

ZAJEDNIČKI RAD



Fenomen umjetničkih suradnji daleko je od novog i nepoznatog: dok se povijesni prethodnici traže u velikim umjetničkim radionicama, u kojima su veliki majstori poput Tiziana, Tintoretta ili Rubensa svojim autorstvom legitimirali umjetničko djelo i garantirali mu određenu vrijednost na tržištu narudžbi a kasnije i umjetnina,¹ kao prvo umjetničko djelovanje u zajednici spominje se aktivnost Nazarenaca u Rimu između 1810. i 1830. godine.² Njihova potraga za izvornim kršćanskim vrijednostima, koje je trebalo ponovo naći u predrenesansnom slikarstvu i autentičnom jedinstvu umjetničkog života i djelovanja, kao i odbacivanje onovremenih akademskih kanona upućuju na ideološku određenost grupnog djelovanja. Pristup je to koji će baštiniti mnogi kasniji kolektivi, posebno u vremenu povijesnih avangardi i osobito kratkog razdoblja početka dvadesetih godina proteklog stoljeća u Sovjetskom Savezu, kada se činilo da će kolektivne

akcije, nedjeljiv dio ruskog umjetničkog eksperimenta, na ulicama, rame uz rame s proleterima, život pretočiti u umjetnost, a umjetnosti udahnuti život.³

Neoavangardni pokreti i konceptualne umjetničke prakse nerijetko su se oslanjali na naslijeđe kolektizma povijesne avangarde,⁴ dok je umjetnički aktivizam 60-ih i 70-ih godina, posebno u Zapadnoj Europi i Sjedinjenim Državama, pratio kako studentske prosvjede tako i pokrete za građanska prava. Na tragu tih nastojanja krajem osamdesetih i početkom devedesetih godina prošlog stoljeća u SAD svoju aktivnost široko provodi grupa Gran Fury u kampanji usmjerenoj protiv predrasuda oko AIDS-a, a devedesete su godine vidjele pravi procvat kolektivnog i kolaborativnog umjetničkog udruživanja. Bilo da je riječ o širokom pseudonacionalnom pokretu poput Neue Slowenische Kunst i njegovoj umjetničkoj jezgri IRWIN (koja je osamdesetih godina

JASNA

JAKŠIĆ

The phenomenon of artistic collaboration is far from new or unknown: whereas its historical precedents can be found in great artistic workshops, in which masters like Titian, Tintoretto, or Rubens legitimated artworks through their authority and guaranteed them a specific value on the market of commission (and later on the art market),¹ the earliest case of artistic activity taking place in a community was that of the Nazarenes in Rome between 1810 and 1830.² Their search for the pristine Christian values, which they sought to rediscover in pre-Renaissance painting, and the authentic unity of artistic life and activity, including the rejection of the prevailing academic canon, reveal the ideological determination of their joint activity. It was an approach inherited by many later collectives, especially in the period of the historical avant-gardes and the brief interval in the Soviet Union of the early 1920s, when it seemed that collective

actions, as an indivisible part of Russian artistic experiment, would there, in the streets, shoulder to shoulder with the proletarians, transform life into art and permeate art with life.³

Neo-avant-garde movements and conceptual artistic practices often relied on the legacy of collectivism of the historical avant-garde,⁴ while the artistic activism of the 1960s and 1970s, particularly in Western Europe and the USA, accompanied student demonstrations, as well as movements for civic freedoms. In the wake of such efforts, the late 1980s and early 1990s were marked by the broadly based activity of the American art group Gran Fury, in a campaign directed against prejudice related to AIDS, and the 1990s saw a real boom of collective and collaborative associations of artists. Be it a broad pseudo-nationalist movement such as Neue Slowenische Kunst and its artistic core IRWIN (which launched the idea of retro-avant-garde



WORKING TOGETHER

prošlog stoljeća lansirala ideju retroavangarde), aktivističkim grupama poput Critical Art Ensemble ili Bureau des Études, ili suradničkom promiskuitetu,⁵ kojim se uz ostale nezdrave navike predao već notorni marketinški proizvod Nove britanske umjetnosti, kolaborativne prakse su iz gotovo sektaško-elitističkih granica ušle u glavnu struju umjetničke produkcije i zalaganja, što je popratilo i određeni broj kataloga, tematskih brojeva i historijskih pregleda na tu temu.⁶

Čak bi i brzi pregled kolektivnog, grupnog i suradničkog djelovanja i analiza različitih vidova suradnje, uzevši u obzir utjecajnu i razgranatu povijest grupa i pokreta unutar moderne umjetnosti,⁷ oduzeli daleko više prostora nego što je namijenjeno ovom tekstu. Željela bih samo dodati da se, kao što je poznato, suradničke prakse ne zaustavljaju tek na usko shvaćenoj umjetničkoj aktivnosti, već su itekako prisutne u kustoskom djelovanju. Uzmimo za primjer samo vjerojatno najpoznatiji kolektiv iz regije, udrugu Što, kako i za koga,⁸ udrugu Blok, tim Galerije Miroslav Kraljević ili beogradski Prelom kolektiv, ili možda lokalni najsvježiji primjer, projekt „Tajne izložbe“ u Galeriji Studentskog centra u Zagrebu, koji je nastao kao plod zajedničkog istraživanja. Možemo li s trogodišnjim odmakom još govoriti o „kolaborativnom preokretu“, kako je svoj uvodni esej u publikaciji „Taking the matter into common hands“ nazvala Maria Lind? Ili je, prema riječima Davida Barretta, riječ o kretanjima mode i interesa?⁹ Hoće

li vrijeme (post)financijske krize još intenzivnije usmjeriti umjetnička djelovanja na samoorganizaciju i nove taktike preživljavanja? Da li se nove prakse i djelovanja mogu, namjesto podvrgavanju liberalizmu s ljudskim licem, pretvoriti u taktike suradnje Juga i Juga, kako je prije nekoliko godina suradnički potencijal prepoznao kustos Gerardo Mosquera?¹⁰

