Street art, heritage and embodiment

Laima Nomeikaite

Department of Heritage and Society, Norwegian Institute for Cultural Heritage Research

Postboks 736, Sentrum, N-0105 Oslo, Norway

laima.nomeikaite@niku.no

Abstract

In recent years, street art and graffiti have been framed as items of cultural heritage. However, until now, there has been no clear agreement on the definition or conceptualization of street art as heritage. This research presents limitations of the conventional approaches to heritage and argues that street art and graffiti does not represent a dichotomy between tangible and intangible heritage or people and object, but instead represents an inseparable relationship of the two. This study calls for greater engagement with more-than-representational approaches in studying the relationship between street art and heritage. More-than-representational approaches address street art's crucial relationships with everyday life and change, as well as its relational, performative, embodied and affective components. Based on more-than-representational approaches, this research conceptualizes street art as a heritage experience in terms of embodiment, affect and everyday performativity. Furthermore, by situating the concept of embodiment within the case of Bergen, Norway, the paper provides an example of how the reasons and meanings behind the preservation of street artworks can be captured within a local context.

Keywords: Street art, Heritage, More-than-representational, Everyday life, Affect, Embodiment

1. Introduction

During the last decade, street art and graffiti have received increased attention within the field of heritage, in terms of issues related to conservation and preservation, cultural values, memory, identity, power and place-making. However, there are still limitations and differences of opinion on the definition and conceptualization of street art and graffiti as heritage. Within academia, street art and graffiti have been defined as tangible heritage (Poon, 2016), intangible heritage (Burdick & Vicencio, 2015), in between tangible and intangible heritage (MacDowall, 2006) and both tangible and intangible heritage (Merrill, 2015; Mulcahy & Flessas, 2016). Most often, street art has been defined in relation to formal heritage frameworks such as the UNESCO 2003 Convention (which defines it as intangible heritage) or the Australian ICOMOS 'Burra Charter' (which defines it as tangible heritage) (ICOMOS Australia, 1999). However, reference to these frameworks has typically lacked detailed explanation of how, for example, street art or graffiti contributes to aesthetic or social heritage values. Moreover, as I will illustrate later in this paper, the definitions of heritage developed by UNESCO and ICOMOS present a gap not only for street art and graffiti, but in general, due to the legal practices and dichotomies it creates between tangible and intangible heritage. With street art, it has shown that the tangible and intangible heritage dichotomy complicates the application of existing heritage strategies and frameworks (Merrill, 2015). In addition, street art and graffiti is a form of art which cannot be

separated from the urban environment or its viewer (Young, 2005: 72). In this paper, I will argue that street art and graffiti does not represent a dichotomy between tangible and intangible heritage or people and object, but instead represents an inseparable relationship of the two. This argument supports Laurajane Smith's (2006: 44) assertion that "heritage is not a 'thing'; it is not a 'site', building or other material object with defined meanings and values' as ICOMOS defines tangible heritage; rather, heritage must be experienced, and 'heritage is the experience" (Smith, 2006: 45- 47). Instead of focusing on street art and graffiti as static object or artefact, I suggest a conceptualization of street art and graffiti as sensuous and embodied experience in which human body interacts with street artworks and urban space in everyday life.

This study calls for greater engagement with more-than-representational approaches in studying the relationship between street art and heritage. 'More-than-representational' stems from non-representational theory (Thrift, 2008). However, Lorimer (2005) prefers to use the term 'more-than-representational' in order to avoid reductionist approaches that are 'against the representational' – acknowledging that both approaches are needed. In recent years, scholars have called for further attention to more-than-representational approaches in the field of heritage studies (Byrne, 2009; Crouch, 2000, 2010; Haldrup & Bœrenholdt, 2015; Lashua & Baker, 2016; Smith, 2006; Tolia-Kelly, Waterton & Watson, 2013; Waterton, 2014). A more-than representational approach to heritage stresses the importance of human interaction with heritage or the physical environment through embodied processes and practices emerging within relational, contingent and dynamic spaces in everyday life (Haldrup & Bœrenholdt, 2015). Relational, contingent and dynamic spaces refer to the shift "from static site or artefact to questions of engagement, experience and performance" (Waterton, 2014: 824). This approach focuses on the social and cultural doings of people with material objects, but it also focuses on what cultural work does to a human body. It focuses on the personal, emotional, social and embodied doing of heritage rather than its material representation. Street art and graffiti is beyond representational; it engages us, communicates with us, surprises us and makes us feel. It is experienced through the body, and any human activity – for example 'visual' activity – occurs through/in the space, as "space is a bodily and sensorial interpretation of the world" (Samson, 2015: 294).

In the following section I will present the limitations of the conventional approaches to heritage and I will introduce the more-than-representational approaches to heritage. Next, drawing on more-than-representational theory, I will conceptualize street art as a heritage experience in terms of embodiment, affect and everyday performativity. Finally, by using the concept of "embodiment" and the case study of the preservation of street artworks by Argus in Bergen, Norway I will provide an example of how the meanings of preservation motives might be captured.

