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1 Introduction

Background of Study

1.1 One of the missions of the Visual Art Committee (VAC) of the Hong Kong Arts Development Council (ADC) is to improve the visual arts environment in Hong Kong. In 2001, VAC considered to conduct a research project on local environments that are conducive to the development of public art. They sent out a call of proposal in March to conduct a research project on public art through an invited competition. After interview and selection, the author of this report was commissioned as Consultant to undertake the research starting November 1, 2001.

1.2 The original scope of the project includes the following suggested tasks to be reorganized or amended by the Consultant:

i. Establish a working definition (or definitions) of “Public Art” applicable to the local situation and this research project.

ii. Review the existing state of public art and the influence of government measures of the different stakeholders in the public sphere concerning public art.

iii. Review and analyze the current public, corporate and government attitude towards the public visual environment and identify the key factors that shape those attitudes.

iv. Review the influence of public art on the environment, transportation and people’s everyday life in Hong Kong.

v. Identify a few cities of comparative value to Hong Kong and account for their legislation, urban planning, display strategies and funding sources in connection with public art.

vi. Develop a framework for identifying and communicating the relationship of public art to the art consumers, the whole community as well as the regional communities.

vii. Identify at least three case studies so as to closely illustrate the framework in Task v. These cases must include one regional study in the New Territories.

viii. Review artistic areas related to local and Chinese cultures.
ix. Assess the future development potential of public art in Hong Kong including the integration of artworks into cityscape and public architecture and the integration of design and signage into the built environment.

tax. Recommend strategies for all classes of stakeholders for creating a better visual environment in Hong Kong.

xi. Plan, develop, promote and implement a series of consultations on the key issues identified in task i-viii. The Consultant may wish to propose a range of consultations for different classes of stakeholders.

xii. Prepare a preliminary schedule or legislative and regulatory requirements as well as funding and logistic arrangements involved in implementing the proposed strategies.

xiii. Based on the research results of this project, propose the focus of future research and development of public art.

1.3 The research, as specified in the call, is to avoid also the areas covered by the Public Art Research Project commissioned by the Hong Kong Heritage Museum under the then Provisional Regional Council in 1997 and 1999, to avoid duplicating resources.

The Research Team

1.4 The research team consists of the following members:

   Dr Desmond Hui - Director
   Mr Martin Fung - Senior Researcher (until August 2002)
   Mr Ken To – Researcher
   Ms Eno Yim - Researcher
   Mr Patrick Mok – Researcher (since August 2002)

Objectives and Scope of Research

1.5 The project is divided into two phases of work. The first six months, the Analytic Phase (Phase I), is to do with understanding the issues of public art in both the local and global context. The Analytic Phase of work comprises four tasks as follows:

i Review – review of both a) the nature of public art in Hong Kong which includes definitions, scope and significance, as well as b) the interrelationship between public
art and public life – its existing state, government measures, stakeholders (in both private and public spheres) and finally the relation to local Chinese culture.

ii Comparison - comparative studies of three cities representative of the Asian Pacific region (although China is not included in this study, we realize its potential in this aspect as development hinterland for public art and artists in Hong Kong). The proposed cities are Taipei, Tokyo and Singapore. Three trips were undertaken (one for each city) to collect information and to understand first hand the following aspects: legislation, planning, implementation strategies and funding sources and mechanisms. These are illustrated with comparison of case studies (one from the New Territories) of Hong Kong (completed in Phase II).

iii Survey - survey and analysis on attitudes, values and impact on the environment, transport and everyday life of a) the general public, b) corporate and c) the government. Representative bodies were carefully selected for these surveys which include data collection, questionnaire and interview.

iv Consultation – two consultation workshops by invitation were organized: the first, one month before the submission of the first progress report and the second, two months before the submission of the consolidated report. Relevant representative stakeholders were identified and invited to participate in the consultations.

1.6 The second phase of six more months, the Synthetic Phase (Phase II), is to do with proposition of concrete action plans and strategies for the realization of public art, outlined as follows:

i Communication – develop framework of communication, promotion and education about public art for the art consumers, the whole community and the regional and international community. These include, for example, identification of potential link up with existing international websites on public art.

ii Formulation – this is the testing ground for formulating strategies and schedules of specific recommendations which include legislative and regulatory measures, the funding and logistics of public art programmes through commissions or competitions.

iii Exploration – the research investigates future and potential development of public art such as comprehensive approach in the design of the built and visual environment, research and development of new forms of public art (in particular
those unique to the cultural and physical urban contexts of Hong Kong) and
international collaboration.

iv Evaluation – evaluation of this project will be conducted within the last month of
contingency and preparation of audit report after the submission of the revised
consolidated report. Identified international authority will be invited to peer review
the final report.

Definition – What is Public Art?

1.7 To give public art a definition is not easy. While we will show in our survey how
different sectors react to different definitions (Appendix I), we would like to quote one
definition given by the Public Art South West Advice in the UK as perhaps a
comprehensive view on the matter (http://www.publicartonline.org.uk/index3.htm):

“The term public art refers to artists and craftspeople working within the built,
natural, urban or rural environment. It aims to integrate artists' and craftspeople's
skills, vision and creative abilities into the whole process of creating new spaces
and regenerating old ones, in order to imbue the development with a unique
quality and to enliven and animate the space by creating a visually stimulating
environment.

Working with artists and craftspeople offers an opportunity to design schemes,
which go beyond the purely functional and create places which reflect the life and
aspirations of the district, county or region.

There is no simple definition of public art:

• It may result in paving, landscaping (hard and soft), fencing, brickwork,
glasswork, gates, grilles, windows, lighting, seating, play areas/structures, carved
lettering and plaques.

• It may take the form of tapestries, carpets, weaving, textiles, hangings, banners,
use of colour, design of spaces, mobiles, ceramics, tiling, interior lighting, signage,
and flooring.

• It could be sculpture, photography, prints, paintings, moving images, computer
generated images, performance, events, music commissions etc. It can introduce
narrative or text, be decorative, humorous, beautiful, subtle or contentious.

• It may refer to our heritage or celebrate the future, highlight specific areas and
issues or be conceptual. Work can be permanent or temporary, internal or external,
integral or free standing, monumental or domestic, large or small scale, design or
ornament.

Whatever the outcome, it has one consistent quality; it is specific to the site and
relates to the context of that site.

What are the benefits?
A well constructed public art policy can result in benefits by:

- attracting investment from the local authority and private sector
- making the district or town a more attractive place for businesses to locate
- stimulating the local economy through creating employment and seeding and developing skills
- encouraging tourism by giving an area a competitive edge in relation to competing visitor destinations
- contributing to local distinctiveness by giving a voice to local artists and craftsmen and opportunities for artists elsewhere to utilise their skills and vision
- increasing the use of open spaces, reclaiming areas and helping reduce levels of crime and vandalism
- humanising environments, involving the community and creating a cultural legacy for the future

Public art is about good design. And good design makes good sense. Quality environments send out positive messages. To implement these two principles does not necessarily mean more expense. It is much more about working creatively with what you've got rather than putting the 'icing on the cake'."

1.8 Public art incorporates two notions: ‘public’ and ‘art’. While definition of ‘art’ itself could be controversial enough to constitute a separate research thesis, the addition of the idea of ‘public’ makes the task doubly difficult. An initial understanding of the two words could be found in dictionaries. By ‘art’, we refer to “practical skill, or its application, guided by principles: human skill and agency (opp. to nature): application of skill to production of beauty (esp. visible beauty) and works of creative imagination, as in the fine arts.” By ‘public’, we refer to that being “of or belonging to the people: pertaining to a community or a nation: general: common to, shared in by, or open to, all: generally known: in open view, un Concealed, not private: engaged in, or concerning, the affairs of the community: devoted or directed to the general good (now rare except in public spirit): international: open to members of a university as a whole, not confined to a college: of a public house.” (Chambers English Dictionary, Cambridge, 1988)

1.9 Although we tend to take a more liberal view as to include in the scope of art both visual and performing art, and indeed even happening or other newer forms of conceptual art that might defy limitations by media or categories, we discover as we progress further into our research (with explanations given in the later chapters) that there is in practice a commonly agreed understanding on the scope of art within the idea
of public art to represent largely visual art. The exclusion of performing art in the
general categorization of “public art” is apparent when the question of management and
resources is discussed: while performing art is usually well taken care of by established
programme and administrative structures, visual art is comparatively ignored in terms of
public patronage and hence its increasing dominance and importance in international art
policy and agenda.

1.10 The global phenomenon of overwhelming disproportion of public funding towards
performing art in neglect of visual art is no news to Hong Kong. In the 2003 Policy
Recommendation Report by the high profiled Culture and Heritage Commission (CHC),
it has been pointed out that half of the total government expenditure on culture and the
arts (amounting to HK$1.3 billion) was spent on the performing arts (p. 39, 5.20). The
expenditure by the ADC, contained already in this total, skewed the ratio even further:
with 70% on performing arts and only 20% on visual and literary arts (CHC (2003):
39 – 5.21 note 1).

1.11 When we contacted some of the local performing art groups for interview and
consultation, we have either been declined or replied that they did not see our research
relevant to their activities.

1.12 Taking the international benchmarking on the conventional scope and definition of
public art and the specific local context and responses into consideration, we have
therefore decided to concentrate our research focus on the visual art as the exclusively
defined aspect for public art.

1.13 As regards interpretation and implication on the public dimension involved with public
art, while we fully appreciate the gravity of the idea in the social and political contexts,
and indeed the relevance of activities as a result of artistic intervention in the public
arena, the political meaning of art (or politics of art) belongs strictly speaking to a
separate discourse – a discourse entailed by the idea and impact of art (whether public
or not) on the public. This is an interesting and important topic but much outside the
scope of the present study and perhaps worthy of a separate research study on its own.

1.14 Notwithstanding what has just been said in 1.13, we nevertheless would alert attention
in our report to the relevance of public art in examining the legal and constitutional
framework in the Hong Kong society, particularly since the controversy over the
legislation of Article 23 in the Basic Law. It is fundamental that for public art, indeed
any cultural, artistic and intellectual endeavour to flourish, the citizen’s basic human
rights such as freedom of expression, beliefs, and participation in public life have to be properly protected and enshrined in the legislature. We believe that the current Laws of Hong Kong: the “Bill of Rights” as contained in Cap. 383 Section 8 have been functioning properly to allow Hong Kong people and artists to explore and experiment with public art and we hope that this will not be affected in the future.
2 Public Art in Hong Kong

A Brief Review (slides in Appendix A)

2.1 If we take the definition of public art to be artwork in public spaces or artistic expression in the public, then public art would have been as old as Hong Kong, since any urban artifact including architecture, engineering, public space, advertising, signage or neon lights would be artistic expression of one kind or another. In this regard, a recapitulation of the historical development of public art would indeed be an account of the historical development of the city itself, which is too far-fetched to be included in this report. What we attempt to sketch below is a concise summary of the development of public art as a self-conscious movement and as such, we would omit the discussion of public art as an un-self-conscious artistic expression in the life of Hong Kong.

2.2 While there are people who argue that as artistic practice, the notion of public art could be traced in the work of some Hong Kong artists, for example, as early as the 70s in Mang-ho Kwok (郭孟浩), and as general as in the graffiti of Uncle Tsang (曾灶財), serious and comprehensive projects of public art began in Hong Kong in the 1980s with large scale commercial and residential projects by HK Land and Swire Properties, namely Exchange Square in 1985 and Tai Koo Shing in 1986, which feature works by internationally famed artists such as Henry Moore and Chu Ming. The Government followed closely by organizing the “Sculpture Walk” in the redevelopment of Kowloon Park in 1987, which also features important contemporary artists such as Eduardo Paolini.

2.3 Throughout the late 1980s and 1990s, both the public and the private sectors have continued with projects in public art, e.g. HKUST organized “Art and Space: From Sculpture to Installation” in 1993 that brought about one of the first controversies in public art by confronting the issue of superstition with installation of wooden spirit plaque on campus. The HK Museum of Art, funded by the New World Development Co Ltd, also sponsored the first open competition for sculptures in the outdoor areas around the museum – the first opportunity for the winning local artists to display their work in a major public space. Since 1994, the Garden Streams Hong Kong Fellowship of Christian Artists has organized the project “Art in Hospital” and have successfully installed mural paintings in children’s ward in more than 18 hospitals by 2001. The Mass Transit Railway Corporation began the “Art in Station” Project in 1998 and commissioned internationally famous artwork for the Airport Express Stations. They also initiated “Art in Station Architecture” for the North Point Station in 2001.
2.4 The mid-1990s witnessed major reform in the culture and arts scene in Hong Kong. In 1995, the government established the Hong Kong Arts Development Council “to plan, promote and support the broad development of the arts (including the literary, performing, visual and film arts) and arts education. The ADC is dedicated to induce artistic creativity and by providing a more enriching life, enhance the quality of living and artistic appreciation of the general public.”\(^1\) Meanwhile, the government department responsible for culture and the arts underwent a major reform in the late 90s resulted in the dissolution of the Urban and Regional Council and Urban Services Department with the creation of the Leisure and Cultural Services Department under the Home Affairs Bureau to oversee planning and execution of work on culture and the arts.