Za teoretičara Stephena Wrighta sama umjetnost je najčešće najveća prepreka umjetničkoj suradnji. Lucidan i duhovit esej „The Delicate Essence of Artistic Collaboration“ ukazuje na neke prepreke i zablude. Na pitanje kako spriječiti da sama suradnja ne postane sredstvo kojim se koristi upravo suprotna strana (danas je nepogrešivi arhineprijatelj upravo globalni neoliberalni kapitalizam), Wright se naizgled utječe „zdravorazumskom“ zaključku da ljudi surađuju zbog zajedničkog interesa, koji se u svijetu umjetnosti može nerijetko gledati kroz prizmu financija i utjecaja. Upravo odrekavši se te premise moguće je izbjeći instrumentalizaciju, preciznom definicijom neprijatelja oko kojeg se zbijaju suradnički redovi. Kada umjetnost napusti nemoć svog autonomnog područja, kada odustane od svijeta umjetnosti zbog normativnog carstva političkog aktivizma i suradnje, potrebno je prije svega pitati se zašto ljudi uopće surađuju.¹¹ Na kraju svog eseja Wright ističe jednu činjenicu: da, unatoč svemu, suradnju ne možemo svesti na puki zajednički interes.¹² Ako se suradničko djelovanje gleda kao zajedničko, kao djelovanje određene

in the 1980s), activist groups like Critical Art Ensemble or Bureau des Études, or collaborative promiscuity⁵ to which the notorious marketing product of New British Art succumbed along with other unhealthy habits, collaborative practices abandoned their almost sectarian and elitist limits and joined the mainstream of artistic production and efforts, a trend that was accompanied by the publication of numerous catalogues, special issues of journals, and historical overviews of the subject.⁶

Owing to the influential and ramified history of groups and movements within modern art,⁷ even a fleeting overview of all their collective, group, and collaborative activities, or an analysis of various types of cooperation, would take up far more space than this occasion allows for. Therefore, I will limit myself to emphasizing the well-known fact that collaborative practices are not limited to artistic practices narrowly understood, but are by all means present also in curatorial work. Let us consider the example of what might be the most famous collective in the region – What, How & for Whom (WHW)⁸ – or perhaps the Blok group, the team of Miroslav Kraljević Gallery, or Prelom collective from Belgrade – or even the most recent example, the “Secret Exhibition” project at the Student Centre Gallery in Zagreb, likewise a result of joint research.

Three years after Maria Lind wrote her introductory essay to the publication “Taking the Matter into Common Hands,” can we still

speak of a “collaborative turn”? Or is it rather that, according to David Barrett, we are dealing here with ideologies and fashion?⁹ Will the period of (post-)financial crisis direct artistic activity even more intensely towards self-organization and new strategies of survival? Can these new practices and actions, instead of subjecting themselves to liberalism with a human face, transform themselves into strategies of cooperation between South and South, as curator Gerardo Mosquera termed this type of collaborative potential a few years ago?¹⁰

For theoretician Stephen Wright, it is art itself that most commonly obstructs artistic collaboration. His lucid and witty essay called “The Delicate Essence of Artistic Collaboration” points to some of these obstacles and fallacies. Asking the question how one should prevent collaboration from becoming a tool used by the opposite side (the unmistakable arch-enemy of today being precisely global neoliberal capitalism), Wright has apparently opted for the “commonsensical” conclusion that people collaborate for the sake of their own interest, which in the art world can often be viewed through the prism of finances and impact. It is precisely by renouncing at that premise that it is possible to avoid instrumentalization – by defining the enemy against which the collaborative ranks will close: “When art forsakes the impotence of its autonomous realm, when it quits the artworld for the normative realm of political activism and

zajednice, upravo iz gore navedenog razloga možemo reći da umjetnost nije *skup* već *zajednica* sposobnosti i percepcija.¹³ Zajednica koju treba osloboditi vladajućih normativnih struktura kako bi se unutar nje mogle ispreplesti nevidljive niti povjerenja. Kao što je paradoks zajednice prvotni nedostatak koji kompenzira i pokreće proces dijeljenja i darovanja, njemu sličan paradoks umjetničke suradnje *pretpostavlja* određenu vrstu solidarnosti koja je dijelom osnažuje. Što može suradnju učiniti „plodonosnom i nužnom“? Prije svega treba raskinuti s institucionaliziranim trojstvom autor–djelo–publika, baviti se sredstvima, a ne ciljevima umjetnosti.¹⁴

No namjera ovog teksta nije toliko izravno bavljenje problematikom društvene stvarnosti i utjecaja umjetničkih privremenih suradnji i kolektiva, niti izdvajanje određenih nacionalnih, regionalnih ili u svijetu umjetnosti već etabliranih suradničkih praksi i projekata. Usmjeren je prvenstveno na dva eseja čija primjena na suradničko ili sinergijsko djelovanje u području umjetnosti može od samog početka osvijestiti polazišta i suradnje. *Singularni plural bitka* Jean-Luca Nancya raspravlja o djelomičnom izdvajanju, razaznavanju individue od zajednice i njezinim slobodama unutar mnogostrukosti u čijem stvaranju sudjeluje. To je zajednica izvan koje „ja“ ne postoji ali čije „mi“ se predstavlja kao skup različitih svjetova i interpretacija svjetova. Jacques Rancière u eseju o emancipiranom gledatelju

umjetničku razmjenu na relaciji kazalište–publika promatra s osnovnih polazišta intelektualne emancipacije i jednakosti među različitim manifestacijama inteligencije. Uklanjanje patronizirajućeg, podučavateljskog impulsa itekako je primjenjivo i na područje vizualnih umjetnosti, posebno ako je priroda rada sadržana u procesu razmjene, kako znanja i vještina tako i umjetničkog djelovanja. Nadalje, težište nije toliko na ostvarenim modelima suradnji, povijesnim ili sadašnjim, kolektivnim ili privremenim, niti se suradnički projekti doživljavaju kao *novum*. Ono što ovaj tekst želi jest pitati se o potrebama i uvjetima za začetak suradnji, neovisno o tome bila li njihova motivacija profesionalna, politička, dokoličarska ili emotivna.

Jedinstvo mnoštvenosti

Singularni plural bitka Jean-Luca Nancya, u engleskom izdanju (sretno) doslovno prevedeno s francuskoga zbog jezičnog jedinstva bivanja i Bitka, u samom naslovu poetskim izbjegavanjem hijerarhijskog sklopa sintakse sažima poruku eseja, koji će kasnije postati jedno od uporišta teorije mnoštva. Istodobnost bivanja u jedini i množini, da li u postojanju ili ceremonijalnijem Bitku, iščitava se višeznačno, poput stiha. Odnos međuovisnosti i ravnopravnosti jednine i množine, od ontološkog oblika ka gramatičkom ili društvenom, Nancy detaljno razlaže najavljujući:

collaboration, what is needed is a clear understanding of why people collaborate at all.”¹¹

At the end of his essay, Wright has emphasized the fact that, despite all, collaboration cannot be reduced to common interest alone.¹² If collaborative activity is seen as the common, as the activity of a particular community, then it is precisely for the above-mentioned reason that we can say that art is a *community* rather than a *set* of competencies and perceptions.¹³ It is a community that must be liberated from the dominant normative structures so that the invisible threads of trust might develop within it. Just as the paradox of a community is its original deficiency that compensates and motivates the process of sharing and giving, the similar paradox of artistic collaboration *presupposes* a sort of solidarity that will partly empower it. What can make a collaboration “fruitful and necessary”? First of all, one should break with the institutionalized trinity author-work-public and dedicate oneself to the specific means of art, rather than its specific ends.¹⁴

