

**NOVIJA POVIJEST POVIJESTI
UMJETNOSTI U HRVATSKOJ
I SUVREMENA KRIZA
INSTITUCIJA**

LJILJANA
KOLEŠNIK

**KULTURA
JE POTREBNA
NE LUKSUZ**

**THE RECENT HISTORY OF
ART HISTORY IN CROATIA
AND CONTEMPORARY
INSTITUTIONAL CRISIS**

Krajem 2012. godine osnovan je pri Institutu za povijest umjetnosti u Zagrebu Regionalni centar za kulturu, umjetnost i nove medije. Početak njegova rada obilježen je održavanjem međunarodnoga panela *Art History and Humanities in the Region – Present State-of-art and Perspectives in Education and Research* posvećenog razmatranju aktualne pozicije povijesti umjetnosti unutar kompleksa humanističkih znanosti Jugoistočne Europe, razgovoru o njezinoj metodologiji, institucionalnoj organizaciji i vidljivosti unutar europske akademske scene. Tekstovi objavljeni u ovom broju *Života umjetnosti* nastavak su tada započetih rasprava, koje su, osim (očekivane) podudarnosti suvremenih povijesnoumjetničkih praksi i nesumnjive potrebe za suradnjom, pokazale i određene razlike s obzirom na moguće teme i metode zajedničkih istraživanja.

Spomenute razlike posljedica su činjenice da pojam Jugoistočne Europe¹ obuhvaća zemlje s vrlo različitim lokalnim tradicijama povijesti umjetnosti i s različitim istraživačkim prioritetima kondicioniranim nizom kulturno-historijskih i političkih okolnosti, stupnjem razvoja lokalne institucionalne infrastrukture discipline (broj fakultetskih odsjeka i istraživačkih instituta, broj i vrsta specijaliziranih časopisa, arhiva, studijskih zbirki i profesionalnih udruženja), kao i teorijsko-metodološkim polazištima na kojima određena sredina temelji svoje istraživačke i prezentacijske prakse. Istina je da su u većini zemalja Jugoistočne Europe ta teorijsko-metodološka

Late in 2012, the Regional Centre for Art, Culture and the New Media was founded at the Institute of Art History in Zagreb. Its inauguration included an international panel talk on *Art History and Humanities in the Region – Present State-of-art and Perspectives in Education and Research*, dedicated to reflections on the current position of art history within the complex set of humanities in South-Eastern Europe, including the debate on its methodology, institutional organization, and visibility within the European academy. Articles published in this issue of *Život umjetnosti* build upon the discussions initiated at that time, which demonstrated, besides the (expected) congruences between the contemporary art-historical practices and the unquestionable need of cooperation, that there were also discrepancies regarding the potential topics and methods of joint research.

These discrepancies result from the fact that the term South-Eastern Europe¹ includes countries with very different local art-historical traditions and different research priorities, determined by a whole range of cultural-historical and political circumstances, the level of development of the local institutional infrastructure in our discipline (the number of university departments and research institutes, as well as the number and type of specialized journals, archives, research collections, and professional organizations), and the theoretical and methodological starting points on which a particular community based its practices of investigation and presentation. To be sure, in most countries of South-Eastern Europe these theoretical and

polazišta u razdoblju ustanovljavanja povijesti umjetnosti kao znanstvene discipline bila gotovo identična te da upućuju na analitičku aparaturu Bečke škole povijesti umjetnosti, kao zajednički konceptualni okvir regionalnih povijesnoumjetničkih praksi. No njihove lokalne specifičnosti i relativno male međusobne razlike postale su nakon Drugog svjetskog rata stvar prošlosti. Radikalnom rekonfiguracijom disciplinarnoga polja povijesti umjetnosti po kriteriju ideološki poželjnih ciljeva znanstvenih istraživanja, u zemljama koje su između sredine 1940-ih i početka 1950-ih godina priključene Istočnom bloku, ali i promjenama i preslagivanjima teorijskoga okvira lokalnih, zapadnoeuropskih disciplinarnih praksi koje su se otvorile snažnijem utjecaju britanske i francuske povijesnoumjetničke scene, tradicionalne, predratne veze između europskih akademskih zajednica, posebice onih iz Srednje i Jugoistočne Europe, znatno su modificirane, a u nekim slučajevima i posve prekinute. Ista ona restriktivna kulturna politika, koja je od kraja 1920-ih sustavno razarala sovjetsku humanistiku, početkom 50-ih čvrsto je obuhvatila mađarsku, rumunjsku, slovačku, bugarsku i povijest umjetnosti ostalih socijalističkih zemalja, osiromašila njihovu metodološku aparaturu, suzila tematsko polje istraživanja i usmjerila ih prema razdobljima i vrstama umjetničke produkcije koja su mogla zadovoljiti ideološke kriterije novoga društvenog poretka.

