
INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF ARTS AND LIBERAL STUDIES (IJALS)
(Open Access, Double-Blind Peer Reviewed Journal)
ISSN Online: 3108-1673



Public Art and Urban Identity in Multicultural Societies

Manoj T R

Associate Professor, Department of History, Milad-E-Sherief Memorial College, Kayamkulam, Kerala, India

Article information
Received: 14th January 2026
Received in revised form: 27th February 2026
Accepted: 5th March 2026
Available online: 23rd April 2026

Volume: 2
Issue: 2
DOI: https://doi.org/10.63090/IJALS/3108.1673.0018

Abstract

Public art occupies a uniquely contested position at the intersection of aesthetics, politics, and urban life in multicultural societies. This article examines the role of public art in the construction and contestation of urban identity by analyzing its diverse functions—from place-making and community building to political resistance and cultural commemoration. Drawing on case studies from global cities and scholarship from art criticism, urban studies, and cultural geography, the analysis addresses contested monuments and the politics of public memory, community-engaged art practices, street art as democratic expression, digital and interactive public art, and the tensions between public art and gentrification. The article argues that public art is not merely decorative but constitutes a vital medium through which diverse communities negotiate questions of belonging, memory, and collective identity, requiring critical attention to power dynamics and social equity.

Keywords: - Public Art, Urban Identity, Multiculturalism, Monuments, Place-Making, Community Art, Street Art, Gentrification.

Introduction

Public art occupies a uniquely contested position at the intersection of aesthetics, politics, and urban life. Unlike art displayed in galleries and museums, public art inhabits shared civic spaces where it is encountered by diverse audiences who have not chosen to seek it out and who bring widely varying cultural references, political commitments, and aesthetic sensibilities to their encounters with it. As Kwon (2002) argues, the meaning and significance of public art are inseparable from its location, and the politics of site-specificity become particularly complex in multicultural urban environments where competing claims to space, identity, and memory intersect in the built environment.

This article examines the role of public art in the construction and contestation of urban identity in multicultural societies. It analyzes the diverse functions that public art serves from place-making and community building to political resistance and cultural commemoration and evaluates the tensions and opportunities that arise when art enters the public realm of diverse cities. Drawing on case studies from global cities and on scholarship from art criticism, urban studies, and cultural geography, the article argues that public art is not merely decorative but constitutes a vital medium through which multicultural societies negotiate questions of belonging, memory, and collective identity.

Literature Review

The scholarly study of public art has developed along several complementary trajectories. Deutsche (1996) provides a foundational analysis of the relationship between art and spatial politics, arguing that public art

is inextricably linked to struggles over urban space, social exclusion, and democratic participation. Her concept of 'evictions' the displacement of marginalized populations through urban development processes that are often accompanied by public art programs draws attention to the ways in which public art can serve both emancipatory and exclusionary functions, depending on the political and economic contexts in which it is produced and received.

Kwon (2002) builds on this foundation with her influential study of site-specific art and locational identity. She traces the evolution of site-specificity from its origins in minimalist sculpture to its contemporary manifestation in community-based and socially engaged art practices, arguing that the relationship between art and place has become increasingly complex in a globalized world characterized by mobility, displacement, and cultural hybridity. Her analysis raises important questions about the politics of place-making through art, particularly in multicultural urban environments where the meaning of 'community' and 'locality' is constantly negotiated.

Lacy (1995) coins the term 'new genre public art' to describe artistic practices that prioritize social engagement, community participation, and political activism over the creation of permanent aesthetic objects. She argues that the most significant public art of the late twentieth century is not the monumental sculptures and memorials that dominate civic spaces but the collaborative, process-oriented projects that engage communities in collective creative practice. This framework has been influential in shaping subsequent debates about the purpose and evaluation of public art in diverse urban contexts.

Miles (1997) provides a comprehensive analysis of the relationship between art, space, and the city, examining how public art contributes to the production of urban identity and the negotiation of social relations in contemporary cities. He argues that public art has the potential to transform urban spaces from mere sites of economic activity and transit into meaningful places that reflect the cultural values and aspirations of the communities that inhabit them. However, he also acknowledges the tensions that arise when public art is deployed as an instrument of urban regeneration, gentrification, or city branding.

Mitchell (1992) examines the relationship between public art and violence, using Spike Lee's film Do the Right Thing as a lens for analyzing the ways in which art in public spaces can both provoke and reflect social conflict. His analysis demonstrates that public art is never politically neutral but always participates in the power dynamics and cultural negotiations that characterize urban public life. This insight is particularly relevant in multicultural societies, where public artworks inevitably engage with questions of cultural representation, historical memory, and social inclusion.