Yet the intention of this text is not so much to deal directly with the problem of social reality and the impact of temporary artistic collaborations and collectives, or to single out certain national, regional, or well-established collaborative practices and projects. I will base myself primarily of two essays that can, applied to collaborative or synergistic activity in the field of art,

raise the awareness about its starting points and collaborations. The first is *Being Singular Plural* by Jean-Luc Nancy, in which he discusses the partial exclusion and separation of individual from the community and its freedoms within the multitude that he or she creates. The community outside of which there is no “I”, but whose “we” is presented as a cluster of different worlds and interpretations of worlds. The second is Jacques Rancière’s essay on the emancipated spectator, where he reconsiders artistic exchange on the line of theatre-audience from the basic viewpoints of intellectual emancipation and equality among different manifestations of intelligence. The aim of abolishing the patronizing, instructional impulse is by all means applicable to the field of visual arts, especially if the nature of work is included in the process of exchange, both of insights and skills, and of artistic activity. Furthermore, the market is not really based on the realized models of collaboration, historical or modern, collective or temporary, and collaboration projects are not experienced as a novelty. The questions raised by the author refer to the needs and conditions for initiating collaborations, regardless of whether their motivation is professional, political, emotional, or a fruit of idleness.

The Unity of Multitude

Being Singular Plural by Jean-Luc Nancy, a title that was

„U stvari, možda nam se događa samo neka druga vrsta ‘kopernikanskog obrata’ - ne ‘kopernikanski obrat’ kozmološkog sistema, niti odnosa subjekta i objekta, već ‘društvenog bitka’, koji se sada vrti oko samoga sebe ili u samom sebi, a ne više oko nečega drugoga (Subjekta, Drugoga ili Istoga).“¹⁵

Svijet se stvara od prve jedinice mišljenja i djelovanja, osnovnog misaonog, početnog položaja (možemo li ga zamijeniti s filozofskim, političkim, ali i umjetničkim pitanjem?) prvog lica jednine i njegova razvoja od kartezijanske sumnje do dijaloga koji uvodi kategoriju bivanja-s ili bivanja-zajedno.¹⁶ Ta se prva, dijaloška forma subjekta upućuje na prisvajanje onoga što je od nas stvorilo to što smo „mi“ danas, „mi“ svijeta koji se više ne bori za smisao, nego da postane smisao sâm.

Postavljajući prvo filozofsko pitanje o smislu, Nancy u naznakama o pretpostavljenom općem konsenzusu o nepostojanju smisla i značenja danas prepoznaje njegov ogoljeli oblik koji se ostvaruje u zajedništvu: više „nemamo“ smisao jer smo mi sâmi smisao – u potpunosti, bez ostatka, beskonačno, s nikakvim drugim smislom drugačijim od „nas“.¹⁷ Kao i najmanja jedinica značenja, i ona najuzvišenija sama za sebe nema smisla, budući da se ostvaruje u komunikaciji, pa makar ona bila „od mene meni samom“.¹⁸

No, prelazeći s prvog lica jednine u prvo lice množine, i iz njega u treće, susrećemo se s „njima“, trećim licem množine, drugima. Zamjenica „oni“ upućuje na sve druge skupine, populacije,

fizionomije ili rase, odmicanjem i distinkcijom od kojih gradimo vlastito jastvo. Drugi su „čudni“ i „bizarni“, no ta čudnovatost drugih i jedinstvenost govornika preduvjet je da postane „netko“. Bez toga prema drugima ne bi bio moguć nikakav osjećaj, želja ili gađenje: odvajanje je preduvjet različitosti, drugoga i drugih.¹⁹ Tragajući za ishodištem, za osnovom svijeta koji nema suplementa, budući da je on „po sebi suplementaran, beskonačno suplementaran izvorom“,²⁰ nailazimo na drugoga, kao mjesto prebivanja ishodišta prvotne razlike; no taj drugi, to bivanje drugog ishodišta, pitanje je drugosti ili alternacije svijeta. Drugim riječima, nije to pitanje drugoga ili drugog, ili drugačijeg, nepoznatog, već drugoga u smislu jednog od dvoje (lat. *alter*). Taj drugi s malim početnim slovom jedna je ili jedan od mnogih, svi smo u množtvu i to uvijek jedna ili jedan, jedan ili jedna među njima ili među svima nama. Iz tog proizlazi da smo „mi“ – „svi mi“, gdje niti jedan od nas ne može biti „svi“, i svatko od nas je stoga (...) drugi izvor istog svijeta.²¹ To naše bivanje-sa, kao i bivanje-mnogima nije nimalo slučajno... – ono oblikuje stvarnu i nužnu drugotnost kao takvu. Pluralnost bičâ je u temelju Bitka, te je svako postavljanje i ispostavljanje, dis-pozicija, a svako pojavljivanje i su-pojavljivanje.²²

U srodnom bismo duhu, kada bi pažnja bila usmjerena na rad (*labor*) ili djelo (*opera*), mogli nastaviti niz da je svaki rad – kolaboracija, suradništvo, su-kreacija ili svako djelovanje –

translated into English literally from French owing to the linguistic unity of being and Being, poetically avoids the hierarchic structure of syntax while succinctly offering the very message of the essay, which would become one of the main points of reference for the theory of multitude. The simultaneity of being in singular and plural, be it in existence or in the more ceremonious Being, is interpreted ambiguously, like a verse. Nancy explains the relationship between interdependence and equality, from the ontological form to the grammatical or social one, by proclaiming the following:

“In fact, it might be that what is happening to us is just another sort of ‘Copernican Revolution,’ not of the cosmological system, or of the relation of subject and object, but rather of ‘social Being’ revolving [*tournant*] around itself or turning on itself, and no longer revolving around something else (Subject, Other, or Same).”¹⁵ The world is created from the first unit of thinking and action, which is the basic, reflexive starting position (can we substitute it through a philosophical, political, or even artistic question?) of the first person singular and its evolution from the Cartesian dilemma to the dialogue that introduces the category of being-with or being-together.¹⁶ That first, dialogical form of the subject indicates the appropriation of what created us as “we” are today, the “we” of the world that is no longer fighting for the meaning, but fighting to become the meaning itself. By asking that first philosophic

question of meaning, Nancy has recognized its bare form in the hints of the presupposed consensus about the non-existence of sense or meaning, the form which is realized in the community: we no longer “have” any meaning because we ourselves are the meaning – entirely, completely, endlessly, with no other meaning that would be different from “us”.¹⁷ Same as that smallest unit of meaning which, even if most sublime, has no sense in itself, since it is realized in communication, even if only that “from me to myself.”¹⁸

However, by moving away from the first person singular and to the first person plural, and then to the third, we meet “them”, the third person plural, the others. The pronoun “they” indicates all other groups, populations, physiognomies, and races, and it is by detaching and distinguishing ourselves from them that we build up our own self. The others are “strange” and “bizarre”, but that strangeness of the others and the uniqueness of the speaker is the precondition for becoming “somebody”. Without that, no feeling would be possible towards others, no desire or disgust; distancing oneself is the precondition for the difference of the other or others.¹⁹

Searching for the origin, for the basis of the world with no supplement, which is “supplemented in itself and, as such, is indefinitely supplemented by the origin,”²⁰ we encounter the other as the place where the pristine difference resides; but that

sudjelovanje ili kooperacija. Svijet umjetnosti od toga nije iznimka, prisjetimo li se izjave Briana Holmesa citirane u eseju Marie Lind²³ da se po izlasku iz ateljea umjetnici nalaze u mreži suradnji i međuovisnosti.

