Hybrid Modes of Collaborations in Contemporary Art Practices: Challenging Politics of Belonging in the Post-1989 European Community

Izabel Galliera
PhD Candidate, History of Art and Architecture
University of Pittsburgh

Abstract:
This paper problematizes the notion of community enacted at the EU level, through a contextual analysis of two collaborative contemporary artworks, *Re:route* (2002, in Turin, Italy) by the Hungarian artist Miklos Erhardt and Scottish artist Dominic Hislop and *Together/Impreuna* (2007, in London, UK) by Romanian artist Matei Bejenaru. I argue that such art projects through their hybrid modes of collaboration based upon a contestational approach to social capital, propose alternative views to a pan-European space with its generally positive notions of belonging and European Citizenship. In contrast to a consensual notion of community among individuals and groups bound together, for instance, by shared norms and interests, I argue these artists, in different ways, utilize the mechanics of social capital as effective resources to engage politically and socially marginalized groups in collective action in order to ultimately inspire an inclusive form of community that embraces dissension and difference.

Keywords: community, citizenship, collaborative contemporary art, EU, social capital

> "Emancipation begins when we challenge the opposition between viewing and acting; when we understand that the self-evident facts that structure relations between saying, seeing and doing themselves belong to the structure of domination and subjection."[1]
>
> Jacques Rancière

In the past two decades, a number of contemporary artists from post-1989 Central Eastern Europe (CEE) have engaged members of local communities, as well as social and cultural organizations, in hybrid forms of artistic collaboration in order to address exclusionary effects exercised by dominant power structures. Responding to the complexities of contemporary life, their collaborative socially engaged work is part of a major current in contemporary art throughout the world. Aiming to dissolve boundaries between art and life, practitioners engage specific publics of a particular site as the works' contents, intervene in the socio-political context serving as catalysts for change, function as platforms for collective representation, and thereby, challenge traditional methods for evaluating art and creating social value. Euro-American art criticism, theory, and art historical research has been increasingly focused on community-based art practice, yet almost never documents similar developments in the work of artists from CEE, and rarely refers to their work for comparative purposes. [2]

In this paper, I critically analyze two art projects that engaged members of specific immigrant communities in two European Union (EU) member states. I examine the 2002 project *Re:route* in Turin, Italy by the Hungarian artist Miklos Erhardt and Scottish artist Dominic Hislop (also known as the artist collective Big Hope),[3] and the 2007 *Together/Impreuna* project in London, UK by the Romanian artist Matei Bejenaru. I consider these collaborative artworks in light of the notion of European Citizenship and its exclusionary effects on immigrant populations from non-EU nations and citizens of recent EU-member states. I argue that such art projects through their hybrid modes of collaboration, based upon a contestational approach to social capital, propose alternative views to a pan-European space with its homogenizing notions of community and citizenship.

A sociological concept that has made a comeback since the 1980s in social and political sciences, social capital represents an accumulated set of formal and informal relationships and connections that help members of a community pursue shared interests. Well-known theorists, such as James Coleman and Robert D. Putnam, identified forms of social capital such as "information channels, appropriable social organizations,"[4] and "generalized forms of reciprocity and networks of engagement,"[5] which are seen to promote a consensual notion of community based on mutual trust among individuals sharing common cultural values and interests. In contrast, I argue that the same mechanics of social capital can be effective resources for politically and socially marginalized groups to ignite collective action in order to inspire a more inclusive and diverse community.

Entering the complex web of locally existent social capital, by identifying with and involving the participation of particular immigrant groups, Erhardt & Hislop's and Bejenaru's projects probe the broader European discourse on belonging and not belonging most vividly illustrated through the debates associated with the EU's eastward expansion from the early to late 2000s and the notion of a European Citizenship. The Maastricht Treaty on the EU in 1993 legalized the category of European Citizenship that conferred upon every legal citizen of any EU member nation the status of Citizen of the European community.[6] Demonstrating a free-market notion of citizenship, the principal rights enjoyed by European Citizens are referred to as the Four Fundamental Freedoms that include the freedom of goods, persons, services and capital. It is significant, as Cris Shore observed, that the EU Citizenship is seen as supplementary and contingent upon the rights and obligations attached to every national member state, which in effect retains the power to define and decide who is or is not a European citizen. Reducing citizenship to a mere legal right, it limits non-EU residents' access to political and social opportunities at the pan-European level,

