

Jochen Gerz: 2-3 Streets

An Exhibition in Three Cities of the Ruhr

NRW KULTURsekretariat, Wuppertal 2006

Table of Contents

Page	2:	Three Quotations
	3:	<i>2-3 Streets</i> is an exhibition of streets
	4-5:	<i>2-3 Streets</i> is a work of art
	5-7:	Three Books
	7-8:	Creativity
	8- 10:	Awareness Industries
	10-11:	Productions

Having spent six months in the village, the friend wanted to start filming. He had received answers to his questions and had not only acquired an idea about his hosts but also about what had brought him there. He had hesitated about asking one question – the occasion had not arisen. But he knew who he wanted to ask. Usually there was an old man sitting on the ground next to the entrance to his house. When he heard the question, he replied without hesitating, pointing indiscriminately at various things in the vicinity, like a few goats grazing on a slope. When the old man saw that the friend was slightly baffled, he looked around some more and finally pointed at a single, little dried up tree behind the house and added: maybe a little grander than that tree over there but quite similar, actually.

JG, The Question about Paradise, 1963

When you find this card, you are part of a book that I have been writing for a long time. Therefore I want to ask you to spend the afternoon in Heidelberg today as if nothing had happened and not to let what you do be influenced by this message. Only in this way will I be able to finish writing the book, which I want to dedicate to you, my rediscovered present.

The Book of Gestures
Manuscript found in Heidelberg in 1969

Just like that and that's all. No matter how artistic the addition or the replacement. No matter how futile the massacre, no matter how much devotion goes into the sacrifice.

F/ T 128, 1984

2-3 Streets is an exhibition of streets

2-3 Streets is an exhibition. It shows 2-3 streets without any noteworthy sites or occurrences, streets that could be found in any number of places. The exhibited streets are typical of post war cities with apartment buildings, stores, garages – nothing worth mentioning in a city guide. Selected by the participating cities of the Ruhr, they will be open to the public as an art exhibition from the beginning of 2009. The criterion of their selection is their normality and the fact, that they are part of a regeneration. Although the exhibition *2-3 Streets* will run for a year (2009-2010), the artistic work will be in existence for longer. The exhibition will take place within the framework of the European Capital of Culture 2010.

The streets, selected by each of the three cities, involve a neighbourhood to be renewed, changed, or built from scratch, refurbished, rehabilitated or rededicated. The profile of the neighbourhood will clearly vary from city to city.

The intervention could not be greater: the streets and everything that is part of them, that is located there and belongs to them, will be turned into an exhibition. Everything that happens in the streets, intentionally or by chance, will change: it will become the object of artistic interest. An informed public from the region – and beyond – will visit the exhibition, which will have been reviewed in the daily papers. Whatever happens in the streets in the course of the three years (transitory phases – before and after – and the exhibition itself) will become a manifestation of aesthetics and society. Daily life will be an act of culture: the appreciation of art, its communication and its reception by the media.

Like cultural developments in general, this project is not primarily the act of an author or an individual invention but rather a minimal modification within sameness, which can only be registered by a contemporary consciousness. The nature of a place is likely to change where differences are neither sought nor found, where deviation tends to be seen as the failure of mimesis; change is conventionally measured by the extent of the difference that it brings about; here, that nature is measured by the harmony, the similarity it bears to what is already given. The greatest intervention equals the smallest change. There will be nothing going on for the trained eye to see. There will be nothing to indicate the transition from one step to another, or from before to after.

2-3 Streets is not a product of creativity. What is new was already there; what is old is still there. Even so, the change could not be more profound. Every object, every person, every concept will change as if the street had moved to another continent, had acquired another language, another history, another time.

What we call culture functions here like a process of distillation; what is similar does not seek to become a spectacle. Time functions as the consciousness of time. It bundles the arbitrary everyday comings and goings of 2-3 streets into the blink of an eye. As though all the many aspects of the city were converging in one prolonged gaze, one act of seeing, the fruit of the multiple gaze being one single space, a mirror, a new image.

An awareness of the slightest divergence, echo of times past and yet entirely here and now – that is culture. Ideally, art has no status of its own either. It plunges in. It is nothing but scruples in dealing with what is.