Povijest povijesti umjetnosti u sastavnicama bivše socijalističke Jugoslavije puno je bliža – doduše, tek od sredine 50-ih godina – pripovijesti o poslijeratnom razvoju

methodological starting points were almost identical at the time of establishing art history as a scholarly discipline, owing to the fact that they inherited the analytical apparatus of the Vienna School of Art History as their common conceptual framework for regional art-historical practices. But by the time following the World War II even their local specificities and relatively minor differences had become a thing of the past. With a radical reconfiguration of art history in countries included in the Eastern Bloc between the mid 1940s and the early-1950s, in terms of ideologically desirable goals of scholarly research, and with the change and restructuring in the theoretical framework of Western European disciplinary practices, increasingly opening towards the influence of British and French art-historical scenes, the traditional, pre-war links between various academic communities of Europe, especially those of Central and South-Eastern Europe, were considerably altered, in some cases even interrupted. The same restrictive cultural policy that had been systematically ruining the Soviet humanities since the late 1920s, was now, in the early 1950s, getting into its firm grip the art histories of Hungary, Romania, Slovakia, Bulgaria, and other socialist countries, impoverishing their methodological apparatuses, narrowing and directing their fields of research towards those periods and types of artistic production that would comply to the ideological criteria of the new regime.

The history of art history in the constituent republics of the former socialist Yugoslavia is much closer – albeit only from the mid-1950s – to the story of the

discipline u bilo kojoj zapadnoeuropskoj sredini, negoli njezinoj sudbini unutar zemalja „narodne demokracije“. Razloge treba potražiti kako u jugoslavenskoj (relativno) liberalnijoj kulturnoj politici, u ranom etabliranju moderne/suvremene umjetnosti na poziciji reprezentativnog izraza modernosti jugoslavenskog društva, tako i u već postojećem, uvjerljivom institucionalnom okviru discipline (fakultetski odsjeci, a potom i instituti za povijest umjetnosti u Zagrebu, Ljubljani i Beogradu, akademije likovnih i primijenjenih umjetnosti, specijalizirana stručna glasila, republička i savezna udruženja umjetnika, arhitekata i dizajnera, itd.), ali i u njezinoj profesionalnoj raslojenosti na agilnu akademsku scenu, angažiranu likovnu kritiku i kvalitetan kustoski kadar, kao i u solidnom broju muzeja i galerija, koji se vremenom povećao kako bi mogao podržati intenzivnu kulturnu razmjenu s inozemstvom² i prezentaciju još intenzivnije umjetničke proizvodnje. Budući da se produkcija svake nacionalne zajednice oslanjala na njezinu vlastitu kulturnu i znanstveno-istaživačku tradiciju, teorijsko-metodološki okvir struke razlikovao se od sredine do sredine. Tako je srpska povijest umjetnosti našla svoja uporišta unutar francuskoga kulturnog kruga, dok su slovenska i hrvatska akademska scena ostale predane Bečkoj školi povijesti umjetnosti, nadopunjavajući tijekom 50-ih i 60-ih godina svoju disciplinarnu praksu – kao i njihove kolege iz Srbije – uvidima i analitičkim alatima suvremene britanske, francuske i talijanske povijesti, sociologije, teorije umjetnosti, semiotike i strukturalizma.³

Uz metodološku heterogenost, postupno uključivanje u međunarodna kretanja,⁴

post-war evolution of the discipline in various Western-European contexts than to its fate in the countries of “popular democracy.” Reasons should be sought both in the (relatively) liberal cultural policy of Yugoslavia, with the early establishment of modern/contemporary art as a representative expression of modernity of the Yugoslav society, and in the already well-established and credible institutional framework of the art-historical discipline (university departments and then also institutes for art history in Zagreb, Ljubljana, and Belgrade, academies of fine and applied arts, specialized periodicals, republic and federal associations of architects, artists, and designers, and so on). An additional reason may be sought in the internal stratification of the discipline into an agile academic scene, engaged art criticism, and high-quality curatorial staff, as well as a solid number of museums and galleries, which was increasing with time in order to support the intense cultural exchange with other countries² and the presentation of the even more intense artistic production. Since the production of each national community was relying on its own cultural and scholarly tradition, the theoretical and methodological framework differed from one setting to another. Thus Serbian art history found its reference points within the French cultural circles, while Slovenian and Croatian academic scenes remained loyal to the Vienna School of Art History, complementing their disciplinary practices during the 1950s and 1960s – similarly to their fellow researchers in Serbia – with insights and analytical tools borrowed from the contemporary British, French, and Italian theory, sociology and history of art, semiotics, and structuralism.³

