Sturtevant, Warhol Silver Clouds, 1987/2004, Mylar and helium, dimensions vary with installation, 88.5 x 12.2cm (each)
Photo: Courtesy of Museum für Moderne Kunst, Frankfurt am Main
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A BRIEF OUTLINE OF THE HISTORY OF EXHIBITION MAKING

Dorothee Richter

Using various illustrations, this paper delineates the history of exhibition display and establishes connections within that history. It also provides a list of suggested further reading. The outline begins at a point in history when art emancipated itself from being a cult object and became an exhibition object. Interpreting various depictions of exhibitions, I raise questions about representation, specifically who or what is represented, and about the human subjects involved, specifically how these are addressed as recipients or as depicted figures. How did such address and depiction affect the formation of identities? Which kinds of being-in-the-world, arrangements of power, and gaze regimes are conveyed by these illustrations? Which status do art objects have within the context of an entire staging, and how does its arrangement predetermine meaning?

The painting by Daniel Teniers does not depict a particular exhibition, but instead a fictitious and programmatic exhibition, or what Ekkehard Mai has called a “personal pantheon of painting.” Depictions of galleries from Francken to Teniers, Pannini and Robert exhibit an art collection whose displaying was meant to demonstrate the connection between power and spirit, in order to substantiate the claims of one’s own dynasty against the claims to power asserted by an array of courts, states, churches, and countries. The paintings need not necessarily reflect actual collections, and those on display were probably exhibited in different places, or they were copies, or indeed they were in the possession of the respective ruler only at a certain point in time. The guiding principles of the collection were size, the number of figures, and theme. “It was not until the eighteenth century,” Mai observes, “that nation, state, and history became equally valid points of reference, not only for contemporary art but also for that of the past and so the representative discourse changed into a public discourse.”

Cartesian perspective is mostly associated with the abstract and detached subject of central perspective, who observes matters from a safe distance. The gaze from within Teniers’s painting gallery falls directly and authoritatively upon the viewer. The geometry of the mathematical certainty afforded by central perspective seems to be equated with the certainty of an order established by God. Inscribed in the ‘show’-room, moreover, are the concepts and effects of gender differences, which since the Renaissance had been constructed upon distancing effects and upon the male subject as the subject of central
perspective. ‘Woman’ became an object – of the male gaze – and she thus became readily available and her image commodified. The gaze is as a rule associated with the male (subject) and the viewed or displayed with the female (object). In structural terms, ‘woman’ bears within herself the place viewed and taken aim at. Anja Zimmermann, for instance, identifies this structure when she summarizes the insights that many contemporary cultural studies scholars have arrived at: “Both the position ‘within’ the image and the position of whoever is gazing at the image are gender-specific positions. Not so much by way of attribution to concrete subjects, but in relation to the significance of this gaze regime for the definition of gender difference itself.” The eroticising of the gaze, that is, the pleasure derived from looking, remains the unalterable prerequisite for addressing viewers: the sexually charged nature of the exhibited results from this particular structure.

2 Pierre Subleyras, The Studio of the Painter

Subleyras’s representation of the painter’s studio leaves a striking impression of exhibiting what were still pre-modern values at the time. The atmosphere seems calm and inward, focused on the painter’s craft.

Malcolm Baker has outlined how the places where art objects were traded were transformed over time: “The artist’s studio or workshop, as apparent in Subleyras’s painting [...] were a place where art was presented and where business transactions between artists and clients could be conducted. But the commodification of art, which the growing art market indicated on the one hand, and the way in which art took on a life of its own as a separate aesthetic category on the other, both led to the establishment of new spaces serving the viewing of images and sculptures by an increasingly wider public.” The fine arts emancipated themselves progressively from their status as an artisanal, manual craft, while their commodity character became nebulous.

3 Gabriel Jacques de St. Aubin, The 1767 Salon

One such newly established space was the Salon de Paris (or simply the Salon), as shown in Aubin’s acquarelle. The Salon was first held following a royal sanction. Various genres were exhibited alongside each other, including history paintings, portraits, landscapes, portrait busts, and stucco models for large sculptures. Exhibits were displayed hierarchically, depending on size. Malcolm Baker has observed that “the exhibitions at the Salon were discussed extensively in contemporary periodicals and art literature, thereby attracting the attention of a wider public to the exhibition event.” The profane and direct trading with art became increasingly invisible; competition among artists, and the discourse on their works, now moved into the foreground.” Moreover, “this shift occurred in the second half of the eighteenth century, especially in France and England. The exhibition artist now became the new leading type of artist, taking the place of the employed court artist; the second leading type who rose to the fore was the artist-as-entrepreneur who accepted commissions for different clients or worked for the market,” as Oskar Bätschmann’s extensive historical research has revealed.