2-3 Streets is a work of art

2-3 Streets is a work of art. Basically, there is no need to make that claim today. But, although the definition of art seems to have gone astray since the beginning of the 20th century and there is practically nothing left nowadays that cannot be art, the interest of the artist in the dialectical relationship between art and non-art has lost none of its intensity. Art dreams of non-art and the 'culture society' is fascinated with art in its midst as if it were of an exotic remoteness. Hence, the statement '2-3 Streets is art' demonstrates the uncertainty of saying that something is art, and how ambivalent we are about it. The statement could just as well have read: 2-3 Streets is not a work of art. The utopian goal (of overcoming art) has fallen into the trap of the culture society. We could just as easily claim that it is not the game that is a trap, but life itself.

To this end, a concept is being implemented that will serve as a framework until, in the course of its own execution, it begins to disintegrate and is ultimately absorbed altogether in the finished work. Once it has been executed, the work will no longer be recognisable as a work of art. 2-3 Streets will have become indistinguishable from other neighbouring streets, which are not works of art.

The idea behind 2-3 Streets is based on the assumption that there is an affinity between a society and its art, which is to say that there is a similarity in the way in which both relate to the (shared) future. In both cases, the relationship to the future is burdened with much that has remained undone in the past. It looks as if neither the promise of civilisation nor of art can be fulfilled. The consensus seems to be that it is too late to hope for change. It is therefore fitting to be disillusioned. That is exactly what we mean by culture in the culture society: not a utopia but rather a consciousness of what is fitting.

Two utopian ideals stood for industrial society and its modernism: the conquest of work and the conquest of art. Machines would liberate people from the constraints of time, and art would become an infinite resource for society. In 1904 Lautréamont said that everybody must create poetry – only then would life be worth living. Freedom is a paradox.

The dispersal of the work to the point of near disappearance is possible thanks to the increasingly dense cultural periphery. Working time and leisure time are no longer mutually distinct, and ever more numerous ways of passing time (life) are de-constructing both work and play. The difference between art and society is getting smaller. Art has become almost invisible. And the idea of a person without work has become acceptable. Art and society are on the threshold of their future, but when they move, they think they are going backwards. They have their backs up against the future. We are moving. It moves us. It moves. The rest is a question of attitude.

Although 2-3 Streets will be decentralised, installed in 2-3 cities of the Ruhrgebiet, it is still to be seen as a whole. As a work (and as part of a work), each street is surrounded by other streets and exerts only a marginal influence on its own environment, of which it is also a part. 2-3 Streets will take place as an inconspicuous process. The streets are streets and will not be subsumed by art. Therefore it will not be easy for locals or art connoisseurs to identify the work as art, but both come into contact with it and address it. They are the authors of the work, often without realising it. What remains and what changes varies from case to case. Both are involved: author and work.

2-3 Streets can be part and whole. The relationship between street and environment is not static because, for the duration of the exhibition, the streets as works of art are exposed to changes that have nothing to do with them. Even if the work were seen as having an independent social, economic, political or sociological dynamic, this would not be the cause of its creation, but, at most, the consequence. The prerequisite for this is an almost ludic

situation, which can be art – or not – as the case may be. Conceptually, the two are on a par: the mimetic talent of art which targets society and the mimetic talent of society which assimilates art. Instability is a prerequisite for the work to be a contribution to the culture society.

From the above it follows that the work does not aim to be a realisation of something. It does not have an agenda. Although the participation of the residents and visitors to the exhibition is a prerequisite for the very existence of *2-3 Streets*, it is not the main objective. The participants make a specific contribution, which only the work can explain (see *Productions*, pp. 66 ff.). But that contribution is marginal in relation to what is not explained or changed by the work. The participants live their lives, they do or do not work, they do or do not earn money – or they have travelled there to look at an exhibition. There is no indication of where exhibition, work and art begin or end. *2-3 Streets* is spatially delimited, but it is not clear how the borders are defined. For viewers there is no recognisable distinction between work and non-work. Even though it is a work of art, one can still ask what makes *2-3 Streets* art. However, the question applies to the streets as streets and not as art.

People who go to the exhibition see a street. They look at something that they could just as easily see somewhere else without being viewers of a work of art.

2-3 Streets is not an artists' colony. These are not places, let alone reservations, for 'creatives'. But their presence is just as important as that of so-called 'ordinary' people and residents of the streets, who were already living there before the work began, or those who have moved in since its establishment. They are all participants in *2-3 Streets*.