poslijeratnu povijest umjetnosti obilježilo je i uspostavljanje specifičnog oblika sinergije između akademske, umjetničke i kustoske zajednice, što je znatno pridonijelo vitalnosti i samosvijesti discipline. Njezin rezultat bio je razvoj novih znanstvenih modela – ponajprije onih kojima su otvorene nove perspektive u zaštiti kulturne baštine i definirane nove metode istraživanja, mišljenja i organizacije urbanog prostora⁵ – kao i sposobnost promptnoga odgovora na suvremene društvene potrebe. Tako je već 1967. godine, na inicijativu prof. dr. Vere Horvat Pintarić, voditeljice katedre za teoriju umjetnosti, osnovana pri Odsjeku za povijest umjetnosti Filozofskog fakulteta u Zagrebu – tada nesumnjivo središnjoj lokaciji suvremenog podučavanja i proučavanja umjetnosti u Regiji – Katedra za vizualne komunikacije,⁶ koja je predmetno polje discipline proširila u smjeru izučavanja vizualne semantike masovnih medija (televizija),⁷ popularno-kulturnih fenomena (strip, ulični grafiti, grafički dizajn plakata i popularnih magazina), kao i prema novim metodama vizualne analize. Pokretanje Katedre za vizualne komunikacije, svojevrsne prethodnice današnjih studija vizualne kulture, bilo je vezano i uz specifičnu atmosferu otvorenosti i kozmopolitizma stvorenu radom međunarodnoga pokreta Novih tendencija, aktivnog u zagrebačkoj sredini između 1961. i početka 70-ih godina, koji se upravo tih godina usmjerio kompjuterski podržanim vizualnim istraživanjima i utemeljio kao nulta točka razvoja novomedijske umjetnosti u Jugoistočnoj Europi. Sinergija između znanosti i suvremene umjetnosti, kao i iskorak akademske zajednice prema širenju predmetnoga

Besides this methodological heterogeneity and gradual incorporation into the international trends,⁴ the post-war art history was marked by the emergence of a specific form of synergy between the academic, artistic, and curatorial communities, which contributed considerably to its vitality and self-confidence. This resulted in the development of new research models – primarily those that opened up new perspectives in the conservation and protection of cultural heritage and defined new methods for researching, thinking, and organizing urban space⁵ – as well as in the ability of art historical community to promptly respond to the contemporary social needs. Thus it was as early as 1967, at the initiative of Prof. Dr. Vera Horvat Pinatrić, Head of the Department of Art History, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Zagreb – methodologically most advanced art history department in the Region at the time – that the Cathedra of Visual Communications and Graphic Design was founded,⁶ expanding the research field of art history in the direction of visual semantics of the mass media (television)⁷ and popular culture (comics, graffiti, graphic design of posters and popular magazines), as well as towards the new methods of visual analysis. Launching the research in Visual Communications, conceptualised as a sort of predecessor to today's Visual Culture Studies, was also linked to the specific climate of openness and cosmopolitanism created by the activities of the international art movement New Tendencies, active in Zagreb from 1961 until the early 1970s, which made its turn towards computer-supported visual research between 1967 and 1969, forming thus the platform for further development of new-media art in South-Eastern

polja discipline, bila je i posljedica slobodnog kolanja informacija, ljudi i ideja, koje je hrvatsku/jugoslavensku kulturnu scenu izravno uključilo u globalnu kulturu modernizma. Specifičnost njezina društvenog (ideološkog i političkog) konteksta pritom se podjednako reflektirala utopijsko-projektivnim karakterom određenih likovnih fenomena, kao i aktivističkom prirodom intervencija u polje opće i vizualne kulture društva, kakvu tih godina susrećemo i u načinima promišljanja umjetničkih potencijala novih slikovnih medija (televizija, video, kompjuter). U pozadini toga aktivističkoga bria nalazila se, međutim, određena napetost između dominantnog poimanja kulture, koje u kontekstu poslijeratnih socijalističkih društava denotira „visoku kulturu”,⁸ i nastojanja da se ona učini dostupnom (razumljivom) najširem krugu korisnika.⁹ Prodor popularne kulture sredinom 60-ih godina, shvaćen kao izravno ugrožavanje takvih napora, ponovno je otvorio pitanje društvene uloge umjetnosti i postavio ga kao urgentan problem jugoslavenske kulturne politike. Rasprave o tom problemu, što su se u različitim formama odvijale u prostoru javnih medija i trajale sve do sredine 70-ih godina, obuhvatile su ne samo pokušaj povijesnoumjetničkih objašnjenja određenih segmenata popularne vizualne kulture, nego i niz drugih pitanja – od odnosa umjetnosti i kiča, preko odnosa umjetnosti i politike, do (reevaluacije) avangarde i razmatranja njezine relacije prema totalitarnim ideologijama. Potonja tema nalazila se u izravnoj korelaciji s tadašnjim političkim zbivanjima, pa iako je indicirala novi smjer u istraživanjima i interpretaciji moderne umjetnosti, a tematski bila bliska interesima

Europe. This synergy between science and contemporary art, as well as the fact that the academic community made a step forward in extending the subject-field of the discipline, was also a consequence of the free circulation of information, people, and ideas, which helped include the Croatian/Yugoslav cultural scene directly into the global culture of modernity. The specificity of its social (ideological and political) context was thereby equally mirrored in the utopian-projective character of certain visual phenomena and in the activist nature of interventions in the field of general and visual culture, which was also reflected in the theoretical explanations of new visual media (television, video, computers) and their supposed, positive influence on the social transformation of the society. In the background of that activist fervour there was, however, a sort of tension between the dominant understanding of culture, which in the context of post-war socialist societies denoted “high culture,”⁸ and the efforts to make it accessible (intelligible) for a widest audience.⁹ The breakthrough of popular culture in the 1960s was understood as a direct threat to these efforts, and reopened the issue of the social role of art as the most urgent problem of Yugoslav cultural policy. Discussions on that matter, which had various forms and took place in the public media, lasted until the mid-1970s and included not only attempts at offering art-historical explanations for particular segments of popular visual culture, but also a series of other questions, such as the relationship between art and kitsch, between art and politics, or the re-evaluation of the avant-garde and reflections on its relations to totalitarian ideologies. The latter topic was an immediate reflection of the

