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Abstract: I propose a reading of a group of art works produced by Ângela Ferreira between 1991 and 2007 in order to understand the development of a critical and nonaligned account of public space as art medium; an account that connects cultural memory, physical and virtual experience on built space, space as archive, and art as a total work on entropy and nostalgic transcendence. These works explore an extensive collection of visual techniques that go from photography to video, from scenic montage to three-dimensional constructs, from ur-architecture to formalist sculpture, and through this multimedia space-time setting, Ângela Ferreira’s artistic production posits the need to assess the qualitative variance between public space as theory and public space as practice.

Introduction and research context
In recent years, I have been examining a set of works from advanced contemporary art that highlights the colonization of the symbolic and the aesthetic by dominant economic forms, and recognizes lived and organized space as the encasement of different and struggling forces. I have been interested in how works like Gordon Matta-Clark’s Conical Intersect or Etant donné pour locataire (Paris, 1975); Victor Burgin’s Minnesota Abstract (Minneapolis-St. Paul, 1983);
Hans Haacke's *So You Were Victorious After All* (Graz, Austria, 1988); Jeff Wall's *Eviction Struggle* (Vancouver, 1988); James Casabere's *Panopticon* (1993), *Monticello's series* (2001), and *Georgian Jail Cages* (2003); Mike Kelley's *Educational Complex* (1995); and Ângela Ferreirinha series from *Khayelitsha* (1991) to *Maison Tropicale* (2007) screen and explore in a creative sense the risks of the simulacrum and the ornament, and take a critical balance to the drift of all aspects of human relations into the realm of commodity.

I have been interested in how they put into artistic form recurrent questions that affect the survival of the individual and of whole communities. What remains to be said in an artistic code about the presence of myths, of technology, of reification, of banality on our daily routines? How has the image of space and the aesthetic of the photogenic and the fixed become a surrogate for the transient and contradictory condition of real space? How does the aesthetic representation of a plural and democratic space disguise the holy alliance between bureaucracy and property in the takeover of the few remaining spots of citizenship, of political use of space (in a sense of belonging and differentiation) that have not yet become consumer artifacts, that haven’t yet become superficial, deprived of dialogue, and predetermined? I read (and value) these artistic objects as active dissenters, as counter-monuments¹ and as ruinment², where the processes of dematerialization–rematerialization and re-representation go beyond the social depletion of art creation, the apparent ideological hegemony of decentred subjectivity, an aesthetic labeled as indifferent to the violence of historical processes.

The conflicting nature of these objects also reflects upon the role of art in a society where image has both become a purveyor of myth and also of fact, and where free territory (spaces where representation can be an action, whether direct or deferred, and not just a qualifier³) and tolled territory have become undifferentiated. Many of these artists explore the post-architectural nature of the built environment, opposing the wishful dreams of modern architecture with its production of space and order in a capitalist society, and return to the house/city duality to create strong visual analogies of postindustrial, neo-liberal, and ethnocentric cultural frameworks. In their different modes of expression and production, these artists characterize the imperfect, the unattended, the incomplete, and the empirical cul de sac (the useless) as important assets of modernist tradition.

In these specific artistic productions, where work and process are intertwined, hierarchical oppositions between repetition and difference, ordinary and
extraordinary, surface and depth, banality and difficulty, have dissipated and become secondary. The artists recognize perceptual difficulty and conceptual depth – the need to question and learn – not just as exclusive categories of scientific work but as prerogatives of artistic production, active agents of the ‘mix and match’ through which advanced art turns theory into practice.

This paper is a means to reiterate the transgressive nature of art, to scope art, in the discourse of sustainability, as a perceiver of social contradictions and cultural bashings and a prime instrument to fire fight the naturalization of injustice and to disclose and deplore the unspoken prejudices and fears embedded in everyday protocols of human and community relations.

