, the question of a work's relationship to its surroundings, as well as the threshold uniting/separating them, is essential. Therefore, I am interested in the surrounding environment both as a broader cultural context as well as a set of practical choices. Undeniably, the commercial nature of public, urban space and the tradition of exhibiting art in museums and other specially designed spaces are essential phenomena relating to the site of presentation. The invisible approach offers possibilities for commenting and criticizing the commercial messages that dominate our urban environment (although, of course, a critical attitude is not an indispensable feature of an invisible piece). Meanwhile, besides being expensive and exclusive, the bureaucratic wheel of the exhibition mechanism often turns very slowly – giving many artists both practical and philosophical reasons to seek opportunities for faster and more agile ways of working.

This viewpoint gets much inspiration from *Situationists and Fluxus*, whose traditions it strongly perpetuates.

According to the Situationists, the capitalist society generates a feeling of alienation to its citizens. They then try to heal this feeling by consuming (in other words by buying approval and appreciation promised in advertisements). The alienation is due to an experience of disconnection: the "real" life always seems to be in some other place (in the dream world shown to us in advertisements). The need to struggle against the feeling of alienation (brought about by the consumer society) by consuming even more only increases the anxiety and forces individuals to work constantly in order to finance their accelerating consumption. For the Situationists, artistic work was identical to constructing a free society – which should be a basic right for all people, not only a property of the (artistic) elite. People should be able to control their own lives and immediate environment by creating *situations* that are important to them. *Detournement*, an important method of the Situationists, originates from Duchamp and Dada. It functions by separating issues from their usual contexts and reconnecting them to form new combinations, thus questioning effectively our accustomed ways of seeing and understanding them (the anti-ad approach is a good example). (Plant 1990)

The Fluxus artist Ken Friedman (2002) describes Fluxus through twelve basic ideas which include for instance *globalism* (=non-nationalism), *unity of art and life*, *intermedia*, (if there should not be boundaries between art and life anymore, why should any be left between the art forms?), *experimentalism* (experimental attitude towards making art), *chance*, *playfulness*, *simplicity* (cf. Occam's razor in science) and *presence in time*. Fluxus art does not try to *imitate* anything; it plainly *is* something (Higgings 2002, 36). The works can have any form: in the sixties, especially characteristic forms were performative events and Fluxkits (boxes containing different objects for the user to explore), but also poetry and music etc. were used (Higgings 2002, 11-12). The pieces were not planned only for the eyes or the ears, but many of them appealed also to touch, smell and taste (Higgings 2002, 46-48). I believe that the humane approach of Fluxus – as well as the Situationists' and Augusto Boal's striving to deconstruct the spectacle of society and to transform the monologue into a dialogue – is very near to the core of invisible working. The roots of the invisible approach grow from the border areas of fine arts: do-it-yourself street art, Fluxus happenings and event scores and the Situationist rejection of art.

Invisible pieces are often based on *the fine tuning of the relationship between the artwork, the author and the viewer*. By fading out authorities, author and institution, also the unaccustomed viewers are encouraged to openly interact with the artwork. The other, partly contrary approach is the effort to force the viewer to react (cf. invisible theater). The amount and direction of the desired reaction may vary from the practical proposals of activist art to the subtle, maybe humoristic, challenging of the accustomed ways of thinking. It is far too easy, and also very common, to avoid the contents of art by saying: "*it's just a painting, it does not concern me*". That is why the theory about the viewer in public space is an important context for my research. Some notable approaches during the last decade are i.a. *relational aesthetics* (Nicolas Bourriaud), *new genre public art* (Suzanne Lacy) and *dialogical art* (Grant Kester).

Relational aesthetics, a theory by Nicolas Bourriaud (2002), is an approach which evaluates artworks on the grounds of the social relationships they produce between people. The entire social field of human life functions as a playground for relational art (Bourriaud 2002, 112-113). The focus lies not in the selection of certain techniques or forms, but in an *interest in the relationships between people* (Bourriaud 2002, 43). The pieces can be objects or situations that enable encounters (Bourriaud 2002, 33), although creating interaction is actually not the objective of working, but rather a way of rendering social questions visible (Kantonen 2007, 129).

Suzanne Lacy defines the concept *new genre public art* by breaking it into pieces. From the 1960's onwards, the term *new genre* has been used to refer to "the new areas" of art: installation, performance, media art and hybrids of these and traditional techniques. The concept of *public art* has traditionally been understood as referring to large, permanent sculptures or paintings located in public places. Despite the location, the public has not necessarily developed a close relationship with them. The word 'public' has several referents: location, owner or audience. The publicity of traditional public art has often been related mainly to the location or owner, whereas the new public art strives to build a relationship to the people around it. In the new approach, the pressure of change is targeted on the *roles of the artist and audience, the locations of the artworks and the definition of art* (Lacy 1995, 19-46).