nove generacije suvremenih umjetnika, „nevidljivost“ njihove produkcije iz perspektive dominantnoga diskursa povijesti umjetnosti, a unatoč njezinoj relativnoj otvorenosti za širok raspon vizualnih fenomena, bila je ozbiljan – iako ne jedini – simptom krize discipline. Umjesto pikturnog/plastičkog univerzuma umjetničkog djela, njezin formalističko analitički aparat našao se pred tipom umjetničkog iskaza koji ne samo da se nije mogao primjeriti nijednom od uobičajenih objekata njegove analize, nego je negirao i sam pojam umjetnosti iz kojega je taj aparat iznikao.

Promjena u pojmu umjetnosti promijenila je i prirodu likovne kritike, rekonfigurirala poziciju i ulogu kustosa i potaknula raslojavanje unutar discipline. Psiho-socijalna, postrevolucionarna konstrukcija historijskog vremena, što je u prethodnom razdoblju osiguravala lakoću prelaženja iz područja kompetencije za probleme ranijih stilskih razdoblja u polje moderne/suvremene umjetnosti, rastakala se zajedno s rasapom kulture modernizma, a zajedno s njom i sinergija između suvremene umjetnosti i znanosti, pa se od početka 70-ih godina nadalje takvo, slobodno kretanje niz dijakronijske osi umjetnosti zbiva znatno rjeđe (osim u slučaju arhitekture i dizajna) i vezuje samo uz onaj dio aktualne produkcije koja pristaje uz klasične umjetničke medije/vrijednosti ili uz muzejske prezentacije međuratnoga modernizma. Drugim riječima, granice između stilskih razdoblja postaju jasnije i čvršće, a akademski diskurs sve se više udaljava od suvremenih društvenih zbivanja i suvremene likovne scene – jednog od glavnih izvora njegove metodološke i teorijske vitalnosti.

political events of the time, also indicating a new direction art history was taking in research and interpretation of modern art. Although it was thematically rather close to the interests of a new and rebellious generation of contemporary conceptual artists, their art production was, and will remain “invisible” from the perspective of the dominant academic discourse, despite its increasing receptivity to a wider range of visual phenomena. Its troubled relation to conceptual art was an obvious – albeit not the only – indication that the history of art in Croatia has entered – for the first time after the WWII, excluding the consolidation period (1950–1954) – a period of crisis: instead of the pictorial/plastic universe of the traditional artwork, it was now – at the beginning of the 1970s – facing artist statements rejecting the very notion of art that provided a foundation for all available, traditional analytic tools and methods of the discipline. This shift in the notion of art also changed the nature of art criticism, reconfigured the curatorial position and its role in the presentation of art triggering internal divisions within the discipline. The psycho-social, post-revolutionary construct of historical time, which had in the preceding period facilitated the passage from the earlier stylistic periods to that of modern/contemporary art was now dissolving along with the demise of the culture of modernism. The same was happening with the synergy between contemporary art and science, so that from the early 1970s onwards such free diachronic movement of disciplinary discourse along the temporal axis of art history was becoming almost exclusively associated with actual art production

Početak 1980-ih, u trenutku sraza između neproblematičnih, eklektičnih manifestacija postmodernizma i radikalnih, kritičkih praksi postkonceptualne umjetnosti (retroavangarda), neobično mlaka i – ustvari – vrlo konzervativna reakcija akademske zajednice bjelodano je pokazala kako je razdoblje u kojem je i znanstvena scena predano i agilno zagovarala progresivna umjetnička stajališta – prošlo.¹⁰ Iako hrvatska postkonceptualna scena možda i nije imala integrativni potencijal, kakav se mogao susresti u Sloveniji, u krugu kulturnih radnika okupljenih oko fenomena *Neue Slowenische Kunst*, što je iznjedrio čitavu skupinu međunarodno priznatih povjesničara, kustosa i teoretičara umjetnosti iz te sredine (Aleš Erjavec, Marina Gržinić, Zdenka Badovinac, Igor Zabel), njihovi pandani u hrvatskom kontekstu (Želimir Košćević, Davor Matičević, Marijan Susovski, Branka Stipančić) nisu, za razliku od svojih slovenskih, ali i srpskih kolega (Ješa Denegri, Miško Šuvaković, Lidija Merenik), našli mjesto u akademskim strukturama discipline. No tad je već bilo jasno, a naredna desetljeća samo su potvrdila takvu predodžbu, da objašnjenja važna za razumijevanje suvremene umjetnosti nastaju na različitim lokacijama i ne više nužno unutar akademske zajednice.