The streets that are part of the work are governed by their own laws. These are discrete laws, which could also be evident elsewhere or which could possibly take effect here or elsewhere, and not as art. Through the interplay between 'ordinary' and artistic forces, they contribute to the situational mutability that is the hallmark of *2-3 Streets*. Instability and malleability are objectives of this work of art. The impressions that viewers receive – impressions similar to those required for the appreciation of art – may also arouse a new sensibility to the cultural and social context. Like paradise and earth for the Dogon, society and art are essentially the same. No matter what happens, no matter what becomes visible, the intention of the work is not to remain a work. The proximity of art to the urban environment is the prerequisite for that environment's proximity to art. Their reciprocal proximity generates a reciprocal potential for confusion, that is, for movement.

Three Books

Three books – *The Fall of the Public Man* by Richard Sennett (1974), *The Cultural Creatives* by Paul H. Ray and Sherry R. Anderson (2000) and *The Rise of the Creative Class* by Richard Florida (2002) – describe the caesura that is currently affecting the way the post-industrial world sees itself. All three describe the perspective of the individual as a loss. Ray, Anderson and Florida react euphorically (from a European perspective), while Sennett shows a critical, almost familiar melancholy.

The public man is an individual whose actions express and address society (note the German subtitle of Sennett's book: the terror of intimacy). Florida does not treat the creative man as an individual but rather as a movement or a group subject to the influence of trends. (Would one have spoken disparagingly of the 'herd' in the past? I am sure it wouldn't even occur to the author to speak of a creative herd.) The cultural creatives described by Ray and Anderson are people who fashion their own lives, having found a (new?) community.

The books describe the end of the individual as inventor and designer. Sennett's group as a sphere of intimacy undergoes a mutation almost 30 years later and is reborn as a 'creative class'. Ray and Anderson place the emphasis on a new way of life. That does not mean that there are no longer any labourers in Florida's (primarily American) society, but their influence as a group declines while that of the 'creatives' increases. This ties in with French economist Daniel Cohen's analysis in *Trois leçons sur la société post-industrielle*, 2006. Cohen comes to the conclusion that all physical products, in other words anything that can be manufactured, will no longer be produced in the First World: things will only be designed 'here' (an immaterial product) and subsequently produced 'there'.

Florida's 'ingenuousness' raises eyebrows in post-industrial Europe not so much because of his adoration of creativity, to which we are already accustomed, but because of his Anglo-Saxon democratisation. He includes not only artists – that tiny coterie of awe-inspiring geniuses – but potentially anyone working independently or in a remotely independent spectrum and making a good living, as a rule – a delimitation which, incidentally, does not even apply to Ray and Anderson's cultural creatives.

"I am creative". In spite of their differences, the culture societies on both sides of the pond seem to accept a personal claim to creativity as a more valid criterion than any academic diploma or craft-related initiation rite. In a statistic cited by Richard Florida, even the police make an appearance as part of the creative class in the United States!

The singular gives way to the plural and the plural integrates the properties that were once the domain of the individual. Hence, the plural becomes the new singular as a group whose identity is not a consequence of its manifestos (as in the past), but rather of sociological observation.

Observing, following up and keeping records are the new methods of cultural visualisation.

Sociological laissez-faire and collecting can function as a bridge to art. It is an arduous process, a fashioning more redolent of reticence than of intervention, let alone the will to organisation or the almost forceful immediacy of the traditional creative gesture.

Were we to apply sociological methods to the realm of aesthetics, the work would be something that is bound to happen anyway, and which may already have occurred to

some extent, albeit still in progress. This is hardly a brilliant insight; it is merely the outcome of a process that occurs within, and even without, an academic or artistic (research) framework which ought to be the starting point of quiet observation.

The work, therefore, is not primarily an expression of conscious or unconscious intent. It exists more as an emerging entity than as a result. It refers to something that can not be part of itself: the object of observation, the social fluctuation to which it owes its existence. The work does not promulgate itself but rather shows what is already there and makes the work possible in the first place.

Quiet observation that does not focus on a single concept decelerates the work to such an extent that it cannot be the object of observation – as the *gesamtkunstwerk* still is – but can be seen only from the perspective of our own participation (as a group) in the making of the work.

Were art to assimilate the method of patient observation, it would no longer be left to history alone to determine what should be seen and observed. Artistic creativity could also play a part.

Hence, the aspects to be adopted from art are not those aspects that make it art, but those that make it a radical manifestation of the present.

It is not the methods of art and sociology, but the concept of the object, the very notion of the work derived from them, that have outlived their usefulness – concepts that the 20th century failed to jettison and which are now the subject of debate. These are the concepts that prevent both art and sociology from exerting any influence on society other than through the conventional channels of the museum and academic theory. Art that integrates a practice of quiet and almost passive observation, just like sociology that unconditionally accepts its own creativity, shapes the framework for shared action.