2.5 One of the last heroic acts achieved by the Regional Council (more accurately Provisional Regional Council) was the launching of the Public Art Scheme in 1999 with the newly formed Heritage Museum. A sum of HK$47 million was set aside for a public art fund and HK$5 million were allocated to commission seven pieces of artwork in three public venues as a result of an open competition. Following the success of this scheme, the newly created LCSD collaborated with Housing Department to launch in 2000 another major public art project in a new housing estate in Tung Chung – Yat Tung Estate. Sixteen artworks were commissioned as a result of an invited competition for the first stage of the scheme.

2.6 Another spin off from the LCSD project was the creation of the Art Promotion Office in April 2001 to focus on public art, community art and the Visual Art Centre. The aim of the Office was “to bring art out of museums and to reach the community in different levels… and to assist the citizens to explore their interest in visual arts, enriching their artistic experiences and enhancing their level of appreciation of art.”\(^2\) The APO therefore will be the key government organization in the future promotion and implementation of public art in Hong Kong. They organized the “Public Art Scheme 2002” open competition in 6 identified public buildings with 12 selected art works.

2.7 Remarks

2.8 The development of public art in Hong Kong seems to be on a par with development of

\(^1\) The HKADC web page http://www.hkadc.org.hk
public art in both the west and the more advanced Asian cities such as Tokyo and Taipei. Considering the initiation of the Percent for Art Programme in New York happened only in 1983 and in Taipei in 1993, corporations like the HK Land and Swire Properties should be credited for their far-sightedness and pioneering projects in Hong Kong in the mid-1980s. The government’s efforts in the promotion of public art should also be recognized. There is a need to study whether public art should be legislated in public works.

2.9 The definition, scope and significance of public art also needs deliberation – as the majority of artwork developed in the last twenty years seem to be predominantly sculptures and murals in the conventionally permanent sense. Examples from other cities point to more diverse options – in particular temporary installations and events in specific sites chosen by the artists, which allows a more proactive artistic response to the environment by the public. In extreme cases (notably Seattle with its well-established and well-respected public art programme), funding for public art includes not only creation of artworks but any idea or action that benefits the public’s appreciation and enjoyment of art – maintenance of buildings and venues for art therefore would also qualify under this broad definition.

2.10 The relation of public art and public life in Hong Kong could be illustrated by several examples of controversy, which reveal the potential of art in the mediation of public discourse and civil order. The display of “New Man” in 1995 caused contestation over the Obscene and Indecent Articles Ordinance with the final High Court ruling that sculpture is not under such a command. In 1996, the artist Pun Sing-lui destroyed the nose of the historic statue of Queen Victoria in Victoria Park and poured red paint over the piece, which led to his sentence for 28-day jail. This action art came at the dawn of the 1997 handover of HK to China. The episode that generated hot debates and confrontations was the erection in 1997 of “Pillar of Shame” by the Danish artist Jens Galschiot in various locations in Hong Kong. Its rejection by the Provisional Councils and final accommodation by the Student Union at the University of Hong Kong underscored the social and political sentiments of the day.

2.11 The relation of public art to Chinese culture is a relatively unexplored territory. While traditional festivals entail elaborate and fantastic handicraft skills, their potential of lending to the development of public art projects awaits cultivation. Art fairs turning out to be festivals, on the other hand, appear to be quite popular. The question indeed is much broader than this, as it touches on the possibility of transformation of Chinese art by its embodiment (or re-embodiment) in the larger public domain, the meaning of
public artifacts of the Chinese origin (including, for example, Chinese architecture and statuary sculptures) and the general artistic expression of the Chinese culture in the public (such as dance and performing arts). We include some preliminary ideas on the potential choice of sites and traditional Chinese Festivals which may be inducive in developing new public art forms unique to Hong Kong (Appendix G).
2.12 Current Practice

2.13 In order to identify the salient features of public art implementation under the current context, the research collates five cases (four cases of organizations and one case of individual artists) by interviews with selected stakeholders of public art. Additional interviews have been conducted with individual artists. The primary objective is to solicit the typological features in promoting public art as well as the organizational issues involved. The observations derived from these cases are understandably not exhaustive in exploring the diverse nature of public art, but perhaps significant enough to describe the critical factors which might affect its vitality. The interviews are listed as below; for details, please refer to Appendix H (case V is not included in the Appendix):

I. Mr Andrew Lam (The Museum of Site [MOST])
II. Ms Evelyna Liang (Art in Hospital [AIH])
III. Mr Tony Ma, Ms Lesley Lau (Art Promotion Office [APO], Leisure and Cultural Services Department)
IV. Ms Elaine Chan (The New World First Bus)
V. Ms Amy Cheung and Mr Kum Chi-Keung

2.14 In our typologies, cases III and IV are exemplars of “administration-led model”. The conception does not entail any negative connotation of administrative control or bureaucratic obstruction in whatever terms. It rather means that there are features in the model which determine the particular shape of the collaborative process among the stakeholders involved.

2.15 In comparison, cases I and II are illustrative of a “community-based” model, with which the creative process is embedded in a social and communal context, and the organizing parties enjoy relatively higher degree of autonomy (hence greater initiative) in promoting social and cultural values through public art activities. Since artistic value of public art is too unique to have common ground for comparison, our selection of interviewee is not on artistic criteria but on the embedded relation of the work or its interaction with the community at large. The MOST was included due to its community-based activities in the northern part of the New Territories, and its initiation of promoting mural art in primary and secondary schools. The Art in Hospital Project is a representative case for the alignment of artistic creation with social services and communal activities. Case V, with Amy Cheung’s “Runaway Spatial Plan Project
Studio” (1999) and Kum Chi-Keung’s “Visual Arts and Public Art exhibited at the Star Ferry Pier” (1996) as exemplars, represents the “artists-led” approach, and were the two successful pieces of work due to the authors’ initiation and strenuous efforts in crossing the boundary between artist-centered activities and corporate organization. The features of these cases are as follows:

2.16 Definition of “Public Art”

2.17 Public art in general is concerned with visual rather than performing arts. This is not exceptional in Hong Kong. The media of public artworks basically comprises mostly sculptures and paintings. Our interviewees generally agree that public art is about installing artwork in a place or space accessible by the public; but given this commonality, public art encompasses as much diversity in creative orientations, mediums of art, forms, artistic and cultural expressions, or audience and participants as in potentials for development.

2.18 As regards the differentiation between public art and community art, it is generally accepted that the former encompasses the latter. For instance, according to representatives from the APO, their set-up of separate units of public art and community art is only for the sake of operational convenience rather than a conceptual assertion. Nevertheless, Andrew Lam of MOST articulated public art as a distinctive notion quite different from community art, the latter having to engage communal issues and the participation of local residents. Based on this disparity, MOST therefore identified their activities more as community arts. Similarly for AIH, with their activities and artistic products aiming to cater for and involve communal participants, they accordingly recognized their programmes as “community arts”.

Objectives

2.19 The objectives among the different sectors may vary due to disparities of organizational nature. For a governmental body like APO, their principle mandates are to promote art appreciation, to embellish public environments and to elevate artistic creativities. As for the two “community-based” models, they are more concerned with social and cultural values of public art within a communal context. AIH posits their artistic creativities in the contexts of hospitals in order to make art a means to enliven both the environment and the people while MOST facilitates through art to arouse public debates
and attentions to local issues. For the two artist-initiated projects, their main objectives were to convey artistic creations, to explore landscapes of public spaces and to confront the population of non-gallery-goers.

2.20 On other hand, for patronage from the private sector, their advocacy is mainly mobilized by the beneficial effect of the art programmes in marketing policy to establish reputation and brand recognition among the general public.

Commissioners

2.21 The SAR Government remains the major patron and facilitator in public art in Hong Kong. The APO of the LCSD acts as an enabler and administrator of public art programmes; as well as a provider of arts education and an intermediary agent amongst different sectors. Among APO’s public art programmes, some are launched upon client-initiation, such as the “Installation of Public Artworks at Yat Tung Estate (2001)” by the Housing Department and the “Mobile Art Gallery (2001)” initiated by the New World First Bus Services Limited.

2.22 As a statutory body, the Arts Development Council (ADC) is responsible for financially sponsoring art organizations and artists to actualize their public art projects. From time to time ADC also proactively delivered seminars and research projects relative to public art discourses.

2.23 Sponsorship of public artworks by private corporations is mainly limited to commissioning of sculptures and paintings, while integration with the environment and involvement of the general public are rare. Besides, the dedicated vendors are mainly from the public transport systems and property companies - the Mass Transit Railway Corporation (MTR), the New World First Bus, Hong Kong Land and Swire Properties are prominent examples. Nevertheless, their involvement is generally restricted to patronage of artworks for decorative purposes; participatory communities are not part of their strategies.

Practitioners/Art Organizations/Artists

2.24 The role of artists and art organizations in initiating public art projects are so far limited due to, firstly, deficiency of resources and secondly, exclusive access to public spaces.
As such the major channel enabling local artists to produce a public artwork is through participating open competitions launched by the government, the public and the private sectors.

2.25 As for artist/art group-initiated public art projects that were carried out. These can be summarized into three ways of induction:

2.26 First, through applying project grants from the ADC and administered the projects on their own, including location of suitable sites and negotiation with counterparts.

2.27 Second, by soliciting corporations with a drafted proposal for sponsorship. Nevertheless, in many cases sponsorship from private corporations is only limited to provision of sites for installation of artworks such as Amy Cheung and Kum Chi Keung’s projects in the tram (2000) and ferry piers (1996) respectively.

2.28 Third, artists/art groups can also integrate their projects with services organized by district level organizations and social services providers, for instance to collaborate with schools and district offices. One recent case in point is investment by the Wan Chai District Office of Home Affairs Department of $2.5 million to decorate three flyovers within the district with artworks.

2.29 The actualization of projects in the “artist-initiated” and “community-based” models owed their success to their authors’ initiation and efforts in crossing the boundaries of corporate organizations. Although there was engagement of a particular intermediary agent in their projects, there was seldom adequate support of administrative backup and coordination undertaken by intermediary agent in the negotiation process between artists and the respective organizations.

Community Participation

2.30 There is yet to be established a participatory approach in public art projects in Hong Kong. The participation in projects of public art by local dwellers is usually constrained at the level of appreciation and education, as audience of installed works and seminars. Only in some exceptional occasions that communal members joined the programmes as voluntary helpers, such as in AIH and MOST’s mural paintings projects; volunteers and students are involved in the process of drafting layouts and mural painting. The communities were not included in the stage of conception and planning
for the artworks and designs.

Funding Sources and Mechanism

2.31 At the moment there is no dedicated fund in support of a full spectrum of public art in Hong Kong. APO is the spearhead enabler of public artworks with its resources coming from the annual budget of the LCSD. APO’s commission of artworks depends on selections from competition campaigns and its sponsorship of public art programmes in collaboration with other organizations which are on project basis with initiation taken mainly by their clients.

2.32 ADC represents the public sector committed to grant artists and art groups directly for creating artworks on a project basis. However, it should be noted that ADC does not specify a fund pool for the category of public art - proposals of public art are subordinated under the categories of visual arts, performing arts or art education. Neither do they develop principles of assessment or regulatory frameworks for granting public art projects.

2.33 Private companies and foundations also fund artwork discretely on individual artworks and artists (list of foundations in Appendix D). Long-term support is scarce, AIH being an exceptional case to manage to secure Kadoorie Foundation’s sustained sponsorship and Hong Kong Arts Center’s support of administrative operation.

Selection of Artists/Artworks

2.34 Open competition is the most common way to select artworks for public spaces, for instance the “Public Art Scheme” in 1999 and 2002 launched by the APO. Also the “Mobile Art Gallery” project coordinated a competition for recruiting artworks to be displayed in the buses. For these competitions, ad hoc boards of jury were set up to choose the winners.

2.35 In cases of commissioning by private corporations, the selection of artists and artworks largely depends on the reputation of the established artists. Accordingly, there is usually preference of overseas artists by private organizations for large-scale projects. The artworks commissioned by the MTR, the Airport Authority and the Swire Property are dominated by names from overseas.
2.36 As can be observed from cases III and IV, public art activity of “administration-led model” requires stronger manipulation of the magnitude and form of public artworks, and therefore procedural control and selection in terms of administrative guidelines and panel system are imposed throughout the process of creative activities. In other words, the clients or administration will preset the parameters and the physical space for creative activity. For example, the accepted works for the “Mobile Art Gallery” should fit into the frame of 17” and 15.5” for the upper deck or 12.5” and 9” for the lower deck of a bus.

2.37 For selection criteria, it also varies according to different organizations. Apart from excellence of ideas and creation, the major concern is usually about the work’s complementarily with the landscape or architectural structures. AIH illustrates another selection mode with regard to a function-specific environment, the hospital. By identifying their activities as people-serving and environment-oriented art creations, AIH is discreet in screening artworks both in aspects of content and presentation, in order to ensure they are inoffensive to the patients, staff and visitors of the hospitals. Meanwhile private organizations are more alerted to contents and motifs of artworks with their primary concern of influence on their brand image.

**Partnership and Networking**

2.38 There were cross-sector collaboration amongst the government departments, public and private corporations and non-profit-making arts groups. The “Public Art Project – Installation of Public Artworks at Yat Tung Estate”, which was co-presented by the APO and the Housing Department to create artworks for the entitled estate, represents an exemplar in cross-departmental collaboration.