transforming them into second-class citizens, an economic underclass of unwanted yet needed foreigners. While aiming to facilitate a borderless territory of free economic transactions, it ultimately contradicts the ideological claims of an inclusive European space.[7] As such, it exemplifies an exclusionary approach to community that transcends difference and is rather constituted of like-minded individuals and groups (or nation states) bound together by mutual trust and shared norms.

In 2000 Etienne Balibar spoke of a *European apartheid* that exists simultaneously with the notion of European Citizenship. It implies that immigrant populations on the EU territory coming most often from the African nations - historically tied to Europe through the labor circuits of recruitment – and Eastern Europe – societies that underwent a selective admission process into the EU community – are constituted "as 'inferior' in rights and dignity, subject to violent forms of security control and forced to live on the border, neither absolutely inside nor totally outside."[8] To combat this situation, as one of his proposed "worksites of democracy," Balibar called for the democratization of borders promoting the notion of "a citizenship in Europe" rather than a "European citizenship," a shared construction of citizenship by the diverse inhabitants of Europe.[9]

Following a similar trajectory, political theorist Chantal Mouffe called for a notion of citizenship not only based on legal status but also on a radical interpretation of the basic democratic principles of equality and liberty, which emerges from and leads to a society that is both egalitarian and heterogeneous. Her approach distances itself from the liberal view, which sees citizenship primarily as a legal status and as each person's right to promote their self-interest, and also from the communitarians or the civic republican view, which prioritizes the notion of the common good independent of, or, above the individual desire. Mouffe's idea of citizenship, which accommodates multi-ethnic and multi-cultural societies, conceives of the individual as a composite of "subject positions constructed within specific discourses" that are always in a mobile process and are only temporally brought together.[10] This relational notion of citizenship relates to the spatial and temporal belonging to a certain place, emphasizing contingency and antagonism as essential components of an inclusive form of democratic belonging.

Both Erhardt &Hislop's and Bejenaru's projects were the results of multi-level forms of local collaboration among communities of heterogeneous social agents. I argue that their art practices can be viewed as important nodal points where macro societal transformations are manifested and interfered into at the micro, everyday level. As such, I examine the ways in which the artists' hybrid collaborations tap into and expand upon existing forms of social capital in order to propose inclusive forms of community and a relational approach to citizenship.

Erhardt &Hislop conceived *Re:route* between December 2001 and May 2002 as part of their participation in the 2002 BIG Torino International Biennial of Young Artists titled "Big Social Game," a citywide event that included artists under 35. According to its artistic director Michelangelo Pistoletto, the event "is not about *applied art*; it is about *implicated art*."[11] While developing a web-based component, each of the artists was asked to create projects "with a socio-cultural link to the city of Turin" and also have a physical presence.[12] The Northern Italian city of Turin, with a legacy of labor activism and one of the few cities in Italy at the time with a leftist local government, is home of numerous non-governmental agencies and social organizations offering, for example, support for immigrant populations, aiming to empower them as active social agents in shaping the local political culture of the city. This is significant when considering the right-wing national legislation on immigration, most vividly represented by the 2002 Bossi-Fini law (two different right-wing political party members Umberto Bossi and Gianfranco Fini), Italy's "most highly restrictive reform since the fascist period."[13]