Ângela Ferreira
In this paper, I present a reading of three art works produced by Ângela Ferreira between 1991 and 2007. In these art works, the historical, anthropological, and architectural realms are worked as symbolic and cultural signifiers of naturalization and dissent, of inclusiveness and separation. The works involve an extensive collection of visual techniques that go from photography to video, from scenic montage to three-dimensional constructs, from ur-architecture to formalist sculpture. Although her work remains somewhat unexamined by academic research, she belongs to that artistic and heterodox genealogy that considers that art can introduce a new set of phenomenon into public, naturalized images/symbols of power.

Art may reaffirm or contradict the instrumental presentation of progress as the only available ‘Being in Time’. The organization of space, the positional class mapping of individuals, is a symbol of power and of urban ideology. The art works presented in this paper differentiate and, at the same time, coordinate with the techniques that turn the city, the urban field, into a centre of power and a crossroads of relationships. They rework and undo the blank and normative aesthetization of public space by exploring the ‘heretic’ and poetic tropism of agit-monuments, by downsizing the concept of artistic autonomy to its insufficiencies and contradictions and repressing from their own mind/content the ‘window dresser’ and ‘entertainer’ identities that in contemporary societies stereotype artistic creation as an orderly beauty and ‘shamanistic’ distraction.

The works of art are addressed as strong, unfamiliar and cognitive images that through procedures of visual analogy (of an identity of relation) take possession of fragmented and dissociated expertise embedded in modern culture: the political economy of urban space production, the ideological
input on public and private space and their associations through the concepts of bureaucracy and property, the architectural and technical accommodation of lived space.

All along Ângela Ferreira’s artistic path one can sense what Thomas Crow (1993) describes as a feature of advanced contemporary art, that it has become “a crossover between the seminar room and the art studio” (p. 63). In the nameless –ism of advanced contemporary art, this pervasive cooperation between the dynamics and inertias of theoretical scoping and the practical endeavors of form-making is no longer biased by judicious and post-Hegelian utopias such as Nikolai Taraboukin’s early 1920s final countdown for artform and art-making, or Situationist critique of modernist art as the institutionalization of the transgressive, but it is also no longer embedded in the utopia of the autonomy of the artistic form built by Clement Greenberg’s Eliotic Trotskyism.5

Faced with a needed critique of the demise of the artistic field into the realm of mass culture, serious and advanced contemporary artists go through modernist remnants (whether architectonic, artistic, or literary) looking for untouched ‘archival’ material and, above all, looking for signs of gender and cross-cultural pioneering. This has become an important reference in the way artists like Ângela Ferreira have been dealing with historical conceptions of space and dwelling, pointing out their time-bomb operationality and useful visual and semantic resources when treated as artistic prime-matter.

Her own condition as an African Portuguese born and raised in Mozambique in the period prior to Independence (1975) and of an émigré studying sculpture in the apartheid regime of South Africa fostered her need to rebuild and understand her identity through a recollection of lived and surely traumatic experience in colonial and postcolonial Mozambique and in hard core South African Apartheid. These contexts run parallel to her efforts to read with an aesthetical but also socio-critical scope the alienation of space by time6, the racial and ideological ethos of urban planning, the vertical decision making that pushes human communities into a culture of isolation and indifference, and the economic and social processes where humanized and lived space becomes a non-real commodity utility – in short, the overlapping of the anthropological by the economic. I argue that she also signals in her visual analogies how individuals position and react against the given, for instance, how vernacular and prosthetic constructs fill handicapped low-income dwellings and give them a sense of place (Marquises, 1994) and how urban agriculture shows up in expressway territories (Hortas, 2007).
She treats selected objects – sanitary facilities in Khayelitsha, the marquees in Oporto Ilhas, the doorstep and the entrance of the Kiefhoek building, the platform that once hold Henri Prouvé’s Maison Tropicale in Niamey, Niger, and even the container that shuttled it back to Europe in a neo-cubist profile – as raw material for her own sculpture research, as if her three-dimensional constructs were a landscape-depicting process (with strong autobiographical features) exploring issues of space in movement and architecture as a *psychic mechanism* (as Anthony Vidler (2007) states on recent installation art embracing architectural themes).