Sharp, Pollock, and Paddison (2005) address the relationship between public art and social inclusion in the context of urban regeneration, arguing that public art programs are often justified in terms of their capacity to promote community cohesion and social equity. However, they demonstrate that the actual effects of public art on social inclusion are complex and context-dependent, and that well-intentioned art programs can sometimes reinforce rather than challenge existing patterns of social exclusion.

Public Art as Place-Making and Identity Construction

The concept of place-making the process through which spaces are transformed into meaningful places through cultural practice and social interaction is central to understanding the role of public art in urban identity construction. Miles (1997) argues that public art contributes to place-making by inscribing cultural meanings, historical narratives, and aesthetic values into the built environment, creating landmarks and gathering points that orient residents' sense of belonging and attachment to their neighborhoods and cities.

Kwon (2002) complicates this picture by examining the ways in which site-specific art can both create and disrupt place-based identities. She notes that in multicultural urban environments, the question of whose identity is being represented by public art is inherently political, as public artworks that celebrate one community's heritage may implicitly marginalize or exclude others. This tension is particularly acute in the context of contested monuments and memorials, where public art becomes a battleground for competing claims to historical memory and cultural legitimacy.

Cartiere and Willis (2008) provide a practical framework for understanding the diverse forms and functions of public art, distinguishing between art in public places, art as public spaces, and art in the public interest. This taxonomy helps clarify the different ways in which public art relates to questions of urban identity, from permanent sculptures that serve as civic symbols to temporary interventions that challenge dominant narratives and invite public dialogue about the meaning and future of shared urban spaces.

Young (2000) examines the specific role of memorials and monuments in the construction of public memory, analyzing how different cultures and communities use public art to commemorate historical events, honor the dead, and transmit collective narratives across generations. His analysis of Holocaust memorials

demonstrates the profound challenges of creating public art that adequately represents experiences of extreme violence and trauma, raising questions about the relationship between aesthetic form and historical truth that are relevant to memorial practices in diverse cultural contexts.

Contested Monuments and the Politics of Public Memory

The global wave of monument contestation that has swept through cities in recent years from the toppling of Confederate statues in the American South to the Rhodes Must Fall movement in South Africa to the defacement of colonial monuments across Europe has brought the politics of public art into sharp public focus. These events demonstrate that public monuments are not inert aesthetic objects but active participants in ongoing cultural and political struggles over history, identity, and power. Mitchell (1992) anticipated this dynamic in his analysis of art in the public sphere, arguing that public art always carries the potential for provoking conflict because it makes visible the cultural values and power relations that shape shared civic spaces.

Deutsche (1996) provides a theoretical framework for understanding monument contestation as a democratic practice, arguing that the conflict generated by controversial public artworks is not a failure of public art but an expression of the democratic politics that public spaces are meant to enable. In her view, the demand to remove monuments that celebrate colonial violence or racial oppression is not an act of cultural vandalism but an assertion of the right of marginalized communities to participate in shaping the symbolic landscape of the cities they inhabit.

Young (2000) offers a more nuanced perspective, arguing that the relationship between monuments and memory is not straightforward, and that the removal of contested monuments does not necessarily resolve the historical conflicts they embody. He advocates for approaches to memorial practice that acknowledge ambiguity, multiplicity, and ongoing contestation, rather than seeking definitive resolution through the installation or removal of permanent artworks. His concept of the 'counter-monument' a memorial that challenges the very conventions of monumentality has been influential in contemporary public art practice.

Hall and Robertson (2001) examine the role of public art in urban regeneration contexts, noting that public art programs are often deployed as instruments of city branding and economic development. They argue that this instrumentalization of public art can undermine its democratic potential by subordinating cultural expression to market logic and reducing the complex cultural meanings of public art to promotional messaging. Zebracki and Ghose (2020) extend this analysis by examining the geographies of public art, arguing that the spatial distribution of public artworks in cities reflects and reinforces broader patterns of social inequality and cultural power.

Community-Engaged Public Art Projects

Community-engaged public art represents a significant departure from the traditional model of public art commissioning, in which a professional artist creates a work that is installed in a public space with minimal input from the community that will live with it. Lacy (1995) argues that new genre public art places community engagement at the center of the artistic process, treating the development of social relationships and collective creative practice as integral components of the artwork itself rather than as ancillary activities.