Erhardt & Hislop identified the conflicted relationship between local and immigrant population – a situation that is characteristic to most EU countries and the world at large – and established contact with social workers, teachers, political activists, cultural organizations and support groups for immigrants that were willing to recommend the artists to potential participants: "Due to their knowledge of English and my knowledge of Italian, we were quite autonomous of making all sorts of contacts… some organizations directed us to specific people…others just invited us to meetings where we could approach people on our own."[14] For example, Association Diafa Al Maghreb, founded in 1997 by Sued Benkindim, offers educational, legal, and welfare support to immigrant groups from Maghreb countries, Morocco, Algeria, and Tunisia, in order to facilitate their integration into Italian society and promote cooperation between immigrant and Italian populations.[15] At the same time, such organizations are "channels of information"– where all sorts of information can be obtained because of the already existing social relations – and "networks of engagement," which they implicitly build further through their mediator roles between the immigrant community and Italian society and among the different migrant groups. The artists worked with a multitude of groups and organizations, which as Hislop expressed gave them "an insight into the broad spectrum of contexts, conditions and concerns of different immigrant groups in the city."[16] Conversely, the participating associations considered the art project as a platform to promote their goals to a broader public.

Expanding upon such locally dynamic networks of social capital, artists entered a "generalized form of reciprocity"– a continuing relationship of exchange that is at any given time unrequired, but that involves mutual expectations that a benefit granted now should be repaid in the future – engaging with willing individuals and avoiding the ethical pitfalls of misappropriation and misrepresentation. *Re:route* represented Erhardt & Hislop's engagement with twenty eight recent immigrants in Turin. It developed through a two and a half month collaborative process that included several meetings. Participants were first invited to draw a "mental map" on a blank white paper with only a dot in the center symbolizing the Torino's Porta Nuova train station (the main entry point to Turin for all immigrants) and talk about their own version of the city based on their routes and affective responses to specific urban places. They were then given a photo camera to capture personally relevant city sites, becoming paid producers of the artwork.[17] In

their roles as facilitators, rather then prescribers of a rigid structure, Erhardt & Hislop maintained an open and fluid premise of participation with individuals becoming part of the project at different stages of its development. Emerging from a collective decision and production process that combined techniques of direct participation, distant observation and a role reversal strategy, the artists relinquished their authoritarian position as sole creators of the artwork.

The *Re:route* web archive features several of the individually hand-drawn maps, photographs and accompanying text. Each participant is identified by name, age, origin and current legal status in Italy.[18] This apparently classificatory criteria for managing immigrant population is brought into tension with alternative yet simultaneously existing views of the city offered by the mental maps. Such spatially subversive attempts are reminiscent of the *psychogeography* approach pioneered by Guy Debord and the Situationist International in the late 1950s. Engaging in a self-reflexive production of space, *Re:route* becomes a platform for articulating a form of citizenship based on complex relational processes, where temporal and spatial differences are continually negotiated between individuals. For example, the markets of second-hand goods at the Porta Palazzo or Porta Nuova that appear in many of participants' narratives become dynamic urban sites where, as the effects of the global financial markets localize, external immigrant populations mingle together with an economically marginalized class of Italian citizens. As Larry from Sierra Leone reflects on one of his photographs, "It's significant that here you can see a white man buying used things." Simultaneously, the same places are perpetual sites for policing practices, such as racial profiling that associate race with criminality. For example, the Turin police consider Porta Palazzo one of the most difficult zones in the city. James from Nigeria observes, "when a black man is involved in a dirty deed the belief of the Italians is that every black man is involved in a dirty deed…" Such informal patterns of everyday interactions have been regulated by Italy's restrictive legislation on immigration, as seen in Silvio Berlusconi's early 2000s "zero tolerance" policy,[19] which is in stark contrast with the inclusive community rhetoric officially promoted at the EU institutional level. Through the collection of individual views where each of the self-narrated oral histories becomes part of a community of singular voices, Erhardt & Hislop disrupts the exclusionary and essentialist approach to immigrant populations. They propose a pluralist form of belonging that recognizes the contingency and ambiguity of social relations forged at the street level.

