

# Questioning the artistic residency

**Nathalie Poisson-Cogez**

Docteur en Histoire de l'art contemporain

Membre associé du CEAC (Centre d'étude des arts contemporains) de Lille 3

Within the framework of the professional meetings on « Rurality: a place for artistic innovation and cultural experimentation in Europe? », I was in charge of introducing the talking points for the forthcoming debates. My perspective, as an art historian, leads me to question mainly one of the subject's topics, which is artistic creation. Whereas it is not necessarily relevant to dissociate this section from cultural development, I propose nevertheless to address it separately. It is not about defining what we mean by artistic creation, which would require a long analysis, itself submitted to a contradictory debate, but questioning the link between artistic creation and the notion of territory, whose rural specificity has to be mentioned and queried. So how are the artistic issues broached specific to rurality? Can't they be transposed, totally or partially, into the context of urban areas?

To conduct these investigations - focusing on the artistic creation in « territories » - I would like to draw further your attention not onto the object that is the « artistic creation » which we suggested the premise that it was defined a priori, but onto the subject which is the instigator, that is to say the creator and more precisely the artist. So it is about questioning specifically the artist's place within rural territories. Several specific studies on the subject exist, in particular Sophie André's essay, *L'inscription de la résidence d'artiste en milieu rural et sa pertinence dans le développement culturel local* (The inscription of artistic residencies in rural areas and their relevance in the local cultural development) or Anne-Claire Lecuyer's essay, *Action culturelle en milieu rural, finalités et logiques à l'œuvre dans les démarches des acteurs en présence* (Cultural action in rural areas, aims and logic at work in the process of the stakeholders involved), under the direction of Jacques Bonniel at the Department of Anthropology and Sociology at the University Lyon 2, or Marie Pleintel's essay, *Art contemporain en milieu rural : un état des lieux* (Taking stock of contemporary art in rural areas). As for me, in order to identify the fundamental themes which would be likely to guide my reasoning, I suggest we take this case study as a starting point: the performance by the artist Joseph Beuys, born in 1921 and died in 1986, entitled *I like America and America Likes Me* set at the René Block Gallery (New York City) in 1974.

What a strange idea, you would say! It is not a residency but a performance set in an American megalopolis more than forty years ago... So why this example? First of all let us consider the date: 1974. We are immersed at the heart of what art history refers to under the generic title of contemporary art; a period stretching from the end of the second world war, 1945, to the end of the 20th century. And yet, one of the meanings of the word « contemporary » in the dictionary is « which is from the present time: today »<sup>1</sup>. In fact, the terminology used nowadays for the productions of artists who are indeed our contemporaries in these early years of the 21st century – whereas Beuys died in 1986 – is Art Today. My viewpoint is to study the work of a contemporary artist, now deceased, in order to understand today's artists, our contemporaries who are well and truly alive. As an art historian, I regularly use this anchorage in the past to support my research on the present time. Working with living artists allows me to benefit from the possibility of questioning their creative process and considering them as clever witnesses of their own work. So, if you accept this chronological twist, let us now look at the choice of the site. First of all Beuys performs in a gallery. The purpose of galleries cannot

1 Sophie André, Post-Graduate Diploma Essay, *L'inscription de la résidence d'artiste en milieu rural et sa pertinence dans le développement culturel local* (The inscription of artistic residencies in rural areas and their relevance in the local cultural development), under the direction of Jacques Bonniel, Department of Anthropology and Sociology, University Lyon 2, 2003-2004.

2 Anne-Claire Lecuyer, *Action culturelle en milieu rural, finalités et logiques à l'œuvre dans les démarches des acteurs en présence* (Cultural action in rural areas, aim and logic at work in the process of the stakeholders involved), under the direction of Jacques Bonniel, Department of Anthropology and Sociology, University Lyon 2, 2006-2007.

3 Marie Pleintel, *Art contemporain en milieu rural : un état des lieux* (Taking stock of contemporary art in rural areas), under the direction of Isabelle Sequeira, EDHEC, Lille, 2011.

4 Le Petit Larousse illustré, Larousse, Paris, 2004, p. 254.

only come down to the marketing of artwork, but it seems however that the structures and institutions (art centres, associative structures...) represented in this seminar, are not specifically preoccupied with the mercantile aspects of art without avoiding their financial and concrete realities. Secondly, also concerning the site, the geographical area is New York, in the United States of America, as implied in the title itself. So what about the European dimension? We will retain for the time being Joseph Beuys' German nationality as the only justification.