This research combines empirical and theoretical approaches. The theoretical approaches combine cultural and heritage studies and more-than-representational theory. Three exemplary cases are illustrative of the city of Bergen, Norway. I conducted semi-structured interviews with street artists from Bergen and a manager of the street art blog MotVeggen in Bergen. I also conducted unstructured-interviews with persons who passed by the artworks in the city space. All of the interviews were conducted during summer and autumn 2016. The interviews with the street artists provided me with information about their motives for selecting urban spaces, the meanings behind their paintings and their opinions on and recommendations for street artwork preservation and protection. I also used methods of observation. Observation allows a researcher (i.e., an observer) to experience reality by seeing, hearing and interacting with a place (Marshall & Rossman, 2011). Having lived in Bergen for the past 14 years, I have interacted with the Bergen environment and experienced the city's

development of street art over this time.

2. From conventional to more-than-representational approaches to heritage

The restrictive definitions and concepts that frame heritage work convey defined boundaries between experts and community members, people and objects, present and past, and tangible and intangible heritage. These boundaries have encouraged heritage scholars to revise heritage concepts and practices (Fairclough, Harrison, Jameson, & Schofield, 2008; Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, 2004; Ruggles & Silverman, 2009; Smith, 2006; Smith & Akagawa, 2009; Walter, 2014). International conventions such as the UNESCO 2003 Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage and Australia's ICOMOS 1999 Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Significance (the Burra Charter) have been criticized for their divisions of intangible and tangible heritage (Bakka, 2015; Kaufman, 2013; Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, 2004; Smith, 2006). Kirshenblatt-Gimblett (2004: 53) expresses the view that the UNESCO convention fails to link the safeguarding of intangible heritage with the protection of a place. She claims that the convention does not ensure a holistic approach to culture, wherein the tangible and intangible are interconnected: "whereas like tangible heritage, intangible heritage is culture, like natural heritage, it is alive. The task, then is to sustain the whole system as a living entity and not just to collect 'intangible artefacts'" (2004: 53). Smith (2015) asserts that international conventions emphasize the preservation of material things, and in so doing, marginalize the practices and beliefs of source communities. The UNESCO World Heritage listings are chosen and authorized by a select group of experts, who promote particular heritage sites over others (Smith, 2015: 134). The convention includes a broad range of measurements that require an expert's knowledge to ensure the viability of intangible cultural heritage.

> 'Safeguarding' means measures aimed at ensuring the viability of the intangible cultural heritage, including the identification, documentation, research, preservation, protection, promotion, enhancement, transmission, particularly through formal and non-formal education, as well as the revitalization of the various aspects of such heritage. (UNESCO, 2003, Article 2.3)

Egil Bakke (2015: 138) notes that safeguarding is at the core of the 2003 convention: continuing to make traditional boats, continuing to sing, continuing to dance and so forth. However, he explains that it is doubtful that practices – or intangible heritage – can be safeguarded and legitimized by experts, because they "do not contribute to the continuation of the practice among the tradition bearers, […] only practitioners can keep practices going" (2015: 156). The continuing practice, he asserts, can only be done "as part of everyday life; it can be individuals or groups practicing their skills, often highly developed, in their leisure time, or as part of their livelihood" (2015: 138).

The ICOMOS Burra Charter reflects the idea of heritage as 'frozen in time', in terms of the objects and values that are ascribed to it. The charter defines objects as consisting of non-renewable fabric and values (Poulios, 2013: 172). Heritage values are mutable and highly influenced by societal change; they evolve over time (De la Torre, 2013). Yet the charter focuses on the preservation of material fabric and the values that are ascribed to it. Araoz (2011: 58, 59) argues that all heritage values are intangible and can neither be protected nor preserved nor ascribed; permanent freezing of values is impossible, and indeed "heritage professionals have never really protected or preserved values."

The limitations of representational theory are grounded in the theory's dependence on value-based systems, objectification of the gaze, heritage as framed or fixed and linguistic-based structures of meaning making. Critics have called attention to more-than-representational approaches in the field of heritage studies (Byrne, 2009; Lashua & Baker, 2016; Tolia-Kelly, Waterton, & Watson, 2017; Waterton, 2014; Waterton & Watson, 2013). More-than-representational theory stems from non-representational theory (Thrift, 2008). However, Lorimer prefers to use the term 'more-than-representational', as 'more-than' facilitates research into "multifarious, open encounters in the realm of practice that matter most" (Lorimer, 2005: 83). More-than-representative theory moves away from representations or "the established academic habit of striving to uncover meanings and values that apparently await our discovery, interpretation, judgment and ultimate representation" (Lorimer, 2005: 84). Instead, it refers to "what people or things do and thus squarely engages with practices" (Müller, 2015, 3), and seeks "better to cope with our self-evidently more-than-human, more-than-textual, multisensual worlds" (Lorimer, 2005: 83). It does not neglect representations, but merely emphasizes that "practices, affects, things, technologies – [are] intertwined with the production of meaning" (Müller, 2015: 3). In more detail, it is concerned with:

> How life takes shape and gains expression in shared experiences, everyday routines, fleeting encounters, embodied movements, precognitive triggers, practical skills, affective intensities, enduring urges, unexceptional interactions and sensuous dispositions (Lorimer, 2005: 84).