Although the term "community," like "citizenship," has varying meanings depending upon the context; most commonly it indicates, as Andrew Mason observed, a group of people who have common interests and goals, share a way of life generated through cooperative activities, identify with the group, and have some means of deciding who is or isn't part of the community.[20] This ordinary notion of community is flexible and/or ambiguous enough to accommodate users from the entire political spectrum. Also, it does not exclude injustice and exploitation between its members interested in pursuing their individual goals. Typically, in institutionally commissioned community-based art projects, the standardized formula is to choreograph the artist to engage with a previously identified local community and to address an *a priori* identified social issue, ultimately exploiting the concept of community-based to advance an institutional goal. In contrast to this formula, Erhardt & Hislop's collaborative process was based on an organically emerging relational process and interactions relatively independent of the art biennale institution. Most importantly, the artists made use of the institutional invitation as a tool, first, to engage with "politically coherent groups,"[21] as illustrated by the various social organizations whose defined goals are advanced through their participation in the art project. Secondly, they triggered a form of temporary, yet intensely, engaged form of community composed of a plurality of individually distinctive voices that share a sense of solidarity in confronting the exploitative effects of political legislation.

This gains particular significance in the context of what Cris Shore referred to as *Fortress Europe* to indicate the tightening of EU borders against immigrants in the early 2000s.[22] Contrary to the artists' conceptualization of an inclusive and productive form of difference, in the Italian context, for example, difference has played an exclusionary role. Markers of differential ordering of immigrant groups had been based on a person's national affiliation, physical appearance, or popular stereotypical notions produced and reproduced in the media or in discussions among Italians rather than on actual interaction with immigrant groups and individuals.[23] As Flavia Stanley argued, the Italian citizens' differential treatment of immigrant groups is motivated by a desire to protect their own European status from and against non-EU citizens.[24] A response to Mouffe's call for an egalitarian and heterogeneous form of citizenship, Erhardt & Hislop's project based on hybrid collaborative modes of production anchored in forms of social capital that result in a collective yet individually distinct views of the city, aims to disrupt the divisive notions of managed diversity within the Italian and European context.

Aiming to transgress essentialist approaches to immigrant groups based on stereotypical views has also motivated Matei Bejenaru in his 2007 work *Impreuna/Together*. It was a video documentation of a one-minute performance that resulted from a two-month long collaboration with various organizations and individuals of the Romanian immigrant community in London. Similarly to Erhardt & Hislop, but employing different collaborative strategies and approaches to the notion of community, Bejenaru's work participated in the socio-political debate on immigration raged at the European level in the mid-to-late 2000s. *Impreuna/Together* was a site and time specific performance in front of Tate Modern London as part of the 2007 *Irresistible Force* exhibition. Installed in the Level 2 Gallery (dedicated to emerging international artists), the exhibition was part of a series of four related shows that aimed to "explore ideas of citizenship through themes of economy, belief, the state and the individual."[25]

At first sight, the one-minute choreographed performance *Together/Impreuna*, suggests an identity politics approach to community formation, emphasizing a generalized view of the Romanian diaspora. At the same time, I argue that Bejenaru's work proposes a shared construction of citizenship based on what Balibar considered "the

universal right of *circulation* and *residency*, including reciprocity of cultural contributions."[26] This is most evident in the artist's multi-layered collaborative process that led to the performance.

While Bejenaru was invited by Tate Modern to participate in the exhibition, he created *Impreuna/Together* during a two-month residence at the Romanian Cultural Institute (ICR), which provided organizational and financial support for the project. A non-profit institution, existing in London only since 2006, ICR represents Romania's official organization through its diverse programming focused on promoting the country's cultural heritage. ICR stated goals are to reverse the "negative stereotype of orphaned-children, stray dogs and too-eager migrants,"[27] which tends to inform the way Romania is seen in the UK. Fitting well within the institute's mission, *Impreuna/Together* was viewed by both ICR and the artist as an important vehicle to influence the public perception of the Romanian immigrant community positively through its active involvement, as stated in the artist's call for participation, which was sent by ICR to the members of various organizations of the Romanian Diaspora in London.