Creativity

From the point of view of the culture society, the traditional concept of creativity represents a paradox and the subtlest form of exclusion. Most members of society – of which we are (all) a part and in which we can more or less recognise ourselves – are excluded from the qualities widely associated with creativity. A lack of creativity goes hand in hand with a lack of culture. It follows that a creative person is also a cultural person. Therefore, if we speak of the 'culture society', we imply, conversely, that everything in the society in which we currently live is creative. This conflicts with the restrictive way in which the word 'creativity' is conventionally applied, particularly in the field of humanities. Exclusion does not take the form of being barred from a specific body of knowledge, from specific social and cultural rules, traditions or customs, but occurs instead in voluntarily foregoing the opportunity to act creatively. Nowadays, this axiomatic notion of creativity takes the guise of exclusion from Being – beyond the pale of progress, justice, theory, politics or philosophy. It is a creativity liberated from all those qualities that once helped to define creativity in the modern age.

Some are creative and they are among the few; most are not and never will be. No revolution can ever make up for the dearth of creativity – for that destructive testimonial issued by the soul (and psyche) of the masses. No masterpiece can ever give recompense for the viewer's own failings.

Artists in the 20th century fought many a quixotic battle against their own privileged status. Time and again they laid the advantage of their creativity open to ridicule. Yet nothing was able to prevent the repudiation of what may well be the only overarching artistic stance of the past century. Though subjected to ridicule, it vanquished the fools, not least because art history was not prepared to risk being devoured at such a young age by Modernism and the brouhaha of social creativity. Instead it has become a memorial to artistic utopia: an 'asylum' for creativity.

Anything long taboo will eventually surface. In the culture society, the question of values is essentially moot because everything that may once have been designated a singular value is expressed nowadays, in the mere functioning of the same, as a plural. The erstwhile identity of the one (or of a caste) is increasingly becoming a sign for the many. Being special and even unique is measured by the degree of distribution. Think of so-called luxury goods. The same goes for creativity: it spreads and flows into everything else. In the culture society, the creative author will be the most radical, quintessential form of pluralisation. Thanks to creativity, society as a production of society will continue to rationalise and bohemianise: a production whose quality as life quality is measured by the degree of its aesthetic, holistic and sustainable realisations. Not as the opposite of the old – but rather as a ludic form of awareness, a deceit of Mneme and a life after 'civilisation'.

Awareness Industries

The steadily increasing sensibility to culture in parts of society traditionally not affected by cultural matters is, of course, a welcome development. Culture as a presence in society is playing, now more than ever, a greater role despite the clearly observable and contradictory tendency to diffuse cultural concerns. Thus when speaking about culture, we are not talking about the cultural lobby, which actually is in decline. Those who are jumping on the cultural bandwagon by way of commercial advertising, for example, are not thinking of the opera house and certainly not of classical music.

Culture is everything and nothing, critics might reply, but by criticizing cultural arbitrariness, they are overlooking the fact that there is a reason for the almost revolutionary accessibility to culture, just as there is a reason for the exclusivity of culture, despite the countless attempts of 20th-century art to overcome its own privileged status. And despite the banality of so much culture, these developments are undoubtedly the legacy of modernism's vain attempts to make art a matter for everyone. In this context, one must also point out that democracy, though much praised as the basis of our society, has had but a limited influence on the arts, which are slow to take it into account.

When we speak of culture, there always remain traces of authorship, of an almost exotic singularity and a nebulous eccentricity, which was and still is associated with the bohemian. Oddly this attitude prevails among those layers of society that are the furthest removed from culture and least likely to venture into such a life. Similarly, the attraction that celebrity life exerts on the lower classes is not coloured by envy or resentment, though they will always be spectators and never participants, vicariously enjoying the exclusivity of that life as if through a keyhole. Such admiration also turns to empathy when fate affects the haves in much the same way as the have-nots, for both can suffer misfortune or the sudden onslaught of illness. Even in this tabloid version, culture is still what I am not, it is the opposite, it is denied to me. Be it artistic genius or Diana hounded by the paparazzi, one thing is certain: the gulf between them and me is unbridgeable. The exclusion of the majority (or the viewer, as it's called in the art world) is a prerequisite for participation in culture. Culture actually does stimulate a detachment from life, a life without end. In a museum, marble is not stone but a life without end that genius has breathed into the stone.