2.39 APO plays a vital role in facilitating intermediary connections between different community sectors. It bridges contacts by providing consultation services and sponsoring public art projects. These include advising private sectors on the selection of artists and artworks and funding operational expenses. Other instances include the funding of the AIH programme in 2002 and the joint presentation of the “Mobile Art Gallery” with ADC and the New World First Bus. However, these partnerships are all ad hoc and project-based with initiation mainly taken by its counterparts.
Site of Public Artworks

2.40 Since the government is the major commissioner of public art projects in Hong Kong, public artworks are mainly installed in public buildings and parks ranged from civic centers, libraries, theatres and museums. Apart from those public venues, public artworks can be found in private estates and commercial multiplexes, the prominent example is the “Sculpture Walk” in East Island developed by the Swire Property and the sculptures placed on the podium of the Exchange Square by the Hong Kong Land.

2.41 Concourses and passages of public transportation systems are emerging as the major accommodator of public artworks. MTR, Airport Express and the Airport are the public places with intensive flow of people and accessed by the widest range of audiences from local citizens to tourists.

2.42 Schools and public estates are another common locales for public artworks, dominated by the artform of mural painting, such as the mural painting projects presented by the MOST and the Society of Mural Paintings.

Education and Supplementary Activities

2.43 Education and relative activities accompany public art programmes mainly in modes of open seminars, talks, guided tours and workshops. These activities serve an elucidatory function to help audiences’ appreciation and understanding of public art. Educational programmes basically revolve at introductory and theoretical perspectives; workshops and courses on practical creation of public artworks are rare. Due to availability of resources, APO remains the major provider of these activities.

2.44 APO also held exhibitions to showcase proposals and designs of award-winners of public art competitions. Recently APO organized post-competitions workshops for artists’ exchange of experiences and ideas. Completed research on the topic of public art was hitherto limited to the “Public Art Research Report” conducted by the HK Heritage Museum in 1999 (accomplished in 2000).

Impacts

2.45 Currently, there is no systematic evaluation policy and practice to examine implications
of public art to the general population. Questionnaire survey is a common channel to solicit public impression and valuation of public artworks and programmes.

2.46 The New World First Bus conducted an online questionnaire survey to collect public responses on the Mobile Art Gallery project. The questionnaire is mainly focused on the effectual impacts of artworks on the public environment and the degree of recognition.

2.47 The rise in numbers of hospitals to host AIH’s programmes also indicates the acceptance and acknowledgment of the positive effects of public art.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tokyo</th>
<th>Singapore</th>
<th>New York</th>
<th>Taipei</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.0 Legislation and Policy</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.1 Cultural Policy</strong></td>
<td>• The Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Sciences and Technology (MEXT) adopts a cultural policy on general promotion and funding of cultural affairs. Under the cultural policy*, MEXT is providing support for artistically creative activities, enhancing the cultivation and training of artists, promoting local cultural activities as well as activities conducted by children, and enriching the activities of cultural facilities.</td>
<td>• In the Renaissance City Report* issued by the Ministry of Information and the Arts (MITA) in 2000, there is no direct reference to the planning and development of public art in Singapore except the planned expansion of the existing Arts Housing scheme and the proposed Sculptural Biennale in indoor and outdoor venues. In the ERC Report on Creative Industries Development Strategy (2002), Recommendation 2.1 is to establish a Percent-for-the-arts Scheme. <a href="http://www.mti.gov.sg/public/PDF/CMT/ERC_SVS_CRE_Chapter2.pdf?sid=131&amp;cid=1299">http://www.mti.gov.sg/public/PDF/CMT/ERC_SVS_CRE_Chapter2.pdf?sid=131&amp;cid=1299</a></td>
<td>• National Council on the Arts was established through the National Arts and Cultural Development Act of 1964, a full year before the federal agency was created by Congressional legislation. • The National Foundation on the Arts and Humanities Act of 1965 established the National Endowment for the Arts. • NY State Council for the Arts (1960, 1965 permanent) • NY City Department of Cultural Affairs.</td>
<td>• 行政院於民國七十年成立文化建設委員會 • 第一個地方文化事務專責機構－台北市政府文化局在八十八年十一月六日正式成立 • 文化局依據組織規程的設計，下設四室（人事、會計、秘書、政風）四科其業務執掌分述如下： • 第一科：國際城市與國內各縣市藝術文化交流 • 第二科：古蹟與傳統藝術等文化資產保存 • 第三科：專業藝術文化輔導與推廣 • 第四科：公共藝術推動與社區文化紮根 • 文化教育政策白皮書 (3/2002) • 落實社區總體營造（note 1）</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.2 Public Art Policy</strong></td>
<td>• No specific public art policy has been formulated.</td>
<td>• No government legislation has been specifically implemented on planning, funding and implementation of public art schemes.</td>
<td>• Percent for Art Program since 1983 • The Percent for Art Program offers City agencies the opportunity to acquire or</td>
<td>• 政府機關(裡)設置公共藝術係依據民國八十一所發布實施的「文化藝術獎助條例」第九條的規定辦理。該條條文內容如下：</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1.3 Legislative Control

- No government legislation has been specifically implemented on planning, funding and implementation of public art schemes;
- There were discussions within the government the feasibility of implementing the Percent for Art scheme but nothing has been realised so far.

- No government legislation has been specifically implemented on planning, funding and implementation of public art schemes.
- In 1982 the “Percent for Art” law was passed by the New York City Council requiring that 1% of the budget for eligible City-wide construction projects be spent on art work for those facilities.
- Implementation of the Program began September 15, 1983 and established a procedure for determining eligible projects and an equitable artist selection process.

2.0 Planning

2.1 Government Agency

- The Agency of the Cultural Affairs is the executing arm of MEXT looking after all art-
- An inter-departmental government agency, the Public Sculpture Committee under the
- Department of Cultural Affairs
- Parks and Recreation in

- The Council for Cultural Affairs of the Executive Yuan (central)

- The Council for Cultural Affairs
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.2 Non-government Agency</th>
<th>• Ministry of National Development is set up to take up the role of planning and approval of tax exemption application of public sculpture works.</th>
<th>• Public Art Fund The Public Art Fund is a non-profit arts organization supported by generous gifts from individuals, foundations,</th>
<th>• Various foundations such as the Open Space Foundation, Lion Club and Rotary Club etc. but the proportion is small compared with Government subsidized public art projects.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Urban Development Corporation was involved in planning of a few major redevelopment projects that entail an extensive amount of public art works namely the Shinjuku I-Land and Faret Tachikawa projects.</td>
<td>• The National Arts Council is involved periodically in commissioning of public art works through curating visual art festival namely the Nokia Singapore Arts.</td>
<td>• Taipei City Government Cultural Affairs Bureau of the Taipei City Government (city)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0 Funding Source and Mechanism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Funding Source (Government)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Japan Arts Fund (for subsidising all cultural activities): 64.2 billion yen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• For government public art projects, the actual funding figures are usually determined on a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>project-by-project basis by the individual government ministries.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Major public corporations like the Metropolitan Transport Authority did incorporate an</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>extensive scope of public art works in their newest subway station line with donations from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No special government money is set aside for development of public art works in a systematic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>manner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Individual government departments may at their own discretion execute public art works on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their own development budget.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The Singapore Tourism Board have just initiated their efforts in master-planning some</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>artwork installations along the Singapore River for promotion of cultural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Performing art groups like the Necessary Stage have been supported by the People’s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association to move into the community centres to involve directly the local inhabitants in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their respective community art activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Others include: Area; Creative Time; Artist in the Gardens; Bronx River Arts Center, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Percent for Art Program:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In order to be eligible for Percent for Art funds, a construction project must be on City-owned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land, funded through the City’s capital construction budget, and must be accessible to the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public. One percent of the project’s construction budget is allocated to art, with half of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one percent allocated if the construction cost exceeds $20 million. Usually, the artist is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commissioned to create</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Over 90% of public art work are funded by Government or through the Government instituted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent for Art Program.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Departments were set up in some big Japanese companies to reveal cultural policies and to</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>undertake execution of public art works in their private or joint projects;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• NGO like the Public Art Research institute in Tokyo promote public art appreciation through</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>research and public events</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and corporations, and with public funds from The New York State Council on the Arts, a State</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agency, and the New York City Department of Cultural Affairs.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Performing art groups like the Necessary Stage have been supported by the People’s</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Association to move into the community centres to involve directly the local inhabitants in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>their respective community art activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Others include: Area; Creative Time; Artist in the Gardens; Bronx River Arts Center, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Percent for Art Program:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In order to be eligible for Percent for Art funds, a construction project must be on City-owned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>land, funded through the City’s capital construction budget, and must be accessible to the</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>public. One percent of the project’s construction budget is allocated to art, with half of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>one percent allocated if the construction cost exceeds $20 million. Usually, the artist is</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>commissioned to create</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3.2 Funding Source (Non-government)

- Major artwork installations in Singapore are mostly donated by major corporations and developed within their own plots.
- Some companies have even set up departments to conduct research on cultural policy and development of public art consultancy.
- It is witnessed that major Japanese corporations are setting aside a portion of the project cost to the planning and acquisition of public art works.

3.3 Funding Mechanism

- Virtually all monuments on public property are paid for through private contributions. The sole exceptions to this rule are commissions through the Percent for Art Program.
- No proper and legislated funding mechanism was established in the government projects.
- No funding scheme equivalent to the "Percent for Art" program was implemented so far even though certain discussions were made within the government authorities during the economic boom in the late 80's and early 90's. For private projects, funds are contributed to the city's ongoing maintenance.
### 4.0 Implementation Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.1 Planning and Development Control</th>
<th>4.2 Public Artwork Purposes</th>
<th>4.3 Legal Frameworks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• No specific set of government controls on planning and development within the private land.</td>
<td>• No specific set of government controls on planning and development within the private land.</td>
<td>• No specific set of government controls on planning and development within the private land.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• For public domain, approvals have to be sought from department of Construction, department of Life and Culture, Police authorities.</td>
<td>• The Urban Development Authority (URA) has laid out master plan to review strategic locations for public art works. Different zones are categorises within mainly the city area for public sculpture installations*.</td>
<td>• A departmental panel including the Commissioner of Parks &amp; Recreation or his representative reviews proposals. Issues of particular concern to Parks include safety and durability of the artwork, and its suitability to the site. Following the approval of a proposal, a permit is issued to the artist and/or sponsoring organization. For many projects, depending on the scope, it may be necessary to obtain the approval of the local community board. There is no deadline for submitting proposals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The Town Council looks after the artwork installations in the suburb area.</td>
<td>• The artist and/or sponsoring organization is responsible for FUNDING, late 80's and early 90's.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 4.1 Planning and Development Control

- No specific set of government controls on planning and development within the private land.
- For public domain, approvals have to be sought from department of Construction, department of Life and Culture, Police authorities.

### 4.2 Public Artwork Purposes

- No specific set of government controls on planning and development within the private land.
  
  - The Urban Development Authority (URA) has laid out a master plan to review strategic locations for public art works. Different zones are categorised within mainly the city area for public sculpture installations*.
  
  - The Town Council looks after the artwork installations in the suburb area.

### 4.3 Legal Frameworks

- No specific set of government controls on planning and development within the private land.
  
  - A departmental panel including the Commissioner of Parks & Recreation or his representative reviews proposals. Issues of particular concern to Parks include safety and durability of the artwork, and its suitability to the site. Following the approval of a proposal, a permit is issued to the artist and/or sponsoring organization. For many projects, depending on the scope, it may be necessary to obtain the approval of the local community board. There is no deadline for submitting proposals.
  
  - The artist and/or sponsoring organization is responsible for FUNDING, late 80's and early 90's.

1. 「文化藝術獎助條例施行細則」，此細則將母法(文化藝術獎助條例)中容易混淆的詞一一加以明確界定，如藝術品、民俗技藝、環境藝術、文化機構、生活藝術、特定區域、公有建築物、建築物造價等，並進一步規範審議內容及獎勵方式等事項。

2. 「公共藝術設置辦法」是實務相關的法規，它乃根據「文化藝術獎助條例施行細則」第九條所訂定，主要規範諮詢委員會、審議委員會及執行小組的組織與任務，公共藝術的設置計畫書、徵選結果報告書及設置完成報告書等應包含的內容，此外尚規範重大工程的範圍及四種徵選方式的定義等事項。

3. 「公共藝術設置裁罰處理原則(草案)」，為執行文化藝術獎助條例第三十二條有關公共藝術之罰則所擬定的規定，文建會法規會已審查通過，可望即可頒佈實施。[草案二條：違反第九條第一項規定者，處新臺幣十萬元以上五十萬元以下罰鍰。]
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.2 Public Art Consultancy</th>
<th>For government projects, ad-hoc public art planning committee will be formed to provide consultancy on the execution of public art works for individual projects.</th>
<th>The Public Sculpture Committee was established in 1988 to encourage private donations in the form of public sculpture and to offer some degree of consultancy to the feasibility of the submitted applications.</th>
<th>The Department of Cultural Affairs administers the selection of artists for the Percent for Art Program.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• For government projects, ad-hoc public art planning committee will be formed to provide consultancy on the execution of public art works for individual projects.</td>
<td>• A handful of prominent public art curators have been offering consultancy on public art events both local and overseas</td>
<td>• The Public Sculpture Committee offers a channel for applying for tax deduction for public artwork installations.</td>
<td>• The Public Art Fund invites application of artists for review and competition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3 Financial Incentive</td>
<td>No tax policy was directly attributed to the execution of art works.</td>
<td>The Public Sculpture Committee offers a channel for applying for tax deduction of charitable gifts</td>
<td>The Government has compiled a list of artists/consultants on public art projects – 264 by the year 2000.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• No tax policy was directly attributed to the execution of art works.</td>
<td>• No non-government art institutions or art curators offer specialised public art consultancy service.</td>
<td>• Tax-exempt foundations and income-tax deductibility of charitable gifts</td>
<td>• The Public Sculpture Committee was established in 1988 to encourage private donations in the form of public sculpture and to offer some degree of consultancy to the feasibility of the submitted applications.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

• The Department of Cultural Affairs administers the selection of artists for the Percent for Art Program.