Grant Kester (2004) focuses in his book 'Conversation pieces' on *art, which aims to construct opportunities for conversation and encounters*. He refers to artist Peter Dunn's definition about the role of artist in this approach being rather a "context provider" than a "content provider" (Kester 2004, 1). Thus the artist is not producing predefined content, but rather building the frame or preconditions where something can take place. For example Rirkrit Tiravanija has provided many art museums and other environments with nice lobbies and spaces that can be used in many ways, depending on the preferences of the people using them. The frame can also be more strictly planned: group Wochenklausur from Austria has organized many conversations on limited, predefined topics. These conversations usually have a preset objective, for example providing a shelter for female drug addicts in Zurich (Kester 2004, 2-3).

My own way of working touches upon all of the above approaches. At times I might work communally and/or discursively. Other times I could produce physical art objects working alone. It is important to keep the framework of materials and production as open as possible, so that an idea, when it occurs, can take the clearest possible form.

My Artistic Work in Relation to the Invisible Approach

I have come to realize that many people outside the arts field feel uncertain in art spaces. This reflects to their relationship to the artworks exhibited in these spaces. Many people consider art as a kind of puzzle and are skeptical about their ability to understand it "correctly". I find it very important to make art (also) for those people – and the invisible approach is a brilliant tool for this purpose. It does not induce 'art allergy' because the viewers cannot be sure of the status of the objects they encounter. When the viewers' energy is not focused on the issue of art, the work hopefully has more power to evoke thoughts. Consequently, I am not particularly interested in making activist-style provocative works, but rather in subtly shaking our everyday routines. I want to celebrate the virtues of curiosity and openness and offer my fellow urban dwellers opportunities to see the world differently for a moment.

A major reason for working invisibly is my interest towards the irresolute boundaries between fact and fiction. My objective is to give my fictive works an independent life that would transform into a part of our shared reality. I worked actively with gallery exhibitions for some years, building site-specific, immersive spaces in an attempt to bring my fiction into the common reality. Afterwards, I was not satisfied with the installations which I felt remained merely as quiet props. At that point, I noticed that the everyday environment can offer notably better possibilities for crossing the boundaries of fiction compared to constructed spaces already filled with meaning. My Master of Fine Art thesis (2010) was an attempt to make fantasy art in real props. The project did not work out like I planned, but still it was an important opening in my artistic path.

Invisible art is naturally located in the everyday environment, but it can also be placed in the art museum. In the spring 2008, I worked as a member of a work group planning and implementing two live action role plays in the Kiasma and Ateneum art museums in Helsinki. The role plays functioned as invisible performances for the arbitrary museum visitors, although the players were, of course, aware of the nature of the play (see Pettersson, 2009). In the year 2009, I started a continuous work called *The Planet of Lost Pens*, which consists of bright yellow pens printed with the text 'where do all the lost pens go?' that are left in different places in the urban environment.

My motives for invisible working are:

- 1) *Animating the relationship between the viewer and the artwork*
 - > partial abandoning of authorship
 - > to induce reactions in the viewer
- 2) *Playing with the boundaries of fact and fiction*
 - > an opportunity to practically change our physical reality, leave a mark
 - > a chance to dissolve the boundaries between reality and stories
- 3) *Detaching myself from exhibition-based working*
 - > philosophical point of view: accessibility, everyday etc.
 - > practical considerations: exclusivity, expensiveness, slowness of the system

Research Questions and Methods

The research questions:

- > *What could art based in moments of distraction be like?*
- > *What kind of possibilities could nonart and invisible art offer for understanding the roles of the artist and the spectator?*
- > *How could nonart pieces be brought into the art context in a way that would not completely destroy them?*

I will work these questions out by:

- 1) familiarizing myself with the theory base mentioned earlier
- 2) organizing workshops, where invisible works are planned
- 3) collecting the moments of distraction by observation and interviews
- 4) trying to find an appropriate way to bring the collected nonart material to art context
- 5) making invisible works

The instructor of the dissertation is **Denise Ziegler**, Doctor of Fine Art.