Heritage studies have attempted to define and understand heritage through notions of affect, performativity and everyday practice. The turn towards 'practice' in heritage studies emphasizes the ways in which people interact routinely at heritage sites, landscapes and museum spaces in everyday life (Auclair, 2015; Crouch, 2010; Edensor, 2005; Haldrup & Bœrenholdt, 2015; Schofield, 2009; Wylie, 2005). Wylie (2005) uses coast walking and writing as a tool to capture embodied experience with the coastal landscape, presenting that landscape is not only visual, but resonating with a range of sensory experiences such as smells, touch, sounds and aural. For Wylie, landscape is lived and practiced, which is never fixed or static, but always in the making.

The affective turn in heritage studies recognizes spaces of heritage as agents of persons' experiences, practical skills, emotions, memories, embodied movements and performances (Harrison, 2013; Tolia-Kelly et al., 2017; Waterton, 2014). Spaces of heritage connect humans with their physical environment, "as with the train station, the shopping centre, the prison and so forth – that garner the affective and emotive values that shape the possibilities for our bodily movements and capacities" (Waterton, 2014: 824). Such spaces refer to the shift "from static site or artefact to questions of engagement, experience and performance" (Waterton, 2014: 824). This perspective acknowledges Laurajane Smith's definition: "all heritage is intangible not only because of the values we give to heritage, but because of the cultural work that heritage does in any society" (Smith & Akagawa, 2009: 6). Heritage is always changing and alive, whatever the material forms it takes (buildings, artworks, and landscapes) has liveliness, it performs on the viewer and social, as well as it is constructed by the social (Crouch, 2001, 2010; Haldrup & Bœrenholdt, 2015). The spaces of heritage are interconnected between the present and the past, as 'they will always be in a process of becoming … it will never be a fixed or entirely anticipated way' (as quoted in Waterton 2014: 828).

This focus on emotion, feeling and sensation is often ignored by the conventional understanding of heritage. Byrne (2009) argues that local peoples' affective responses to heritage sites works against formal heritage frameworks, as such

frameworks do not engage in an understanding of the human experiences and feelings that are attached to these sites. The affective turn seeks to understand the emotional nature of peoples' interactions with historical environments (Schorch, 2014). The concepts of emotion, feeling and affect serve to understand visitors' embodied experiences, or what is felt at heritage sites and museums. For example, it focuses on understanding painful or 'difficult' historical events (Logan and Reeves 2009). Emotion is also used to analyze the everyday museum experience or the interpersonal relationships within community engagement settings (Munro, 2014).

3.   Embodiment, street art and everyday heritage

Non-representational theory (Thrift, 2008) conceptualizes the body as "sensuous, sensitive, agentive and expressive in relation to the world, knowing and innovating amongst context and representations that become refigured in practice" (Crouch, 2001: 62). Everyday practice describes the routine ways in which people interact in everyday life – the ways in which they bodily and sensorially interact with the material world (art objects or physical environments) and how the material world is agential to action, itself. Such practice can involve a range of activities, such as walking, singing, dancing, painting, photographing and so forth. Performative everyday practice involves sensorial, emotional and embodied interaction with the material world. Performativity is what take place, for example, "in-between the work of art and its participant" (Samson, 2015: 293). Furthermore, performativity emphasizes the transitional and transformative process wherein "the everyday and the commonplace, events and occurrences shape our lives and social practices and give our lives pattern and meaning" (Schofield, 2009: 96). People construct meanings and feelings about physical environment through their everyday practices. De Certeau (2010: 883) explains that practices such as walking provide people with various means of producing a place "walking constitutes a paradigmatic illustration of the force of practice and its role in the ongoing (re)production of place." Furthermore, he explains that place making through walking is facilitated by the relational experience of the thinking, feeling body/subject who registers the surrounding environment (De Certeau, 1984). Place within the more-than representational approach is not physically bounded or plotted on a map, but rather, "place always conjures the lived, felt, and relational experience of a thinking, feeling body/subject" (Duff, 2010: 885).

Furthermore, non-representational theory is concerned with the affective capacities of the body. Affects relate to the body's capacity to affect and be affected by other bodies. Affect can refer to "an array of feeling states characteristic of everyday life, with its constant shift in mood and emotional resonance" (Thrift, 2004: 59; in Duff, 2010: 884). These states constitute the emotional states of lived experiences: negative experiences can lead to negative emotional projections such as anger, frustration, disgust and outrage, while positive experiences can lead to delight, joy, gratitude and hope. Each of these emotional states corresponds with a specific feeling state (Duff, 2010: 884). Feelings are ongoing reflections and associations to for example an emotion or about valuing, meaning or attitudes (ibid).