So, how could this work be used as a first step for our working meetings? We would now suggest that the reader who has not yet seen Joseph Beuys' performance should watch a recording of it using the following link: <http://vimeo.com/29225407>.

After this viewing, you probably still ask yourself the reasons why I chose this example to illustrate the theme of our meetings: « Rurality: a place for artistic innovation and cultural experimentation in Europe »? The many meanings of these terms have been analysed during our two days' work by the different protagonists present, but three words have caught my attention more specifically: Residency. Rurality. Culture. I wish to address them through the prism of Beuys' performance, first of all in order to identify a series of questions applicable in general to the different situations of artistic residencies in rural areas.

### 1° The Residency

Joseph Beuys produced this performance for the inaugural exhibition at the New York gallery founded by the exiled Berliner René Block. Without lingering over the exhibition itself – which would merit particular attention – we could question the meaning of this singular event, which happened between the 21st and the 25th of May 1974, a continuous duration of five days. For the purposes of my demonstration, I described this performance as a « residency », which the dictionary confirms: « Artist, writer in residence: artist, writer invited by a cultural institution, a local community, etc. to stay in a certain place for a certain amount of time, in order to create a work of art, often connected to this place. »<sup>5</sup> Let us first examine the very conditions of Joseph Beuys's residency and first of all, his journey. He leaves his home in Düsseldorf in an ambulance, wrapped in a felt blanket. He is transported by plane to J. F. Kennedy Airport in New York, and then another ambulance drives him to the gallery. It is important to underline that Beuys does not set foot upon American territory and does not take a look at it either because he is wrapped up from top to bottom in his felt blanket. He spends five days in the gallery without going out. I will review the proceedings of these days later on. He then leaves the same way he came: ambulance, plane, and ambulance for his trip back to Düsseldorf. Isn't it this an exemplary process of territory impregnation? Isn't it a perfect example of appropriating a place within its environment? Let us see now how the exhibition's display and the connection with the public works. As shown in the recording of the performance, the audience is placed at a distance by a metal barrier, which encloses the whole gallery. This barrier reminds us of a prison or a zoo and raises therefore the question of limits. Beuys had already experimented with this kind of display, which places the spectators at a distance, for his performance: *How to Explain Pictures to a Dead Hare?* (1965), which the audience experienced via a monitor broadcasting live the recording of the performance happening in another room. It would be important to question here the nature of the public and the relationship the artist has with it. In addition to the specificity of the public, because I do not know if it is an informed audience of art lovers and art professionals or curious passers-by and locals, it is important to underline the frustrated dimension established by Beuys with this display, eluding any participatory principle of meeting and mediation. I will review this specific point later on.

### 2° Rurality

We now turn to the second point of my study, concerning rurality. I mentioned earlier that the René Block Gallery was at the heart of Manhattan. In what way does this performance lead to a rural approach? Probably because of the coyote's presence. This wild animal, captured in the desert, finds itself locked up with Beuys in the confined space of the gallery, a White Cube. Here, it is more about wild nature, if it still exists as such, than rurality. We cannot perceive anything from the urban space surrounding the gallery. Beuys does not offer any perception of the movements and sounds of the city behind the windows. However, a soundtrack, broadcast by a tape player emitting sounds of turbines, evokes the industrial world.

<sup>5</sup> Ibid., p. 884.

The coyote evokes the wild nature, but the objects manipulated by Beuys call on rural issues. As underlined by Pierre Palliard in his book: *L'ordre domestique, mémoire de la ruralité*<sup>6</sup> (Domestic order, the memory of rurality), doesn't the term rurality imply the notion of domesticated nature? Apart than the torch, the leather gloves and the metallic triangle hanging from his belt, three elements in particular catch our attention: the cane, the piles of Wall Street Journals and the felt blanket. For Joseph Beuys, the cane is an allusion to the imaginary shepherd of his childhood. It is about the beuysian utopia of Eurasia, which would proceed to the reconciliation of the east and the west (especially the two Germanies) in the specific context of the Cold War. The piles of Wall Street Journals, fifty copies of which were delivered every day, are an allusion to the capitalist system, because this daily newspaper includes information about financial investments. The coyote deliberately urinating on this symbol is, for Beuys, about turning the economic concept into a cultural concept. Finally, the felt blanket is a material made of glued animal hairs, which are an excellent thermal insulation. During the performance, Beuys emulates shamanic rituals with his various accessories, to which the coyote is either very attentive or completely disdainful.