My objective is to collect a large database of moments of distraction by using observation and interviews. I will make inquiries and interviews in many different contexts, also in the workshops, which I hope will break the ice between the participants and me. The workshops will have different durations and target groups. The idea is to plan (and perhaps implement) a piece that would not be easy to recognize as art, and consequently stir up conversation about this kind of art. Because I am interested in the human nature of the moment of distraction, I find it important to organize the workshops for many different groups of people: children, disabled, Finnish, American, nurses etc. Every participant is, of course, an individual with her/his opinions above being a representative a group, but I believe the diversity of backgrounds will give rise positive variety in the material. The workshop is an important working method, because it lets me *discuss the making of the works* with different people. The situation is also natural for *collecting moments of distraction*. Furthermore, the workshops will give me *plenty of artworks to research*. They will also give me the opportunity to *encourage people in practice to work invisibly* and influence their environment. Moreover, I am applying for a position of a visiting researcher abroad for the academic year 2012 – 13 in order to be able to organize workshops, inquiries and interviews also outside Finland. I also want to set myself into the position of a foreigner in order to have more experiences of distractions produced by operating in a foreign culture and environment.

I will continue developing the collected material by seeking an appropriate way to show the nonart pieces in the art context as well as by making invisible works related to it. The study will advance cyclically, starting by collecting the experiences, then making art of them, and again collecting experiences of the works etc. Even the collecting process itself may turn into an art piece. While collecting, I will not even try to categorize the experiences by source ("real" or art): it is usually impossible, and actually irrelevant. However, I do plan to interview people also in locations near my own works in order to get information about the reactions they have generated. Through my own pieces, I can also study the borderline between nonart and invisible

art: how will the interpretation change, if I tell the viewer that the object she/he thought was coincidental is, in fact, an artwork? Finally, I will develop my own pieces in relation to the collected moments of distraction and the earlier works made in the workshops and by professional artists. The process will include plenty of works, but at the moment, it is not possible to yet even sketch them.

The framework for the dissertation:

1) Nonart and Invisible art

Defining and contextualizing the concepts (Fluxus, Situationists, Boal...)
 The relations between nonart, invisible art and artart
 Venues: everyday and public space (philosophy of everyday, urban space)
 The possibilities offered by the approaches:
 The convergence of the roles of author and viewer (playing)
 Highlighting the constructive nature of the reality

(Mainly theoretical sources)

2) The Moment of Distraction as (non)art

The special nature of the moment of distraction
 Failure in the system
 The variety of possible worlds
 Uncertainty – embarrassment – laughter (psychology)
 Distraction as art

(Sources: mainly the collected experiences, workshops, artworks)

3) The Roles of the Author and the Viewer in Nonart and Invisible Art

The effect of knowledge in the process of interpretation
 Seeking a method to bring nonart to the art context
 Is invisible art imitating nonart?
 From viewer to author?

(Sources: mainly the artworks of my own and from the workshops)

Key Concepts:

Nonart, invisible art, artart, everyday, routines, public space, failure, distraction, classification, embarrassment, play, laughter, expanded authorship, the relation of artist and public, the relation of art and life.

