

diferencijalni prostori umjetnosti

differential spaces in art

▼ “Što bolje promatramo prostor, ne samo očima, ne samo umom, već i osjetilima, cjelinom tijela, jasnije smo svjesni postojećih sukoba, sukoba koji vode eksploziji apstraktnoga prostora i stvaranju prostora drugoga.”¹

Analiza koja slijedi započinje avangardnim pokretima prošlog stoljeća među kojima se javljaju i pluralizam, sumnja i “performativnost”. Pored toga, traži se de-estetiziranje autonomne umjetnosti (pored kritike institucija) i približavanje svakodnevnom djelovanju ili životu; no sve i dalje ostaje unutar mehanizma produkcije, distribucije i recepcije značajkama autonomne umjetnosti. To je bio početak samonegacije sustava (samonegacija je tek jedna od brojnih operacija sustava), “pokušaj dovođenja sustava do njegovih krajnjih granica, do uključivanja isključenog ili nadmašivanja vlastitom negativnošću svega onoga što je prethodilo ili dopuštanja bilo kakvoj neumjetničkoj stvarnosti pristup na tlo umjetnosti”,² kao što to sugerira Niklas Luhmann. Avangardni pokreti prošlosti *napadali su* visoke pozicije institucijske moći, no te institucije su ih konačno ipak nadvladale. Uprkos tomu, pokrenuli su raspravu kako umjetnički sustav tretira nesigurnosti i poteškoće koje sam stvara i daje im oblik.³ To pitanje stoji i danas. Međutim, postavka kako avangarda može promijeniti neki hegemonijski sustav ili utjecati na prirodu sadašnjih socijalnih institucija, naivno je poimanje. U nekim raspravama avangardizam se prepoznaje kao zasebno tijelo, kao jedna od kategorija povijesti umjetnosti, oblik kojim se autor služi u izražavanju novoga, protestnoga i tako dalje.

Istovrsni paradoks može se uočiti i u suvremenoj umjetnosti. On dovodi do “beskrajnih oscilacija odnosa između unutrašnjega i vanjskoga”⁴ što otvara mogućnosti izražavanja na osnovu tih distinkcija i pokazuje umjetničko djelo kao simbol različitosti; integriranjem isključenog u okvire uključenoga.⁵ Traže se načini prikazivanja umjetnosti na onoj razini operacija koje se promatranjem iskazuju *kao umjetničko djelo* i ta potreba je trajni integralni dio samonegacije umjetnosti.⁶ Time prakse u kojima stvarno dolazi do spajanja života i umjetnosti - vanjsko kao život - više nisu umjetnost. Izjednačavanje umjetnost = život moguće je jedino, sve dok je riječ o umjetnosti, uz nužnu pretpostavku reprezentacije. Drugim riječima - “ako je unutrašnje sustav različitosti ili različito deter-

● “The more carefully one examines space, considering it not only with the eyes, not only with the intellect, but also with the senses, with the total body, the more clearly one becomes aware of the conflicts at work within it, conflicts which foster the explosion of abstract space and the production of a space that is other.”¹

The following analysis should begin with the avantgarde movements of the last century where pluralism, doubt and “performativity” found their ground. And where stress was set on the request for de-aesthetization of the autonomous art (also with the critique of the institutions) and on switching to everyday praxis or life; but it has always remained within the mechanisms of production, distribution and reception, significant for the autonomous art. It was the beginning of a self-negation of a system (self-negation being one operation among many in the system), “an attempt to press the system to its limits so as to include the excluded, or to surpass with its negativity everything that preceded it, or to allow every possible nonartistic reality to reenter the realm of art,”² as Niklas Luhmann suggests. Avantgarde movements of the past *attacked* established positions of institutional power but were in return taken over by the very same institutions. They nevertheless raised the issue on how the art system handles the self-generated uncertainties and difficulties and put it into form.³ The question remains up-to date. But to presume the avantgarde can change any hegemonic systems or affect the nature of social institutions at present is a naive claim. It has been suggested that avantgardism is itself a genre, an art historical category, an available role that can be adopted by artists in the case of novelty, protest, and so on.