### 3° Culture

In a third point, Beuys' performance allows us to question the notion of culture itself: could it be defined as a complex joining of individual and collective heritage?<sup>7</sup> Beuys' real or fictional biography informs us that he was born in Germany in 1921. In 1942, he joined up as a Luftwaffe pilot on the east front. In 1943, when his plane was shot down above the Crimea, he was apparently taken in for eight days by Tatar Mongol tribes, who healed him with honey, grease and felt blankets, all of which have figured frequently in his work since then. Let us underline that inquiries made about this period reveal that Beuys' stay with the Tartars could not have exceeded twenty-four hours. And yet we see how the artist creates a temporal expansion of his immersion in the Mongolian territory, given the great importance that this real or fictitious biographical event will take in elaborating his artistic concepts. A few elements from his theoretical background are added to this personal story: theology, « exact sciences », art history, botany, medicine, ... He has also learned from the German Romanticism (Goethe, Schiller, Novalis, etc.) and is affected by the reconciliation of nature and culture, the part of animality in humanity, the construction of the subjective ego, ...

Before continuing the research initiated by Joseph Beuys' performance, I would like to dwell for a moment on the relationship between nature and culture, which probably takes on a specific meaning in rural areas. Through the shamanic figure, the coyote's presence and the choice of the American territory, which was once the Indians', Beuys' idea is to bring back together the old world (Eurasia) and the new world (America), perverted by capitalism. In order to achieve this, he relies in particular on what we define today as the immaterial or intangible heritage, which was the object of a Unesco convention in 2003 and which is defined as such: « Immaterial cultural heritage shall mean the practices, representations, expressions, knowledge and know-how – along with the instruments, objects, artefacts and cultural spaces – which the communities, groups, and if need be, the individuals acknowledge as part of their cultural heritage. This immaterial cultural heritage, passed down from generation to generation, is constantly reinvented by the communities and groups according to their background, their interaction with nature and their history, and brings them a feeling of identity and continuity, which helps promote the respect of the cultural diversity and human creativity. »<sup>8</sup>

Doesn't this fusion of individual and collective heritage use art as a means? Which leads us to question the singular place of art within culture. Is art an integral part of culture or is it only leaning against it? What culture are we talking about? I would like to substitute the fine-arts' traditional definition rendered obsolete by the multiplicity of today's practices, with the definition proposed by Nicolas Bourriaud, who states that « Art is an activity which consists of producing our relationship to the world, with the help of signs, forms, gestures, or objects. »<sup>9</sup>. The detailed study of Joseph Beuys' performance *I like America and America likes Me*, raises a number of questions about his form of travel and display, as well as his choice of cohabitating with a wild animal. The first would be – by reversing the roles – to ask ourselves if it is not actually the artist who is perceived as a strange beast? The audience would indulge in the pleasures of unhealthy voyeurism by watching this strange animal as though it were in a zoo or a fair. Or, on the contrary,

<sup>6</sup> Pierre Palliard, *L'ordre domestique, mémoire de la ruralité dans les arts plastiques contemporains en Europe* (Domestic order, the memory of rurality in the European contemporary fine arts), Arts et Sciences de l'art, Harmattan, Paris, 2006.

<sup>7</sup> On this particular point, read: Jérôme Clément, *La culture expliquée à ma fille* (Culture explained to my daughter), Seuil, Paris, 2000.

<sup>8</sup> <http://www.unesco.org/culture>

<sup>9</sup> Nicolas Bourriaud, *Esthétique relationnelle* (Relational Aesthetics), Les presses du réel, Paris, 2001, p. 111.

the spectators could have no interest whatsoever for this bizarre individual producing an incomprehensible ritual so different from their familiar social conventions.