Over the course of several weeks Bejenaru entered in numerous dialogic interactions with several members of the Romanian immigrant community. According to the artist, "30 to 40 people responded to my call and I personally met with them. Several discussions happened in a Romanian restaurant in London."[28] Inevitably, being a Romanian citizen and speaking the language, the artist identified with the Romanian immigrant community and was also able to gain support for his project from both official organizations and individual members. An important step forward was gaining the trust of the religious community including the priest of the Romanian Orthodox Church of London, who spoke about Bejenaru's project during his masses and invited the Romanian parishioners to participate in his project.[29] Spontaneous cooperation with and among various members of the community for the project was facilitated, in a similar fashion as we've seen with Erhardt & Hislop, by the artist's access to the various forms of social capital, built through a network of different Romanian organizations in UK. For instance, organizations implicitly became "appropriable social organizations" that in addition to their officially defined goals met their members' and affiliates' diverse interests.

Bejenaru's individual interactions were coalesced in a collective representation as seen in the *Impreuna/Together* video of performance, which consisted in the individual immigrant bodies gradually coming together into a nearly forty-member group. While a symbolic gesture, it nevertheless brought together an active collective of bodies into a form of community where its members were in control of enacting its own self-presence, desires and goals. In a podcast on the museum's website, Bejenaru referred to the performance as a space where the Romanian immigrant community can communicate self-esteem through "the power of a gaze" aimed at breaking through the public perception of their identity based on ethnically and culturally divisive stereotypical notions. His collaborative work with "politically coherent communities" challenged the cultural and economic discrimination towards a specific immigrant community. He brought together various organizations of the Romanian diaspora, each contributing a different aspect to the project while also providing a space to advance each of their individual missions. As a productive component of the artist's accessed social capital, "generalized forms of trust and reciprocity" contributed to his various relational exchanges with different organizations that considered their participation in the art project to benefit them at a future date rather than offer them an immediate advantage. For example, Bejenaru engaged members of the Romanca Society, whose mission is to support Romanians' integration into the British society. In 2008 the Romanca Society filed a petition signed by 208 individuals addressed to the British Prime Minister Gordon Brown asking for legislation that would give Romanians in the UK an unrestricted right to work.[30]

This request is particularly significant especially since currently Romanian and Bulgarian nationals are subject to restricted regulations, although both countries are members of the EU. This is due to one of EU's regulations instated in 2001 regarding accession negotiations with several CEE countries. It states that citizens of new EU-members do not have the legal permission to work in any of the existing 15 member states for a period of seven years following their nations' official entrance in the EU.[31] As I mentioned earlier, one of the fundamental rights of being a European Citizen (status which is conferred automatically to nationals of any EU member state) is mobility of labor or services. Thus, EU's policy discriminates not only against non-EU state citizens but also against specific EU-nations by going against one of its core idea – the four freedoms that theoretically should be open to any EU-state. As Heather Grabbe observes, even though aware of EU's hypocrisy, candidate states agreed to the condition since the overall gains of membership, especially in terms of economic investments outweighs the costs of the restriction. As the decision of who can belong or not belong to the privileged community is made independently by each of the EU member states, the restriction further indicates the highly negative impact the presence of immigrants in EU-nations have on the overall tightening of European borders as a way to politically manage the presence and future intake of foreigners.

Together/Impreuna in London and *Re:route* in Turin, both based on collaborative processes unfolding in various city sites, each wove an alternative urban geography by revealing the potential of the city's everyday sites as places for a self-reflexive production of space and collective action. The artists, in different ways and from different cultural and national contexts, used their institutional invitation to react to socio-political exclusions affecting various immigrant populations. At the same time, rather than take a directly oppositional stance towards the institution of art as such, they employed institutional critique strategies.[32] They aimed to expand it into an institution of critique, able to reflect on its own role, for example, in the wider contemporary discourse on immigration and the accompanying notions of community as a way to possibly enable practices that help redress problematic issues. *Re:route*'s installation consisted of an overwhelming amount of information – hanging fragments of texts next to over 600 photographs along with numerous hand-drawn "mental maps" of geographical city coordinates – all aimed at

encouraging informed and sustained interaction with the art project. Nevertheless, the authority of the institution in shaping the work could be seen in the artists' inability to create an official foldable map of Turin featuring the mental maps with the accompanying individual texts, as they initially intended.[33] The Turin Biennial in partnership with the city government did not support the production and distribution of the proposed map, thus implicitly also maintaining the political divide between those who belong and those who do not belong to the European Union community.