Zajednički ili dijaloški rad prema tome ne predstavlja iznimku, on je sadržan u osnovi mišljenja ili djelovanja. Kolektivni i kolaborativni radovi izdvajaju se po tome što osvještavaju taj napor zajedništva i što, u konačnici, postoji osnovni uvjet kolektivnog, ili, šire shvaćeno, zajedničkog rada: da stvara sadržaj koji pojedinci ne bi mogli zasebno stvoriti.²⁴

U opisu autorstva zajedničkog rada, koje se u takvom zajedničkom djelovanju određuje kao „višestruko i raspršeno“,²⁵ prijedlog „sa“, skraćena verzija „u suradnji sa“ ili „zajedno sa“, ukazuje na labavi čvor nazivnika. Više nego grupa, koja u najkraćoj privremenosti posjeduje kakav-takav fiksni identitet (zanemarimo li isključavajuće „grupe“ poput Fluxusa), „sa“ je mjesto rascjepa i spoja.

Ono jest ili tvori znak jedinstva/razjedinjenosti, koji u sebi ne ocrta jedinstvo ili razdvojenost kao u toliko mjeri fiksne supstancije koje bi ga poduprle; „sa“ nije znak stvarnosti, ili čak „intersubjektivne dimenzije“. „Sa“ je obilježje povučeno iznad praznine, koje se istodobno prekoračuje i podcrtava tvoreći na taj način težnju u opiranje, privlačenje i odbijanje, koje se odvija „između nas“. „Sa“ ostaje među nama, i mi ostajemo između nas:

i ništa osim nas, i ništa osim intervala među nama.²⁶

„Vrijednost“ može nešto značiti samo u kontekstu su-bivanja, odnosno samo ukoliko podrazumijeva *commerce* u punom smislu riječi, trgovanja i općenja. No kapital iznosi upravo tu diobu, diobu trgovine i diobu općenja bitka-skupa. Zbog nasilja kapitala biti-skupa postaje tržišno-biti i komercijalno-biti. Razotkriven na taj način, su-bitak je istodobno prikriven i ogoлио.²⁷

Kao zajedničku mjeru, koja ne predstavlja neki jedinstveni standard, Nancy navodi „sumjerljivost nesumjerljivih singularnosti, *jednakost svih izvora svijeta*, koji jesu, utoliko ukoliko jesu izvori, strogo nepromjenjivi – u tom smislu, savršeno nejednaki, međutim oni su takvi samo zato jer su svi jednaki jedni prema drugima“.²⁸ Različitosti i jednakosti tih izvora svijeta i njihova nesumjerljivost prizivaju postulate o intelektualnoj emancipaciji, o jednakosti manifestacija inteligencija koju u svojem djelu promiče Jacques Rancière. U već antologijskoj knjizi „Učitelj neznanica“ (koja je u izvrsnom prijevodu Leonarda Kovačevića netom objavljena na hrvatskom jeziku) Rancière iznosi osnove intelektualne emancipacije: nešto kasnije objavljen esej „Emancipirani gledatelj“ primjenjuje principe iznesene u „Učitelju neznanici“ na umjetnički kontekst. Postulat jednakosti, koji se od individua prenosi u pedagoški sustav ili umjetničku medijaciju, mogao bi, poput Nancyeva, predstavljati još jedan preokret u shvaćanju složenih odnosa individue i cjeline i političkog djelovanja u zajednici.

other, that being of the other origin, is the question of otherness or alternation of the world. In other words, it is not the question of the other someone or something, of what is different and unknown, but of the other in terms of one of the two (lat. *alter*). That other, beginning with a minuscule, is one among the many; we are all in that multitude and we are always one, one among them or among us all. What comes out is that “we” – “all of us”, where none can be “all” and where each one of us is therefore (...) the other origin of the same world.²¹ That being-with of ours, as well as being-many, is far from accidental... – it shapes the real and necessary otherness as such. Plurality of beings is the basis of Being, so that every position is also dis-position, and all appearance is co-appearance.²² In line with that, by turning our attention to work as *labor* or work as *opus*, we might continue the sequence and say that all work is – collaboration or co-creation, and that all activity is participation or cooperation. Art world is no exception to that, if we recall the statement of Brian Holmes quoted in the essay of Maria Lind,²³ namely that even upon leaving the atelier, artists remain in the network of collaboration and interdependence.

Therefore, joint work or dialogue is no exception, it is contained in the basis of thinking or action. Collective and collaborative work is exception insofar as it makes one aware of the communal effort and eventually includes the basic condition of collective or, broadly understood, joint work: namely, creating something that the

individuals could not create by themselves.²⁴

In describing such joint work, which is within such joint activity defined as “multiple and dispersed,”²⁵ the preposition “with”, which is an abbreviated form of “in collaboration with” or “together with,” indicates a loose knot of denominators. Unlike a group, which has at least some sort of a fixed identity, even in its most fleeting transience (if we ignore slippery “groups” such as Fluxus), this “with” is a place of division and connection.

It is, or creates a sign of, unity/diversity, which in itself does not delineate so much unity or separateness as the fixed substances that sustain it; “with” is not a sign of reality, or even an “intersubjective dimension.” “With” is a feature drawn above the void, which is stepped over and underlined at the same time, thus creating desire and resistance, attraction and repulsion, that happens “between us.” The “with” stays between us and we stay between us; and there is just us, but only as for the interval between us.²⁶

“Being valuable” is worth something only in the context of being-with, that is, only insofar as it concerns *commerce* in every sense of the word, as trading and dealing. But it is precisely the sharing of these senses – the commerce of goods and the commerce of being-together – that capital exposes. It is exposed as a certain violence, where being-together becomes the being-of-market-value and haggled over. Thus exposed, the being-with vanishes as it is stripped bare.²⁷