*You don't live here, said the fox. What is it you are looking for?*

*-I am looking for men, said the little prince. What does « tame » mean?*

*-Men, said the fox. have guns, and they hunt. It is very disturbing. They also raise chickens. These are their only interests. Are you looking for chickens?*

*-No, said the little prince. I am looking for friends. What does « tame » mean?*

*-It is something too often forgotten, said the fox. It means « to establish ties »...*

*-To establish ties?*

You may have recognised a section from Antoine de Saint-Exupéry's *The Little Prince*<sup>10</sup>. This extract allows me to address several aspects of the issues related to the notion of artistic residencies in territories: the issues would especially relate to the status and place of the artist, to the different types of residencies and what they imply in terms of artistic creation on the one hand and the inhabitants' participation on the other hand, and finally to the political issues of artistic creation.

## 1° Status and place of the artist

Joseph Beuys' emblematic figure « considered to be in his time either a genius or a charlatan »<sup>11</sup> allows us to dwell for a moment on the status of the artist and the myths related to it in the collective imagination. Romanticism forged an image of the artist as a solitary tormented figure, apart from the right-thinking middle-class society, but it seems that today's artists offer an alternative to this cliché. Today, the artist is considered a « hybrid individual producing ideas and emotions, conveyed in accordance to specific language »<sup>12</sup>, a being relating to the world in a singular way, capable of creating a new perspective on what we already know and of transcribing it using different types of artistic expressions. With this unusual point of view, he reveals a different meaning to all kinds of realities.

If, while facing a multiplicity of positions, opinions and attitudes forged by singular individualities, it proves to be impossible to define the artist as such, what about the artist's place in territories? François Pouthier writes that « in spite of his wandering nature, [the artist] is nonetheless not deterritorialized »<sup>13</sup> and identifies three possible roles for the artist in any given territory<sup>14</sup>: the artist as a guest (staying temporarily for a residency), the artist as an associate (his contribution is maintained over time), the established artist (who uses his home as a creative place). In the debate following the introductory presentations of this seminar, Christophe Piret<sup>15</sup>, underlines that the artist is himself an inhabitant of somewhere, and therefore of his own territory, and can be « permanently tempted to write with his own environment ». Céline Poulin<sup>16</sup>, quoting Hal Foster<sup>17</sup>, also adds that like an ethnologist or an anthropologist, the artist is both « inside and outside ». Beyond the subject of the site, the notion of temporality also arises. For the artist, as much as for the territory, isn't it just a moment, a temporary stage or on the contrary a sustainable involvement? How does this stage fit itself into the artist's comprehensive approach? The artist finds himself immersed in a setting, an (un)usual context, whatever the place or time of the intervention. During other seminars, the artist Antonio Placer confirms that is all about « questioning yourself, taking risks, accepting making mistakes... and being judged » and that « this weakness is a strength »<sup>18</sup>.

<sup>10</sup> Antoine de Saint-Exupéry, *Le Petit Prince* (The little Prince), Gallimard, New-York, 1943.

<sup>11</sup> Maïté Vissault, *Der Beuys Komplex. L'identité allemande à travers la réception de l'œuvre de Joseph Beuys (1945-1986)* (The German identity through the reception of the work of Joseph Beuys), Les presses du réel, Paris, 2010, p. 9.

<sup>12</sup> Quelle peut-être la place de l'artiste dans une société du « savoir » ? (What could be the role of the artist in « knowledge based » society?), Meeting n° 2, Grand Lyon Vision Culture, June 2009, p. 18.

Available on [http://www.millenaire3.com/uploads/tx\\_reesm3/debat\\_savoirs\\_2009\\_01.pdf](http://www.millenaire3.com/uploads/tx_reesm3/debat_savoirs_2009_01.pdf)

<sup>13</sup> François Pouthier, « Portrait de l'artiste en passeur de territoire(s) » (Portrait of the artist as a territory mediator), halshs-00781869, 1<sup>st</sup> version, January 2013, p. 7.

<sup>14</sup> Ibid., p. 6

<sup>15</sup> Artist, 232U Director.

<sup>16</sup> Manager in charge of the extramural programme at the Pougues-les-Eaux Art Center.

<sup>17</sup> Hal Foster, « L'artiste comme ethnographe ou la « fin de l'Histoire » signifie-t-elle le retour à l'anthropologie ? », *Face à l'histoire* (« The artist as an ethnographer or does the « end of History » mean a return to anthropology? », *Facing History*), 1933-1996, Éditions Centre Georges Pompidou/Flammarion, Paris, 1996.