4 Johann Zoffany, Charles Towneley’s Library in Park Street

In the eighteenth century, art was increasingly depicted as a place of tasteful pleasure and critical judgement. Being able to speak appropriately about art was regarded as an expression of educated behaviour. The ability to pass individual judgement and to behave accordingly imputes a self-responsible subject, an ideological construction that assumed increasing significance. For Immanuel Kant, one of the most important Enlightenment philosophers, aesthetics assumed a prominent place: for instance, the current Suhrkamp edition of his
Critique of Judgement, in which the first and second versions of the text are reprinted, runs to 456 pages. Terry Eagleton has shown that Kant discusses aesthetics as an ideological function through which aesthetic judgement produces individuality. Jointly savoured judgement renders aesthetics a utopian place, the only place where a sense of community can arise. Such thinking differs markedly from the Middle Ages, where human beings occupied a fixed, unalterable position in a certain social strata, for instance a guild, family, or system of belief, and regarded themselves as part of a group, from whose determined positions behaviour and moral stance largely resulted. The ideology of the autonomous subject coincided with the development of a mercantile class.

Dating from 1883, Zoffany’s painting shows the British officer and collector Charles Towneley (1737-1805) surrounded by sculptures or their casts amid a group of men engaged in discussion. The men are positioned at eye-level between the Greek sculptures. The casts of ancient sculptures refer to the democratic ideal of ancient Greece, as the pictorially represented historical legitimation of democratic values claims.  

The first public exhibition for the ‘common people’ was held at the Louvre in 1792, as a ‘Museum of the French Republic.’ Images, furniture, and art objects taken from the defeated aristocracy were placed on public display. Written into this spectacle were both the appropriation and affirmation of prevailing circumstances. Hubert Locher describes how exhibitions were increasingly regarded as narratives or stagings, in which the meanings of single, autonomous works of art were placed within a overall context: “Shortly after 1800, Friedrich Schlegel, the German philosopher and theorist of art and literature used the term ‘exhibition’ in the context of a museum presentation. While in Paris, he visited the Louvre to see displayed the works that Napoleon had looted, especially in Italy. Schlegel described his experience for German readers interested in art in a journal that he edited. In the light of a series of the most important canonical paintings, he observed that each arrangement of a series of paintings in an exhibition presented the viewer with a new ‘body,’ and that such presentation entailed a new concept.” The rightful owner of the Louvre art collection was the Republic, that is to say the nation, and no longer an individual ruler, around whose gesture of display art objects had previously been grouped. The context of exhibitions therefore had to be organised around another (imaginary) place of representation.

5 George Baxter, Gems of the World Fair, (Belgian section), wood engraving, coloured, 12.1 x 24.1, 1854

10 BAKER, pp. 288/289.
11 LOCHER, p. 20.

5 George Baxter, Gems of the World Fair, (Belgian section)  
During the nineteenth century, national gallery exhibitions and world fairs were held across Europe and in the United States. World fairs were still exhibitions that jointly displayed commercial products, technology, and art as expansive, large-scale international exhibitions: 1851 in London (Crystal Palace), 1855 Paris, 1853 New York, 1854 Munich, 1867, 1878, 1889 Paris, 1876 Philadelphia, 1879 Sydney, 1880 Melbourne, 1885 Amsterdam, and 1888 Brussels. From about 1850, museum associations began establishing bourgeois museums.

Sculptures on display at world fairs included items assembled from what we would today consider unusual combinations of materials, for instance volcanised rubber or papier-mâché, since at the same time they represented new technologies. The participating countries...
and their products competed against each other, in an attempt to draw attention to themselves. Statues, industrial products and other art-facts were exhibited side by side. Writing about the spectacle that such large exhibitions involved, Walter Benjamin wrote: “The world fairs glorify the exchange value of goods. They create a framework in which their use value recedes. They open up phantasmagoria, into which the human being enters for the purpose of distraction.” The inter-relation of mass audience, industrial products and art can be seen as a precursor of the ‘culture industry,’ that is, the blending of commerce, spectacle and culture that became subject to audience, industrial products and other artifacts were exhibited until 1866.”