It follows that life (the life of the have-nots) has to change first in order to change culture. Either this thesis is wrong or the life of the have-nots is indeed changing.

The omnipresence of culture in a democratic society leads to a new use of exclusivity. Every act of consumption is involved in that use. Be it a yogurt, a car, or a piece of information, I make a choice. My choice of a mass product does not espouse Karl Marx's industrial revolution but exclusivity, i.e. culture. Even when I choose a small car (a Smart or a Cinquecento), I am choosing exclusivity. This is happening in a democratic society, which tends to neutralise contrast and difference and can therefore certainly be seen as a result of the Communist manifesto and, of course, of 1968. All three examples incidentally share the same motto: more justice! Equality and exclusivity go hand-in-hand. It is not Nina Ricci's day cream that promises exclusivity but the choice I make from a sea of goods. Advertising campaigns market choice. In short: nobody can create exclusivity in this world. Exclusivity is not profitable and therefore a social contradiction per se.

Culture is successful because it threatens and dilutes the most venerable dichotomies of social life: the anonymous arbitrariness of daily life, its often criticised fathomless banality and its creation, the genius of masterpieces for all the dwarves. That's what we called and still call culture and art. Threaten is the right word for it: progress threatens the familiar.

Parting is never easy. The merger of exclusivity and mass is an outrageous thought but it is an almost imperceptible territorial event. It is happening: no more and no less.

Cultural diffusion equally affects the arts and banality. High and low flow towards one another, not like fire and water but as similarities.

In all this universal and predictable hybridization, there are hints of a new authorship. Apart from the above-mentioned pain of parting, the omnipresence of culture is a welcome development, even for artists. Like everything cultural, they too are confronted with a loss of orientation that calls what they are defending into question. Culture with its inexorably growing banality is often accused of no longer addressing vital concerns. This certainly doesn't refer to the crisis of the askers, which is best expressed on the summits of culture whose foothills peter out into endless plains of banality. Today the documenta exhibition shocks artist colleagues as much as it shocked the public-at-large 40 years ago.

The confusion that we may feel is not confusion about art; it is the confusion caused by the discovery of our own lives in the broad centre of society. Diffusion means the status of art, of the work, of the artist and above all, the status of the viewer. Nonetheless, I would venture to say that the confusion is not only about art. We, the artists, have possibly forgotten this kind of confusion, although modernism is still reverberating in our ears.

Nowhere is the call for an author louder than in fusion, in the middle of society. The call for an author and the answer to that call do not make sense in museums and libraries but in the midst of society.

The middle of society is getting bigger, making room for the congregation of peripheries to which only few people hitherto had access. The boundaries of culture are disintegrating. "We could be anywhere – I know this place."

In this new culture, the resonance of artistic, self-enamoured responsibility for society has survived although culture is typically characterized by the anonymity of the arbitrary, which washes away, dilutes and diffuses all that is contradictory and exclusive. This may well be a phantom pain because culture is, of course, the author's quintessential territory.

The willingness of all people to make a contribution of their own is something that must first be released. The phantom pain of ingenious authorship therefore only seems to contradict the utopia of the democratic everyman's willingness to make his own contribution. Both are equally threatened by fusion and self-diffusion.

The new culture is creating an increasingly broad base for what we call society as author and its production. This is about inviting all the members of society to make a contribution and about those contributions being a product of society -- and a production of a society. And in the process, we have to be careful not to slip once again into the realm of unreality, of wishes and dreams, by delegating to others what we ourselves cannot manage or dare to do. Where do things dreamt of go? There is only one answer: here. And where is here? Here is everywhere.

Democracy – if we want to find the creative spirit in the democratic body, then we have to treat society with the same respect, the same tolerance as we do the individual genius; we have to believe in society, to trust that it is endowed with as much creative inner life and being, as much creative perplexity and profundity as the individual. This may sound like an ethical or political postulate: it is not. It is only a description of something that is happening anyway.

The omnipresence of culture goes hand-in-hand with the omnipresence of the awareness of injustice. So this is not just about things being diluted, as rightly put forward by Adrienne Goehler, and fusion, but about a new quality: democratic awareness. It is in the name of that awareness that society reaches behind the mask of the author. A society of authors is not a utopia and utopia is not an alternative to life. At the moment and at this point, one might say that nothing is an alternative.

Awareness industry means an industry that leads to society. It is not a commodity or an ideology but a question of the influence through a dialogic confluence of sensibilities, opinions, ideas and reactions, which, like industry, provides the infrastructure for countless individual productions and manifests itself as society. One might speak of a plural that absorbs and reuses the properties of what was once singular in order, in turn, to become a new singular again for which (temporarily) there is no plural.