<sup>18</sup> François Pouthier, « Portrait de l'artiste en passeur de territoire, la place de l'artiste dans les projets de territoire » (Portrait of the artist as a territory mediator, the role of the artist in the territories' projects), *Synthesis, Culture et Départements*, September 2010, p. 2.

## 2° Place and role of the inhabitants. The memory

Beuys' performance questions the notion of residency, de facto, there are several types of residencies: research or creative residencies, diffusion residencies, and mediation residencies. These different types of residencies induce a singular relationship between the artist, the work, the inhabitants and the territory. In the specific case of creative residencies, several questions come to mind, other than the artist's place previously mentioned: what is the inhabitants' place? What role can they play in the creative process? But also: what is the specific nature of the objects produced? Do they have a legitimacy outside the territory in which, or even for which, they have been created? What are the modes of exhibition, diffusion and mediation?

The device chosen by Beuys works according to the principle of « closed-doors (...), a sacred and delimited space (...) focused on himself »<sup>19</sup>. The lack of any relationship with the audience emphasises the idea of art's cathartic value acting upon the spectators' soul <sup>20</sup>. As opposed to this relational fracture, the artist's residency in territories implies the presence of a specific audience formed by the inhabitants themselves. First as simple spectators, they can contribute to the creative process, according to the project. This effective participation can take place at intervals in accordance with the different levels of involvement. In her report entitled *Faire œuvre collective, aux frontières du monde de l'art*<sup>21</sup> (Making a collective work, to the edges of the art world), Virginie Millot defines three positioning types of the artist: the relational aestheticians, the craftsman of reality, the partisans of a threshold experience. It is necessary to point out that this report relates to the specific setting of *L'Art sur la place* (Art on the spot), an event occurring at the same time as the Biennale de Lyon, for which artists create collective works with targeted audiences<sup>22</sup>. The first category is the partisans of relational aesthetics - concept created by Nicolas Bourriaud<sup>23</sup> - who « redefine the sphere of human relationships as a space and/or an object of their creation »<sup>24</sup>. Further on, the report establishes that artists are defined by « the assertion of the authorship and ownership of works defined as relational. »<sup>25</sup>. The craftsman of reality, on the contrary, would tend to erase their own individuality, to appear more like « conductors » with a tendency to break with the common idea of a work's originality in the legal meaning of the term. These two categories have in common a « conception of art as a potential transformation of reality »<sup>26</sup>. Finally, the third category of artists transforms the artistic experience in territories into an educational experience without any direct link to their personal work, which can be considered sometimes as simply amateur work, not really even artistic.

The examples studied in Virginie Millot's report, question the nature of the objects produced. My deliberate choice was to concentrate on the artists, but a quick focus on the artistic creation is necessary. Beuys considers his performances more as « actions », defined by Franz-Joachim Verspohl as: « Presentation using theatrical means. The concept and the methods used are meticulously established. There are no improvised additions. The audience's participation is limited to a spectator's role. The action and proceedings are limited in time and space, but may be repeated, like a theatrical show »<sup>27</sup>. Therefore, we witness a dematerialisation of the work of art, in line with the artistic mutations of the 20th century. Nicolas Bourriaud would confirm this by stating that « the essence of artistic work would lie in creating a relationship between subjects; each particular work of art would be a proposal to inhabit a communal world, and each artist's work would create converging relationships to the world, themselves creating new relationships and so on, for ever. »<sup>28</sup> This definition of art, considered as relational aesthetics, leads Bourriaud to place the creation of every formal object below the effect it produces. It is probably the real-life experience, more than the artistic object, whatever its form (drawing, painting, sculpture, photography, video, installation, performance, choreography, etc.), that is at the heart of the issues of artistic creation in territories. Indeed, Antonio Placer, quoted earlier, continues his comments

19 Maïté Vissault, *Der Beuys Komplex*, op. cit., p. 28.

20 Ibid.

21 Virginie Millot, Axel Guïoux, Evelyne Lasserre, *Faire œuvre collective aux frontières du monde de l'art* (Making a collective work, to the edges of the art world), ARIESE, Lyon 2 Lumière University, 2004.

22 *L'Art sur la Place* (Art on the spot) is part of the Quarters' Cultural Projects of the Minister of Culture. This plan exists since 1997.