In general, her work inquires about given history: How were racism and segregation core to Portuguese colonialism but have been hidden and misrepresented throughout media culture? How do you use your own childhood memories to debate cosmopolitan lifestyles, modern building and consumer habits in a society based on colonial and anti-democratic perceptions of civic life? How do you come to terms with a society that no longer exists? How do you look at history not from the point of view of the victorious but of the defeated, knowing that those who lost were blind to change? Through a kind of ‘harvesting’, her work tries to look through collective and individual processes of remembrance, through the human need to give a present tense to nostalgia.

She wants to find flaws in the larger picture of human dwelling and contemporary society but rather than expose them in a doctrinal way, she proposes to question them. Like Vancouver-based photographer and post-conceptual artist Jeff Wall, one can argue that she is not looking for the big disaster or the king-size crater in human history as an artistic theme; instead, she depicts the comings and goings of history’s smaller but continuous handicaps.

Three of Ferreira’s works – *Khayelitsha: Sites and Services*, *Duas Casas/Two Houses*, and *Maison Tropicale* – are briefly examined here to illuminate how this type of artistic practice and inquiry can contribute to revealing and rethinking the real-life practices of the organization and design of urban form and architecture, and to exposing the underlying political and socio-cultural currents that propel these occurrences and trajectories.

*Khayelitsha: Sites and Services*

*Khayelitsha: Sites and Services* (see Figure 1) refers to a particular place in time and in space: an urban phenomenon that has become a reified object. We look at the images of an almost formless field; we learn through some ‘literature’, which
always outlines Ferreira’s visual interventions, that this landscape is located in the township suburban rings of Capetown, South Africa.

The word Khayelitsha comes from Xhosa, meaning ‘New Home’. One cannot avoid the cynical overtone of this labeling if one considers the fact that under apartheid, South Africa urban organization was based on the racist Group Areas Act. ‘New Home’ becomes a metaphor for segregation, pass books, limited urban circulation for non-whites, curfew, displacement, forced removal, tribalization of the non-white education system, racist leveling of the non-white curriculae and criminalization of non-white working skills. The area was originally built and prepared in 1985 in the western outskirts of Capetown, which was then one of the most segregated cities of South Africa. Its main function was to redirect, through compulsory measures, the Xhosa migration into Capetown. The area was provided with a rudimentary water supply infrastructure and with some sanitary facilities localized at strategic points. In 1991, Khayelitsha stood in the pictures depicted by Ângela Ferreira as an empty, stilled territory; today, it stands as one of the fastest growing and poorest suburbs of Capetown, with almost half a million residents.

The installation Khayelitsha: Sites and Services has a dualist presentation: there is a group of documental photography, almost laconic, reduced to a post-human, austere,
and anti-narrative perception, and small-scale, portable, and composed three-dimensional built objects (see Figure 2). Khayelitsha’s monosemic discourse and low-cost industrial-built materiality becomes the object-subject of a sculpture experience. In the small floor objects there is clearly a reasoning between Khayelitsha as place and as a discernible social reality, and Khayelitsha as pure physicality, as a built, unconscious, and unexpected statement. Concreteness and behavioural response to the phenomenological and syntactic features of the artistic object becomes a primary outline.

When Ferreira’s intervention/assertion was first mediatized in Lisbon’s Contemporary Art Museum exhibition of her then-recent works, *Em Sítio Algum/No Place at All* (2003), this ‘ready-made’ township surface grilled by austere sanitary modules transmitted a less is incompleteness sensation. One would fall into the photography’s two-dimensional silence, perceiving that in the depicted environment there was no human presence, no complexity, only repetition. Then one would turn around in the exhibition room and realize that these pictures, these devices of ambiguity and incompleteness had lost their grip on the vividness of historical facts, and they had metabolized into small, horizontal, somatic sculptures. Yet if phenomena, if the bodily firmness of this empty and unsaid space becomes an abstraction, if a segregated form becomes its being at the same time, Kayelitsha in the state of expectancy (a community yet to be born long after its demographic occupation) in which Ângela Ferreira took her pictures strangely becomes a place, a place of the unsaid. Khayelitsha becomes a urbanscape and its visuality unlocks a discourse on mimesis and unrooted repetition, on the aesthetics of the built environment where the words of Saint Just gain new strength: “The present order is the disorder of the future” (Dean and Millar, 2005: 18).
**Duas Casas/Two Houses**