Emancipacija pogleda i autonomija umjetnosti

U eseju/predavanju „Emancipirani gledatelj“, održanom prilikom otvaranja Frankfurtske ljetne akademije, Rancière primjenjuje učenje o intelektualnoj emancipaciji Josepha Jacktota²⁹ na pojam gledatelja u kazališnoj umjetnosti, ali i umjetnosti općenito. Tradicionalnoj poziciji tzv. „pasivnog“ gledatelja, u kojoj „biti gledatelj znači istovremeno biti razdvojen od sposobnosti saznanja i od mogućnosti djelovanja“,³⁰ suprotstavlja epski teatar Bertolta Brechta i teatar okrutnosti Antonina Artauda. Brechtov teatar gledatelja pedagoški izdvaja iz opsjenarskog djelovanja pozornice i osvještava njegovu distancu, dok Artaudovo kazalište isključuje lagodnu poziciju neutralnog gledatelja stavljajući samu publiku u središte zbivanja. Oba principa, prema Rancièreu, za polazište imaju nejednakost izvođača, autora i publike: „Čak i kad dramaturzi ili redatelji ne znaju što žele od svoga gledatelja, u najmanju ruku znaju jedno: znaju da gledalac *mora učiniti nešto*, mora preći bezdan koji dijeli pasivnost od aktivnosti.“³¹ Suprotnosti aktivnost/pasivnost, gledanje/znanje, privid/stvarnost u tom kontekstu definiraju „diobu osjetilnog, *a priori* podjelu pozicija i kapaciteta, kao i nekapaciteta pridruženih uz te pozicije...one su otjelotvorene alegorije nejednakosti“.³² Taj se princip može primijeniti i na umjetničke vrste izvan teatra, uključivši, naravno, i vizualne umjetnosti čija je povijest od vremena povijesnih avangardi, sukladno događajima u književnosti

i teatru, obilježena težnjom za aktivnim uključivanjem gledatelja-perceptora u umjetnički proces. No taj plemeniti naum ima, prema Rancièreu, jednu zatupljujuću pozadinu: premisu o nejednakosti znanja i položaja i superiornosti samog izvođača, redatelja, dramaturga, umjetnika ili autora općenito naspram publike koju valja educirati i pokrenuti.

Performans ili umjetničko djelo, pročitamo li ga šire, nije prijenos znanja ili daha umjetnika gledatelju. Ono je „treća stvar koja nema vlasnika, čiji smisao nitko ne posjeduje, koja stoji između njih, udaljavajući se od svakog identičnog prijenosa, svake identičnosti uzroka i posljedice“.³³

Ono što umjetnička aktivnost potiče i provjerava nije djelovanje u nekoj moći otjelovljenoj u kolektivu. Kolektiv možemo čitati izravno iz samog predavanja i shvatiti ga kao privremenu zajednicu okupljenu oko teatarske izvedbe ili šire, kao sretnu zajednicu aktivnih i upućenih. Svako umjetničko djelo ili djelovanje, imajući na umu da nema privilegiranih medija ili polazišta, preispituje „sposobnost anonimnih, sposobnost koja svakog čini jednakim sa svakim drugim. Ta sposobnost se uvježbava kroz nesvodljive distance, kroz nepredvidljivu igru asocijacija i disocijacija“.³⁴ U moći asocijacija i disocijacija počiva emancipacija gledatelja, emancipacija svakoga od nas: mi učimo i podučavamo, kao oni koji u svakom trenutku povezuju ono što vide sa onim što su vidjeli i rekli, učinili i sanjali.³⁵

As a joint measure, which does not represent a unique standard, Nancy mentions the “commensurability of incommensurable singularities, the *equality of all the origins-of-the-world*, which, as origins, are strictly immutable. In this sense, they are perfectly unequal; however, they are such only because they are all equally equal to the others.”²⁸ The differences and equalities of these origins-of-the-world and their incommensurability invite postulates about intellectual emancipation, about the equality of manifestations of intelligences as promoted by Jacques Rancière in his work. In his seminal book “The Ignorant Schoolmaster” (which has recently been published in Croatian, in an excellent translation by Leonardo Kovačević), Rancière has offered some bases for intellectual emancipation: while his essay on “The Emancipated Spectator,” published somewhat later, applies the principles given in the “The Ignorant Schoolmaster” to the artistic context. The postulate of equality, transposed from the individual to the pedagogical system or artistic mediation, could become, just like Nancy’s, another turn in our understanding of the complex relations between the individual and the whole, and of political action in the community.

Emancipation of the Gaze and the Autonomy of Art

In his essay/lecture called “The Emancipated Spectator,” which he held at the inauguration of Frankfurt Summer Academy, Rancière

applied Joseph Jacktot’s doctrine of intellectual emancipation²⁹ to the notion of the spectator in the performing arts, as well as art in general. The traditional position of the so-called “passive” spectator, where “the spectator is separated from the capacity of knowing in the same way as he is separated from the possibility of acting,”³⁰ is here opposed by the epic theatre of Bertolt Brecht and Antonin Artaud’s theatre of cruelty. Whereas Brecht’s theatre pedagogically extracts the spectator from the delusive influence of the stage and makes him aware of his detachment, Artaud’s theatre excludes the comfortable position of a neutral spectator and brings the audience into the centre of events. According to Rancière, both approaches have as their starting point the inequality of the performer, the author, and the audience: “Even when the dramaturge or the performer does not know what he wants the spectator to do, he knows at least that he has to do something: switching from passivity to activity.”³¹

In this context, oppositions such as activity/passivity, watching/knowing, or appearance/reality define the “partition of the sensible, a distribution of places and of the capacities or incapacities attached to those places... they are allegories of inequality.”³² That principle can also be applied to artistic forms outside the theatre, including, of course, the visual arts, the history of which has been marked, from the times of the historical avant-gardes, parallel to the developments in literature and the

U sažetom predstavljanju osnovnih oblika umjetničke djelatnosti danas³⁶ Rancière izdvaja totalno umjetničko djelo i hibridne forme, koje predstavljaju dva lica iste medalje. Granice medija prelaze ili predimenzionirani umjetnički ego ili strategiju intenziviranja učinka performansa nadilaženjem granica i brkanjem uloga.³⁷ No tu je i *treći put* koji, reverzibilno, teatru i teatarskom, kojemu u hibridnosti i totalnosti zaglupljivanja i ostale umjetničke forme mogu težiti, pretpostavlja pričanje priče, čitanje knjige ili gledanje slike. Gledatelji nisu više fantomski aktivni sudionici već aktivni interpretatori, koji, prisvajajući „priču“ stvaraju vlastiti prijevod i inačicu.