23 Nicolas Bourriaud, *Esthétique relationnelle* (Relational Aesthetics), op. cit.

24 Virginie Millot, Axel Guïoux, Evelyne Lasserre, *Faire œuvre collective aux frontières du monde de l'art* (Making a collective work, to the edges of the art world), op. cit., p. 26.

25 Ibid., p. 28.

26 Ibid.

27 Franz-Joachim Verspohl, Joseph Beuys, *Das Kapital Raum 1970-1977: Strategien zur Reaktivierung der Sinne*, Frankfurt am Main, Fischer, 1984, p. 74-75. Quoted by Maïté Vissault, *Der Beuys Komplex*, op. cit., p. 23.

28 Nicolas Bourriaud, *Esthétique relationnelle* (Relational Aesthetics), op. cit., p. 22.

about putting the artist in danger, adding that « the encounter is vital »<sup>29</sup>. I also mentioned The Little Prince. The notion of taming has a double meaning: on one hand, the artist's point of view, on the other, the inhabitants' point of view. When the artist arrives in a territory, must he act like a conquistador? Or, on the contrary, must he blend into the background, to enable him to take his time in taming the territory? Which tools does he use to appropriate this territory, which consists of the material and immaterial heritage and the people living there? What is necessary to ensure his integration? What part must the associative, institutional and political structures play?

### **3° A political perspective**

We have noticed, through Beuys' performance, his refusal to set foot in America. Far from a denial of the territory itself, it is a way for the artist to signify his disagreement with the American government's policy, especially concerning the Vietnam War. This artistic gesture becomes therefore a political one. Beyond his personal commitment, Beuys offers an art concept, which he defines as « social sculpture », considering aesthetic education as a driving force of the social revolution. He also defends the notion of « expanded scope » which considers that everyone is involved in the field of art. These concepts may seem paradoxical, given the mythical figure he created for himself and the detachment from the audience previously underlined, but Beuys puts his theories into practice concerning the educational role of art by creating the Freie Internationale Hochschule für Kreativität und interdisziplinäre Forschung<sup>30</sup>, in particular, in 1973. The concept of the artist's political and social role is broached in the Agenda 21 de la Culture (21st Cultural Agenda), written in 2004, and more precisely in article 35, which suggests: « [to] invite the creators and the artists to commit to the cities and territories in order to identify the problems and conflicts of our society, to improve the social cohesion and the quality of life by developing every citizen's capacity to create and his critical reasoning, especially when it is about facing the big issues of the cities. »<sup>31</sup>. There are also issues in rural areas. However, we must not exploit the artists in order to resolve the evils of our era, but we must see how they can contribute to changing the ways of thinking and in stimulating their fellow citizens, by their points of view and opinions.

The territory is defined as « an economical, ideological, political (social) appropriation of a site by groups giving a particular representation of themselves, of their history »<sup>32</sup>. François Pouthier defines, in this layout, the artist as a « mediator » and underlines the principle of « co-construction [by] the three participants: the inhabitants (the locals), the artist (the mediator), the territory (the public issues) »<sup>33</sup>. Besides acting as a mediator the artist can also be a source of meaning, to the extent that he transforms intelligible data into sensitive forms. Caught up with today's society, he contributes in his own way to the development of what we call « cognitive capitalism » or the « knowledge-based society ». This singular position is studied in particular in the professional meetings of Grand Lyon Vision Culture, entitled: *Quelle peut-être la place de l'artiste dans une société du « savoir »?*<sup>34</sup> (What can the artist's role in a « knowledge-based society be »?) The artist may be a mediator or a source of meaning, but the installation of an artistic creation in territories works only on condition that the issues we previously studied relate to those which concern him from a humane and an artistic point of view. This means therefore that not every artist can be immersed in a territory.

### **By way of conclusion :**

I have knowingly caricatured Beuys' performance deliberately for the purposes of my statement, by isolating it artificially from his entire work, which sets itself in the post-Romantic concept of a complete work of art. The issues of artistic creation question the artist's role and place in the specific framework of a residency in a territory. How is it envisaged by the artist on one hand, and on the other by the territory where he is hosted? How does it make sense to the locals in the individual and collective extent? How is temporality taken into account, either the temporality of the creative process or that of the appropriation? What memory of this residency remains? Is the object produced less important than the experiences of the artist and the inhabitants? How can this memory exist as an autonomous artistic object? Isn't artistic

29 François Pouthier, « Portrait de l'artiste en passeur de territoire, la place de l'artiste dans les projets de territoire » (Portrait of the artist as a territory mediator, the role of the artist in the territories' projects), Synthesis, Culture et Départements, September 2010, p. 2.