In contemporary art a similar paradox can be observed. This generates “endless oscillation between inside and outside”⁴ and offers opportunities for expression on the basis of this distinction - which shows how artwork symbolizes difference; by integrating the excluded into realm of inclusion.⁵ One looks for ways of staging art at the level of operations that present themselves to observation *as works of art* - this claim remains an integral part of the self-negation of art.⁶ Therefore practices, where the actual blending of art and life takes place - outside as life - are no longer art. Art = life is therefore possible only on assumption that as long as it is art it is intended to be repre-

miniranih pozicija - tada vanjsko ne može biti neka druga različitost ili pozicija, jer bi time i samo bilo dio tog unutrašnjeg”.⁷

Predrasuda “unutrašnje-vanjsko” i dalje ostaje stalni predmet rasprava. Dok mnogi teoretičari brane činjenicu kako unutrašnje nužno treba svoje (iz)vanjsko za konstituciju identiteta (na primjer), pa dosljedno tomu nastoje utvrditi granične crte, Hardt i Negri tvrde kako u “postmodernom svijetu... suvremenu dijalektiku vanjskog i unutrašnjeg zamjenjuje igra stupnjevanja i intenzivnosti, hibridnosti i artifičnosti.”⁸ Drugim riječima, oni govore kako više nema jasne distinkcije u odnosima vanjsko-unutrašnje, a umjesto toga nastalo je nešto što izgleda kao “kontinuirani, uniformni prostor”.⁹ U skladu s time, nema više “drugoga”, zato što nema definicije kakvo bi to “drugo” trebalo biti. Budući da je stara kategorizacija izgubila vrijednost (zahvaljujući novom potrošačkom identitetu i novim autoritetima), novi (zapadni) kulturni imperativ je “individualni projekt autokreacije”.¹⁰ Ti novi autoriteti (zaštitni znakovi - imena proizvođača) u stvari diktiraju takozvanu slobodu izbora. U tom kontekstu, “drugo” je postalo samo pitanje izbora među brojnim mogućnostima identifikacije, čime se zamagljuje pitanje kulturne različitosti i individualnosti.

U ovom tekstu iznosim drugačiji pogled na “prostore umjetnosti izvan institucionalnih okvira”. To su prostori onih praksi koje nastaju kao “modeli otpora depersonalizaciji i dekulturalizaciji globalnog kapitalizma”¹¹ (zamagljivačima razlike između unutrašnjega i vanjskoga) ili bilo kojeg drugog homogeniziranog sustava (uključujući totalitarne uvjete), prostori u kojima se stvaraju različiti krajolici koji svoj kulturni potencijal iskazuju stvaranjem diferencijalnih prostora umjetnosti.

Važno je, po mom mišljenju, imati na umu činjenicu kako govorim o prostorima u kojima se ono što se zbiva u tom prostoru ili razumijeva i doživljava kao umjetnost, odnosno umjetnički proces, ili se ne doživljava kao takvo - o prostorima koji nisu naprijed određeni da budu “prostorima namijenjenim umjetnosti”¹² već se naglasak stavlja na sferu međuljudskih odnosa, ali ne u Luhmannovom smislu, gdje se integriranje negacije (umjetničkog) sustava u takav sustav smatra posebnom strategijom, što će reći strategijom koja neminovno uključuje priznavanje i utvrđivanje granica sustava. Slažem se, međutim, sa Doreen Massey

sentation. To put it in somewhat different terms - “if the inside is a system of differences or of differentially determined positions, then the outside cannot be a further difference or position, for then it would be part of the inside.”⁷

This “inside-outside” bias has been an on-going debate. While many theorists consider the fact that the inside necessarily needs its outside to constitute an identity (for example) and subsequently direct their attention towards defining borders, Hardt and Negri argue that in a “postmodern world... the modern dialectics of inside and outside has been replaced by a play of degrees and intensities, of hybridity and artificiality.”⁸ In other words, what they are saying is that there is no clear distinction between outside-inside anymore, and, instead, there is what appears to be a “continuous, uniform space.”⁹ Accordingly there is no “other” anymore in a sense that there are no definitions of what this “other” is. Since the old categorizations became obsolete (with new consumer identifications and new authorities) the new cultural imperative (of the West) became “individual project of self-creation.”¹⁰

They are actually the new authorities (trade marks-brand names), which dictate the so-called freedom of choice. “Other” in this context became the question of multiple choices of identification, which blurs all cultural diversity and individuality.