Productions

In the streets designated by the city for the exhibition and its realisation, the combined output of the residents and the people visiting the exhibition makes a contribution that will lead to a production. Without that contribution, *2-3 Streets* can not be realised. Although it is part of the exhibition, the production is visible neither to the viewers nor to the participating residents. It consists of a text that emerges on site and only in the course of the exhibition.

The residents can contribute by applying for the use of a laptop that is part of *2-3 Streets*. All of the laptops in the exhibition are linked and every sentence, every part of a text, such as one written at home by a resident of one of the exhibited streets, is added onto whatever has already been written. In this way one single text is produced. To enable visitors to the exhibition to contribute as well, an Internet Cafe will be installed in each of the streets. In addition, each of the streets should have a hotel or guest house for those who wish to 'log in' and participate at short notice (e.g. the press), so that they, too, can help to realise *2-3 Streets*. Staying overnight in the streets is part of the work and therefore free of charge. This will enable everyone who spends time at the exhibition to become part of the work and be a contributing author of the production.

Prior to the exhibition, courses will be offered free of charge for residents of the streets who do not know how to use a computer. However, it will also be possible to digitalise handwriting. Computer experts and others interested in helping out can move into refurbished flats in the streets one year before the exhibition begins. These will be supplied by the participating cities. People working on the exhibition will live free of charge in their streets for the duration of the exhibition.

The 'services' offered by the exhibition for participants in *2-3 Streets*, which are included in the budget of the artistic work in progress, may be considered as a kind of basic income available for a limited time to those who are creating a work. This work also figures as part of what might be called the basic properties of society, like the works of individuals, which are often subsidised, i.e. paid for, by society as a whole.

Terms like art, exhibition, society, author, street, work, viewer, creativity, labour, production or literature are used here so that they appear to be interchangeable. What is or is not a work in *2-3 Streets* cannot be determined in the long-term with any clear-cut precision. The same applies to the above terms, which can fuse at any time with others, whose meaning is also in flux. If the work is unstable and could just as easily not be a work, the viewer cannot help being affected. The viewer, too, faces the threat of becoming part and parcel, indeed author, of what he/she only wanted to look at and appreciate. Just as the term consumption evokes self-consumption, so too are well-tempered art historical terms coloured by the time of authorship – childhood, freedom, dreams, games and possibly: people in the culture society.

The text is a chronicle in real time of the one-year exhibition. It is a record of all the events, feelings and thoughts, whether inner or outer, whether far or near, experienced by each participant, regardless of underlying rationale. It is a production of society. It is a strictly consecutive production of each and every entry and obeys no principles of style or content. The text is a public and plural production that cannot be controlled. There is no reason for not taking any contribution into account as long as it comes from the authors of the work.

This text is the invisible production that will emerge in the course of the exhibition; its outcome will be known only after the exhibition ends. It will develop much like the richly associative, imaginative inner workings of an artist, but in this case, the inner workings are the product of a social body with the entire scope of its potential experience and expression, transcending the individual as witness. In theory, this body is shared by all the people in a

shared social space, and therefore has at its disposal an inconceivably vast imaginative potential. Just as one can speak of a basic income, to which every member of society is entitled, regardless of social status, one can also speak of the basic properties of society as a whole. One of those properties is the productions that are themselves an expression of society. We are no longer dealing with the great artistic or cultural achievements of individuals, advanced by the traditional concept of culture, but rather with the expression of society itself, which consists of the contribution, the authorship of theoretically everyone. This expression of society as a whole is a basic property to which everyone is entitled. As familiar as this may seem, it is a new concept of culture which empowers and prefigures current developments in technology and the media.

When the exhibition comes to an end, the text will come to an end too. It will be published in 2011 and distributed to all the participants – the residents of the streets and the visitors to the exhibition. The text (neither actively wanted nor unwanted by its authors) is, incidentally, an attempt to pick up the trail of Modernism after Ezra Pound, William Burroughs, the *écriture automatique* of the Surrealists and Arno Schmidt, and to test the chances of a new form of production for the contemporary audience at large. It should therefore be published by a literary press with wide distribution.

In the exhibition, the residents and their flats are part of what is on view. (The "viewer and image" dialogue is the second, ephemeral form of production in the exhibition. The dialogue is real. When the two parties talk to each other, hypothetical communication between viewer and image becomes a conversation between authors).