30 Free International Graduate School for Creativity and Interdisciplinary Research, later on named F.I.U (Free International University)

31 Agenda 21 de la culture (21st Cultural Agenda), complete text on: [www.agenda21culture.net](http://www.agenda21culture.net)

32 Guy di Meo, Géographie sociale et territoire (Social Geography and territories), Nathan, Paris, 1998. Extract available on <http://www.hypergeo.eu/spip.php?article485#>

33 François Pouthier, « Portrait de l'artiste en passeur de territoire(s) » (Portrait of the artist as a territory mediator), op. cit., p. 8.

34 *Quelle peut-être la place de l'artiste dans une société du « savoir » ?* (What can the artist's role in a « knowledge-based society » be?), op.cit.

creation just a pretext to contribute to human development? Finally, to complete Nicolas Bourriaud's definition quoted above, Joseph Beuys asserts that art is « a concept of creativity, of human liberty, of awareness by thinking, feeling, willing, in short by a dynamic awakening and by deploying creative forces »<sup>35</sup>.

## **Bibliography**

### **Publications**

- Bourriaud Nicolas, Esthétique relationnelle (Relational Aesthetics), Les presses du réel, Paris, 2001.
- Clément Jérôme, La culture expliquée à ma fille (Culture explained to my daughter), Seuil, Paris, 2000.
- Lamarque-Vadel Bernard, Joseph Beuys: is it about a bicycle ?, Paris : Marval Beaubourg Gallery, 1985.
- Tisdall Caroline, Joseph Beuys - Coyote, Schimer/Mosel, 1976. Republishing Hazan 2009.
- Palliard Pierre, L'ordre domestique, mémoire de la ruralité dans les arts plastiques contemporains en Europe (Domestic order, the memory of rurality in the European contemporary fine arts), Arts et Sciences de l'art , Harmattan, Paris, 2006.
- Vissault Maïté, Der Beuys Komplex. L'identité allemande à travers la réception de l'œuvre de Joseph Beuys (1945-1986) (The German identity through the reception of the work of Joseph Beuys), Les presses du réel, Paris, 2010, p. 28.

### **Research works**

- André Sophie, Post-Graduate Diploma Essay, L'inscription de la résidence d'artiste en milieu rural et sa pertinence dans le développement culturel local (The inscription of artistic residencies in rural areas and their relevance in the local cultural development), under the direction of Jacques Bonniel, Department of Anthropology and Sociology, University Lyon 2, 2003-2004.
- Millot Virginie (dir.), Guïoux Axel , Lasserre Evelyne, Faire œuvre collective aux frontières du monde de l'art (Making a collective work, to the edges of the art world), ARIESE, University Lyon Lumiere, 2004.
- Lecuyer Anne-Claire, Action culturelle en milieu rural, finalités et logiques à l'œuvre dans les démarches des acteurs en présence (Cultural action in rural areas, aims and logic at work in the process of the stakeholders involved), under the direction of Jacques Bonniel, Department of Anthropology and Sociology, University Lyon 2, 2006-2007.
- Pleintel Marie, Art contemporain en milieu rural : un état des lieux (Taking stock of contemporary art in rural areas), under the direction of Isabelle Sequeira, EDHEC, Lille, 2011.
- François Pouthier, « Portrait de l'artiste en passeur de territoire(s) » (Portrait of the artist as a territory mediator), halshs-00781869, 1<sup>st</sup> version, January 2013.

### **Websites**

- [www.agenda21culture.net](http://www.agenda21culture.net)
- [www.beuys.org](http://www.beuys.org)
- [www.culturedepartements.org](http://www.culturedepartements.org)
- [www.unesco.org/culture](http://www.unesco.org/culture)

<sup>35</sup> Caroline Tisdall, Joseph Beuys, Dernier espace avec introspecteur (Joseph Beuys, Last space with introspection), D'Offay Gallery, 1982, p. 121.