Događaji koji su uslijedili krajem prošlog i početkom ovoga stoljeća – Domovinski rat, proces tranzicije i njime potaknuto ubrzano raslojavanje postsocijalističkoga hrvatskog društva, izrazita politizacija tradicionalne institucionalne infrastrukture svijeta umjetnosti i samoga procesa uspostave nacionalnih likovnih scena, nagli prodor

pertaining to traditional artistic media/values or to the museum presentations of the interwar modernism. In other words, the boundaries between different stylistic periods had become less permeable, while the academic discourse was increasingly moving away from contemporary social processes and the contemporary scene of visual arts – regardless its positive influence on methodological and theoretical vitality of the discipline. In the early 1980s, at the time of clash between the unproblematic, eclectic manifestations of post-modernism and the radical, critical practices of post-conceptual art (retro-avant-garde), the unusually lenient and, in fact, very conservative reaction of the academic community manifestly showed that the time in which it was enthusiastically and actively endorsing the progressive artistic positions was – over.¹⁰ Even though the Croatian post-conceptual scene may not have had an integrative potential exercised by the phenomenon of *Neue Slowenische Kunst*, which generated a group of art historians, curators, and art critics (Aleš Erjavec, Marina Gržinić, Zdenka Badovinac, Igor Zabel), who were already at the end of 1980s internationally recognized and, same as their Serbian colleagues (Ješa Denegri, Miško Šuvaković, Lidija Merenik), adopted by research institutes and universities, their Croatian counterparts (Želimir Košćević, Davor Matičević, Marijan Susovski, Branka Stipančić) could not find their place in the academic structures. But by that time it had already become clear, and the following decades only confirmed it, that the explanations crucial for understanding Croatian contemporary art will be generated at different locations

novih teorijskih paradigmi (feminističke, poststrukturalističke, neohistoricističke, postkolonijalne) i niz „zaokreta“ unutar disciplinarnog polja povijesti umjetnosti (lingvistički, slikovni, filozofski, globalni) – rezultirali su nesumnjivom, novom krizom struke i njezinom rekonfiguracijom u terminima preraspodjele uloga i omekšavanja granica između institucionalnih i izvaninstitucionalnih povijesnoumjetničkih praksi. Ključnu ulogu u tom procesu odigralo je stvaranje i afirmacija nezavisne kulturne scene krajem 1990-ih godina, koja je otvaranjem prema novim teorijskim paradigmatama preuzela na sebe i važan posao artikulacije odnosa povijesti umjetnosti prema novim naddisciplinarnim područjima istraživanja (kulturalni studiji, studiji vizualne kulture, studiji sjećanja, itd.), a nešto poslije i formulacije njezinih interesa/ mogućih doprinosa aktualnom procesu transformacije humanističkih znanosti. Nove metode produkcije i prezentacije umjetnosti, povezivanja i umrežavanja unutar europske/regionalne/nacionalne nezavisne scene (projekti Clubture, Operacija grad, Pravo na grad, Kooperativa), lokalni akteri nezavisne kulture – kustoski kolektivi (WHW, DeLVe), udruge za promicanje vizualne kulture (Blok, Kontejner), nezavisni instituti (Institut za suvremenu umjetnost, Institut za vizualne studije, Multimedijalni institut MAMA) i njima srodne udruge (Kustoska platforma, Platforma 981, Attack) odigrali su središnju ulogu i u stvaranju preduvjeta za izravno sudjelovanje lokalne zajednice u zbivanjima na suvremenoj teorijskoj i umjetničkoj sceni. Premreženo još i alternativnim oblicima obrazovanja¹¹ – predavanjima, čitalačkim i debatnim grupama,

within the art world and no longer necessarily within the academic community. Events that occurred at the end of the 20th and the beginning of the 21st century – Croatian Liberation War, the process of transition and the ensuing accelerated class division of the post-socialist Croatian society, the outspoken politicization of the traditional institutional infrastructure of art world surrounding the very process of establishing national scenes of visual arts, the sudden inflow of new theoretical paradigms (feminist, post-structuralist, neo-historicist, post-colonial), and a series of “turns” within the disciplinary field of art history (linguistic, visual, philosophical, global) – positively resulted in a new crisis of the profession and in its reconfiguration in terms of redistributing the roles and blurring the borders between institutional and extra-institutional art-historical practices. A key role in that process was played by the creation and affirmation of an independent cultural scene in the late 1990s, which was open for new theoretical paradigms and thus took over the important task of articulating the attitude of art history towards the new, interdisciplinary and multidisciplinary fields of research (cultural studies, studies of visual culture, memory studies, and so on), and somewhat later also the task of formulating its interests and possible contributions to the current process of humanities transformation. With their new method of art production and presentation, of interconnecting and networking within the European/regional/ national independent scene (projects such as Clubture, Operation City, Right to