In this text I propose a different overview of “art spaces outside institutional frames”. These are spaces of certain practices, which occur as “resistance models against the depersonalization and acculturation of global capitalism”¹¹ (which blurs the distinctions between inside and outside) or any other homogenized realm (including totalitarian condition) and where different realms emerge in which cultural capacity is exercised producing differential spaces of art.

I believe it is important to draw attention to the fact that I talk about spaces where that, what happens in space is perceived and experienced as art or art process - or not, where space is not being pre-determined as “space marked for art”¹² and where the importance is placed on “relations” focused into the sphere of human relations. And not in the sense of Luhmann who calls integrating the negation of the (art) system into that very system a particular strategy, i.e. that strategy would neces-

- ▼
- ¹ HENRI LEFEBVRE, *Production of Space*, Blackwell, 1999., (prvo engl. izd. 1991.), 391. U engleskom prijevodu *Space that is other*. U ovom kontekstu pojam označava *diferencijalni* prostor.
 - ² NIKLAS LUHMANN, *Art as a Social System*, Stanford University Press, 2000., 293.
 - ³ NIKLAS LUHMANN (bilj. 2), 315.
 - ⁴ NIKLAS LUHMANN (bilj. 2), 293.
 - ⁵ NIKLAS LUHMANN (bilj. 2), 294.
 - ⁶ NIKLAS LUHMANN (bilj. 2), 296.
 - ⁷ OLIVER MARCHART, *Art Space and the Public Sphere(s)*, 1998, na http://www.eipcp.net/diskurs/d70/text/marchart_prepublic_en.html
 - ⁸ MICHAEL HARDT, ANTONIO NEGRI, *Empire*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, England, 2000., 187.-188.
 - ⁹ MICHAEL HARDT, ANTONIO NEGRI (bilj. 8), 190.
 - ¹⁰ RENATA SALECL, HENRIETTA L. MOORE, *So ljudje, ki nimaju dvomov*, u: *Delo* (Sobotna priloga), 30. 10. 2004., 31.
 - ¹¹ OKWUI ENWEZOR, *Mega-Exhibitions and the Antinomies of a Transnational Global Form*, u: *Manifesta Journal*, br. 2., zima 2003./prolj. 2004., 31.
 - ¹² *Ausgeträumt*, (kat.izl.), Secesija, Beč 2001., 36., komentar Borisa Groysa: “Mislim da danas umjetnost nije zanimljiva po umjetničkim djelima... Kod umjetnosti me zanimaju prostori namijenjeni umjetnosti (dodano potcrtavanje), koji funkcioniraju relativno autonomno.”

-
- ¹ HENRI LEFEBVRE, *Production of Space*, (transl. Donald Nicholson-Smith), Blackwell, 1999 (English transl. first published 1991), p. 391. Space that is other in this context signifies a differential space.
 - ² NIKLAS LUHMANN, *Art as a social system*, Stanford University Press, 2000, p. 293.
 - ³ *Ibid.*, p. 315.
 - ⁴ *Ibid.*, p.293.
 - ⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 294.
 - ⁶ *Ibid.*, p.296.
 - ⁷ OLIVER MARCHART, *Art, Space and the Public Sphere(s)*, 1998, at http://www.eipcp.net/diskurs/d07/text/marchart_prepublic_en.html
 - ⁸ MICHAEL HARDT, ANTONIO NEGRI, *Empire*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, England, 2000, pp. 187-188.
 - ⁹ *Ibid.*, p. 190.
 - ¹⁰ RENATA SALECL, HENRIETTA L. MOORE, *So ljudje, ki nimaju dvomov*, *Delo* (Sobotna priloga), 30.10.2004, p. 31.
 - ¹¹ OKWUI ENWEZOR, *Mega-Exhibitions and the Antinomies of a Transnational Global Form*, in: *Manifesta Journal*, no. 2, Winter 2003/Spring 2004, p. 31.