• The Public Art Fund invites application of artists for review and competition.

<p>| INSTALLATION, INSURANCE, MAINTENANCE, TIMELY REMOVAL of the artwork, and RESTORATION OF THE SITE. | • The Art Commission ultimately decides upon aesthetic grounds for donation of art work in public parks. | INSTALLATION, INSURANCE, MAINTENANCE, TIMELY REMOVAL of the artwork, and RESTORATION OF THE SITE. | INSTALLATION, INSURANCE, MAINTENANCE, TIMELY REMOVAL of the artwork, and RESTORATION OF THE SITE. |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4.4 Implementation Logistics</th>
<th>Only for a handful of projects* where direct collaborations between artists, curators and architects/planners were involved.</th>
<th>No projects where direct collaborations between artists, curators and architects/planners were involved.</th>
<th>Collaboration of different departments in the 2002 Whitney Art Biennial: City of New York/Parks &amp; Recreation and the Central Park Conservancy working with the Public Art Fund, to host this outdoor component of the Biennial.</th>
<th>Collaborations on public art projects governed by law.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.5 Research and Development</td>
<td>No government agency has been established yet serving solely for the research and development of public art.</td>
<td>No government agency has been established yet serving solely for the research and development of public art.</td>
<td>Done by both government and non-government agencies such as Public Art Fund.</td>
<td>Done by both government and non-government agencies such as Open Space Foundation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>The research and development of public art projects are mostly conducted by individual public art curators, non-government organisation like the Public Art Research Institute and the art research branch of major private corporations.</td>
<td>An inter-departmental committee, the Community Co-location Committee* has been set up to initiate the development of community participation in public art, both visual and performing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
English Translation

Note 1

• The Council for Cultural Affairs was set up by the Executive Yuan in 1981

• The first regional government office in charge of cultural affairs was the Cultural Affairs Bureau of the Taipei City Government (CABOT) set up on November 6, 1999. The organization of the CABOT, according to constitution, consists of four offices (general affairs, personnel, accounting and government ethics) and four divisions:
  Division 1 – international and local cultural exchange;
  Division 2 – preservation of heritage and traditional art forms;
  Division 3 – cultural management, training, and promotion;
  Division 4 – cultural planning for community and public art.

• The White Policy Paper on culture and education (3/2002)

• To implement the concept of “integrated formation of communities”

Note 2

• Government institutions set up public art according to Clause No. 9 of the regulation “Awards and Assistance on Art and Culture” gazetted in 1992, which stipulates:
  • All owners of public buildings should establish public art to beautify the building and the environment, the cost of which should not be less than 1% of the building construction cost.
  • The owners, managers or users of buildings accessible to the public should be awarded by the government, if their buildings have public art established to beautify the building and the environment at a cost higher than 1% of the building construction cost.
  • Important government projects should establish artwork to beautify the environment.

Note 3

• The Council for Cultural Affairs of the Executive Yuan Legislation on culture:
  1 Awards and assistance on art and culture
  2 Details of implementation on awards and assistance on art and culture
  3 Methods of set up public art

Note 4

• Projects costing over NT$5 billion should be submitted to the Council for Cultural Affairs for approval.

Note 5

1 “Details of implementation on awards and assistance on art and culture”: this sub-clause will clarify the terms in the main clause that may cause confusion, such as artwork, folk art and crafts, environmental art, cultural institutions, art in living, specific districts, public buildings, cost of building, etc; and will further regulate the contents of investigation and forms of awards etc.

2 “Methods of set up public art”: is a practical clause entailed from Clause No. 9 of the “Details of
implementation on awards and assistance on art and culture” to regulate mainly the formation and terms of advisory committees, adjudicating committees and executive committees; contents and formats of proposals for public art projects, report on calls of proposals, report on execution of public art projects etc; it also determines the scope of important projects and the definitions of four methods of soliciting artwork.

3 “Principles of penalty on the establishment of public art (draft)”; to carry out Clause 32 of the regulation “Awards and Assistance on Art and Culture” about penalty (Anybody violating the first item on Clause 9 will be fined NT$100,000 to 500,000). This has already been passed by the Council and will be implemented soon.

4 Related laws to the establishment of public art include: government purchase and procurement, building regulations, rights on literary creation, urban planning, executive procedures etc. All executive parties on public art should familiarize with these laws.

Note 6

• Donations to national (or provincial and municipal) foundations on art and culture will be deemed as donations to the government.

• Recognized business in art and culture could be exempted from business and entertainment taxes.

• The terms for the recognition of tax exemption/deduction and donation will be determined by the Council in liaison with the Ministry of Finance.
4 Questionnaire Survey

4.1 We devised a questionnaire (please see http://jukebox.ad.arch.hku.hk/temp/ and forms in Appendix J) throughout the months of December and January with the advice from the Statistics Department and Social Research Centre at the University of Hong Kong in order to gauge opinion on public art by government, private corporations, art groups and individuals. We posted our survey questions on the Internet and wrote to 235 organizations to solicit their response. By the beginning of April, we received the answers from some fifty respondents and conducted an analysis of the survey results which are explained each with a graphic chart (slides presentation copies in Appendix I).

Report on Questionnaire Survey

4.2 Percentage of reply:

Government (no. sent out = 67)
  25% response with
  15% completed reply and
  7% rejection

Private Corporate (no. sent out = 95)
  22% response with
  17% completed reply and
  5% rejection

Art Group (no. sent out = 27)
  37% completed reply with
  0 % rejection

4.3 Part I - Definition of Public Art

4.3.1 90% of Art groups know of famous Public Art examples in the world and in Hong Kong

4.3.2 On the whole, the majority of each group agree the meaning of Public Art as “Any artistic expression in the public, including paintings, sculptures and performance”
4.4. Part II - Importance of Public Art

4.4.1 Almost all the target groups agree upon the importance of Public Art in HK in the following:

a. Enhancement of the aesthetic quality of the environment
   - Government: 100% (Totally agree + Agree)
   - Corporate: 90% (Totally agree + Agree)
   - Art group: 100% (Totally agree + Agree)

b. Enrichment of the quality of life
   - Government: 100% (Totally agree + Agree)
   - Corporate: 100% (Totally agree + Agree)
   - Art group: 70% (Totally agree + Agree)

c. Elevating the image of HK as a world city
   - Government: 90% (Totally agree + Agree)
   - Corporate: 100% (Totally agree + Agree)
   - Art group: 60% (Totally agree + Agree)

4.4.2 100% of replies from Government and Corporate while 90% of Art Groups do not think that Public Art is a luxury for the rich.

4.4.3 Average 70% of each the target group totally agree or agree Public Art can attract business. However, only about 62% of the Government and the Corporate wish to incorporate Public Art into their business plan.

4.5 Part III - Public Art Policy

4.5.1 Average 80% of each target group does not know of any current Public Art policy by HKSAR government.

4.5.2 All Government and Corporate and 96% of Art group agree there should be a government policy on Public Art.

4.5.3 All Art group agree public art should be incorporated in all public work project
while only average 63% replies from Government and Corporate show agreement.

4.5.4 The majority of Government departments (100%) and Corporate (88%) totally support/support the idea of tax exemption on the sponsorship of public art. Meanwhile, only 30% of Art group supports this idea and 70% show no comment.

4.5.5 88% of Art group totally support/support the allowance of 1% construction cost for public art. Regarding the result from the government, 40% of them support the idea and 50% show no comment. 44% of Corporate totally support/support the idea, and 56% show no comment.

4.5.6 Each target group shows no significant preference to the idea of the allowance of 1% construction cost should be compulsory by law.

4.5.7 90% of Art group and 75% of Government department but less than half of Corporate (40%) wish to take part in the consultation workshop about public art in HK

4.6 Part IV - Participation

4.6.1 80% of Art group knows of artist involved in public art in HK.

4.6.2 75% of Art group organize and take part in Public Art activities but only 40% of each government and corporate group does so.

4.6.3 44% of Corporate allow the general public to take part in Public Art activities within their property. 60% of Government department show no comment on this public participation.

4.7 Part V - Education and Promotion

4.7.1 90% of Art group totally disagree/disagree that there is enough art education for the public in HK
4.7.2 Almost all the replies totally agree/agree Public Art is a good means for Art education for the general public. (Government: 90% Corporate: 94% Art group: 100% Agreement)

4.7.3 58% of Corporate and 67% of Government department show no comment on subsidizing the promotion of Public Art in HK. They do not show strong wish to subsidize the promotion, only 21% of Corporate and 22% of Government department are willing to do so.

Preliminary Findings

4.8 As shown from the above, we can see that the importance of Public Art in HK is ensured with respect to the quality of environment and life, attracting business and building the image of the world city as well as providing good means to art education for the general public. Therefore, the majority of each group agrees that Public Art Policy should be implemented in HK while they do not know of any current government policy.

4.9 However, less than half of the Government and the Corporate response, on average, organize and take part in Public Art activities and allow the general public to join the activities within their properties. About only 20% of them wish to subsidize the promotion of Public Art in HK.

4.10 Regarding the Public Art Policy, Art groups show different opinions from the Government and the Corporate. Most of the Art groups support the idea of incorporating Public Art into all public work projects and the allowance of 1% of construction cost to Public Art, while the Government and the Corporate show no significant preference. In contrast, almost all Government and Corporate go for the idea of tax exemption on the sponsorship of Public Art while only 30% support this idea of financial incentive.

Observations & Conclusion

4.11 Needless to say, we are disappointed with the low rate of reply, not only from the government and corporate sectors, but also the art groups (at only 37% completion rate). Nevertheless, the received data are barely enough to generate some insights into the problems we intend to examine. We list some of the interesting findings as follows:
i. For definition of public art, most people choose the answer “any artistic expression in the public.” This seems to be a more generalized idea than the normal definition as “artwork in public places” given by most literature on public art.

ii. Contrary to 90% of answers from the art groups which disagree with the notion that art is a luxury only for the rich, there is still 10% that agree totally with it. We are not sure if this is consent made in irony.

iii. There is no exception to the idea that public art can enhance the aesthetic quality of the environment; nor that public art can enrich the quality of life (apart from a few ‘no comment’ from the art groups for the latter).

iv. While everyone agrees that outstanding public art can elevate HK as a world city, there is a small fraction from the art groups that remain skeptical.

v. Most people disagree that there is enough importance given to public art in HK.

vi. The majority agrees that public art can attract business – 30% of corporations, however, remains neutral.

vii. Only about 60% of government and corporate responses state their wish to incorporate public art in their business plan.

viii. There is an overwhelming support from all sectors that there should be a government policy on public art.

ix. While art groups unanimously support the idea that public art should be incorporated in all public work projects, the support rate from both government and corporations is only sixty-some percent each.

x. While over 90% of government and corporations support the idea of tax exemption on sponsorship of public art, only 30% of art groups think the same (70% has no comment).

xi. While the majority supports the allowance of 1% construction cost for public art, half of government and corporate responses remain neutral.

xii. The response to the question on making the 1% allowance compulsory by law generates a normal distribution by all sectors: majority in the center (with no comment) and minority in the two extremes of agreement and disagreement.

xiii. While the majority of government and art groups say they wish to participate in a consultation workshop about public art, the turnout at our consultation workshop
on April 20 did not reflect such a promise – many did not reply to our invitation and did not come.

xiv. 90% of art groups do not agree there is enough art education for the public in HK.

xv. Only 20% of government and corporations state their wish to subsidize the promotion of public art in HK.