U kontekstu suradničkih praksi, uključivale one samo uski krug koautora ili širu zajednicu (lokalnu ili imaginarnu), nužan preduvjet je početni položaj jednakosti. Ne samo za ostvarenje zajedničkog rada, nego i za njegovu životvornu recepciju: tek tada svi akteri mogu postati suučesnici, a svi gledatelji – sugovornici. U umjetnosti, estetski režim razdiobe osjetilnog, koji čini sveukupnost ljudskih doživljaja i kreacija, podrazumijeva jednakost formi, sadržaja i rodova, uvodeći autonomiju umjetnosti. No, egalitarni estetski režim u pitanje dovodi i izdvojenost umjetnosti od ostalih formi života i djelovanja, stoga je, naizgled paradoksalno, zahtjev za autonomijom umjetnosti (u maniri svih putova popločanih dobrim namjerama) put ka propasti te autonomije. Kao i jednakost, i autonomija je zahtjev i osnovno polazište koje je potrebno braniti.

Riječ-dvije o kapitalu umjesto zaključka

U eseju „Production and distribution of the Common. A few questions for the Artist“ Michael Hardt Rancièreovu paralelizmu estetskog i političkog priključuje i ekonomski aspekt, prožimajući međuodnose politike i estetike s ekonomijom, koju smatra osnovom proizvodnje biopolitičkog. Općenito uzevši, forme ekonomske proizvodnje namijenjene su reproduciranju i proizvodnji formi života. Krajnji doseg kapitalističke proizvodnje nije roba, sam kapital nije predmet – već društveni odnosi, te se stoga kapitalistička proizvodnja prepoznaje kao (re)produkcija društvenih odnosa.³⁸ Poveznicu koju Rancière uspostavlja između diobe estetike i politike Hardt širi na ekonomsko pitanje budući da su „sva tri područja – umjetnost, politika i ekonomija stoga povezani zajedničkim i usmjereni ka proizvodnji društvenih odnosa i oblika života“.³⁹

Povezanost ta tri područja i njihova međusobna razmjena modela djelovanja može dovesti i do toga da se vještine i umijeća iz umjetničkih područja prepoznaju unutar ekonomske proizvodnje, što konkretno fleksibilnosti i nestabilnosti pozicije unutar radnog procesa može dati stanovitu auru boemskog šarma, ili, s druge strane, dovesti do zlouporabe umjetničkih taktika u službi kapitala. No čini se da je naličje pomalo idealističke slike o korporativnom preuzimanju modela umjetničkog rada ono koje upućuje na organiziranosti umjetničke radionice kao korporacije ili lobističke

theatre, by a desire to actively include the spectator/perceptor into the artistic process. However, that noble intent has had, as Rancière argues, a numbing background: the presupposed inequality of knowledge and position, as well as superiority of the performer, director, dramaturge, artist, or author in general with regard to the audience that must be educated and activated. Performance or artwork, interpreted more broadly, is not the transfer of knowledge or spirit from the artist to the spectator. It is “a third thing, to which both parts can refer but which prevents any kind of ‘equal’ or ‘undistorted’ transmission... identity of the cause and the effect.”³³

What artistic activity promotes and checks does not mean acting in some sort of power, embodied as a collective. Collective can be read directly from the lecture and understood as a temporary community, gathered around a theatre performance or, more broadly, as a happy community of active and informed individuals. Every artwork or artistic activity, keeping in mind that there are no privileged media or starting points, questions “the capacity of the anonymous, the capacity that makes anybody equal to everybody. This capacity works through unpredictable and irreducible distances. It works through an unpredictable and irreducible play of associations and dissociations.”³⁴ It is in the power of associations and disassociations that the emancipation of the spectator resides, the emancipation of all of us: we all learn

and teach, as the ones who link in each moment what they see with what they have seen and told, done and dreamed.³⁵ In his succinct presentation of the basic forms of artistic activity today,³⁶ Rancière has singled out the total artwork and the hybrid forms, which present the two faces of the same medal. The borders between the media are crossed either by a overdimensioned artistic ego or by a strategy of intensifying the impact of the performance by overstepping the limits and confusing the roles.³⁷ But there is also a *third way* that, in a reverse order, prefers telling a story, reading a book, or watching a picture to the theatre and the theatrical, to which other forms could tend in terms of hybridism and totality of dumbness. Thus, the spectators are no longer phantoms of active participants, but genuinely active interpreters who, by appropriating the “story”, create their own translation and version.

In the context of artistic practices, regardless of whether they include only a narrow circle of co-authors or a broader community (local or imaginary), the starting position of equality supposes an important precondition; not only for realizing the joint work, but also for its live-giving reception: it is only then that all agents can become collaborators and all spectators – collocutors. In art, the aesthetic regime of dividing the sensory, which is comprised of the totality of human experiences and creations, presupposes the equality of forms, subjects, and genres, thus introducing

agencije, i nešto je bliže istini. Takav način ustrojstva, koji podrazumijeva anonimni zajednički rad skriven iza *branda* autora, začeti u Warholovoj *Tvornici*, a danas najvidljiviji u pogonima Takashia Murakamia, Damiena Hirsta ili Jeffa Koonsa, teško da predstavlja politički privlačan model. Relacijske estetike, koje se hrane socijalnim kapitalom i koje se mimikriraju unutar suradničkih i participatornih izvedbi, donedavno su puno bolje kotirale. Upravo je stoga važno pitanje koje Hardt postavlja pred umjetnike: kakve se mogućnosti umjetnosti otvaraju u biopolitičkom kontekstu priznavanjem da i umjetničko i političko djeluju u raspodjeli i generiranju zajedničkih oblika života? Daje li takav odnos umjetnicima sredstva da se uključe u političke borbe današnjice i obranu zajedničkog, za njegovu jednaku distribuciju? Na koji se način umjetnički talenti i vještine mogu usmjeriti prema demokratskom projektu obrane, produkcije i distribucije zajedničkog?⁴⁰

Sa strukturnom negacijom jedinstvenog autorstva, kolektivni i kolaborativni radovi, akcije, intervencije, a ponekad i djela, pokraj djelovanja, mogu se gotovo formalno postaviti kao autorski predložak. Ne iznenađuje velika zastupljenost umjetničkih kolektiva i samoorganizacija u političkim akcijama. Čak i kada radikalno odbacuje političko, zajedničko djelovanje, bilo međusobno ili interdisciplinarno, nosi jezgru političkoga. U takvim se slučajevima može govoriti gotovo o preziru spram, kako ga Nancy naziva,

trivijalnog pitanja o „umjetnosti i društvu“ i drugačijem promišljanju onoga što možemo smatrati „kritičkom umjetnošću“.⁴¹

Kakvo je mjesto umjetničke suradnje u tom kontekstu, ako se ona, prema Johnu Robertsu, shvati kao kulturalna forma kroz koju se odigrava estetska kritika vrijednosti-forme i alternativna primjena tehnologije?