- ▼
- ¹³ DOREEN MASSEY, Power-geometry and a progressive sense of place, Mapiranje budućnosti, lokalne kulture, globalna promjena, Routledge, 1993., 67.
- ¹⁴ radi usporedbe vidi pogl. Self-Description u knjizi NIKLASA LUHMANN, (bilj. 2), 244.-315.
- ¹⁵ ROMA REASON, NIKLAS LUHMANN, Art as a Social System, u: *Manifesta Journal*, br.1., prolj./ljetno 2003., 54.
- ¹⁶ ROMA REASON, NIKLAS LUHMANN (bilj. 15), 44.
- ¹⁷ HOMI K. BHABHA, Location of Culture, London/New York, 1994., 25.
- ¹⁸ DOREEN MASSEY (bilj. 13), 60.
- ¹⁹ DOREEN MASSEY, Politics in Space/Time, u: *New Left Review*, br. 196., (stud./pros. 1992.), 77.
- ²⁰ HENRI LEFEBVRE (bilj. 1), 286.
-
- ¹² *Ausgeträumt* (exh. cat.), Secession, Wien, 2001, p. 36.
Boris Groys commented: "I think what makes art interesting today are not the artworks...What makes art interesting for me are the spaces marked for art (emphasis added) which function relatively autonomously."
- ¹³ DOREEN MASSEY, Power-geometry and a progressive sense of place, in: *Mapping the Futures, Local cultures, global change*, Routledge, 1993, p. 67.
- ¹⁴ Cf. See chapter *Self-Description* in: NIKLAS LUHMANN, Art as a social system, (transl. Eva M. Knodt), Stanford University Press, 2000, pp. 244 - 315.
- ¹⁵ ART & LANGUAGE, Roma Reason. Niklas Luhmann's Art as a Social System, in: *Manifesta Journal*, no. 1, Spring /Summer 2003, p. 54.
- ¹⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 44.
- ¹⁷ HOMI K. BHABHA, Location of Culture, Routledge, London/ New York, 1994, p. 25.
- ¹⁸ DOREEN MASSEY, Power-geometry and a progressive sense of place, in: *Mapping the Futures, Local cultures, global change*, Routledge, 1993, p. 60.
- ¹⁹ DOREEN MASSEY, Politics and Space/Time, in: *New Left Review* No. 196 (Nov./dec. 1992), p.77.
- ²⁰ HENRI LEFEBVRE, Production of Space, (transl. Donald Nicholson-Smith), Blackwell, 1999 (English transl. first published 1991), p.286.

koja kaže kako su granice nužne jedino ako se radi o konceptualizaciji prostora kao takvog, no definicija u tom smislu ne nastaje jednostavnim suprotstavljanjem vanjskom, već se stvara kroz povezivanje s vanjskim kao sastavnim dijelom prostora.¹³ No, želim istaknuti kako predmet mog istraživanja nije pitanje kako i zašto se javlja taj proces integriranja "isključenog" u područje "uključenog". Prije svega je potrebno zaobići tu zastarjelu predrasudu o "institucionalnom - izvaninstitucionalnom" (isključenom - uključenom / vanjskom - unutrašnjem) koja i dalje preteže u načinu razmišljanja i umjesto toga inicirati nove načine promatranja i pristupa - to je ono što nazivam (stvaranjem) *diferencijalnih prostora umjetnosti*. Razlika bi, dakle, bila u pokušaju da se "misli proizvodnja prostora" u zamjenu za pitanje o konstituiranju i ovladavanju granicama. U tom kontekstu vratila bih se još jednom Luhmannu koji ustrajava na tome da "diferencijacija sistema umjetnosti...dopušta da odnos između sistema i okoline bude nanovo uveden u sistemu u vidu odnosa između autoreferencije i heteroreferencije".¹⁴ Isto se može primijetiti u slučaju diferencijalnih prostora umjetnosti; umjetnost je integrirana u prostor svakodnevice: "prihvaćajući, opisujući i nanovo opisujući vlastitu diferencijaciju kao formu" kao što tvrdi Art&Language,¹⁵ ali s razlikom - budući da sistemi nisu ništa više negoli "odnos između aktera i nečeg što je takvo kakvo jest, štoviše, jest to što jest upravo kao rezultat tog odnosa".¹⁶ U tom slučaju umjetnički sistem stvara određenu otvorenost suodnosnu s vanjskim neobilježenim prostorom (društvenim prostorom svakodnevice - kolaborativnim, dijaloškim, antagonističkim, konfliktnim itd.) i budući da je ta otvorenost neophodan korelat operacija samog sistema, zauzvrat rezultira nastankom diferencijalnih prostora umjetnosti.