An expanded circle of visitors was subject to disciplinary measures, as Tony Bennett has discussed at length. Bennett conceives the museum not only as a place of instruction, but also as a place that ostentatiously altered behavioural norms and inscribed them in the body. From the mid-nineteenth century, a series of measures was developed to educate broad social strata to appreciate art. Brochures, guided tours, and instructions served to inculcate a specific chastened habitus. The paternalist instruction of manual labourers at the world fair in Glasgow included a ban on spitting, raising one’s voice, or excessive movement. This setting of instruction effectuated choreography with implicit actors, behavioural drills, and distance-maintaining regulations.

Sculptures were exhibited at large fora, like the Salon de Paris and the Royal Academy in London. These fora partly...
represented the performance of a bourgeois public sphere, comparable to cafés, parliaments and newspapers, thereby rendering obvious that access to the ‘public sphere’ and thus to the discursive power was reserved for a small section of the population. How images were assessed was now related to a ‘public’ discourse.19

9 Galerie 43 at the Landesmuseum Hannover

While eighteenth and nineteenth-century museums commonly adopted the former courtly practice of presenting art objects on coloured wall spans and vivid wallpaper, a gradual shift occurred toward upper-class interiors featuring quasi-residential collection arrangements. The Impressionists assumed a pioneering role when they mounted sales exhibitions in their workshops-cum-studios around 1870. In 1888, Paul Signet demanded exhibits to be hung in a single row, and already in 1888 gray fabric was used preferably to cover exhibition walls. We can nevertheless imagine late nineteenth-century exhibition spaces as distinctly colourful and splendid. Between 1870 and 1900, single-row hanging became the preferred convention; human eye-level became the basic measure, and exhibitions spaces were planned accordingly with lower ceilings.

10 Dome Gallery, Landesmuseum 1917

The white wall, however, derives from architecture and the interior furnishing of modernity, and can be traced to the brighter design factories and workspaces. In 1906, white walls were used to design one part of the Jahrhundertausstellung deutscher Kunst [Centennial Exhibition of German Art] at the National Gallery in Berlin. The director of the National Gallery thereafter retained this exhibition technique on the upper floor. Almost concurrently, this form of presentation was also introduced in the Rhineland. Initially, walls were mostly covered with white or pale-gray fabric, and a white or light-coloured wall design also began to assert itself in the academies. Especially in the Vienna Secession exhibition arrangements became increasingly colder from 1903 onward. In 1910, a solo exhibition of the works of Gustav Klimt presented the modern exhibition practice to an international audience. The Venice Biennale, founded in 1895, played a decisive role in spreading this practice. In the second decade of the twentieth century, studio aesthetics increasingly became a convention of museum exhibition practice. The early exhibitions of the Russian Constructivists were important stations for abandoning the picture frame; exhibits were, however, not hung in linear fashion. As Grasskamp observes, it was the Große deutsche Kunstausstellung ['Great German Art Exhibition'] of all things, held in the newly built Haus der deutschen Kunst [House of German Art] in Berlin in 1937, that bears witness to the triumph of the white exhibition wall.

11 Mies van der Rohe and Lilly Reich: The Velvet and Silk Café, Ladies Fashion Exhibition, Berlin 1927

Nevertheless, numerous experimental exhibition and spatial designs existed, especially in the twenties and thirties, to which contemporary artists often refer these days. One such example is Mies van der Rohe and Lilly Reich’s Velvet and Silk Café (1927). Visitors’ bodies were conceived here not as disembodied pairs of eyes, but also as subjects enjoying themselves and exchanging ideas. The softly flowing fabrics create niches and blinds, providing spaces for smaller groups.

12 Herbert Bayer, Walter Gropius and Laszlo Moholy-Nagy. Trade Union Building, Berlin 1936

Another example is the education of workers in a
very modern-seeming exhibition set-up, which provided a predetermined itinerary on different levels. The viewer became the subject of instruction. Visitors were offered the possibility of a change of perspective, together with different lines of view and vistas. At the same time, they could draw close to the artifacts on display. Auratising the objects was dispensed with; instead, they served as print media conveying knowledge and as means of directly addressing visitors as a political group.