In Spinozist and Deleuzian philosophy, bodies are not only human bodies, but also the bodies of buildings and objects – the fabric and form of the city (Samson, 2015: 318). Kristine Samson (2015: 318) explains that the materiality of urban space, the human body and our perceptions simultaneously and constantly affect one another. Samson (2015: 318) describes that "affect between bodies could be understood as dynamic relations, for instance, the human social body and the urban environment, its design and architecture." Simmon O'Sullivan (2013), in his book chapter 'The aesthetics of affect: Thinking art beyond representation', examines art through the aesthetics of affect. Following Spinoza, O'Sullivan defines affect "as the

effect another body, an art object, for example, has upon my own body and my body's duration" (2013: 11). Art is an experience – a body register; it opens a path to feeling and seeing the world differently (ibid).

Halsey and Young (2006: 296) stress that street art and graffiti is more than visual, instead it is embodied or inherently haptic – "that for particular kinds of bodies a surface is never just 'looked upon' so much as it is felt or lived." They assert that we perceive and experience the space of street artworks and the urban environment with all the senses (aural, visual, haptic, physical, visual, touch). Street art is experienced in the space between the human body and the artwork. It ruptures people's sensory experiences as they pass through public space in ordinary life. Further, it is an art form that is profoundly different from art in galleries. Street art is part of the cityscape, with the viewer and object inseparable: "street art is being written on the skin of the city" (Young, 2005: 73). The experience of street art comprises a broad range of senses, movements of cars and people, and city tastes, smells and sounds. Street art and the viewer create instant meanings through engagement and everyday spatial production – for instance, through a passerby's physical and sensory engagement with the street artwork and urban environment. Street art is performative in the sense that it grasps the flow of everyday life: "in rhyming the rhythms of the landscape and the body, meaning and reality are constituted in performance" (Bolt, 2010: 171). People construct meanings and feelings about a street artwork or physical environment through their everyday practices of walking, writing, sensing, painting, seeing, and so forth.

Hanauer's (2004) study shows that graffiti writing can have embodied personal psychological content. He documented the use of graffiti as a mourning ritual following the assassination of the Israeli Prime Minister Yitzhak in Tel Aviv. Here, graffiti transformed a site into a living object and functioned as a response to national trauma and an act of participatory and personal mourning. Furthermore, Hanauer explained that graffiti played an important therapeutic role for the people who were affected by this traumatic event; it allowed for verbal and visual responses, it embodied personal feelings and beliefs and it enabled meaning to be drawn from the trauma. Diane Walle (2014), in her analysis of group therapy, concluded that image making and an image, itself, can be performative by enabling suppressed feelings to be expressed and "here-and-now" emotional experiences to be accessed; further, art objects can contain powerful emotions.

In street art, affect between bodies could refer to the dynamic relationship between an artwork and the community, the materiality of the urban space and peoples' "perceptions." The meanings, feelings and affective qualities that are attached to a particular street artwork might be unknown until it is removed. Thrift (2008: 61) claims that "the particular nature of individual affects and their provenance may be unclear – even unconscious." Removal of an artwork can reveal the meanings and feelings that are attached to the artwork or its place. I will explain this in more detail through the example of the removal of the Argus street artwork *What Do You See* in the Møhlenpris neighbourhood of Bergen, Norway.

In summer 2014, a municipality worker painted over the artwork. The piece was not removed intentionally; rather, the worker was carrying out his regular job of repairing the wall, unaware of the significance of the painting for the neighborhood. The day after the removal, a member of the community sent a complaint to the local news channel, NRK. NRK conducted interviews at the spot at which the painting had been located. Emotional reactions to the painting's removal were described and aired on the local news channel NRK Hordaland (4 August 2014):

    I was totally upset. It was so great! (Møhlenpris resident)

> I saw through the window at work that they were cleaning the wall, and thought "God dammit" (Møhlenpris resident)

The municipal leader of the Sports Service expressed that the municipality had not known that the painting had been removed:

> Here is simply someone who was told to fix the wall, and did so. But the result was, as we see, not very good. […] I understand heartily that residents miss it. This was the signature of the area as well.

Two days later, Argus repainted *What Do You See*, and this resulted in much happiness in the community. Local reactions were again broadcast by NRK Hordaland (19 August 2014):

> I was so happy when I saw it. There are many in this area who care about this street artwork. (Worker in the neighborhood)

> Oh, is it back now? That's great! (Old woman from the neighborhood)

The removal of *What Do You See* led the municipality and community to consider the affective qualities of the street artwork. The community expressed negative emotions when the artwork was removed and positive emotions when it was repainted. Thus, the removal led to an evaluation of the importance of the street artwork to the neighborhood, and it unfolded the community's understanding of the shared collective space/place.