4.12 We might venture to conclude from these observations that the majority sentiment in society supports the idea of instituting some form of measures of incorporating public art in both public and private projects. The position of both government and corporations tend to agree with measures which are more flexible – such as tax exemption – rather than a rigid legislated practice of a fixed percentage. While art groups advocate a more thorough art education for the public, the positive support of government and corporations is reinforced by motivation of business and economy, and the prospects of building an image of world city for Hong Kong.
5 First Consultation

5.1 Based on the response from the questionnaire survey, we sent out over 70 invitations (checklist in Appendix K) of potential attendants for the consultation workshop scheduled in the afternoon on Saturday, April 20, 2002. We managed to obtain 20 confirmed attendants and the final turnout at the workshop was about 25. Below is a report of the consultation held at the Graduate House of HKU:

Report on the First Public Art Research Consultation Workshop

Date: April 20, 2002, Saturday
Time: 14:15-17:30
Venue: Room 503, Graduate House, University of Hong Kong

Research Team: Dr Desmond Hui, Mr Martin Fung, Mr Ken Too, Ms Eno Yim
Commentators: Mr Tony Ma (Leisure and Cultural Services Department)
               Mr Chan Nap-ming (Housing Authority)
               Mr Mathias Woo (HK Cultural Sectors Joint Conference)
Attendants (partial list):
               Mr Howard Chan (1aSpace)
               Ms Loretta Chang (Office of the Telecommunications Authority)
               Mr Christopher Cheng (HK General Chamber of Commerce)
               Ms Stephanie Cheung (Fine Arts Department, HKU)
               Mr Raymond Fung (Architect/Artist)
               Mr Steven Ho (Housing Authority)
               Ms Virginia Ho (Hong Kong Arts Development Council)
               Mr Andrew Lam (Museum of Site)
               Ms Lesley Lau, Ms Noel Ng, Ms Veronica Chan, Mr Law Man Lok
               (Art Promotion Office)
               Ms Elaine Lau (New World First Bus Services Ltd)
               Ms Monica Ling (Hong Kong Dance)
               Ms Yvonne Lok (Personal Assistant to Chairman, Wing Tai Asia)
               Ms Kitty Ma (Culture Heritage Commission Secretariat)
               Mr Mervyn Tam (The Philippe Charriol Foundation Ltd)
               Ms Evelyn Liang (Art in Hospital)

5.2 Agenda
i. Welcome and Introduction
ii. Report of Research Team
   • Recapitulation of development of public art in Hong Kong
   • Comparative studies of Tokyo and Singapore
   • Comparative studies of New York and Taipei
   • Opinion survey of public art in Hong Kong

iii. Tea/coffee Break
iv. Response from commentators
v. Open Discussion

5.3 Objectives of Consultation Workshop

i. To obtain feedback on the report of the research team.
   • To evaluate strategy and methodology of the research
   • To review documentation of development of public art in HK
   • To review comparison of public art policy and implementation issues of different cities
   • To review results of questionnaire survey on opinion of public art

ii. To discuss the problems and prospects of planning and implementing public art in HK.

5.4 Suggestion of questions for commentators and participants

i. To extrapolate the relevant issues from the report for consideration of public art in HK or examples:
   • whether there is any clear pattern and indication in the development in HK
   • whether any particular model of cities is suitable for HK
   • whether percent for art should be introduced
   • whether there should be more incentives

ii. To suggest improvement of research focus and directions. For examples:
   • whether there is any problem in the questionnaire survey
   • whether there is any issue missing that we need to investigate
• Other questions include:

- What are the major constraints to be foreseen in the planning and execution of public art works in Hong Kong?

- What are the distinctive opportunities to be foreseen in the planning and execution of public art works in Hong Kong?

- What are the strength and weakness in the current development of public art in Hong Kong?

- What are the channels to increase the public's awareness and appreciation of the role of public art in quality of life?

- How to get the private sector involved more in the sponsorship and execution of public art?

- How to situate public art in the sphere of cultural and social development in HK?

- How to best use public art as a means to build up the community?

5.5 Summary of Discussions and Suggestions

Policy

5.5.1 It was generally agreed that policies on public art were essential and conducive to the overall development of local communities in diverse aspects. However, these policies should be formulated with flexibility so as not to impose a heavy mechanism on their execution.

5.5.2 It is important that any policy formulated should mobilize not just the government but the whole society in the promotion and execution of public art. The role of government is to facilitate the development and growth of public interest.

5.5.3 Legislation on public art such as the “Percent for Art” rule should be studied carefully to be adopted in the long-run and not to be propagated until solid platforms such as art
education, consultation mechanism and cultural policies etc, have also been established. There should be transitional measures before these long-term goals are implemented.

5.5.4 A high-level and well respected panel of specialist is essential for control of quality and the administration of any form of public art project.

5.5.5 Incentive policies, for instance tax exemption, development bonus, etc. were suggested as proactive measures to encourage participation from the private sector.

Implementation Strategies

5.5.6 The government should take the lead to support public art projects by both the public and private sectors. Resources and authority, however, should be delegated to the regional districts (though not necessarily through the District Councils). Centralization of resources and power would impede proliferation of public art.

5.5.7 The government should assist in the establishment of a mechanism of consultation with expertise on public art and to provide professional advice in various aspects.

5.5.8 Cross-departmental effort to bring policies into execution was essential for the successful implementation of public art projects.

5.5.9 The role of artists should be incorporated in the early stage of planning and design of a project.

5.5.10 Percent for Art programmes tend to be more effective with bigger rather than smaller projects.

5.5.11 Long-term research and consultancy projects should be formulated for the sustainable development of public art.

5.5.12 Art education and corresponding education policies will be vital as foundation for the future growth of public interest in art. Integrate public art with school education.

5.5.13 Public art projects as forms of community economy and to address issues of unemployment (as reinstatement of the original raison d’etre of Percent for Art Programme in the US in the 1930s).
Research and Development

5.5.14 The scope and definition of “public art” should be further articulated and considered within the peculiar socio-cultural contexts of Hong Kong. Projects might be developed with reference to traditional festivals (e.g. Yu Lan) and unique urban landscapes.

5.5.15 Relation between art and public spaces/places should be studied and addressed in the research project.

5.5.16 Past example of public art programmes by established corporations such as Swire should be examined and improved with strategic advice.

5.5.17 Distinction should be made between art and community projects. Involvement of artists in the former is very important.

5.5.18 To consider building (public architecture) as a form of public art for award and recognition.

5.5.19 To investigate and target government departments for public art projects, e.g. Agriculture and Fishery Department.

5.5.20 Investigation should be conducted on possibilities to incorporate public art projects in new plans of development and urban renewal projects, e.g. the West Kowloon Reclamation project and the Sea Front Promenade between Central and Wanchai.

Remarks

5.6 The consultation was conducted smoothly with enthusiastic response from the attendants. Although the numbers of attendants were not great, those who came represented the core people who are now actively engaged in the planning and organization of public art projects. The general mood of discussion was very positive – and the issues and questions we suggested and raised were mostly covered. There seems to be a consensus that the government should formulate a policy on public art and to take the lead to facilitate the promotion and implementation of public art projects, while looking for means of encouraging the private sector to sponsor with tax and financial incentives.
6 Second Consultation

6.1 Based on the response to the first consultation, we sent out another round of invitations to all who came to the first workshop and those who expressed interests before to come. We also extended invitation to individual artists this time. A total of 112 invitations were sent out with 33 replies (checklist in Appendix K). All those who indicated they would attend the workshop were sent a draft copy of the consolidated report with our recommendations for comments and discussions.

Report on the Second Consultation Workshop

Date: October 26, 2002, Saturday
Time: 1430-1800
Venue: Room P503, Graduate House, University of Hong Kong

Research Team: Dr Desmond Hui, Mr Patrick Mok, Mr Ken Too, Ms Eno Yim

Officiating Guests: Mr Darwin Chen (Chairman, HKADC)
Mr Tony Ma (Assistant Director, LCSD)

Commentators: Ms Lesley Lau (Art Promotion Office)
Dr Chan Wai Kwan (HK General Chamber of Commerce)
Mr. Danny Yung (Zuni Icosahedron)

Attendants: Ms Wong Wo Bik, Ms Virginia Ho, Ms Mianco Wong, Ms Josephine Yan (Hong Kong Arts Development Council)
Ms Noel Ng, Ms Ronny Leung, Mr Law Man Lok (APO)
Ms Lisa Cheng (Hong Kong Institute of Planners)
Ms Stephanie Cheung (Department of Fine Arts, HKU)
Dr Christina Chu (Hong Kong Museum of Art)
Mr Joseph Kwan (Hong Kong Institute of Architects)
Mr Andrew Lam, Mr James Wong (Museum of Site)
Mr Tim Li (Para/Site Art Space)
Ms Evelyna Liang (Art in Hospital)
Dr Louis Ng (Antiquities and Monuments Office)
Mr Siu King Chung (HK Polytechnic University)
Ms Phoebe Wong (Asian Arts Archive)
Mr Louis Yu (Hong Kong Arts Center)
6.2 Programme

1. Opening address by Mr Darwin Chen, Chairman, Hong Kong Arts Development Council and Mr Tony Ma, Assistant Director (Heritage and Museums), Leisure and Cultural Services Department
2. Introduction of consolidated report draft by Dr Desmond Hui, Project Director of Public Art Research
3. Comments by Ms Leslie Lau, Dr Chan Wai Kwan and Mr Danny Yung respectively.
4. Open Discussion

6.3 Summary of Comments and Suggestions

6.3.1 Lesley Lau

a. Ms Lesley Lau introduced the historical development of the Art Promotion Office (APO) with its current positioning in the course of promoting public art in Hong Kong. Ms Lau stated that the recommendations listed in the consolidated draft report were compatible to the general directions and development of the APO.

b. Ms Lau explained that the adoption of the Chinese translation of “public” art as “公眾” rather than “公共” by their office illustrated the emphatic role played by the public/community in public art programmes. (Dr Desmond Hui responded later that consideration to use the latter rather than the former by the research team was to avoid confusion with another term “mass art”; Mr. Darwin Chen echoed that a similar debate was held by the Urban Council twenty years ago with the eventual adoption of the latter “公共” as the Chinese translation of “Public” Library.)

c. She said that the APO performed an intermediary role in bridging the stakeholders from different sectors, particularly between the government departments and the art communities.

d. Ms Lau also remarked that many government departments and organizations were very supportive in the promotion of public art, which was reflected from their commissioning of artworks during the past years. She believed that there was prosperous room for developing public art despite the constraints brought about by
the congested urban landscape in Hong Kong.

e. She opined that many government departments and organizations could contribute to the promotion of public art as public artworks always required the involvement of various disciplines, such as engineering, architecture, landscaping and interior design, etc. (an example of cross-departmental public art projects having been undertaken is the Department of Public Works of the Queensland Government in Australia).

6.3.2 W K Chan

a. Dr Chan Wai Kwan raised the concern that policies to promote public art should be sought within the setting out of policies of arts and culture in Hong Kong, which were still far from establishment. As such, comprehensive framework of policy should address the overview of arts and cultural development of Hong Kong instead of on public art separately.

b. Dr Chan also stressed that programmes of public art should involve the participatory community, who were supposed to take up activities proactively and having a strong sense of belonging to the public spaces.

c. Regarding the framework of recommendation drafted in the consolidated report, Dr Chan cautioned that the establishment of a public art fund would risk the exploitation of public money by a small community. Furthermore, funding of public art should not be restricted to one specific budget source, rather it should apply for subsidies from other fund pools such as the Community Development Fund and the Environment and Conservation Fund, etc.

d. In a broad sense, Dr Chan stated that historical buildings were public artworks of the city in an extensive scale and should be preserved properly for the education and promotion of local cultures. The responsibilities to restore and conserve heritage properties should be shared by the government and the private sector together (example for consideration: the Stanley Police Station to be converted into a supermarket).

e. The establishment of partnership was crucial to the promotion of public arts and the models of partnership should be adaptable to the contemporary society - a relationship that could give merits to both the commercial and arts sectors. The model of partnership and sponsorship practiced by the Hong Kong Arts Festival served as a good example. All in all, initiatives should be propagated by a
bottom-up approach. Dr Chan also pointed out that the District Board could be a direct partner and support to programmes of public art; the recent decoration of three flyovers by the Wan Chai District Board demonstrated a good point to start.

6.3.3 Danny Yung

a. Mr Danny Yung suggested a macro-view on public art placing dynamics among art policies, economical and political sectors. Art apart from functioning as a means of decoration and education also acted as drivers of reflections and critiques within societies and communities.

b. On the recommendations in the consolidated report draft, Mr Yung regarded them as guidelines of strategies, with practical barriers to be solved in implementation. For instance, it would be difficult for the ADC to single out a committee to handle public art, which was not specified in their terms of reference. Mr Yung suggested that a body of the Third Sector should be responsible for the monitoring and execution of public art. The problem now confronted by the Taiwanese with their legislation on public art was the absence of an intermediary agency to monitor policy execution.

c. Instead of a top-down approach, Mr Yung considered initiatives from the bottom-up model would be more conducive to development of public art. Public artworks should provoke self-consciousness and elevate spiritual concepts among the general populace. Graffiti in New York were developed from unintended movements before becoming institutionalized concepts, which verified the intriguing relationship between arts activities and socio-political institutions.

d. Mr Yung emphasized that follow-up research after the “Public Art Research” project should be a priority concern. In addition, a summary report of policy recommendations and a comprehensive questionnaire survey should be sent to corporate and potential partners to solicit feedbacks on the respective issues.

e. Mr Yung added that on advocacy and lobbying, concrete steps need to be recommended for ADC to follow up with art community, HAB and government departments, the Legco, Ex-Co, the media and the general public. These steps should be specific and the results measurable. The best is for ADC to commission community organizations to do follow-up. The task should not be done by ADC alone.
6.3.4 Mr Tim Li stated that it was essential to accord priority to artists’ role in artistic creation. Inherently the cultivation of artists would be of utmost importance to ensure sustainable development of local arts.