Both *Duas Casas/Two Houses* and *Maison Tropicale* explore the theme of sleeping beauty (modern architecture) nurtured and kept alive by an old and ugly society (the global market and its “accumulation by dispossession process”) that remains intact in its contradictions and insufficiencies. Ferreira developed the installation *Duas Casas/Two Houses (J.J.P. Oud)* (2001) in the framework of the exhibition *Squatters #1* produced in 2001 at the Witte de With’s Contemporary Art Center in Rotterdam and later that year at Fundação de Serralves in Oporto. The installation makes a biography (Jacob J.P. Oud, 1890-1963) jump out of a period (Der Stijl modernism in the Dutch 1920s) and out of that biography a work (the Kiephoek urban project, *Existenzminimum*, 1925/30).

Ferreira rediscover this prototype of architectonic heroism, a case study of the ideological partnership dreamt by The Stijl neo-plasticists between the claim of life and the aesthetic ordering of chaos. She rediscover it in its rightist drift when the building and the issues it addressed – its cubomorphic codification of human dwellings, and its presence as a visual and concrete booster of hope and belief in an egalitarian and participative society of productive efficiency – had been ‘captured’ by consumer society, by neighbourhood gentrification, and by architectural tourism. The building’s use value had been turned into the museum framing/cultural protection of a place that no longer existed (and that apparently no longer made sense). To relate and question that subtext on the intranscendency of human products that surrounds the Kiephoek neighborhood, she built a fac-símile of one of its twin entrances. This strange plywood and plastic construction (Figure 3) is a reflection about the phenomenology of the urban condition,
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_Figure 3. Ângela Ferreira, Maison Tropicale. Sculpture and Installation view as it was viewed by author in 2008 exhibition “Hard Rain Show” in Berardo Museum, Lisbon. Photo taken and edited by P. Pousada._
that is, the alienation of space by time, the estrangement of place and identity, and the perception of native land as a foreign country. The disembodiment of utilitarian beauty becomes the prime matter: function displaced from form and form no longer following function but looking for a new meaning.

Maison Tropicale

In Maison Tropicale (2007), the “clean-drawn” and “good design” (Greenberg, 1995: 180, 184) theatrical mannerism of Minimal art opens its Monist window to sociological and (auto) biographical issues. Ângela Ferreira again takes the misadventures of an architectonic object as the material base to her work; in this particular case, the nomadism fin de siècle of three replicas of a one-family prototype dwelling developed by the talented master of pre-fabricated constructions Jean Prouvé (Maisons Portiques, Issoire, 1939-40; Maison Standard, Meudon, 1949-50) and his brother Henri Prouvé. These replicas were designed to be sited in tropical and subtropical regions still under French colonial administration, respectively in Niamey, the capital of Niger, and in Brazzaville, Congo’s capital. Migration flow and speculative rescue (Judith Rodenbeck [2010] calls it “neocolonial repatriation”) done by a French businessman would transform these buildings, already in a post-mortem state, into newly found super-valued architectural treasures to be exhibited in Paris and New York (see Figures 3, 4, and 5).

Maison Tropicale, the art project, comprises two parts. The first part, with anthropological features, is the audiovisual and photographic documentation of the visit that Ângela Ferreira made to the old settings of Prouvé’s prototypes. In this travel and inquiry, she went together with filmmaker Manthia Diawara. In their promenade on architectural absence, presented as a film documentary entitled “Maison Tropicale,” they disclose everyday routine in the historical and spatial epilogues of the Prouvé Maisons: what remained of the Niamey house, the cement platform, occupied and used as a working facility for Tuareg refugees; the memories of one of the past owners of the Congolese Maison, Mireille Ngatsé, a slum landlady as Diawara describes her. This part also posits a critical assessment on the posthumous importance of these objects as historical artifacts that have been defunctionalized and levitated to European grounds. A built ghost carved in the modernist fiction of the Other becomes cinematic through economics; it moves and, in its containment as a commodity, it gains a ludic walkthrough ambivalence. In Le Corbusier’s Le dehors est le dedans proposition, what was a void filled with anthropological memories has become an optical and
Figure 4. Ângela Ferreira, *Maison Tropicale (Niamey)*, photograph 2007. Through the inertia of a modern artifact’s passing, a place in the world is rediscovered. Photograph taken and edited by P. Pousada from a video produced by Ângela Ferreira and presented at her 2008 exhibition “Hard Rain Show” in Berardo Museum, Lisbon.