Bejenaru's *Together/Impreuna* was presented at one of London's (and the world's) major art institutions. His participatory work became a platform for collaboration among various organizations, the art museum and individual members, who were actively engaged in constructing a positive public image of the Romanian diaspora in England.[34] While focused on a specific group's national identity Bejenaru's project avoided an essentialist or victimizing approach inherent in an identity-politics approach through his hybrid collaborative process, where participants were active social agents in promoting their legal and public recognition both as a collective and as individuals.

My analysis aimed to show these projects' emphasis on the shifting conditions of belonging that are continuously negotiated through relational processes, which foreground a multiplicity of identifications across and within different groups. The artists' works become platforms for contesting existing conditions of specific immigrant groups in particular contexts, and challenging exclusionary effects of normative conceptions of community. As such, they offer a terrain for articulating different modes of democratic participation and for conceiving citizenship in political and legal terms while taking into account each individual's active bodily presence in a particular space and time.

Rather than isolated forms of art practice significant only within the specific geopolitical context from within which they emerge, Erhardt & Hislop's and Bejenaru's projects are part of a worldwide discourse on socially engaged art forms created by a younger generation of artists concerned with socio-political interventions at local levels. Practitioners share a multi-level collaborative mode of production over a sustained period of time with local organizations and members of specific communities, with which they actively engage through dialogic interactions, empathetic identification, and role reversal strategies. Secondly, they take part in the constructions of emancipated forms of community composed of heterogeneous social agents actively involved in a self-reflexive process of recreating their immediate locality. And finally, they aim to expand the self-critical potential of the art institution by putting the exhibition framework to use as a public site for collective advocacy and forms of democratic belonging.

Endnotes

1. Jacques Ranciere, The Emancipated Spectator (New York: Verso, 2009), 13

2. See Nicolas Bourriaud, Relational Aesthetics (Dijon: Les Presses du Réel, 2002); Claire Bishop, Participation, Documents of Contemporary Art (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2006); and Grant Kester, Conversation Pieces: Community and Communication in Modern Art (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2004).

3. The artists prefer not to use the collective name of Big Hope for this particular project as to keep with their use of individual names in the context of the 2002 Turin Biennale.

4. James Coleman, "Social Capital in the Creation of Human Capital," American Journal of Sociology, 94 (1988): S95-S120.

5. Robert D. Putnam, Making Democracy Work (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1993).

6. Technically the term community was used in the European Coal and Steel Community (ECSC), which was established in 1951 and brought France, Germany, and Italy and the Benelux countries together in a Community with the aim of organizing free movement of coal and steel and free access of sources of production. In 1957 to ECSC was added EEC and the European Atomic Energy Community (EAEC) all forming the European Communities. See http://europa.eu. It may certainly be revealing to elaborate the etymological aspects and the social, political and cultural implications of the shift in the use of the term "Community" after World War II to the use of the term of "Union" in the early 1990s. However, as my aim in this text is not to offer a history of this political and economic formation, I do not use the term community to refer to a particular phase in the history of the EU, but rather to refer to current EU-member nations and (arguably) sense of cultural belonging that the status of European citizenship aims to invoke.

7. Shore also noted that the freedom to reside within any EU Member State is subject to numerous exceptions, as in the case of pensioners, students or any others that might become a burden on the member state's social assistance programs. Cris Shore, "Citizenship of the Union: the cultural construction of a European citizen," in Building Europe: The Cultural Politics of European Integration (New York: Routledge, 2000), 66-83.

8. Etienne Balibar, We, The People of Europe? Reflection on Transnational Citizenship (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2004), 171-2.

9. Balibar, We, The People of Europe,177.

10. Chantal Mouffe, "Democratic Citizenship and the Political Community," in Dimensions of Radical Democracy: Pluralism, Citizenship, Community (New York: Verso, 1992).