6.3.5 Mr Siu King Chung suggested to list the last recommendation from the long-term strategy in the draft report - “Public Art as Community Development” – to be the first. He pointed out that “community development” should go with public art policy hand-in-hand. Public art activities taking place in the public would benefit the dissolution of community conflicts. Mr Siu instanced the recent exhibition organized by the Housing Department and the Hong Kong Society for Community Organization at Lower Ngau Tau Kok Estate as a good example of public art project. He therefore advised collaboration between artists and community-building services to enable the integration of resources as well as profiting development of both sides.

6.3.6 Ms Phoebe Wong stressed the indispensability of the community not only as “user” in the consumption sense, but also as participatory producer of artistic creativities. Ms Wong referred to Dr Chan Wai Kwan’s usage of the term “public arts” in the plural indicated a variety of arts activities in the community level in contrast to high art.

6.3.7 Yu Shu Tak

a. Mr Yu Shu Tak underscored the scope of “art” activities of public art was contestable whether to include performing arts and festival activities.

b. Mr Yu also put forward the significance to identify the compatibility and merits of public art projects in the contexts of local society, economy and tourism, etc.

c. Mr Yu considered promotion of public art as imperative, weighing in addition the importance of landscape design and conservation issues. He pointed out that maintenance and conservation should also be included in public art policy formulation, otherwise landscape decorations would turn into visual pollution - the worn out sculptures in Cheung Chau were cited as an example.

d. Mr Yu emphasized the development of public art policy should be hinted at a higher-level official understanding. He also suggested it would be illustrative to policy-makers and commercial sectors to draw on successful examples of overseas public art cases in relation to socio-economical aspects.

6.3.8 Christina Chu
a. Dr Christina Chu raised questions on the definition of contemporary art at large. Art as a product or behavior or something else could no longer be articulated precisely. Dr Chu explained that architecture as a public art form best exemplified mutual interactions among different sectors. She stated that public art by nature transformed the relationship between the art provider and receiver, which in turn opened up the value of artworks and its position in society. As such, evaluation of art *per se* became ungaugable.

b. Mr Danny Yung responded with an instance that the Chairman of Kwang Hua Information and Culture Centre once requested artists to create artworks of subversion to celebrate Taiwan’s National Day. This exemplified the role of artists in inducing reflections and dynamical interactions among socio-political institutions.

6.3.9 Mr Joseph Kwan referred to definition of art as pure objects or forms taking space. Architecture on the other hand was an art dividable into exterior and interior spaces, with its construction involved collaborations of architects, interior designers and landscape designers, etc. The scope of public artworks should also be broadened to include street configurations like lamp-post, railing and paving. Mr. Kwan agreed with recommendations put forward in the consolidated report, especially incentives to attract investments from the commercial sectors.

6.3.10 Evelyna Liang

a. Ms Evelyna Liang shared experience of difficulties encountered by the programmes of Art in Hospital. Hospitals had their own expectations: preferring only a decorative function of artworks to their environment. Restrictions were thus imposed on the selection of artworks in both contents and styles. Ms Liang suggested that education should be the pivotal task of public art policy to elevate communities’ capacity of artistic appreciation.

b. Ms Liang proposed that policy should be set up to deal with artworks of poor quality. Referring to the recommendation of a “Public Art Festival”, Ms Liang emphasized that this kind of activities should be initiated by the community rather than by a top-down imposition from the government.

6.3.11 Ms Lisa Cheng commented that public art *per se* illustrated the interlocking dynamism among “art”, “public” and “space”, hence recognition by the general populace should
be the foremost concern of public art policy. Ms Cheng stated that public art should be inclusive to different art forms such as performing arts, product design, interior design, etc. Also the meaning of public space should not be limited to physical spaces, but also spaces of daily life. To this end, public art policy should reflect ideas of the populace at different levels.

6.3.12 Andrew Lam

a. Mr Andrew Lam advised that the research should include investigation of the Pearl River Delta region: references of public art development in nearby Mainland cities like Shenzhen and Guangzhou would be important reference to Hong Kong. Collaboration with Mainland cities should also be further explored.

b. Mr Lam recommended that the report should review and underscore problems and failures of current executions so as to facilitate future success.

c. Mr Lam further suggested that independent curatorial practice in public spaces should be studied and the research could be more visionary by assuming context of interpretation in, say 10-30 years, such that the government could make comparable studies with the policy paper of the Planning Department with projected land use in 2030.

6.3.13 Tony Ma

a. Mr Tony Ma summarized that there existed no contradiction or conflict between a bottom-up and top-down model of promoting public art – the two concepts were not mutually exclusive. He suggested that these two models could be put into parallel practice. Mr. Ma pointed out regulations from the government sector would be necessary especially in the initiative stage to preclude exploitation of public money. He illustrated with cases of the District Boards, that although the LCSD did release budgets to District Boards for launching their own cultural programmes, money was either returned to the LCSD or events that lack quality and insight were presented.

b. The organization of Public Art Commission could draw in representatives from the government as well as from other sectors. Mr Ma also reiterated that it would be advantageous for the government to spearhead public art because firstly, it facilitated as the best moderator among government and corporate sectors and secondly, the government was at present still the principal and dominant owner of
public spaces.

Post-consultation comments

6.4 A paper was received from Dr W K Chan after the consultation as follows:

*Rationale, philosophy and institutional positioning*

Should “public arts policy” be an arts policy or a community (public) policy? Whatever the answer, a public art policy cannot be divorced from art or community policy. There has to be a bigger picture of how public art is placed within the broader cultural policy or community policy. In other words, public art policy cannot be a standalone, isolated policy.

For this reason I am doubtful of the structure recommended in the report, namely, to set up a Public Art Commission and a Public Art Fund. This is a top-down approach which may not work for public art. Without a strong Arts Development Council, the use of a Public Art Commission is doubtful.

Likewise, the suggestion to have another Fund is to fall into the trap of interest group politics, that of creating another interest group to “capture” government funding. There are numerous examples of public funds being established and then captured by small-circles, thus defeating the original purpose (e.g. the Community Development Fund).

Public art should be responsive to the needs of society. Our need at the current moment is for partnership and social integration. The core values for community development policy (and hence public art policy) should therefore be participation, involvement, ownership and community building.

Instead of a top-down approach, we should strengthen our community development policy (“public”) and our cultural policy (“arts”). A genesis of public art could arise from the cross-impact between these two policy areas.

*Some reflections on concrete cases*

The destruction of Tsim Sha Tsui by the KCRC works – could the public and the art community be mobilised so as to rectify the messy and intrusive construction impacts? Innovation and creativity is needed to reduce the impact of the construction to restore TST’s sorry state.

Asia Society’s proposal to erect a new centre in the Former Explosive Magazine site in Admiralty – as a cultural project it ought to involve the public, instead of pushing through its plan behind the scene and alienating the local community.
Stanley Police Station’s conversion into a supermarket by Wellcome – Dairy Farm should explore ways of working with the local community, not only to preserve the heritage building but also to make it stand out as both a “public project” and a “cultural project”, while at the same time a commercial concern.

Urban renewal in Wanchai – St James Settlement’s project in Stone Nullah Lane whereby they involve local citizens in the design of the communal garden and open space, is a fine example of community involvement. If artistic element is added to it, it could become a good product of public art.

Some further recommendations

Community development needs not be a “long term” recommendation, but should instead be an emphasis upfront.

Changes can be sought in the Hong Kong Planning Standard and Guidelines, which could be achieved as a short term, rather than long term, measure.

Some sort of non-bureaucratic institution or organisation is needed to act as advocate for public art. Instead of a Public Art Commission, it will be best to come in the form of an NGO, e.g. comprising the business sector and the cultural sector.

The District Councils should also be partners in promoting public art. With the abolition of the municipal councils, DCs will have more resources and responsibility to promote art and culture in the local community.

Finally, the biggest public art project for Hong Kong has to be the West Kowloon cultural district. If this is not done well, it could become the biggest failure in public art. Or it could become the signature of HK public art. The cultural community must seize this opportunity and not let the matter be decided only by the government and developers.

Remarks

6.5 The second consultation was on a whole a more than moderate success. Constructive comments have been made which provide plenty food-for-thought in revising our position. Three major points need to be re-considered:

1. emphasis on a bottom-up approach versus a top-down policy;

2. highlight the component of community development in public art up front;

3. the importance of a mediating NGO for advocacy in public art.
These points as well as other relevant comments from the consultation will be integrated into our final recommendations and conclusion of the report.
7 Assessment and Analyses

Framework of Communication

7.1 The research envisions a framework of communication for public art at a terrain where the potentials of public space will be explored – with artistic creation or other forms of engagement of social or cultural meanings. It also structures a collaborative process where different segments of stakeholders or organizational participants interact with each other directly or indirectly.

7.2 To the extent that a communication process is constructive, inclusive and dynamic, its conceptual framework shall observe that –

i. Stakeholders shall undertake a unique role to play;
ii. Their “activity domains” are expandable, multilateral and complementary;
iii. Existing linkages and dynamics among different players can be strengthened by enabling factors, and therefore;
iv. Strategies shall be devised to facilitate the mutual dialogue and exchange of stakeholders of different sectors under concern.

7.3 To devise a communication strategy for the promotion of public art, we appreciate the dynamic scene of public art and the diversity of public art forms in Hong Kong and therefore do not submit to a singular conception of communication meaningful or applicable. We aim instead at formulating a multi-dimensional framework of communication. There are some fundamental conceptions and guiding principles to this framework.

7.4 We conceive in particular a communication interaction model in a polygonal relationship composed of three sectors and three communities – the government, public and corporate sectors on the one hand – and artists, audience / participants, and social and community institutions or organizations on the other (Diagram A).
7.5 The following paragraphs postulate the matrices and the salient features of the polygonal relationship, and then follow with a typological analysis based on our case studies reported in Part II.

**Government Sector**

7.6 The SAR Government is now the major supplier of resources for art and culture, and concurrently the most important stakeholder in building cultural infrastructure, venue construction as well as cultural management. Given these resources and capacities, its role as *rule-maker, sensitive policy-maker, facilitator* or *enabler* is invaluable in setting the environment and regulatory framework conducive to the development of public art in Hong Kong.

7.7 A coherent policy framework for promoting public art is still in infancy within the government bureaucracy; however it is noticeable that a variety of activities related to public art have recently been undertaken at different levels. Considering that the SAR
government has committed to promote Hong Kong as an international city in Asia as well as its renown position in promoting the service sector as the locomotive of local economy, policy parameters of social and economic domains can be better geared not only to the formulation of cultural policy in general, but also complemented with the development of public art in Hong Kong.

7.8 The establishment of the Art Promotion Office (APO) since 2001 has been a good starting point for promoting public art. However, without a cohesive regulatory framework at the policy center, the role and contribution of the APO could only be limited, and its capacity being narrowly confined in programme-oriented activities. Given that some organizational units within the government structure (for example the Housing Authority) have been involved in public art projects from time to time, while others can also play an active role in future, there is still room to consolidate the coordinating function of the APO. A reference example is the Film Services Office under the Information Technology and Broadcasting Branch of the Commerce, Industry and Technology Bureau (CITB).

Public Sector

7.9 The public sector is narrowly defined here as statutory or public organizations outside the government sector. Organizations in this sector have their own designated missions and therefore their role in promoting public art varies in different contexts. But junctures can be identified so that collaborative efforts can be made in promoting public art for mutual benefits. The key to this collaborative process is an intermediary agent dedicated to the promotion and development of public art.

7.10 We identify the APO and ADC’s unique position in the framework of communication due to their collaborative partnership already built up with local artists, and their primary role as funding agent and the intermediary agent to promote the arts. Given these edges, it is likely that both organizations can assume additional initiatives to explore further collaboration with the government as well as other sectors for the development of public art.

7.11 We do not conceive the government and public sectors are functionally overlapping or mutually exclusive. Objectives and functions of an organization in one sector can be complementary with that of other sectors in many ways. Synergy effect owes much to initiatives, commitment and innovation of parties in the sector that should not be
obstructed by artificial boundaries of organization, limitation of self-projected competition and power designation.

Corporate Sector

7.12 The corporate sector in Hong Kong has a relatively long history in sponsoring public art. The forerunners such as the Hong Kong Land and Swire have commissioned a number of artworks in their property projects. Recently, the New World Bus and the MTR have initiated a number of public art commissioning projects. It is no doubt that private corporations have always been one of the major sponsors or patrons in this field. And it is also true that in many occasions they are the taste-makers in molding general appreciation of public art.

7.13 Taking corporations the natural ally of public art however needs qualification. There are at least two considerations. First, commissioning project of private corporations in public artworks is due to reasonable expectation of marketing purpose or other commercial deliberations; and therefore the autonomy of artistic creation is sometimes subject to constraints in the forms of creative activities or nature of sponsorship. Secondly, artists can seldom initiate public art project and rally the full support from commercial corporations. The difficulty is either because of lack of an intermediary agent to enable communication between the two parties, or because of inadequate awareness of corporations that need to be nurtured for greater sensitivity and appreciation of public art.