Figure 5. The Prouvé Prototype assembled in Long Island City, Queens, 2008. Ruin becomes treasure. Photograph taken and edited by P. Pousada from a video produced by Ângela Ferreira and presented at her 2008 exhibition “Hard Rain Show” in Berardo Museum, Lisbon.
moving playground (if not an anatomical lesson on Mecanno’s constructivism); you no longer possess it or live on it, yet you can become more than a viewer, a morbid voyeur.

The second part of the project materializes into an object with neocubist vibrations, the corridor/container (Figure 3) with which Ângela Ferreira poetically represents the thingness of the maisons tropicales, disassembled and numb, resting, waiting to become conceptual bait for the relation between truth and power, authenticity and disguise.

The Prouvé project essentializes an experience on mechanical construction (the operational relation between static frameworks and climate control), on transport logistics (the maisons were fabricated in France and travelled by air to Africa), and on a business opportunity, to promote the French metallurgical industry of aluminum. But opposite to the words uttered by Albert Sarraut at the first French congress on colonial urbanism in 1931 – “for now on the European building will be supported by colonial pilotis!” – functionalism adapted to the tropics never came around, becoming a picture of an era’s collapse and a ‘hunting’ trophy. The undoing and the packaging mimicking the construction/composition dualism of European easel abstraction as well as the cement platform (Figure 4) are, probably in an unplanned way, ruinments that whisper the sinister word Françafrique, the code name that shadows the neocolonial policies that Quai d’Orsay has been staging ever since French colonies became independent. The magnetic emptiness of that cement platform, iced in the illo tempore of the Niamey cliché, reminds us that “colonial pilotis” are well buried and fixed in the Western representation of the Other.

Post-script
In discussing the subject of advanced art in the animation of public space, one must consider that artists – at least those with a proactive and non-aligned agenda concerning the problems of post-Fordist urban spaces, the recurrent problem of dwelling, and poetics in lived space – tend to shortcut, mine, and reverse socialized accounts on the role of art in social transformation, and to demonstrate how allegory, perceptual estrangement, and aesthetic difference are essential in the perseverance of utopia in the map of our living space. Throughout their long history of belonging and separation with and within the built environment, the visual arts (pictorial, graphic, sculptural art forms) strived to place in its core the conscience of the tragic (of suffering and destiny) as well as the desire for a unified aesthetically organized world. Harmony and
chaos, pain and joy, reality and fiction, briefness and transcendence were always prevailing polarities in art-making.

Yet this duality also means that art endures for a longer time when it does not reiterate the naturalized and the socially accepted, when it does not comply with the conveniences of either friends or foes, when it specifically hangs between its Icarian desire to be autonomous and carefree of the incongruences of history and its utopian desire to embed itself into political transformation. Good and enduring art is not opportunistic, though its artists may fall into the charms of the status quo. Great art commits itself against common places, stereotypes, and systems of beliefs; it goes on strike, it confronts social passiveness and conformism, and it strives to be a ‘public nuisance’, to be something which is difficult to insert in the public space, which is resistant to interpretation, which is in a permanent estrangement, fighting against cultural commodification, that is, against style. Art is always in the business of opening gaps, reverting, and resizing social and cultural objects so that the impossibility of change (conformism) does not become the impossibility of living (nihilism), or, as Robert Filliou remarked, “Art reminds us that life is worth living.”