radionicama, seminarima, kolegijima – intenzivnom izdavačkom djelatnošću,¹² istraživanjima i nizom drugih aktivnosti, područje nezavisne scene tako je postupno postalo najvitalnijim segmentom suvremene kulturne proizvodnje u Hrvatskoj. Fleksibilnost, interdisciplinarnost, inovativnost i osjetljivost na društvene promjene osobine su koje se od sredine 1990-ih rijetko susreću u polju institucionalne kulture. Takva se situacija nužno odrazila i na područje znanosti. Društvene promjene i nesumnjivo preslagivanje prioriteta u drugim humanističkim znanostima do sredine prošloga desetljeća jedva da je dodirnulo sveučilišne kurikulume discipline. Tom činjenicom mogao bi se objasniti i pad interesa studenata za modernu i suvremenu umjetnost na (preskupim) doktorskim studijima, koji bi se – s obzirom na broj i raznovrsnost kolegija s tim temama na nižim razinama akademskog obrazovanja – mogao proširiti i na preddiplomske i diplomatske programe. Ne bi trebalo zanemariti ni inzistiranje EU na projektima cjeloživotnoga učenja i nastojanje da se stvori pravna osnova za formalno priznavanje alternativnih edukacijskih programa, poput onih s nezavisne kulturne scene, u kojima se zadnjih desetak godina razmjenjuju znanja i vještine što ih nije moguće steći na fakultetima. Dodamo li tome i stalno smanjivanje ulaganja u visoko obrazovanje, kao i utjecaj neoliberalne ekonomije, koja je već rastočila tradicionalnu, humanističku koncepciju sveučilišta, slika budućnosti discipline i humanistike u cjelini ne čini se osobito ružičastom. To, naravno, ne znači da će se studijski programi povijesti umjetnosti ugasiti, nego

the City, Cooperative), the local protagonists of independent culture – curatorial collectives (WHW, DeLve), associations for promoting visual culture (Blok, Kontejner), independent institutes (Institute of Contemporary Art, Institute of Visual Studies, Multimedia Institute MAMA), and similar organizations (Curatorial Platform, Platform 981, Attack) – also played a central role in creating the preconditions for direct participation of the local community in the contemporary theoretical and art scene. Interrelated with alternative forms of education¹¹ – lectures, reading and debate groups, workshops, seminars, courses – and intense research, publishing,¹² and a range of other activities, the independent scene gradually became the most vital segment in the Croatian contemporary cultural production.

Flexibility, interdisciplinarity, innovation, and sensitivity for social changes are among the features that could rarely be found in the field of institutional culture after the mid-1990s. This situation necessarily had an impact on academic research and education. Social changes and the unambiguous restructuring of priorities in other humanistic disciplines barely touched the university curricula of art history before the middle of the last decade. That fact could also explain the decreasing interest of students in modern and contemporary art topics at (too expensive) PhD studies, which should be also more extensively present – in terms of number and variety of the offered courses – in BA and MA programmes. One should not neglect the insistence of the EU on lifelong learning projects either, or its efforts invested in creating a legal framework

prije – nužno i neizbježno – transformirati. Iako je od tradicionalne akademske infrastrukture discipline „živa“ još samo veza s muzejskim institucijama, pa negdašnja sinergija s poljem suvremene umjetnosti više ne može potaknuti promjene nalik onima iz 60-ih godina, konačno preslagivanje prioriteta i unutar ove humanističke discipline moglo bi se (i moralo) dogoditi već i zbog kontinuiranog povećavanja količine raznovrsnih vizualno-kulturalnih fenomena koji traže odgovarajuće objašnjenje u terminima i unutar metoda što su (još uvijek) najbliže praksama povijesti umjetnosti. Mislimo, stoga, kako je W. J. T. Mitchell posve u pravu kad, u razgovoru što je također objavljen u ovome broju *Života umjetnosti*,¹³ njezino „prošireno polje“ izjednačava s poljem vizualne kulture, kao što je u pravu i kada tvrdi da se povijest umjetnosti „iskazuje kao nebitna“ upravo onda kad nastoji samu sebe ograničiti. U slučaju lokalne scene, to se ograničavanje već desetljećima manifestira kao ustezanje od teorijskih objašnjenja i kao strah pred mogućim zahtjevom za napuštanjem tradicionalnih analitičkih i interpretacijskih alata struke, dok je – ustvari – samo riječ o tome da ih se, kako kaže Mitchell, „u potpunosti iskoristi“. Za povijesnoumjetničku zajednicu koja ima dugu tradiciju „klasične“ povijesti umjetnosti takav pristup ne bi bio osobit problem kad ne bi podrazumijevao i radikalnu promjenu perspektive iz koje se visoka umjetnost vidi samo kao jedan od diskursa unutar širokoga i prenapućenog polja vizualnih prikaza, unutar kojega je, na primjer, slikarstvo bilo kojega stilskog razdoblja jednako prihvatljiv predmet analize kao i suvremena reklamna kampanja,

for the formal recognition of alternative educational programmes, such as those offered by the independent cultural scene, which have in the past ten years created an opportunity to exchange knowledge and skills that cannot be obtained through the university. If one adds the permanent budget cuts when it comes to university education, or the impact of neoliberal economy, which has already dissolved the traditional, humanistic concept of the university, the future of our discipline does not seem too optimistic.