The removal of an artwork can lead to a realization of the specific experiences or experiential connections the work previously triggered; for example, "you notice new colors, discern details previously ignored, hear extraordinary sounds, as familiar landscapes of sense sharpen and intensity" (Bennett, 2001: 5). Furthermore, the removal of artworks can create atmospheric experiences that are "affective, characterized by intensities of feelings that are co-constituted by people and their spatial and material environment" (Hillary & Sumartojo, 2014: 202). Hillary and Sumartojo illustrate that the 'urgent ephemerality' created by the erasure of street art and graffiti and the new art installation of Adrian Doyle's *Empty Nursery Blue* in Rutledge Lane in Melbourne led to an affective atmosphere. This atmosphere, in turn, led to a realization of the embodied relationship between street art and various publics, and the sense of meaning and belonging to the place. Through an atmospheric experience, the role of street art was considered, as was the community's relationship to the site and the community's internal relationships.

4. Embodiment and the meaning of the preservation of Argus street artworks in Bergen

In recent years, Bergen has developed into a street art destination attracting international and national artists and audiences. Although the city of Bergen has begun to open more doors for street art, graffiti is not yet widely accepted by the public, and remains the old enemy – society's apparatus for control (Grasdal, 2015). The uncommissioned images of both street art and graffiti are still under the authority of the state or city, and this often leads to their spontaneous removal. In what follows, I will examine the exceptional case of the preservation of Argus's *Otto* and *Smiley* stencil artworks.

Argus's *Otto* and *Smiley* street artworks were preserved with Plexiglas not long after they appeared on street walls. The impetus for preserving Argus's *Otto* came from the private owner in 2014, and the faculty of Social Sciences at the University of Bergen called for the preservation of *Smiley* in 2015. The day after *Smiley* was tagged over, the local newspaper *Bergens Tidende* published an article titled "*Smiley* has been Cleaned"; in the article, the tagging was described with the statement "zero respect" (*Bergens Tidende*, 18 September 2015). Walter Wehus (*Bergens Tidende*, 5 July, 2015) expressed that the University of Bergen was usually very quick to remove street artworks, but not this time: after the tagging incident, the university secured the artwork with Plexiglas. The question could be raised: Why were these street artworks preserved? What were the heritage values concerning preservation of these artworks?

Otto and *Smiley* are perceived as city symbols of Bergen. Argus painted *Smiley* in 2015, and *Otto* was painted in 2014. Otto Fredrik Wollertsen (*Otto*) and Tore Syvert Moen (*Smiley*) were called the "best known Bergen characters" and "city originals." They both recently passed away. When I asked Argus about the meaning of these characters for Bergen, he explained:

> They signify the outsiders, the ones who do not design their own environments but still are the ones who are most affected by it. The conscience of society. The outcasts, the pariahs. The ones we all know about, but whom no one knows. The ones who make up the fabric of the city and make it a richer place. (Personal communication, 14 June 2016)

But why are these characters significant for Bergen? How have we come to know them, without knowing?

4.1 Affective bodies

The human subjects of *Otto* (Fig. 1) and *Smiley* (Fig. 2) can be compared to actors on a stage. With a distinct form of dress, bodily gesture and style they were noticeable persons in the Bergen city centre. Their particular style and expressiveness were described as follows:

> Otto – the old man and his bike, a familiar sight in the city. Otto never riding the bike, just shambling around, or seated on a small box on the pavement, playing the harmonica on occasions. One of the rare characters whom I believe everybody looks upon with great sympathy. (Argus, argusgate.wordpress.com)

Fig. 1. Argus "Otto" stencil. Source: Permission obtained from Walter Wehus/ Motveggen.com

Smiley was described in the following way:

> Long overcoat, big beard and roll between his fingers. Every day Tore Syvert Moen (Smiley) passed thousands of people in Bergen. In decade after decade he was an early bird in the city center of Bergen asking for cigarettes and money with the repetitive question "Do you have a krone for me?" (Kjersti Mjør, *Bergens Tidende*, 15 July 2015)

Fig. 2. Argus "Smiley" stencil. Source: Permission obtained from Argus/argusgate.wordpress.com.

Smiley and Otto's routinized and embodied movements affected the Bergen city environment. They created an emotional meaning or experience through the bodily experience that is inherent in the expressive space of their body movements in smell, look, sound and gestures. Emotional experience is relational; for example, between the city of Bergen and Smiley and Otto. It is "an affective space, which is the space in which we are emotionally in touch – open to the world and its 'affect' on us" (Simonsen, 2013, 17). They were like street art paintings – shaping an urban environment, reacting with their bodies and with other bodies and eliciting emotional affect, both positive and negative:

> Right back where I remember him. His stare always made me feel a little uneasy, like if he knew a secret I was hiding from myself. This caused some introspection on my behalf, and just those encounters are vital to the civilizing effect of public space (Argus, argusgate.wordpress.com)

> Smiley has also been part of the city for me, I remember him first from my high school time. I have always been a little afraid of him, and I have noticed that he is dirty. (Personal communication with Lene, 15 September 2016)

> I wonder if Otto had a backache. I thought about the stairs at the Cafe Opera where he ate soup there 'everyday' (Personal interview with Iselin, 3 October 2016)

Their affective bodies – their strong smell and expressive looks – made passersby stop, spell out, took over and transfixed their thoughts and senses. When I myself met Smiley in the streets, his body affected me and my thoughts were transfixed: sometimes I thought about his personal story, which I once heard about; sometimes I felt badly that I did not give him money and sometimes I felt sad or surprised.