Bibliography

- Alberro, Alexander & Stimson, Blake**, editors (2009) *Institutional Critique: An Anthology of Artists' Writings*. MIT Press, Cambridge
- Baudrillard, Jean** (1998) *The Consumer Society. Myths & Structures*. SAGE Publications, London, Thousand Oaks & New Delhi
- Bishop, Claire** *Participation*. Documents of Contemporary Art / MIT Press, Cambridge
- Boal, Augusto (2000) *Theatre of the Oppressed*. Pluto Press, London
- Borden, Iain & Kerr, Joe & Rendell, Jane & Pivaro, Alicia**, editors. (2002) *The Unknown City – Contesting Architecture and Social Space*. MIT Press, Cambridge
- Bourriaud Nicolas** (2002) *Relational Aesthetics*. Les presses du reel, Dijon
- de Certeau, Michel** (1984) *The Practice of Everyday Life*. University of California Press, Berkeley
- Carlson, Marvin** (2006) *Esitys ja performanssi*. Translated by Riina Maukola. Like, Helsinki
- Coverley, Merlin** *Psychogeography*
- Debord, Guy** (1995) *Society of the Spectacle*. New York : Zone Books,
- Derrida, Jacques** (1987) *The Truth in Painting*. University of Chicago Press
- Doherty, Claire**, edited. (2009) *Situation*. Documents of Contemporary Art / MIT Press, Cambridge
- Fried, Michael** (2008) *Why Photography Matters as Art as Never Before* Yale University Press, New Haven and London
- Hannula, Mika** (2004) *Nykytaiteen harharetket -kommunikaatioprosessi valkoisen kuution ulkopuolella*. Kuvataideakatemia, Helsinki
- Harvie, Jen** *Theatre and the City*
- Higgings, Hannah** (2002) *The Fluxus Experience*. University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles
- Jacob, Mary Jane** (1995) *An Unfashionable Audience* teoksessa *Mapping the Terrain – New Genre Public Art*, edited Suzanne Lacy. Bay Press, Seattle, Washington
- Johnstone, Stephen**, edited. (2008) *The Everyday*. Documents of Contemporary Art / MIT Press, Cambridge
- Kantonen, Lea** (2005) *Telтта – Kohtaamisia nuorten taidetyöpajoissa*. Taideteollinen korkeakoulu A 54
- Kantonen, Lea**, edited (2010) *Ankaraa ja myötätuntoista kuuntelua. Keskustelevaa kirjoitusta paikkasidonnaisesta taiteesta*. Kuvataideakatemia, Helsinki
- Kantonen, Pekka** (2010) *Vakoilua ja vastavakoilua* in publication *Ankaraa ja myötätuntoista kuuntelua. Keskustelevaa kirjoitusta paikkasidonnaisesta taiteesta*, edited by Lea Kantonen. Kuvataideakatemia, Helsinki
- Kaprow, Allan, toim. Kelley, Jeff** (1996) *Essays on the Blurring of Art and Life*. University of California Press, Berkeley, Los Angeles, London
- Kester, Grant H.** (2004) *Conversation Pieces – Community + Communication in Modern Art*. University of California Press, Berkeley and Los Angeles
- Kwon, Miwon** (2004) *One Place After Another*. The MIT Press, Cambridge
- Lacy, Suzanne**, edited (1995) *Mapping the Terrain – New Genre Public Art*. Bay Press, Seattle, Washington
- Lippard, Lucy** (1997) *The Lure of the Local: Senses of Place in a Multicentered Society*. The New Press, New York
- Lefebvre, Henri** (2000) *The Production of Space*. Blackwell Publishers, Oxford & Malden

- Massey, Doreen B.** (2005) *For Space*. SAGE Publications, London, Thousand Oaks & New Delhi
- Naukkarinen, Ossi** *Ympäristön taide*
- O'Doherty, Brian** (1999) *Inside the White Cube – The Ideology of the Gallery Space*. University of California Press: Berkeley, Los Angeles, London
- Pettersson Susanna**, edited (2009) *Tulevaisuuden taidemuseo*, Valtion taidemuseon julkaisusarja / museologia 3, Helsinki
- Plant, Sadie** (1992) *The Situationist International in a Postmodern Age*. Routledge, London and New York
- Pyhtilä, Marko** (2005) *Kansainväliset situationistit – speaktaakkelin kritiikki*. Like, Helsinki
- Ranciere, Jacques** *The Emancipated Spectator*
- Ridell, Seija & Kymäläinen, Päivi & Nyysönen, Timo**, edited (2009) *Julkisen tilan poetiikkaa ja politiikkaa. Tieteidenvälisiä otteita vallasta kaupunki-, media- ja virtuaaliloissa*. Tampere University Press. Tampere
- Sadler, Simon** (1998) *The Situationist City* The MIT Press, Cambridge
- Sheringham, Michael** (2006) *Everyday Life – Theories and Practices from Surrealism to the Present*. Oxford University Press
- Vaneigem, Raoul** *The Revolution of Everyday Life*
- Äikäs, Topi** (2010) *Yleisö* in the publication *Ankaraa ja myötätuntoista kuuntelua*. Keskustelevaa kirjoitusta paikkasidonnoisesta taiteesta, edited by Lea Kantonen. Kuvataideakatemia, Helsinki

Online sources

- Friedman, Ken** (2002) *Forty Years of Fluxus*
<http://www.artnotart.com/fluxus/kfriedman-fourtyyears.html>. Referred 15.11.2009.
- Plant, Sadie** (1990) *Kansainväliset situationistit: speaktaakkelimainen kieltäminen* in publication *Väärin ajateltua – anarkistisia puheenvuoroja herruudettomasta yhteiskunnasta*, edited by Timo Ahonen, Markus Termonen, Tuomas Tirkkonen and Ulla Vehaluoto. [Http://cc.joensuu.fi/~jnsoa/kokoelma/000va.htm](http://cc.joensuu.fi/~jnsoa/kokoelma/000va.htm). Referred 15.11.2009.