Sharp, Pollock, and Paddison (2005) examine the potential of community-engaged public art to promote social inclusion in the context of urban regeneration. They find that while public art programs can create opportunities for community participation and cultural expression, their effects on social inclusion depend critically on the quality of the engagement process, the degree of genuine community ownership, and the extent to which the project addresses the material as well as the symbolic dimensions of social exclusion.

Cartiere and Willis (2008) document numerous examples of community-engaged public art projects from around the world, demonstrating the diversity of approaches and outcomes that characterize this form of practice. Their collection includes projects that range from participatory mural-painting and community sculpture to digital storytelling and social media-based art, reflecting the growing range of media and technologies available to community-engaged artists.

Miles (1997) cautions that community-engaged public art is not without its own tensions and contradictions. He notes that the rhetoric of community participation can mask power imbalances between professional artists and community members, and that the outcomes of participatory processes do not always reflect the genuine priorities and aspirations of the communities involved. This critique underscores the importance of developing ethical frameworks for community-engaged practice that ensure genuine power-sharing and accountability.

Street Art and Graffiti as Democratic Expression

Street art and graffiti represent forms of public art that operate outside the institutional frameworks of commissioning, permitting, and curating that govern most public art programs. As unauthorized interventions in public space, street art and graffiti challenge the assumption that public art must be sanctioned by official bodies and raise important questions about who has the right to make marks on the urban landscape. Hall and Robertson (2001) note that while institutional public art programs tend to reflect the values and priorities of cultural elites and political authorities, street art and graffiti provide platforms for voices and perspectives that are excluded from official cultural spaces.

Zebracki and Ghose (2020) analyze the complex geographies of street art, examining how the spatial distribution of murals, graffiti, and other unauthorized interventions reflects the cultural dynamics of urban neighborhoods. They demonstrate that street art is not randomly distributed but is concentrated in particular types of spaces transitional zones, marginal neighborhoods, sites of cultural contestation where it serves both as a form of place-making and as a marker of cultural identity and resistance.

In multicultural cities, street art and murals have become important media for the expression of diverse cultural identities and for dialogue across cultural boundaries. Deutsche (1996) argues that the democratic potential of public art lies in its capacity to make visible the plurality of perspectives and interests that constitute the public sphere, and street art fulfills this function in ways that officially sanctioned public art programs often fail to achieve. However, Kwon (2002) notes the tension between street art's democratic aspirations and the processes of gentrification and commodification that can co-opt unauthorized art practices and transform them into instruments of real estate speculation and cultural tourism.

Digital and Interactive Public Art

The development of digital technologies has opened new possibilities for public art that is interactive, responsive, and participatory. Digital public art installations including projection mapping, augmented reality overlays, sensor-responsive sculptures, and networked media artworks create opportunities for audience engagement that go beyond passive contemplation to include active participation, co-creation, and real-time interaction. Cartiere and Willis (2008) document several examples of digital public art projects that use technology to create immersive experiences and foster community dialogue in urban spaces.

Mitchell (1992) provides a theoretical context for understanding digital public art by analyzing the relationship between art, technology, and public space. His analysis of the ways in which different media shape the politics of public art suggests that digital technologies have the potential to democratize public art by lowering barriers to participation and enabling forms of collective creation that are impossible with traditional media. However, he also acknowledges the risks of technological exclusion and the digital divide that may limit the accessibility of digital public art to technologically literate audiences.

Zebracki and Ghose (2020) examine the emerging geographies of digital public art, noting that the increasing prevalence of digital interventions in urban spaces raises new questions about the relationship between physical place and virtual experience. They argue that digital public art has the potential to create new forms of public space that transcend physical location, enabling dispersed communities to participate in shared artistic experiences. However, they also caution that the privatization of digital infrastructure may limit the democratic potential of digital public art by placing control over public artistic expression in the hands of technology companies and platform owners.

Gentrification and the Commodification of Public Art

The relationship between public art and gentrification is one of the most contentious issues in contemporary urban cultural politics. Public art programs are frequently deployed as components of urban regeneration strategies, with the expectation that artistic interventions will enhance the desirability and economic value of neighborhoods. Hall and Robertson (2001) critically examine this instrumental use of public art, arguing that while art can contribute to the aesthetic improvement of urban spaces, the use of public art as a tool for increasing property values and attracting investment can contribute to the displacement of the low-income communities and cultural practitioners who originally gave those neighborhoods their distinctive character.