Otto and Smiley created instant meanings and everyday spatial production by walking and bodily and sensuously engaging with the Bergen environment. They shaped the everyday life of the city and their expressive space of body movements "engages in and emerges from 'affective dialogical practices […] born in and out of joint action'" (Thrift 1997: 128). Their repetitive practices, such as walking in the same tracks, and dressing in the same style, enabled the community to generate knowledge about them. They were part of the city, as evidenced by quotations from the public: "Smiley' was one of the most known faces in Bergen" (Marie, *Skarpaas Karlsen*, 18 September 2015, Bergensavisen) and "many appreciated Smiley" (Siri Meyer, 18 September 2015, På Høyden).

In a *Bergens Tidende* article titled "Diversity Blessing" (18 December 2008), Ole Hamre expressed that Otto is an identity object for Bergen through his everyday practice in time and space:

> If one asks himself what living individual represents most of the Bergen population's sense of identity, I think it is the 80-year-old Otto. Otto Fredrik Wollertsen has had the street as his home for most of his adult life. Through his daily hunched wanderings through the city streets for decades, by bike, cassette player and harmonica, he has become a part of Bergen's soul. And through his choice of existence, he has seen the world from a standpoint that almost no one else knows.

Perhaps Otto and Smiley became part of the place because they were locals, originally from Bergen. However, they also represented "otherness." Kirsten Simonsen (2013: 12) describes "otherness" as "bodily and social experiences of restrictions, uncertainty and blockage." Smiley and Otto's lifestyle can be related to Lefebvre's (1996) concept of the 'right to the city' – they are also very close to the essence of the philosophy of street art. Andrzej Zieleniec (2016: 10-11) asserts that graffiti and street art can be understood as an "expression or embodiment of Lefevre's cry and demand for the 'right to the city', the right to appropriate, appreciate, know and use its spaces and places (…) a free art or politics which challenges the normal, banal, functionalized and increasingly commodified and privatized space". Smiley and Otto presented 'the right to the city' in the way that they challenged the legal, commodified space and functional space; they managed urban space for themselves, beyond the state, capitalism and consumer society. For them the streets were their living space where they could move and live freely. Although Otto and Smiley symbolize free expression of the choice to live on the streets of Bergen, Argus's street artworks of these persons are now framed with Plexiglas. Walter Wehus comments: "It's great that Otto and Smiley who are associated with cityscape of Bergen get a place on the wall but Plexiglas goes beyond the meaning of these characters" (personal communication, 8 June 2016).

Scholars have identified that tangible preservation techniques (such as covering an artwork with Plexiglas or Perspex) are

harmful to street art or graffiti because those techniques stimulate cultural privatization, encourage vandalism, and break the ongoing dynamic relationship between the artwork and the community (Hansen, 2016; Hansen & Flynn, 2015; Young, 2013). Uncommissioned street art and graffiti has traditionally fought for the urban commons and been intentionally accessible. Framing street artworks deprives citizens of the right to experience them (in the public space and ephemerally) in daily life and the broader right to engage with the city; it stimulates the privatization and commodification of culture, which uncommissioned street art and graffiti nature is against.

5. Conclusion

This paper has suggested that street art could be conceptualized as a heritage experience in relation to embodiment, affect and everyday performative practice. I have argued that street art and graffiti does not represent a dichotomy between tangible and intangible or people and object, but instead represents an inseparable relationship. Street art and graffiti coexists between cultural and socio-materials in everyday life; to ignore this is to ignore the function of street art. Street art is temporary and changeable by nature. But its temporal nature is not necessarily negative, and not all street artworks should be preserved. Photography, video, websites and other forms of communication can be used to document street art. On the other hand, Peter Bengtsen (2016: 427) points out that street art "works only in a certain context, when this context is lacking, the artwork is nothing." A street artwork might have a strong link to a particular public space; for example, it might contain a particular message that cannot be applied to another location. The notions of embodiment, affect and everyday practice might provide a framework for identifying which street artworks function within the context of a community. I have illustrated that the *Otto*, *Smiley* and *What Do You See* street artworks have a local base; they are embodied within particular locations, each with exceptional significance for Bergen. The removal of street art can be a source for the realization of specific experiences or experiential connections to a place. It also has the potential to transform the individual and the place by introducing new qualities into the environment. The removal of street art can also alter the dynamic relation between the community and the street artwork. A lack of knowledge about this dynamic relationship between the physical context and the community can lead to a street artwork being removed, and, with it, the experiential, emotional and sensory values from everyday life that it offers. More-than-representational theory can help us to understand and to study the embodied relationships between street art cultures and various publics, and the sense of meaning and belonging involved. It can also serve to decode the embodied meanings of a street artwork and its relationship with the local community and the physical environment.