That, of course, does not mean that the university programmes in art history will be extinguished, but rather radically transformed. Even though the link to museums is the only aspect of the traditional academic infrastructure that is still “alive”, which is why the once present synergy with the field of contemporary art can no longer trigger change as it did in the 1960s, a restructuring of priorities may (and should) eventually happen in this academic discipline as well, if only for the continuous increase in the number of various phenomena of visual culture that demand adequate explanation in terms that are (still) closest to art-historical practices. Therefore W. J. T. Mitchell is perfectly right when, in an interview published in this issue of *Život umjetnosti*,¹³ he identifies the “expanded field” of art history with the field of visual culture, or when he claims that art history “presents itself as unimportant” whenever it is trying to limit its own epistemological capacities. In case of the local Croatian academic scene, this limitation has been manifested in terms of reluctance to theoretical explanations and

dokumentarna fotografija ili sadržajno gotovo neograničen raspon slika iz virtualnog prostora interneta. Takav, „slikovni zaokret“ bez dvojbe bi pridonio epistemološkoj uvjerljivosti discipline, koja pritom ne bi trebala odustati od poučavanja i nekih drugih, „zanatskih“ segmenata struke (kustoske prakse) što su se već dobro izmakli pod okrilje nezavisne kulturne scene.

No trenutačne disciplinarnе i organizacijske probleme povijesti umjetnosti u Hrvatskoj, vrlo slične onima u ostalim zemljama Jugoistočne Europe, nije opravdano svesti samo na relaciju između nefleksibilnoga akademskog *establishmenta* i dinamičnoga područja izvaninstitucionalnih povijesnoumjetničkih praksi. Tako bismo, naime, izgubili iz vida kako najveći, konkretni i aktualni problem povijesti umjetnosti nije promjena uloga ili „omjera snaga“ unutar disciplinarnih granica, nego ozbiljna institucionalna kriza što se iz područja suvremene političke prakse prenijela u polje znanstvene i kulturne proizvodnje. Bez obzira vidimo li je u tradicionalnim terminima usredištenosti u akademski diskurs, ili smo skloniji vizuri iz koje disciplinarna odrednica povijesti umjetnosti pokriva niz usporednih i međusobno različitih narativa što istovremeno nastaju unutar i izvan polja institucionalne kulture, u pozadini obje projekcije nalazi se vrijedna kulturna baština, koja bi trebala biti podjednako dostupna stručnoj i najširoj javnosti. Kad bismo stoga tražili zajednički nazivnik stanja povijesti umjetnosti u Regiji – ili barem u dijelu koji je prije dvadesetak godina pripadao geopolitičkom prostoru socijalističke Jugoslavije – onda bi to bila pravo nepristupačnost važnih kulturnih resursa.

fear of abandoning the traditional tools of analysis and interpretation, while – in fact – the only thing it should do is, as Mitchell says, to “use them in their full capacity.” For an art-historical community with a considerably long tradition of art history as a scientific discipline, such an approach would not be a particular problem if it did not also imply a radical change in perspective, where art is considered as one among the number of discourses within a broad and overpopulated field of visual images, in which, for example, painting from any given stylistic period is just as acceptable object of analysis as it is a contemporary marketing campaign, a documentary photography, or an almost unlimited amount of images from the virtual space of the Internet. Such “visual turn” would undoubtedly contribute to the epistemological credibility of art history, which does not assume giving up other segments of “the craft” (curatorial practice, for example), that have already slipped to a considerable extent into the hands of the independent cultural scene.

However, the current disciplinary and organizational problems of art history in Croatia, rather similar to those in the rest of South-Eastern Europe, cannot be justly reduced to a mere opposition between the non-flexible academic establishment and the dynamic field of extra-institutional art-historical practices. That would mean overlooking the fact that the major, very tangible and urgent problem of art history is not the change of roles or “power relations” within the discipline, but a serious institutional crisis that has been slowly shifting from the field of contemporary political practice into that of

Pritom ne mislimo samo na – istovremeno tužno i skandalozno – obustavljanje rada ključnih kulturnih institucija Bosne i Hercegovine, nego i na godinama nedostupne zbirke središnjih umjetničkih muzeja Srbije, na prepolovljene budžete novoizgrađenih slovenskih muzeja moderne i suvremene umjetnosti, ali i na bojkot javnoga natječaja za ravnatelja zagrebačkoga Muzeja suvremene umjetnosti. Iako su financijski (i kadrovski) problemi u pozadini ove institucionalne krize nesumnjivo realni, njezin pravi uzrok jest specifičan (su)odnos lokalnih političkih i kulturnih elita, što ga uvjerljivo objašnjava Senadin Musabegović u svome prilogu ovome izdanju.¹⁴ Već je posve jasno kako će njezine posljedice zahtijevati dugotrajan i vrlo skup proces sanacije, no s obzirom na stalno smanjivanje sredstava za kulturu i znanost, koje podjednako pogađa i proizvodnju i istraživanje umjetnosti, teško je povjerovati u okončanje ove institucionalne krize u bližoj budućnosti. Naime, preduvjet za to jest radikalna promjena stajališta već spomenutih elita, koje su tijekom posljednjih dvadesetak godina sudjelovale u procesu (političke) rekonfiguracije nacionalnih kulturnih identiteta u Regiji i – u tom smislu – modernu i suvremenu umjetnost učinile nevažnima. Pitanje je – što u međuvremenu učiniti?