Notes
1. The term counter-monument was originally coined by German conceptual artists Jochen and Esther Gerz to describe the memorial against fascism (Hamburg-Harburg, 1986), a 12-metre-square steel column slowly receding into the ground (1986-1993) where public agency and participation was articulated as a way to engage and deplete the didactic and rhetorical traits of the conventional monument. The artists claimed that by excluding from the work of historical remembrance its primal and historical focus, the hero or individual agent, and by refusing the abstraction of the human condition into a totality, they managed to short-circuit all the aesthetic procedures in a conventional monument that were far too close to the fascist conception of the monument as a “keeper of national fiction” (Tompkins, 2006: 83). With their metaphor of the haunting past of the German people they “foreground the play with absence” (Tompkins, 2006: 83) where the social function is less about sanctioned history or the memory of specific demographics and more about social and civic responsibility and the idea that counter-monuments are positional space-time views against collective amnesia. For further work on this concept, see Young (1993) and Buchloch (2006).
2. The concept of ruinment focuses on the perception that the myth of progress, of a teleological impulse defining human activities, is a symbolic and cultural construct that hides (through a lack of image) the non-productive, unplanned dimension of modernity and, at the same time, aesthetically represents as rationality the capitalist
processes of destitution, the premature archaisms of the built environment, and the urban space as a cycle of production and consumption. Gordon Matta Clark applied this word play (ruin + monument, amnesia + epic memory) as a corollary to the urban effects of entropy, specifically, the sense of irreversibility perceived on objects and sites that become the image of their own de-valuation and alienation, of their own inaccessibility as lived spaces. The impossibility of built modern space as monument and the sense of impermanence and place *unmaking* are intrinsic to Gordon Matta-Clark’s proposed concept (see Graham 1985/2003).

3. See Lefebvre (1972) and Harvey (2000, especially Chap. 1, “The Difference a Generation Makes”). More recently, Alejandro Zaera Polo (2008) has become an important and somewhat alternative sequel (with a liberal touch) to the public space critical reading developed by these two Marxist authors.

4. The agit-monument concept proceeds from Nikolay Punin’s (1920) reading of Tatlin’s Tower (1919-20) in which he claims: “A monument must live the social and political life of the city and the city must live in it. It must be necessary and dynamic, then it will be modern. The forms of contemporary, agitational plastic arts lie beyond the depiction of man as an individual.” Punin’s main argument is that in modern times the monument has to become a real life experience and a social want made out of the entente between “purely creative form” and “utilitarian form.” Monuments have to become aesthetic displayers of social dynamics, have to be as immersive, and through that immersion the city must be contained within.

5. This oxymoron was devised by T.J. Clark (1983) to describe Clement Greenberg’s critical thought on Modernism. It highlights a dialectical bind between a partisan fight against kitsch and ornament (the derision of art into style), an effort to restore the bond between pleasure and work that was disrupted by Fordism, and an historical (and nostalgic) perception of advanced (contemporary) art as a moving forward and a looking backwards process where the essence of art, its landmark, remains in the realm of art-making (its conventions, traditions, and specificities give positional and methodological directions and insights to newcomers), that is, the subject of art is art and its undoing, transformation, and reinvention is historically charged. See also Criqui (1987).

6. In the context of an invitation from the De Witte Institute, Ferreira’s work *Duas Casas/Two Houses (J.P.P. Oud)* addresses the failed gentrified urbanism of the Kiefhoek neighborhood in Rotterdam. In this work, the dead labour architectural and urban artifacts give way to new processes of accumulation.


8. The words of Saint Just, the French revolutionary leader of the Jacobins and close ally to Robespierre, are inscribed upon large plates of masonry in Ian Hamilton Finlay’s poetic garden and artistic environment of Little Sparta (West Edinburgh, Scotland).
9. Surpassing the dualism between mind and body knowledge of space (i.e., space and body interactions) through variety of phenomena and of structure, ABC/Minimal artists propose a realism of the art object in clear disagreement with Modernist tradition, arguing that the real substance of art is the material and sensorial phenomenology produced by its artistic substance. Literalism is the Fountainhead.
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