Acknowledgement

References

Araoz, G. F. (2011) Preserving heritage places under a new paradigm. *Journal of Cultural Heritage Management and Sustainable Development, 1(1):* 55-60.

Auclair, E. (2015) Ordinary Heritage, Participation and Social Cohesion. The Suburbs of Paris. In E. Auclair & G. Fairclough (Eds.) *Theory and Practice in Heritage and Sustainability: Between Past and Future*. London: Routledge.

Avery, T. (2009) Values not Shared: The Street Art of Melbourne's City Laneways. In L. Gibson & J. Pendlebury (Eds.) *Valuing Historic Environments*. Farnham: Ashgate. 139-156.

Bakka, E. (2015) Safeguarding of intangible cultural heritage – The spirit and the letter of the law. *Musikk og Tradisjon.* Oslo: Novus Forlag. 135-170.

Barad, K. (2003) Posthumanist performativity: Toward an understanding of how matter comes to matter. *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 28(3):* 801-831.

Bengtsen, P. (2016) Stealing from the public: the value of street art taken from the street. In J. I. Ross (Ed.) *Routledge Handbook of Graffiti and Street Art*. London: Routledge. 416-428.

Bennett, J. (2001) *The Enchantment of Modern Life: Attachments, Crossings and Ethics*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Bolt, B. (2010) *Art Beyond Representation: The Performative Power of the Image*. London: IB Tauris.

Burdick, C. & Vicencio, C. F. (2015) 'Popular demands do not fit in ballot boxes': Graffiti as intangible heritage at the Iglesia de San Francisco, Santiago? *International Journal of Heritage Studies, 21(8):* 735-756.

Byrne, D. (2009) A Critique of Unfeeling Heritage. In L. Smith & N. Akagawa (Eds.) *Intangible Heritage.* London: Routledge: 229-252.

Crouch, D. (2000) Places around us: embodied lay geographies in leisure and tourism. *Leisure studies, 19*(2): 63-76.

Crouch, D. (2001) Spatialities and the feeling of doing. *Social & Cultural Geography, 2*(1), 61-75.

Crouch, D. (2010) The Perpetual Performance and Emergence of Heritage. In E. Waterton & S. Watson (Eds.) *Culture, Heritage and Representation: Perspectives on Visuality and the Past*. Farnham: Ashgate.

Byrne, D. (2009) A Critique of Unfeeling Heritage. In L. Smith & N. Akagawa (Eds.) *Intangible Heritage.* London: Routledge: 229-252.

De Certeau, M. (1984) *The Practice of Everyday Life*, translated by Steven Rendell. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Duff, C. (2010) On the role of affect and practice in the production of place. *Environment and planning D: Society and space, 28(5):* 881-895.

Edensor, T. (2005) The ghosts of industrial ruins: ordering and disordering memory in excessive space. *Environment and planning D: Society and space, 23(6):* 829-849.

Fairclough, G., Harrison, R., Jameson, J. H. & Schofield, J. (2008) *The Heritage Reader*. London: Routledge.

Grasdal, C. G. (2015) Gatekunst i Bergen. *Tidsskrift for kulturforskning, 14*(1).

Haldrup, M., & Bœrenholdt, J. O. (2015) *Heritage as Performance: The Palgrave Handbook of Contemporary Heritage Research.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan. 52-68.

Halsey, M., & Young, A. (2006) 'Our desires are ungovernable': Writing graffiti in urban space. *Theoretical Criminology, 10(3):* 275-306.

Hanauer, D. I. (2004) Silence, voice and erasure: Psychological embodiment in graffiti at the site of Prime Minister Rabin's assassination. *The Arts in Psychotherapy, 31(1):* 29-35.

Hansen, S. (2016) "Pleasure stolen from the poor": Community discourse on the 'theft' of a Banksy. *Crime, Media, Culture, 12(3):* 289-307.

Hansen, S., & Flynn, D. (2015) 'This is not a Banksy!': Street art as aesthetic protest. *Continuum, 29*(6): 898-912.

Harrison, R. (2013) *Heritage: Critical Approaches*. London: Routledge.

Hillary, F., & Sumartojo, S. (2014) Empty-nursery blue: On atmosphere, meaning and methodology in Melbourne Street Art. *Public Art Dialogue, 4(2):* 201-220.

ICOMOS Australia (1999) The Burra Charter (fourth version) *The Australia ICOMOS Charter for Places of Cultural Significance. Australia.*

Kaufman, N. (2013) Putting intangible heritage in its place(s): Proposals for policy and practice. *International Journal of Intangible Heritage, 8(1):* 19-36.

Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, B. (2004) Intangible Heritage as Metacultural Production. *Museum International, 56(12):* 52-65.