7.14 Besides business corporations, there are some private foundations whose sponsorship for artworks or cultural activities are quite substantial but less visible. The Hong Kong Jockey Club Charities Trust, the Li Ka Shing Foundation, the Philippe Charriol Foundation, and a number of private funds in support of cultural activities have regular investment in culture, and they are potential partners or sponsors of public art. Collaborative partnership with these foundations needs to be cultivated; and therefore initiatives and promotion campaigns undertaken by the intermediary agent(s) become necessary.

Social and Community Sector

7.15 Social and community sector should be an indispensable part of public art. Social and
community organizations can be the originator to promote artistic ideas and creative activities of public art. And that depends on the nature of social and community activities as well as the general acceptance of public art as means of social enhancement or community enrichment. Besides, when public art anchors with social and community contexts, the multiplying effect of public art may reach wider segments of the community that the government and corporate sectors cannot. A thorough assessment of the landscape of the social and community sector is not a mandate of this study, but we offer a preliminary sketch of those institutions or organizations who have shown interests or been engaged in activities related to public art (Appendix C).

7.16 Concurrently, there is a wide range of social and community groups and institutions which may be involved in the promotion and development of public art. As far as our research is concerned, there are a number of social services groups and organizations that have already attempted to make artistic creation the means to serve social and community purposes. For example, the “Art in Hospital” and many community halls have organized activities in great diversity. Besides, educational institutions also engage in promoting public art through their courses or formal curriculum. Some of these activities or parts of their components are related to topics on public art although it is not possible to give an exhaustive list here.

7.17 The social and community sector is still an unexplored field for developing a collaborative process in public art. On one hand, the potential of public art as vital means in alignment with social and community processes is still a novel idea for acceptance. On the other hand, there is a lack of centripetal force in access to information, organizational and financial resources so that resources of different sectors could be brought into the social and community processes through the means of public art. Meanwhile, coordinating services can be provided in promoting public art in the social and community sector.

Practising Artists and the General Public

7.18 Local artists or art groups and the public form another two building blocks of the communication framework for public art. In those activities of artist-centered nature, local artists are invariably the initiators of artistic creation, originators of artistic presentation and creation, and also risk-takers who exploit the possible forms of public art as well as its social and cultural meanings.
One may argue there is no designated role as such given artists are sometimes adapting their creative process for the causes of social and cultural meaning rather than mere aesthetic value. In other words, the boundary between public artworks of pure artistic value and those of social or cultural meanings is unnecessary and largely artificial. The crux of the issues is how flexible and resourceful the environment is to realize the potential of artists who are engaged in the creative process of public art, or in some contexts, are absorbed in other social and community processes. The cultivation of this favorable environment depends, to a large extent, on the dynamic configuration of cultural policy at the government sector and complementary supports in both public and corporate sectors.

Besides artists, the general public is more than an audience who passively receives public art. As shown in our case studies, the public could be keen participants and collaborative partners of creative activity. There is no doubt that educational programmes need to be introduced so that appreciation of public art can be promoted among the general populace. Apart from the enhancement of appreciation, general participants in many occasions may evolve to be amateurs or even practitioners. More importantly, the development of public art should be a process so that the general public can become creators, promoters and the critical mass of different forms of public art.

Analyses and Assessment of Current Operation and Policies

Based on the above analyses, the study identifies some enabling factors or conditions that could lubricate the communicative process, which include:

i. Cultural infrastructure at large is of primary importance in nurturing cultural life. The regulatory environment plays a key role. While programmes related to public art and introduced in our school system could be one direction, legislative measures to provide structural incentive to the stakeholders are contributory to the development of public art.

ii. An overall policy framework for promotion of public art needs to be developed in the policy centre of the government. It formulates, on one hand, the guideline for inter-departmental cooperation and better coordination within the government sector; and on the other hand, it provides visionary parameters for the development of public art.
iii. The role of intermediary agent, either within the government structure or in the public sector, shall be strengthened to serve as a constructive platform for collaborative engagement of different sectors in the community for the interests of public art.

iv. The coordination of the intermediary agent is very important in facilitating the communication between practitioners of public art and the social and commercial sectors. Their coordinating role should be an invaluable buffer to bridge any obstruction, and to facilitate negotiation or provide administrative backup to practitioners.

v. In terms of development, there are possibilities for the diversification and exploration of representation of public art. Because of its dynamic nature, the spectrum of public art shall not be narrowly defined.

vi. Whereas current programmes supported or sponsored by intermediary agents increase the “visibility” of public art in the art scene, there needs to be occasion for exchange of experiences, ideas and understanding among intermediary agents, practicing artists of public art, and the social and corporate organizations.

vii. Widespread educational campaign shall be introduced to enhance the appreciation of public art among the general populace, cultural administrators, policy makers, management of social organizations and corporations so as to nurture the culture sensitive and conducive to the development of public art.

viii. Plans and strategies shall be in place to estimate and allocate adequate financial resources in support of the development of public art. The government or public sector shall not be the only partners or sponsors of public art. Rallying the support of the corporate sector is one of the cornerstones for the successful model of promoting public art.

Strategic Positioning

7.22 Taking the above policy parameters into consideration, the stakeholders are advised to delineate respective positions corresponding to their own corporate objectives, resources available and particular features of their organizations. Given the diversity and potentials of public art, there is no compulsion for a centralized mechanism to dictate
development in public art. Ideally speaking, the prospect of public art lies with initiatives of individual artists, social and cultural communities and corporate sectors who should be the best agents themselves in exploring and defining the potentials of public art. It is also certain that given a favourable environment, interaction among these stakeholders will evolve a collaborative engagement for a meaning art field.

7.23 It is at this point that the intermediary agents are to be given a unique role so that a cultural infrastructure favourable to the development of public art would be in place and beneficial to all for the potentials of this art form to be fully realized. As this research suggests, the intermediary agents in government and the public sectors could assume different but complementary roles for cultural investment so as to entertain the diversified development of public art. Given this understanding, the responsibilities of APO or respective bureau in the government and the ADC should be highlighted in the following matrices.
7.24 Matrices in Devising Strategic Positioning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Government Sector / APO</th>
<th>Public/Private Partnership &amp; NGOs</th>
<th>Public Sector / ADC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Policies &amp; Functions in Government Sector</strong></td>
<td><strong>Areas for Partnership</strong></td>
<td><strong>Policies &amp; Functions in Public Sector</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Level and Corporate Strategy</td>
<td>Encouraging stakeholders of public, corporate and community sectors to develop their own strategies for promotion of public art</td>
<td>Corporate strategy of public art devised by public body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legislation and Regulatory Framework</td>
<td>Reference and consultations</td>
<td>Develop standards and practices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Funding and Resources</td>
<td>Endorsement given to public and corporate sectors for sponsorship and funding to public art</td>
<td>Develop foundations and funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managing Public Art in Government and Public Sectors</td>
<td>Commissioning of intermediate curators and managers</td>
<td>Liaison and co-ordination with government sector or departments; intermediary agent between artists and the government sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Public/Private Partnership Funds</td>
<td>Resources allocation and administrative backup to public art programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Liaison and co-ordination for better usage of space owned or managed by other public bodies or corporations</td>
<td>Exploring the potentials of the form and nature of public art and the dynamic relationship between public art and space</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education, Exchange Programmes, Community Development, Research and Information Resources</td>
<td>Public education and promotion of appreciation of public art</td>
<td>Independent private education programmes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Events, festivals or exchange programmes for public art</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Research (public/private partnership and other topics)</td>
<td>Research on policies and implementation strategies for promoting different forms of public art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NGO network</td>
<td>Networking and partnership building programmes with community sector for the development of public art</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clearing house and database of information related to public art in Hong Kong and references elsewhere</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public/private Partnership

7.25 The table does not exhaust the areas that should be undertaken by the government and public sectors, but it highlights how the respective bodies in these two sectors (and the emergence of the NGO sector) could develop different platforms and concerted efforts for the promotion of public art. Some of the above items are further elaborated into recommendations in the next section and there is no need for repetition here. The research however reinstates the following principles for determining the strategic positioning of respective bodies in the government and public sectors:

i. **Organizational feature and official capacity of the government and public sectors:** the APO and its higher authorities are given a unique position and therefore the co-ordination and promotion of public art within the government bureaucracy should be more effective. Meanwhile, the initiation of these bodies for improvement in the regulatory framework of the government is of utmost importance. Because of its representation of the cultural sector, the ADC, if effectively partnered with the art communities, could be more responsive to the anticipation of artists and the dynamic development of public art as well.

ii. **NGO as a potential intermediary agent:** as discussed in the second consultation workshop, the role of an intermediary agent for the promotion and execution of public art could well be the task of an NGO. This could take example from the New York Public Art Fund or similar organizations. The potential for this development is great and should be explored by both the government and public sectors.

iii. **Resources and coherent policy of public art funding:** the development of public art in Hong Kong largely depends on public finance in short-and-medium terms. Although the ADC enjoys financial autonomy in devising its own funding programmes, it is still a subvented body. The government remains not only the major funding agent but also the arbitrator in determining the best allocation of public resources to public art.

iv. **Diversity of public art:** given that the dynamic nature, meanings, medium of expression, permanence of art form or dimension of space in public art vary from time to time, there should more than one single intermediary agent in promoting public art.
8 Recommendations & Conclusion

Our research of comparative studies, questionnaire survey, interviews, consultations and qualitative analyses shows clearly both a need and desire to promote and develop public art in Hong Kong. After assessing the issues, problems and prospects, our study envisages the following suggestions that may stir further discussion and follow-up research on the subject.

We conceive the overall recommendations in long-, medium- and short-term strategies with stages of progress depending on the policy muscle and determination of respective organizations.

8.1 Short-term Strategies

8.1.1 Bottom-up as well as Top-down Approach

- It is important to state at the beginning that public art belongs to the public and therefore, the first and foremost concern with promotion and development of public art should rest with the initiatives of the public, in the sense that art as expression of the people is inherent in the dynamics of the community. In this regard, the role of the District Councils is of utmost importance and tapping of sources of funding should be sought from various established channels, including, for example, the Community Development Fund. However, to give the public its proper due in this respect does not excuse the government, or any organization in society their share of the responsibility to adopt a strategic approach to public art. We believe that in order for the community to develop this self-awareness, it is even more important for all sectors to coordinate aconcerting effort; thus a bottom-up as well as a top-down approach should work closely together in promoting and developing public art in Hong Kong.

8.1.2 Corporate Strategy and Policy for Public Art

- Policies work best if they are viewed as a corporate policy. Therefore it is

---

3 There are other possibilities such as the Community Investment and Inclusion Fund (CIIF), the Integrated Neighbourhood Project (INP), the Neighbourhood Level Community Development Project (NLCDP) and the 13 community centres operated by NGOs under the subvention of Social Welfare Department.
important that all departments within the authority are involved and feel a sense of ownership for the policy. This is particularly true for a policy in public art since it has potential alliance with almost all departments. We recognize nevertheless that at present arts policy is within the jurisdiction of the Home Affairs Bureau. Hence to arrive realistically at an overarching policy framework for public art, the HAB in consultation with the Arts Development Council\textsuperscript{4} shall formulate the scope, policy programmes, and social, cultural and economic importance of public art.\textsuperscript{5} The policy framework is dedicated to initiating coordinating efforts at high level of government structure so that strategies can be devised for the promotion of public art in alignment with other economic and social policies of the SAR government (for example, promotion of tourism, brands of Hong Kong, or World city in Asia). Similar exercise undertaken by the public bodies shall be concerted and complementary to strategies formulated at the policy centre. And differentiation should be made for both sectors to meet the diversity of public art.

- A review of existing resources in the promotion of public art is urgently needed which may include allocation and redeployment of funding as well as release of government owned properties for the purpose of public art projects.

- Given the regulatory and policy structure of the government, a marketing strategy for promoting general appreciation of public art among different sectors shall be undertaken. The strategy shall also be on enduring basis so that regular events can be held to amplify its importance as a strategic policy.

8.1.3 Establishment of a Public Art Commission

- Based on 8.1.1, a public/private partnership is the ideal intermediary agent in the promotion and development of public art. There are two alternative

\textsuperscript{4} According to the Policy Recommendations of the Culture and Heritage Commission (CHC) (2003): 42, Section 5.29-39, the CHC proposes to dismantle the ADC and to replace it with a Culture and Arts Foundation. Depending on the Government’s decision, we believe the ADC or the future CAF will be the body to advise the government on policy regarding development of public art.

\textsuperscript{5} Cf Tony Bovaird “Public Art in Urban Regeneration: An Economic Assessment.” (http://www.ub.es/escult/LIBRARY/bovaird.htm). Being the author and Chief Editor of the consultancy study commissioned by the Central Policy Unit of the HKSAR Government, the Baseline Study on Hong Kong’s Creative Industries (September, 2003), I have included the idea of public art as an important strategy for the clustering concept with creative industries in Hong Kong (Chapter 5, 4.8).
views on the setting up of such a body, tentatively named as “Public Art Commission.” From a bottom-up strategy, it would best be identified in the form of an NGO, and indeed in multiples rather than in singularity, since the diversity nature of ‘public’ and ‘art’ would best be fulfilled by more than one driver. However, from a top-down alternative, policies and programmes would most efficiently be expedited by a uniform entity. Thus a high-level and well-respected panel of experts, artists, critics, consultants, cultural managers and advisors are called for to oversee the development of public art according to the corporate strategy and policy formulated at the policy centre. This Public Art Commission would act initially as an advisory body to the Government in matters relating to public art. Ultimately it should become a statutory body with funding and executive power, like the art commissions of many US cities in charge of public art policy and execution. We believe that since the NGO culture is still developing in Hong Kong, in the short-term it would be more practicable to adopt the latter alternative, but with a view that the commission thus formed should gradually develop into an NGO structure, and to anticipate further subdivisions into multiple organizations for diversity in the long run.