The exhibition convention now widely known as the White Cube asserted itself on an international scale in the thirties and forties, among others at the Museum of Modern Art in New York where the opening exhibition was mounted in 1936 in what was now acclaimed as an ‘international style.’ From 1945, this type of exhibition was considered the generally accepted norm.

14 Exposition internationale du Surrealisme, Man Ray, Max Ernst, Miro, Dalí, Tanguy, Ceiling installation: Duchamp, Paris 1938
Artists also began to question the single-row, auratic hanging of exhibits and its implications, among others at the 1938 exhibition of Surrealist work in Paris. Of special interest here is Duchamp’s installation using bags of coal suspended from the ceiling. The only source of light was the stove at the centre, said to be coal-fired. In effect, the bags were empty, stuffed with paper, and the stove was lit with electricity. Duchamp thus established a relationship between the gallery space and its implicit presuppositions. An abundance of artifacts, things and fabrics, odour (a coffee roaster), the laughter of asylum inmates via a loudspeaker were supposed to evoke a syn-aesthetic and confusing experience, and to arouse desires.

15 Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, New York, Atrium 1959
A new wave of museum building began in 1945. Due to the migration movements and the altered international balance of power brought about by the Second World War, American collectors now had huge collections of Impressionist and Post-Impressionist works and, moreover, they collected modern and abstract works. New economies of attention developed with the differentiation of the art system, in which spectacular museum buildings played an important role in the competition for public favour. The paradigm of such buildings is Frank Lloyd Wright’s sensational Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum, designed in 1943 to house the collection of abstract art, and built between 1956 and 1959 on a corner plot on Fifth Avenue. Such spectacular buildings deviate from the linear design of former museum buildings, enabling vistas and relations almost capable of producing hallucinatory effects. Architecture often competes with and stands in a conflicting relationship with the art on display. In the exhibition hall, visitors are positioned less as individuals, than as a mass divided into small sections. Central perspective is no longer the exclusive architectural paradigm; vistas and open spaces no longer deploy the subject as a ruler of perspective but instead subject it to events occurring in the exhibition space.
were less occupied by men than traditional genres like painting and sculpture. The new media of art were nevertheless pervaded by patriarchal patterns, even though these had meanwhile been modified. The ideal of the idle, culturally refined aristocratic male had shifted into the ideal of the enterprising male. This relationship also emerged in the new art directions, and the topos of the genius was once again revived. As Abigail Solomon-Godeau writes: "This development is largely the consequence of the redefinition of masculinity under the auspices of a bourgeois culture. The aristocratic, courtly ideal of male comeliness and elegance was irreconcilable with a new gender ideology, according to which the concept of beauty and grace was increasingly and exclusively associated with feminity."24

17 Andy Warhol, Silver Pillows, New York Castelli Gallery 1966
The exhibition space also became a subject for discussion increasingly among conceptual artists. Andy Warhol's work follows on iconographically from Duchamp's ceiling installation. Nevertheless, this work does not negate the white space, but instead renders it visible.

18 Palermo, Wall painting, 1971
In the 1960s, a radical paradigm shift occurred in the fine arts: Pop Art, Fluxus, Concept Art all focused attention on 'the institution of art' and the relationship between art and the financial market. Artists integrated references to philosophical discourses into the works. On a theoretical level, moreover, the fine arts were subject to review, as Brandon Taylor, among others, has observed: "A sociology based on statistical empiricism, as developed for instance by Pierre Boudieu in The Rules of Art (1969), related a dedication to art institutions with factors like education and class membership. Since the 1960s, conceptual artists have repeatedly and directly addressed the relationship between art museums and the power to define culture; for instance, Michael Asher and Hans Haacke, and most recently Louise Lawler and Andrea Fraser, have debated institutional structures and the meaning of gaze conditions in the work."25

19 8.10.72, last day of Documenta 5, Harald Szeemann among artists
Harald Szeemann was the prototype of the free curator. His exhibitions became 'works,' and the impresario staging them an author. This development occurred, since curators no longer worked only as salaried staff for museums or other institutions, that is to say, as a 'function' of the museum, but as independent guest or migrant workers, requiring them to make themselves known and recognisable, like freelance artists. This brought the various actors in the field of art into competing positions, whose structure was clearly hierarchical." Daniel Buren has commented on the curator's unifying meta-function: "More and more, the subject of an exhibition tends not to be the display of artworks, but the exhibition as a work of art. [...] The organizer assumes the contradictions; it is who safeguards them."26 While this critique became visible as a contribution to the catalogue for Documenta 5, it was also integrated into the exhibition as a whole. Robert Smithson cancelled his participation.