Lashua, B. & Baker, S. (2016) Cinema under the Stars, Heritage from Below. In J. Schofield (Ed.) *Who Needs Experts?: Counter-mapping Cultural Heritage*. Farnham: Ashgate.133-145.

Lefebvre, Henri. 1968. Right to the city. In E. Kofman and E. Lebas (Eds.) (1996) *Writings on Cities.* Oxford: Blackwell.147–159.

Logan, W. & Keir R. (2009) *Places of Pain and Shame: Dealing with 'Difficult Heritage'.* London: Routledge.

Lorimer, H. (2005) Cultural geography: The busyness of being 'more-than-representational'. *Progress in Human Geography, 29(1):* 83-94.

MacDowall, L. (2006). In praise of 70K: Cultural heritage and graffiti style. *Continuum: Journal of Media & Cultural Studies, 20(4):* 471-484.

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (2011) *Designing Qualitative Research* (5th Ed.). Sage: Los Angeles.

Merrill, S. (2015) Keeping it real? Subcultural graffiti, street art, heritage and authenticity. *International Journal of Heritage Studies, 21(4):* 369-389.

Mulcahy, L. & Flessas, T. (2016) Limiting law: Art in the street and street in the art. *Law, Culture and the Humanities*. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1743872115625951

Müller, M. (2015) More-Than-Representational Political Geographies. In J. Agnew, V. Mamadouh, A. Secor & J. Sharp (Eds.) *The Wiley Blackwell Companion to Political Geography*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Munro, E. (2014) Doing emotion work in museums: Reconceptualising the role of community engagement practitioners. *Museum and Society, 12(1):* 44-60.

Poon, S. T. F. (2016) Street murals as a unique tangible cultural heritage: A case study of artifact value preservation. *International Journal of Cultural and Creative Industries, 4*(1): 48-61.

Poulios, I. (2013) Moving beyond a values-based approach to heritage conservation. *Conservation and Management of Archaeological Sites, 12(2):* 170–185.

Ruggles, D. F. & Silverman, H. (2009) From tangible to intangible heritage. In D. Fairchild Ruggles & H. Silverman (Eds.) *Intangible heritage embodied.* New York: Springer-Verlag. 1-14.

Samson, K. (2015) Aesthetic Performativity in Urban Design and Art. *Engaging Spaces: Sites of Performance, Interaction, and Reflection*, 292.

Schilling, J. (2012) Preserving Art that Was Never Meant to Last. *Deutsche Welle.* Available at: http://www.dw.com/en/preserving-art-that-was-never-meant-to-last/a-15933463

Schorch, P. (2014) Cultural feelings and the making of meaning. *International Journal of Heritage Studies, 20(1):* 22-35.

Schofield, J. (2009) Being Autocentric: Towards Symmetry in Heritage Management Practices. In L. Gibson & J. Pendlebury (Eds.) *Valuing Historic Environments*. Farnham: Ashgate. 93-113.

Schofield, J. (2016) Heritage Expertise and the Everyday: Citizens and Authority in the Twenty-first Century. In J. Schofield

(Ed.) *Who Needs Experts?: Counter-mapping Cultural Heritage*. Farnham: Ashgate. 1-11.

Simonsen, K. (2013) In quest of a new humanism: Embodiment, experience and phenomenology as critical geography. *Progress in Human Geography, 37(1):* 10-26.

Smith, L. (2006) *Uses of Heritage*. London: Routledge.

Smith, L. (2015) Intangible heritage: A challenge to the authorised heritage discourse? *Revista d'etnologia de Catalunya (40),* 133-142.

Smith, L., & Akagawa, N. (2009) *Intangible Heritage*. London: Routledge.

Thrift, N. (2008) *Non-Representational Theory: Space, Politics, Affect*. London: Routledge.

Tolia-Kelly, D. P., Waterton, E., & Watson, S. (2017) *Heritage, Affect and Emotion: Politics, Practices and Infrastructure*. London: Routledge.

Waller, D. (2014) *Group interactive art therapy: Its use in training and treatment.* London: Routledge.

Walter, N. (2014) From values to narrative: A new foundation for the conservation of historic buildings. *International Journal of Heritage Studies, 20(6):* 634-650.

Waterton, E., & Watson, S. (2013). Framing theory: Towards a critical imagination in heritage studies. *International Journal of Heritage Studies, 19(6):* 546-561.

Waterton, E. (2014) A more than representational understanding of heritage? The 'past' and the politics of affect. *Geography Compass, 8(11):* 823-833.

Wylie, J. (2005) A single day's walking: narrating self and landscape on the South West Coast Path. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers, 30(2):* 234-247.

Young, A. (2005) *Judging the Image: Art, Value, Law*. London: Psychology Press.

Young, A. (2013) *Street Art, Public City: Law, Crime and The Urban Imagination.* London: Routledge.

Zieleniec, A. (2016) The right to write the city: Lefebvre and graffiti. *Environnement Urbain/Urban Environment (Volume 10).* Available at: http://journals.openedition.org/eue/1421