8.1.4 Strengthening the Role of the Art Promotion Office

- Since its creation in 2001, the APO has demonstrated its effectiveness in serving as facilitator and enabler to promote public art within the government and other public sectors of the community. Its “intermediary role” shall be strengthened within the government structure as an executive arm to carry out public art projects until its incorporation with the Public Art Commission. A parallel could be drawn with the Film Services Office now playing an important role in helping film industry for location shooting. We expect the Government, however, to further anchor the importance of public art as a corporate vision by setting up an inter-departmental steering group to help the APO in this regard. This suggestion should be understood not only as a means for the government to promote public art, but also to use public art as a means to build up understanding of the government’s work by the public. Recent projects by the Seattle Art Commission to institute artist-in-residence in different government departments (such as water, sewage and drainage, by means of photography or other installation works), for example, proved extremely popular and successful for the public appreciation of government...
work in these departments. This idea therefore, is very timely and appropriate for adoption by the SAR Government when it is desperately in need of solutions to improve its image and popularity.

- Whereas the APO has proved successful in an “administrative-led” approach to organizing public art projects, we also urge them to investigate other curatorial forms such as “artist-initiated” or generally “bottom-up” approach in public art. The APO shall seek to improve and streamline the procedural arrangement for the application and intervention of public art in public spaces and strives to remove obstacles in order to foster an encouraging environment for artistic creation or exhibition of public art.

8.1.5 Development of Database in Public Art

- Currently there is no recognized database of all public art projects in Hong Kong nor a clearing house of the profile of sponsors and practitioners in public art; it is urgent that an inventory of these information be created which would be very useful not only for stakeholders in public art but also the general public and visitors to the city. The database could include guide-maps of public art projects, profile of sponsors and artists, their artworks, useful information related to funding, application of venues, reference library, major events of public art activities, websites as well as links to other international database. Since the ADC has already built up a network with local artists, it will be more effective as the body to play a leading role in constructing this database either by internal staffing resource or by contracting out to suitable consultancy. A good reference is again the Seattle Art Commission’s Arts Resource Network launched in March 2002 (http://www.artsresourcenetwork.org/).

8.1.6 Public Art on-line

- Closely related to the last recommendation is creation of a website not only for database information but for the new form of public art work on the Internet, or “cyber-public art”. To include the internet as a public site for art work is a new initiative which is just beginning to attract artists and ideas worldwide. This site should be maintained together with the database site perhaps by the ADC; or if conceived as an executive venture in an actual project, then by the APO.
- As a new frontier, this project will expand our conception of public art as site-specific within a locality to an international anonymous public domain with non-site-specificity. The idea could be jointly developed with the digital entertainment sector in the Creative Industries for its economic potential.

8.1.7 Public Art in Schools

- Some of the past Quality Education Fund projects might have already touched upon this idea. What we are proposing is a full-scale campaign to bring public art into our schools, not only physically as efforts to beautify the campus, but also as part of the curriculum (as medium-term strategy below) to nurture the values of public art in our school education. Public art curators could be invited to conduct projects with individual schools; the objective being to develop the civic virtues (hence public) as well as creativity (hence art) through such projects.6

8.1.8 Public Art Festival and Award

- Either independently or in conjunction with other institutions such as the Art Museum or the Tourism Board, a biennial or triennial festival on public art (in alternate years with the HK biennial art exhibition)7 – to select different sites from the city and to organize it in different seasons to coincide with certain traditional festivals in different years – to make it truly unique with Hong Kong characteristics as an international event. We are not as ambitious as to have this rival the big players such as Documenta or Venice Biennale. The closest reference in the region is the Fukuoka Triennial and the Museum City Tenjin Project which has certainly put Fukuoka since the last decade on the cultural map of the world. Faced with keen competitions in the region – the Singapore Nokia Festival and the Shanghai Biennale, just to name two recent players in this world cultural festival game, not to

---

6 Recently one Taiwanese high school invited the famous French artist Daniel Buren (author of Deux Plateaux in the Palais Royale of Paris in 1989) to conduct public art projects with their students.

7 I have proposed this idea in “The Prospects of the HK Art Biennial” in the 2003 HK Art Biennial Exhibition Publication, HK: HK Art Museum, 2003.
mention the recent wonderful public art exhibition in Shenzhen\(^8\) – it is high
time indeed that Hong Kong came up with our own festival in visual art to be
featured as one of the main attractions for both citizens and tourists like the
annual HK Arts Festival (in performing arts), and organized with private
donations and sponsorships. In association with the Festival, the organizer
could also consider setting up of an award programme in public art.

8.1.9  \textit{Training, Commissioning, Implementation and Removal}

- Apart from offering training (e.g. short-term workshops) to artists and related
personnel in public art (in technical as well as management issues), there is
an urgent need to review and set up commissioning and implementation
mechanism of public art once the overall corporate strategy is formed. Past
experiences by APO will be valuable but consideration should be sought
from overseas examples such as in the US, Europe, Australia and Taiwan.
This could be part of the medium-term suggestion of an R&D programme
(see below) and could be part of the work of the Public Art Commission.
However, on the short-term basis, APO should either look at this in-house or
commission a consultancy study to iron out some of the problems they faced
in their past projects. The study should also include a review of existing
planning and building regulations and how to streamline the process for
public art implementation within the regulatory limits.

- The review should also include consideration of a mechanism of how to
remove unsuccessful public art.

8.1.10  \textit{Short-term Legislative Review:}

- Following from 8.1.9 and to facilitate the implementation of public art
projects, changes could be sought in the HK Planning Standard and
Guidelines as short-term strategies.

- Short-term review and amendments of existing laws and regulations would
help promote public art without extra resources. These may include laws
that would affect the provision of public art such as:

\(^{8}\) \textit{Fifth System: Public Art In The Age Of "Post-Planning"} The 5th Shenzhen International Public Art
Exhibition (12 December 2003 - 11 December 2005) is organized by the He Xiangning Art Museum,
Shenzhen. Venue: Overseas Chinese Town, Shenzhen. Please refer to the following site:
8.2 Medium-term Strategies

8.2.1 Voluntary adoption of Percent for Art Scheme

- As shown in the comparative studies of other cities, legislation on mandatory provision for a percentage of the overall cost dedicated to art works for new public building, place, space, infrastructure or construction work will provide a conducive environment to burgeoning investment in public art. The legislation will create a multiplying effect on the demand of public artworks and therefore empowering the vitality of public imagination and creativity.

- However, legislation takes time, and it falls on the government to take the initial lead to establish the administrative protocol so that a voluntary Percent for Art Scheme could be adopted by departments involved in all public projects that could incorporate public art works. These indeed are not limited only to building or construction work, nor only to departments in charge of such projects, but to all kinds of departments and units that could exercise their creative imagination to espouse the idea of public art in promoting their work. The set up of the voluntary scheme is to pave way for the long-term mandatory scheme, which may take years to realize.

- The Government may also look at the possibility of extending such a voluntary scheme to the private sector, without triggering the legislative mechanism. APO should continue collaboration with the private sector in organizing their public art projects.

8.2.2 Public Art in School Curriculum

- In connection with 8.1.7 above, it is important that public art (much like
heritage) be developed into the curriculum of both primary and secondary schools, simply because of the values of public art as an educational tool for both civic virtues and creative imagination, and a chance to execute ideas in a real social and physical context as an important learning step in mediating between concepts and reality, or knowledge and experience. HAB should take this on board to work closely with the Education and Manpower Bureau to set up a curriculum development group to study this. A good example is the setting up of community and school programmes by the Canadian Centre for Architecture in Montreal for the inclusion of architecture and heritage in school curriculum.

8.2.3 Public Art in Tertiary Education

- As in school education, so also for tertiary education: there is need and demand to set up courses and eventually programmes in public art in our tertiary educational institutions such as the Fine Arts, Architecture or Planning Department in Chinese University or the University of Hong Kong. These courses or programmes will aim at training artists, curators, critics, cultural and art managers as well as other professionals (planners, architects, landscape architects, engineers and interior designers) involved in public art projects. There are many models to look at both in the US and the UK.9

8.2.4 Research & Development Programme in Public Art

- In association with education programmes, there should also be a comprehensive R&D programme in public art to be set up either at the tertiary institutions or with the museums or independent research institutes. The R&D programme will advance discourse and discussion in public art and inform the policy makers of the latest issues and trends. As a start, both ADC and HAB might initiate this R&D programme within their existing research departments with a view to contracting out studies wherever and whenever possible.

- The areas and topics of research may include:

  - Public art projects and research in the Chinese and Hong Kong context
  - A comprehensive legislative review to promote public art

---

9 Please refer to our list in Appendix F of the main report.
New forms of public art
The social and political dimension of public art
Public art and cultural exchange

8.2.5 Regional and International Exchange

- The education and research development will not be complete without an international perspective. Therefore, it is also important to set up regular international exchange in public art in various forms: conference, exhibition, artist-in-residence, joint curating, competition, lectures, seminars, workshops, exchange study programmes etc. in addition to invitation of international artists to create public artwork in Hong Kong. Implicit in this broadening of the local context is the immediate hinterland of China, which provides opportunities for HK artists to work in the Pearl River Delta and other cities to the north.

8.3 Long-term Strategies

8.3.1 Tax-incentive

- Current tax laws allow individual and corporate tax exemption for charitable donations. However, there is no allowance for expenses on culture and arts. While skeptics argue against an absolute reduction on government revenue with tax concession, the private sector generally (as represented in our first consultation by the General Chamber of Commerce) welcome such a move – some indeed even argue for double taxation benefits. We believe that tax exemption for the arts in the long run will benefit Hong Kong, not only materially improving the artistic environment but even economically by increasing job opportunities and generation of wealth in the new mode of creative economy. The primary objective of this policy is to provide incentive for the private sector to allocate resources for cultural and artistic causes. Therefore the reduction in tax income for the government eventually will be balanced out by the reduction of government subsidies of the arts when the climate of private sponsorship becomes mature. We see this recommendation as an evolving process by which a partnership between commerce and art will gradually be built up.
8.3.2 **Zoning-incentive**

- Similar to the last point, zoning or development incentive is another form of encouragement by the government for the private sector to sponsor arts, done at virtually no (or very low) costs to the government. The New York Plaza Law of 1961 provides the first model of zoning incentive (apparently inspired by the Seagram Building of Mies Van der Rohe) to dedicate public spaces by private developments. This is said to be studied by the SAR Government in relation to heritage protection and urban renewal. Once legislated, it could also apply to provisions of public art projects, as creation of public spaces in itself is already a form of public art.

8.3.3 **Mandatory Percent for Art Scheme**

- As argued in 8.2.1, mandatory Percent for Art Scheme is the ultimate solution to ensure the sustainable growth of public art. However, we recommend that this legislation be evolved gradually, to allow time for the establishment of a solid platform in the general awareness of public art and the mutual growth of ties between the private sector and the art community. Ideally when both tax incentive and zoning incentive are more or less in place, then the push for a mandatory Percent for Art Scheme will have more chance of success prosperity. In this regard, we should learn from the experience of Taiwan – to bring in full legislation prematurely might create public art pollution instead.

8.3.4 **Establishment of a Public Art Fund**

- While making rules to encourage people to invest in public art is desirable, to encourage people to surrender cash direct for the same cause will definitely be more effective, though it may take even longer to accomplish the task. This would be the case of establishing a fund or trust despite the fact that this mode of funding public art projects will be on the best possible terms: no constraint whatsoever set on the nature, site or forms of public art work. The prime model of reference is the New York City Public Art Fund which allows many artists to realize their wild proposals in the city, and brings the meaning of public art to its full potential. There are similar funds in HK such as the Lord Wilson Heritage Trust that could lend as model for a fund or trust in public art. Indeed, if HAB is willing to investigate, this idea might
be realized even sooner than expected, and certainly before all legislated matters on public art are brought forth to the public.

8.3.5 Public Art for Community Development

- Echoing our very first recommendation in 8.1.1 - public art belongs to the public and is the true expression of the people of a community - this last suggestion is more an end than a means – as a strategy for public art to promote welfare of society than for society to promote the welfare of public art. Our research on the subject points us clearly to this final destination of the path of the public art walk. The whole rationale of an increasing interest and attention to the subject in all developed societies both east and west is based on the magical effects of public art projects on society – the charm with which it draws people together to celebrate, to bring factions of forces into harmony, to heal social sickness and wounds and to resurrect dying quarters or dead wastelands in the forgotten districts of the city. Indeed while this is the ultimate cause of public art, it is also the fundamental *raison d’etre* of its being. We hope that whoever is given the responsibility of carrying out public art projects in Hong Kong will never overlook this last point, perhaps even to begin with it. At the juncture when Hong Kong experiences one of its most difficult periods, we should all consider the redemptive possibility of public art and to urge everyone, most of all the leadership of both the private and public sectors, for a try.

[End]