Ako je suradnja u umjetnosti dio zajedničke borbe protiv kapitalističke vrijednosti-forme, zbog čega se ta aktivnost može nazvati umjetnošću a ne, primjerice, politikom? Nadalje, da li je suradnja esencijalno postautonomno stanje? Da li je ona sredstvo pomoću kojeg umjetnost može raspliniti svoju uporabnu vrijednost u svakodnevno djelovanje?⁴²

Ono što kolaborativna praksa donosi u kritiku forme vrijednosti je, stoga, prostor zajedničkog otpora, čak i pri „asocijalnosti“ u djelovanjima i iskustvima umjetnosti. Umjetnost se, pod uvjetima kapitalizma, treba braniti kao umjetnost, kao drugo spram ne-estetskog rezoniranja, kako bi se oduprla potpunoj instrumentalizaciji. U prevladavajućim uvjetima proizvodnje, spoj umjetničke i socijalne tehnike će, posljedično, po sebi biti kontradiktoran i razlomljen proces.⁴³ Vratimo li se tu samosvojnosti umjetnosti, kako je predstavlja Rancière, i prijetnji izoliranosti umjetnosti od njezine autonomije, možda ćemo suradnju moći pročitati i kao prvotni konsenzus koji se veže uz neku privremenu zajednicu. Kasnije djelovanje i postupci to mogu dovesti u sumnju,

the autonomy of art. But an egalitarian aesthetic regime also questions the separation of art from other forms of life and activity, and therefore, paradoxically as it may seem, the demand for the autonomy of art is (in the manner of all roads paved with good intentions) a road to the defeat of that autonomy. Same as equality, autonomy is a demand and a starting point that needs defending.

A Word or Two on Capital: Instead of the Conclusion

In his essay on the “Production and Distribution of the Common. A Few Questions for the Artist,” Michael Hardt has added an economic aspect to Rancière’s parallelism of the aesthetic and the political, fusing the interrelations between politics and aesthetics with economy, which he considers the basis for the production of the biopolitical. Generally speaking, the forms of economic production are intended for reproducing and producing forms of life. The final goal of capitalist production is not the commodity, and its object is not capital as such – but rather social relations – so that capitalist production is recognized as the (re)production of social relations.³⁸ The connection that Rancière has established between distribution in aesthetics and politics, Hardt has extended to the question of economy, since “all three domains – art, politics and economics – are thus linked via the common and oriented towards the production of social relations and forms of life.”³⁹

The connection between these three domains and their mutual exchange of models for action can also lead to a situation where skills and insights from artistic fields can be recognized within economic production, which would supply the flexibility and instability within the working process with a certain aura of bohemian charm or, again, bring about the misuse of artistic strategies in the service of capital. And yet it seems that the reverse of the somewhat idealistic picture about the corporate adoption of the model of artistic work is what points to the organization of artistic workshop as a corporation or a lobbying agency, and that may come somewhat nearer to the truth. Such a mode of organization, which presupposes anonymous joint work hidden behind the brand of an author, a model conceived at Warhol’s *Factory* and today most visible in the workshops of Takashi Murakami, Damien Hirst, or Jeff Koons, hardly seems politically attractive. Relational aesthetics, which feed on the social capital and are camouflaged among collaborative and participatory performances, were far more popular until recently. It is precisely therefore that Hardt’s question, with which he approaches the artists, is important: What possibilities are opened in the biopolitical context by the recognition that artistic practice and political action are both engaged in the production and distribution of the common? Does this relation provide a means for artists to participate in the many contemporary political

poput gloženja oko autorskih prava nekadašnjih preziratelja diktata individualnog autorstva, ali ostaje trag ili barem sjećanje na pokušaj uspostave strategija otpora i autonomije.

¹ Nastavljači te tradicije su danas, primjenjujući ogoljenu taktiku Warholove *Tvornice*, koja je kolaborativno autorstvo posredovala osobnošću i profilom jednog autora, superzvijezde poput Jeffa Koonsa, Damiena Hirsta, Takashia Murakamia. Suradnja na toj osnovi – rad na ugovor u studiju – koegzistira s identitetom postwarholovskog umjetnika kao urednika/prisvajača/menadžera ideja. Vidi: John Roberts, „Collaboration as a Problem of Art's cultural form“, *Third Text*, 18 (2004.), 6, 558.

² Angelika Nollert, „Art is life, life is art“, *Kollektive Kreativität*, Kunsthalle Fridericianum, Kassel, 2005., 26.

³ Bilj. 1, 559.

⁴ Vjerojatno najpoznatiji hrvatski kolektivni umjetnički pokušaj – EXAT 51, svoj je program temeljio na tradiciji konstruktivizma i u skladu s avangardističkim idejama zahtijevao ukidanje distinkcije umjetnosti i svakodnevnog života.

⁵ Izraz je prilično uspješno uveo u optičaj škotski umjetnik Douglas Gordon, vidi: Claire Bishop, *Participation*, MIT Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 2006., 6.

⁶ Usp. *Third Text*, 18 (2004.), 6; *Kollektive Kreativität*, Kunsthalle Fridericianum, Kassel, 2005.; Johanna Billing, Maria Lind i Lars Nilsson (ur.), *Taking the matter into common hands*, Black dog publishing, 2007.; Charles Green, *The third hand: collaboration in art from Conceptualism to Postmodernism*, Minnesota University Press, 2001.

⁷ Irit Rogoff je u tekstu „Production lines“ zanimljivo primijetila kako se procesom historiziranja kolektivnog umjetničkog djelovanja nastoji izvući figuru genija, nositelja pravog duha grupe ili pokreta. Usp. Irit Rogoff, *Production lines*, 2005., izvor: www.collabarts.org/?p=69 [30.4.2010.].

⁸ Vidi: Una Bauer, *Crvena nit kolaboracije* (razgovor s kustoskim kolektivom WHW), izvor: www.kulturpunkt.hr/i/kulturoskop/417/ [6.5.2010.].

⁹ David Barrett, *Co-operating then and now*, 2006., izvor: www.collabarts.org/?p=59 [6.5.2010.].

¹⁰ Nikos Papastergiadis, *The global need for collaboration*, 2008., www.collabarts.org/?p=201 [6.5.2010.].

¹¹ Stephen Wright, „The Delicate Essence of Artistic Collaboration“, *Third Text*, 18 (2004.), 6, 543.

¹² *Ibid.*, 541.

¹³ *Ivi.*

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 545.

¹⁵ Jean-Luc Nancy, *Dva ogleđa*, Tomislav Medak (prev.), Multimedijalni institut, Zagreb, 2003., 102.

¹⁶ Jean-Luc Nancy, *Being singular plural*, Stanford University Press, 2000., XVI.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 55.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 56.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 61.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 63.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 64.

²² *Ivi.*

²³ Bilj. 6, Maria Lind, nav. dj., 16.

²⁴ Bilj. 2, 26.

²⁵ Bilj. 1, 557.

²⁶ Bilj. 15, 105.

²⁷ *Ibid.*, 116.