Positionings in the field now had to be negotiated between curators, artists, and institutions. Power – and social, cultural and economic capital – is subject to negotiation. Professionalisation points to the emergence of courses in curating. Postgraduate courses, like the Postgraduate Program in Curating at Zurich University of the Arts (ZHdK), aim to provide theoretically well-grounded training, leading to collaborative working methods and projects.

20 Daniel Buren, Une Peinture en 5 sur deux murs, 1973/76
Brian O'Doherty's collection of essays The White Cube, published in 1974, attempted to describe the framing power of the white exhibition space as an institution within art, especially its elevating, charismatic, and ideological
effects. O’Doherty’s polemical and combative tone revealed that aesthetic debates also involved social groups formulating and rejecting claims. Thus, he writes: “During the classical period of the polarisation of artist and audience, the gallery space preserved its status quo by implementing its contradictions in the described socio-aesthetic imperatives. For many of us, the gallery space has negative associations to this day. Aesthetics becomes an elitist affair: the gallery space is exclusive. Neatly isolated from each other, the objects on display somewhat resemble precious items, jewelry or silver – aesthetics becomes a commodity: the gallery space is expensive. What it contains is almost incomprehensible without specialist guidance: art in the gallery space is difficult. An exclusive audience, valuable objects, difficult to understand – these ingredients make for social, financial and intellectual snobbery, which our system of limited production, our values, and our social behaviour wholly reproduce (and in the worst case parody). No other space corresponds better to the prejudices and values of the upper middle classes and boosts its self-image more effectively.

The classical gallery of modernity hangs in limbo between studio and lounge. Here, the conventions of both zones move around on neutral ground. Here, moreover, the respect for the artist’s achievement utterly reshapes the bourgeois striving for private property. It does so because ultimately, the gallery is a sales facility, quite unobjectionally so. The mysterious social customs clustering around this fact, the stuff of which our social comedy is made, deflect attention from business, which is about attributing a material value to an object that effectively has none.”

In these essays, O’Doherty referred to illustrations of concept art, which used visual means to formulate strategic counterdiscourses, and which reflected their fetish character of art and the conditions of its production, distribution, and reception. Prompted by philosophy, linguistics and structuralism, art, its installations and objects were subject to a radical reinterpretation. These visual rereadings remained not only on a formal level but also revealed political connections.”

21 Entrance Hall, Architecture and Design Collection, MoMA, New York, 1984

Art and exhibition institutions now became a subject increasingly discussed in art journals and academic publications. The dehistoricising effect of the neutral presentation of artifacts, as occasioned by an idealising, ennobling exhibition practice was criticised, among others, by Douglas Crimp in On the Museum’s Ruins. Writing about the exhibition of a combat helicopter at MoMA, which celebrated it as a beautiful object, Crimp classified this performative presentation as a hegemonic demonstration: “[…], the hard facts are that Bell helicopters are manufactured by the Fort Worth corporation Textron, a major U.S. defense contractor, which supplies the Bell and Huey model helicopters used against the civilian populations of El Salvador, Honduras, Nicaragua, and Guatemala. But because the contemporary art of exhibition has thought us to distinguish between the political and the aesthetic, a New York Times editorial entitled ‘Marvelous MOMA’ was able to say of MOMA’s proud new object: ‘A helicopter, suspended from the ceiling, hovers over an escalator in the Museum of Modern Art… The chopper is bright green, bug-eyed and beautiful. We know that it is beautiful because MOMA showed us the way to look at the 20th century.’”