Sharp, Pollock, and Paddison (2005) demonstrate that the relationship between public art and social inclusion in regeneration contexts is highly ambiguous. They find that public art programs can create short-term opportunities for community participation and cultural expression, but that these benefits may be offset by the long-term effects of gentrification, including rising rents, displacement, and the erosion of existing social networks. Their analysis underscores the importance of evaluating public art programs not only in terms of their immediate cultural outcomes but also in terms of their broader social and economic effects.

Deutsche (1996) provides a structural analysis of the relationship between art, urban development, and social exclusion, arguing that the deployment of public art in gentrifying neighborhoods serves an ideological function by aestheticizing the processes of displacement and social cleansing that accompany urban renewal. She contends that a critical approach to public art must attend not only to the aesthetic qualities of individual artworks but also to the political and economic contexts in which they are produced and installed, asking whose interests are served by the transformation of urban space through artistic intervention.

Lacy (1995) offers an alternative vision of public art that prioritizes community empowerment over economic development, arguing that the most significant public art is that which strengthens the capacity of communities to advocate for their own interests and resist the forces of displacement and gentrification. Her concept of new genre public art art that is defined by its social engagement rather than its aesthetic form provides a framework for evaluating public art programs in terms of their contribution to social justice rather than their economic impact.

Conclusion

Public art in multicultural societies operates at the intersection of aesthetics, politics, and urban life, serving as a vital medium through which diverse communities negotiate questions of identity, belonging, and collective memory. As this article has demonstrated, the functions and effects of public art are complex, contested, and deeply context-dependent, ranging from the place-making and community-building practices analyzed by Miles (1997) and Cartiere and Willis (2008) to the political contestation of monuments examined by Deutsche (1996), Young (2000), and Mitchell (1992).

The scholarly perspectives surveyed in this article from Kwon's (2002) analysis of site-specificity and locational identity to Lacy's (1995) advocacy for new genre public art, from Sharp, Pollock, and Paddison's (2005) examination of art and social inclusion to Hall and Robertson's (2001) and Zebracki and Ghose's (2020) analyses of the geographies of public art collectively demonstrate that public art is never merely decorative but always participates in the cultural and political dynamics that shape urban life. In multicultural societies, where competing claims to space, identity, and memory are particularly visible and contested, public art has the potential to serve as a medium of democratic expression, cross-cultural dialogue, and collective imagination but only when it is produced and received with critical attention to the power dynamics, economic interests, and social inequalities that shape the public realm.

The challenge for artists, policymakers, and communities in multicultural cities is to develop public art practices that genuinely reflect the diversity of urban populations, that engage meaningfully with questions of social justice and inclusion, and that resist the pressures of commodification and gentrification that threaten to reduce public art to an instrument of economic development. The future of public art in multicultural societies depends on our collective willingness to treat the public realm not as a space to be managed and marketed but as a democratic arena in which diverse voices, visions, and cultural traditions can coexist, interact, and mutually enrich one another.

References

Cartiere, Cameron, and Shelly Willis, eds. *The Practice of Public Art*. London: Routledge, 2008.

Deutsche, Rosalyn. *Evictions: Art and Spatial Politics*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1996.

Hall, Tim, and Iain Robertson. "Public Art and Urban Regeneration: Advocacy, Claims and Critical Debates." *Landscape Research* 26, no. 1 (2001): 5–26.

Kwon, Miwon. *One Place After Another: Site-Specific Art and Locational Identity*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2002.

Lacy, Suzanne, ed. *Mapping the Terrain: New Genre Public Art*. Seattle: Bay Press, 1995.

Miles, Malcolm. *Art, Space and the City: Public Art and Urban Futures*. London: Routledge, 1997.

Mitchell, W. J. T. "The Violence of Public Art: Do the Right Thing." In *Art and the Public Sphere*, edited by W. J. T. Mitchell, 29–48. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1992.

Sharp, Joanne, Venda Pollock, and Ronan Paddison. "Just Art for a Just City: Public Art and Social Inclusion in Urban Regeneration." *Urban Studies* 42, nos. 5–6 (2005): 1001–1023.

Young, James E. *At Memory's Edge: After-Images of the Holocaust in Contemporary Art and Architecture*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2000.

Zebracki, Martin, and Rina Ghose. "Geographies of Public Art: Articles, Interventions and Reviews." *GeoHumanities* 6, no. 1 (2020): 1–17.