Imajući u vidu sve te činjenice ne želim izlagati o izvaninstitucionalnim prostorima, niti o alternativnim prostorima (umjetnosti) - što bi značilo konceptualizirati prostore koji bi, doduše, bili drukčiji nego institucije, ali bi i dalje ostali jednako ideološki uvjetovani.

Takvu (nepotpunu) terminologiju nameće zapadna logika utemeljena na binarnim suprotnostima: na primjer A / ne-A, institucionalno/izvaninstitucionalno. Zbog toga je moj pristup potpuno otvoren. Homi Bhabha naziva to "prostorom translacije: mjestom hibridnosti."¹⁷ Taj se prostor u

sarily involve acknowledgement and research of the system's boundaries. I agree with Doreen Massey who argues that boundaries may be necessary for the conceptualization of a space itself, but definition in this sense does not have to come about through simple counterposition to the outside, definition can actually come about through the linkage to that outside, which is part of what constitutes the space.¹³ But I would like to point out that the case of my study is not the question of how and why the process of integration of "excluded" into the realm of "included" occurs. The purpose is above all to bypass this old "institutional-non institutional" (excluded-included/outside-inside) bias which still prevails in current thinking and to introduce new ways of observing/approaching it instead, through opening up the opposition with a new term and new approach - which I designated as (production of) *differential spaces of art*. The difference now is to "think of space production" which substitutes the question of what constitutes the boundaries/borders and how these borders are managed. To return to Luhmann in this context again, he goes on saying "the differentiation of the art system ...allows the relation between system and environment to be reintroduced into the system in the form of relationship between self-reference and hetero-reference."¹⁴ The same can be observed with differential spaces of art; art is integrated into everyday space: "by accepting, describing and re-describing its own differentiation as a form", as Art & Language says¹⁵ but with a difference - as systems are nothing more than the "relation between an actor and something which is as it is and, furthermore, is what it is a result of that relation"¹⁶ - the case here is that the art system creates certain openness which correlates with an external unmarked space (social space of everyday; which could be collaborative, dialogical, antagonistic, conflictual etc.) and since this openness is being a necessary correlate of the system's own operations it results - in return - in the production of differential spaces of art.

Taking all these facts into consideration I intentionally do not expose non-institutional spaces neither alternative spaces (of art) - because this would mean conceptualization of spaces which would be different compared to an institution, but still ideologically conditioned in the same way. This (incomplete) terminology is dictated by Western logic based on binary contraries; for

prvom redu temelji na drugačijem razumijevanju prostora, pri čemu prostor nije podređen vremenu kao zatvoren i nepromjenjiv sustav (*stasis*), nego se smatra ekvivalentnim dijelom njihove uzajamne povezanosti. Dakako, u tom odnosu prostor je na neki način problematičan. I to zbog toga što se "prostorno-vremenska kompresija", kako piše Doreen Massey, "ne zbiva svakome u svim sferama djelatnosti",¹⁸ nego je uvjetovana ekonomskim faktorima, imovnim stanjem, spolom, mobilnošću, pristupom tehnološkim prednostima kao što su kompjutori, internet i tako dalje. Treba uzeti u obzir da su te različite društvene skupine i osobe na vrlo različite načine povezane s prostorno-vremenskom cjelinom (u vezi s tim možda valja razmotriti Burdieuov pojam *habitus*). Ta društvena diferencijacija navodi nas na pitanje (kako sugerira Massey) o *kojim* i *čijim* uvjetima postmodernosti u stvari govorimo.