22 Materials – A Temporary Archive of Feminist Art Practices in Contemporary Art, Künstlerhaus Bremen, 1999

Works of the eighties and nineties were subsumed under the term context art and displayed in an eponymous exhibition; the works focused explicitly on institutional, political, and social contexts, that is, the context of discourses. Subsuming very different artistic practices under a single term is, however, in itself reductive, a programmatic monopolising of discourse that some artists therefore rejected. Institutional critique affiliated itself
with political concerns and sought new formats of self-organisation. Once more, the power structures within the institution of art were subject to negotiation. Under the artistic direction of Helmut Draxler, Andrea Fraser examined the Kunstverein München in 1993 as a Gesellschaft des Geschmacks (A Society of Taste). Free floating groups of cultural producers committed to politics and feminism protested the possibility of using art institutions as sites for the articulation of agonistic interests. Besides the occasionally booming market for paintings, a ‘counter-public’ based on cooperative working methods has emerged in the niches of culture. (In the German-speaking world, this includes, among others, Büro Bert und Botschaft e.V. in Berlin, Shedhalle in Zürich, Künstlerhaus in Stuttgart, Depot in Vienna, Künstlerhaus Bremen). Reflecting on this development, Marion von Osten remarks: “Beyond the familiar artistic strategies, there also existed, from a historical perspective since the rise of the transmission complex of bourgeois art, a tactical usage of institutionalised spaces by groups of artists, left-wing, anti-racist, and feminist collectives and of course consumers themselves. These tactics, including the use of the art gallery for debates, meetings, workshops, film programmes, community projects, and so forth, became active in the shadow of the official art market, its power of distribution and a bourgeois public sphere; in Michel de Certeau’s terms, they can be considered an attempt to appropriate and reinterpret hegemonic structures – in the knowledge that they will not simply vanish.” Other forms of knowledge production, oriented not towards display but process, also mattered in these bureaus, clubs, action groups, artists’ houses and media initiatives. Integrating these groups and their working methods into the spaces of representation ran the risk of keeling over into a stylised, symbolic gesture.

In Sturtevant’s work, the White Cube functioned as a self-quote; the status of space, art and the bodies arranged therein became questionable; certainties dissolved. Appropriation Art still deployed the subject as the subject of central perspective; this subject must exhibit restrained, controlled behaviour and become a pair of ‘wandering eyes.’ Nevertheless, the status of the art object, space, spectator and artist changes, for where am I if art is no longer art but imitation? Seldom disclosing her first name and only signing her works with her surname, Sturtevant thus also indirectly broaches the subject of gender and the attributions of masculinity and femininity bound up therewith. What do we see – original or copy? Sturtevant eventually claimed in the catalogue that one collector passes off one of her works as a genuine Warhol, since he is no longer able to match artists and works. Subtly, this failure also calls into question the art market.

We have now arrived in the present, where the advent of digital media often renders impossible the distinction between copy and original;
in reality, pixeled printouts of a so-called 'original' are indistinct therefrom. Manipulated images are also no longer distinguishable from 'reproductions.' The truth claim of art and re-production is thus dissolved. The gaze regime of modernity is shifting towards a hallucinatory visual, which Martin Jay has presented in detail as one of three overlapping scopic regimes of (post)modernity. Notwithstanding the manifold artistic and theory-based critique of exhibition situations, of the ensemble of rule-governed procedures for the circulation, production and reception of art, of the disciplining of subjects, of the practices deployed to contain discourses, the White Cube remains the preferred mode of presentation in contemporary museums and galleries. Often, reference is made to the sensuous, self-explanatory presence of the work, and the object is situated within the tradition of idealistic aesthetics as an inexplicable, incircumventable thing-in-itself. Objects and subjects are arranged in a relatively rigid hierarchical relationship. All types of exhibition — whether art exhibitions or indeed video, design, history, or knowledge exhibitions — are meanwhile often subject to politics with regard to their commercialisation, their connection with the tourist industry, and their representation function (that is, to represent the city, nation, professional group, industry sector), and less with regard to an expand educational remit. The key measure of things is the number of visitors. Exhibition formats consequently become aligned — the staged media spectacle enters classical art and knowledge exhibition formats, and the ennobling gesture of the museum moves into product fairs. Media-based modes of display do not alter the passive strolling through an exhibition as such, but they can also create an infantilisation of visitors towards the senses. Instead of this apparent compensation of the passivity of visitors in the mass-media-staged exhibition, a new diversification of exhibition formats would need to be claimed. One measure of quality is a fundamental involvement of the public in terms of participation, discussion, and self-empowerment. Available as a banner and sticker, Antoni Muntadas’s statement (which can also be read vice versa) points in this direction: "Warning: Perception requires Involvement."
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