²⁸ *Ivi.*

²⁹ Usp. Jacques Rancière, *Učitelj nezalica*, Leonardo Kovačević (prev.), Multimedijalni institut, Zagreb, 2010.

³⁰ Jacques Rancière, *Emancipovani gledalac*, Edicija Jugoslavija, Beograd, 2010., 5.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 18.

³² *Ibid.*, 19.

struggles in defence of the common, for an equitable distribution of the common? What are the ways in which artistic talents and skills can be channelled towards the democratic project of defending, producing, and distributing the common?⁴⁰

With the structural negation of unique authorship, collective and collaborative artworks, actions, interventions, and even acts, besides actions, can be almost formally established as an artistic matrix. It is not surprising that there are many artistic collectives and self-organizations present in political actions. Even if radically rejecting the political aspect, joint action, be it mutual or interdisciplinary, does have a political core. In such cases, one can almost speak of despising the trivial question, as Nancy calls it, of “art and society” and a different reflection on what we might consider “critical art.”⁴¹

What is the place of artistic collaboration in that context, if it is understood, following John Roberts, as a cultural form through which the aesthetic criticism of value-form and the alternative application of technology are taking place?

If collaboration in art is part of the common struggle against the capitalist value-form, then why should this activity be called art rather than, let's say, politics? Furthermore, is collaboration an essentially post-autonomous condition? Is it the means by which art is able to dissolve its use-values into everyday practice?⁴² “What collaborative practice brings to the critique of the value-

form, then, is a space of collective resistance, even ‘asociality’ to the interventions and experience of art. Under conditions of capitalist administration, paradoxically, art needs to defend itself as art, as other to non-aesthetic reason, in order to resist its complete instrumentalisation. Under prevailing relations of production, the meeting of artistic technique and social technique, consequently, will itself be a contradictory and fractured process.”⁴³ But if we go back to the autonomy of art as presented by Rancière, and to the threat of isolating art from its autonomy, we might also interpret collaboration as the original consensus linked to a temporary community. Later activities and actions might cast some doubt on that, such as the copyright bickering of those who used to despise the dictate of individual authorship, but there will be traces or at least memories of an attempt at establishing strategies of resistance and autonomy.

¹ Some of the followers of that tradition, who apply a more straightforward version of the strategy of Warhol's *Factory*, which mediated collaborative authorship through the personality and profile of a single artist, are superstars such as Jeff Koons, Damien Hirst, or Takashi Murakami. Collaboration on that level – working at the studio on contract – coexists with the identity of the post-Warholian artist as an editor/appropriator/menager of ideas. Cf. John Roberts, “Collaboration as a Problem of Art's Cultural Form,” *Third Text* 18 (2004), pp. 6 and 558.

² Angelika Nollert, “Art is life, life is art,” in: *Kollektive Kreativität* (Kassel: Kunsthalle Fridericianum, 2005), p. 26.

³³ Ibid., 22.³⁴ Ibid., 26.³⁵ Ivi.³⁶ Iako je riječ o teatru, terminologija je primjenjiva i na vizualne umjetnosti, posebno u njihovim hibridnim formama, koje nerijetko imaju elemente privremeno ispraznjenih kulisa.³⁷ Ibid., 32.³⁸ Michael Hardt, Few questions for the artist, izvor: www.skor.nl/article-4111-nl.html?lang=en [30.4.2010.].³⁹ Isto.⁴⁰ Isto.⁴¹ Bilj. 15, 99.⁴² Bilj. 1, 563.⁴³ Ibid., 564.³ As n. 1, p. 559.⁴ Probably the most famous of all collective artistic projects in Croatia – EXAT 51 – based its programme on the tradition of constructivism, and in accordance with the avant-garde ideas demanded the abolition of the distinction between art and everyday life.⁵ This term was rather successfully introduced by Scottish artist Douglas Gordon, cf. Claire Bishop, *Participation* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2006), p. 6.⁶ Cf. *Third Text* 18 (2004), p. 6; *Kollektive kreativität* (Kassel: Kunsthalle Fridericianum, 2005); Johanna Billing, Maria Lind, and Lars Nilsson (eds.), *Taking the Matter into Common Hands* (London: Black Dog Publishing, 2007); Charles Green, *The Third Hand: Collaboration in Art from Conceptualism to Postmodernism* (Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press, 2001).⁷ In her text on "Production Lines," Irit Rogoff has interestingly observed that the process of historicizing collective artistic activity has the aim of extracting the figure of the genius, the carrier of the true spirit of the group or movement. Cf. Irit Rogoff, "Production Lines" (2005), source: www.collabarts.org/?p=69 (last accessed on 30 April 2010).⁸ Cf. Una Bauer, Crvena nit kolaboracije [The red thread of collaboration] (interview with the curators' collective WHW), source: www.kulturpunkt.hr/i/kulturoskop/417/ (last accessed on 6 May 2010).⁹ David Barrett, "Co-operating Then and Now" (2006), source: www.collabarts.org/?p=59 (last accessed on 6 May 2010).¹⁰ Nikos Papastergiadis, "The Global Need for Collaboration" (2008), source: www.collabarts.org/?p=201 (last accessed on 6 May 2010).¹¹ Stephen Wright, "The Delicate Essence of Artistic Collaboration," *Third Text* 18 (2004), pp. 6 and 543.¹² Ibid., p. 544.¹³ Ibidem.¹⁴ Ibid., p. 545.¹⁵ Jean-Luc Nancy, *Being Singular Plural*, transl. by Robert D. Richardson and Anne E. O'Byrne (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2000), p. 57.¹⁶ Ibid., p. XVI.¹⁷ Ibid., p. 55.¹⁸ Ibid., p. 56.¹⁹ Ibid., p. 8.²⁰ Ibid., p. 11.²¹ Ibidem.²² Ibid., 12.²³ As in n. 6, Maria Lind, op. cit., p. 16.²⁴ As in n. 2, p. 26.²⁵ As in n. 1, p. 557.²⁶ As in n. 15, p. 62.²⁷ Ibid., p. 74.²⁸ Ibid., p. 75.²⁹ Cf. Jacques Rancière, "The Emancipated Spectator," *ArtForum* (March, 2007), pp. 271-80.³⁰ Ibid., p. 272.³¹ Ibid., 277.³² Ibidem.³³ Ibid, 278.³⁴ Ibid., 279.³⁵ Ibidem.³⁶ Even though he refers to the theatre, his terminology is applicable to the visual arts as well, especially in their hybrid forms, which often have elements of a temporarily emptied stage.³⁷ Ibid., 280.³⁸ Michael Hardt, "Few Questions for the Artist," source: www.skor.nl/article-4111-nl.html?lang=en (last accessed on 30 April 2010).³⁹ Ibidem.⁴⁰ Ibidem.⁴¹ As in n. 15, p. 55.⁴² As in n. 1, p. 563.⁴³ Ibidem, p. 564.