11. See the 2002 Turin Biennale Press Release.

12. Author interview with Thomas Sheidebauer, biennial curator

13. Heather Merril and Donald Carter, "Inside and outside Italian political culture: immigrants and diasporic politics in Turin," GeoJournal 58 (2002): 167-75.

14. Matei Bejenaru, e-mail correspondence with the author, December, 2010.

15. "Associazione Diafa Al Maghreb," accessed November 5, 2011, http://www.diafaalmaghreb.ideasolidale.org/index.asp?IDCAT=12.

16. Dominic Hislop, e-mail correspondence with the author representing the collective Big Hope, February, 2011. For a complete list of the associations that assisted the artists, see "Big Hope/re:reroute," accessed November 5, 2011, http://reroute.c3.hu/participant_list_e.html.

17. Author's e-mail correspondence with Miklos Erhardt of Big Hope, December 2010.

18. The participants' real names have been intentionally omitted for protection of privacy. Only stand-in names, chosen by the collaborators themselves have been used. "Big Hope/re:reroute," accessed November 5, 2011, http://reroute.c3.hu/participant_list_e.html.

19. Merril and Carter, "Inside and outside,"167-75.

20. Andrew Mason, Community, Solidarity and Belonging: levels of Community and Their Normative Significance (Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 27-40.

21. Grant Kester coined the term in response to forms of negation that can occur when artists view their collaborators as raw and inert material to be transformed or improved in some ways. "Community and Communicability" in Conversation Pieces: Community and Communication in Modern Art (Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2004): 161.

22. Shore, "Citizenship of the Union," 77.

23. Flavia Stanley illustrates this through ethnographic studies conducted at an immigrant service organization (Servizi per Immigrati) in Rome. She argues that the process of citizenship making in Italy and Europe is based on the active creation and protection of racial privilege on the part of the Italian nationals. "On Belonging in/to Italy and Europe: Citizenship, Race, and the "Immigration Problem" in Citizenship, Political Engagement and Belonging: Immigrants in Europe and the United States, eds. Reed-Danahay, Deborah and Caroline Brettell (New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press, 2008), 49-50.

24. Reed-Danahay and Brettell, "On Belonging in/to Italy and Europe", 56-7.

25. Exhibition curators were Ben Borthwick and Kerryn Greenberg. "Tate Modern| Past Exhibitions | Level 2 Gallery: The Irresistible Force," accessed November 5, 2011, http://www.tate.org.uk/modern/exhibitions/theirresistibleforce/.

26. Balibar, We, The People of Europe,177.

27." About us - Romanian Cultural Institute in London," accessed November 5, 2011, http://www.icr-london.co.uk/aboutus.php.

28. Bejenaru, e-mail.

29. Bejenaru, e-mail.

30. "Societatea Romanca – patru ani de voluntariat in interesul communitatii," Diaspora Romaneasca, no. 305 (July 3-9, 2009).

31. Heather Grabbe, "Regulating the Flow of People across Europe," in The Europeanization of Central and Eastern Europe (eds) Frank Schimmelfenning and Ulrich Sedelmeier (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2005): 113.

32. Andrea Fraser, "From the Critique of Institutions to an Institution of Critique," Artforum 44, no. 1(2005): 278-83.

33. Bejenaru, e-mail.

34. It is perhaps no coincidence that Impreuna/Together articulating an ideal of belonging was conceptualized and performed in 2007, the year that also marked the official entry of Romanian in the EU. Also, in the exhibition, it accompanied his 2005-2007 Travel Guide, an artwork in the form of a tourist map that detailed the precarious reality and conditions of the various routes for prospective Romanian illegal immigrants to England.

Author's Bio:

Izabel Galliera is a PhD Candidate in the History of Art and Architecture at the University of Pittsburgh. Her dissertation research is on socially engaged forms of contemporary art in post 1989 Central Eastern Europe, with a particular focus on projects from Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania. Izabel investigates the ways in which such contemporary art practices have the critical potential in shaping democratic forms of civil society and inclusive public spheres in their respective countries. She is currently on a Fulbright Fellowship conducting her research in Bulgaria and Romania.