Prostor definira i definiran je odnosima u društvu i kako kaže Doreen Massey: "(...) društvo se neminovno konstruira prostorno i ta činjenica - prostorna organizacija društva - ključ je njegove funkcionalnosti. Prostornost je posljedica međusobnih odnosa objekata (...) Prostor nije apsolutan, već relativan."¹⁹ Dalo bi se zaključiti kako sami društveni odnosi stvaraju i definiraju prostor i vrijeme. Prema Lefebvreu, prostor je sav prožet društvenim odnosima; društveni odnosi ne samo što podržavaju prostor, nego prostor proizvodi i sam biva proizveden društvenim odnosima.²⁰

Zato više ne treba razmišljati o "prostorima namijenjenim umjetnosti" (gdje je prostor oblikovan isključivo umjetničkim sustavom), nego o fluidnijim prostorima nastalim kroz umjetnost ili čak o "stvaranju novih konceptualnih prostora" (Deleuze) usklađenim s raznim prostorno-povijesno-društvenim cjelinama koje danas smatramo jednakovrijednima, uz naglasak i vođenje računa o činjenici da je proizvodnja prostora, inherentno, uvijek politički proces. Tako se diferencijalni prostori mogu smatrati simultano i "izvan" i "unutar" diskursa u kojima umjetnički sustav svemu određuje svoje značenje. ▼

example A/non-A, institution/non-institution. That is why my approach is essentially open. Homi Bhabha calls this "a space of translation: a place of hybridity."¹⁷ It is based primarily on different understanding of space, where the space is not seen as subordinated to time, as closed and never-changing system (*stasis*), but is perceived as an equivocal part of this particular relation instead. Of course, space in this relation is not an unproblematic one. The difference is that "space-time compression", as Doreen Massey writes "has not been happening for everyone in all spheres of activity";¹⁸ and is being defined by the economic factors, wealth, gender relations, mobility, access to technological advantages like computers, internet and so on. It needs to be taken into consideration those different social groups and individuals are placed in very distinct ways in relation to space-time (we should also perhaps consider Burdieu's *habitus* at this point). This social differentiation leads us to the question (as Massey suggests) as of *which* and *whose* condition of postmodernity we are talking about.

The space is defined by and defines the relations in a society, or to put it in the words of Doreen Massey: "(...) society is necessarily constructed spatially, and that fact - the spatial organization of society - makes a difference to how it works... The existence of the spatial depends on the interrelation of objects... Space is not absolute, it is relational."¹⁹ It can be concluded that the social relations themselves create and define space and time. And according to Lefebvre, space is permeated with social relations; it is not only supported by social relations but it is also producing and produced by social relations.²⁰

Therefore I propose not thinking of "spaces marked for art" (where space is given shape exclusively by the art system) but of more fluid spaces/ becomings of art, or even of "creating new conceptual spaces" (Deleuze) according to different spatial-historic-social settings which are now considered as equivalents but with an emphasis and taking into consideration that every production of space is inherently a political process. This way differential spaces of art can be thought of as being simultaneously "outside" and "inside" of the discourse in which art system gives meaning to everything. ●

prijevod / translation: Jasna Friščić

→ Bojana Piškur - povjesničarka umjetnosti. Istražuje i piše o temama iz suvremene umjetnosti. Radi kao kustosica u Modernoj galeriji u Ljubljani.

Bojana Piškur - art historian. Researches and writes on contemporary art subjects. Works as a curator at Modern gallery in Ljubljana.