Ono nas vraća početnoj primjedbi o zamijećenim razlikama s obzirom na moguće teme i metode zajedničkih istraživanja povjesničara umjetnosti Jugoistočne Europe. Sumarni prikaz poslijeratne povijesti umjetnosti u Hrvatskoj, a dijelom i u ostalim zemljama bivše Jugoslavije, kojim – umjesto klasičnoga uvodnika –

scholarly and cultural production. Regardless of whether one sees it in the traditional terms of its anchorage in the academic discourse, or tends to a vision in which the disciplinary framework of art history includes a series of parallel and different narratives created both within and outside the field of institutional culture, the background of both projections is the possibility to access valuable cultural heritage, which should be at permanent disposal to both experts and the general public. Therefore, if we sought for a common determinant for the situation in the Region – at least in the segment that used to belong to the geopolitical space of socialist Yugoslavia some twenty years ago – then it would be precisely the inaccessibility of important cultural resources.

Thereby we are not referring solely to the – sad and scandalous – closing down of crucial cultural institutions in Bosnia and Herzegovina, but also to the collections in the most important art museums (Museum of Contemporary Art, National Museum) of Serbia that have been inaccessible for years, to the severely cut budgets of recently built Slovenian museums of modern and contemporary art, but also to the boycott of public competition for the position of the Head of the Museum of Contemporary Art in Zagreb. Even though the financial (and staff-related) problems in the background of this institutional crisis are undoubtedly real, its true cause is the specific (co-)relation between the local political and cultural elites, as Senadin Musabegović has plausibly exposed in his contribution to this issue.¹⁴ It is already obvious that the consequences

otvaramo ovaj broj *Života umjetnosti*, posvećen aktualnim prioritetima i problemima disciplinarnih praksi u Regiji, nastojao je prikazati njezinu temporalnu putanju u jednoj lokalnoj zajednici tijekom posljednjih sedamdesetak godina, ali i upozoriti čitatelje, kao i potencijalne suradnike na budućim projektima Regionalnog centra, na suvremene i – uvjereni smo – zajedničke probleme struke, koji dodatno naglašavaju važnost te suradnje. Iskustva neovisne kulturne scene zorno pokazuju da je ona gotovo uvijek moguća, unatoč i bez obzira na kulturno-historijske razlike i nerazborite političke elite, koje su – kako se čini – sudbina ovoga dijela Europe.

¹ Detaljnije informacije o motivima osnivanja Regionalnoga centra, planovima njegova rada i organizacijskoj strukturi, vidi na: <http://www.iahregio.org>.

² Prva izložba europske moderne umjetnosti, *Francuska moderna umjetnost*, održana je tijekom 1952. u Zagrebu, Beogradu i Ljubljani.

³ Od inozemnih autora, koji su između sredine 50-ih i 70-ih godina bili posebno utjecajni unutar jugoslavenskih povijesnoumjetničkih krugova, treba posebno istaknuti H. Readu, P. Francastela, R. Huyghea, E. Gombricha, H. Lefebvrea, L. Goldmanna i C. G. Argana te nešto kasnije U. Eca, F. Mennu, G. Celanta i R. Barthesa.

⁴ Jugoslavija je vrlo rano postala članicom AICA-e (prvi kongres FNRJ održan 1957. u Dubrovniku), INSEA-e (21.

svjetski kongres organizacije održan 1972. u Zagrebu), a 31.3.1950. i članicom UNESCO-a.

⁵ Osnivanje Instituta za povijest umjetnosti u Zagrebu 1961. bilo je – između ostaloga – motivirano upravo potrebom definiranja novoga interdisciplinarnog, znanstvenoga modela istraživanja povijesti prostora, koji je našao svoju primjenu i u regionalnome planiranju, kao i u zaštiti graditeljske baštine.

⁶ Najavom osnivanja Katedre za vizualne komunikacije i grafički dizajn, najzuidljivijeg obrazovnog projekta unutar čitave jugoslavenske povijesnoumjetničke akademske scene 60-ih godina, može se smatrati tekst prof. dr. Vere Horvat Pintarić „Vizualna kultura i problemi vizualnih komunikacija,” objavljen u časopisu

of this crisis will require a long-term and costly process of restoration, but considering continuous cuts in the budget allotted to culture and science and causing a positive handicap of both – art production, as well as art historical research – it is highly unlikely that it would be possible in the near future. But before it could happen at all, there has to be a fundamental change in the perspective of the aforementioned elites deeply involved in the (political) reconfiguration of national cultural identities in the Region, which made modern and contemporary art almost obsolete. The question is – what can be done in the meantime?

It brings us back to our initial comment on the differences regarding the possible topics and methods of common research between art historians in various parts of South-Eastern Europe. This brief overview of the post-war history of art history in Croatia, and partly also in other countries of former Yugoslavia, that is dedicated to the priorities and problems of art-historical practices in the Region and takes place of classical editorial introduction to this issue of *Život umjetnosti*, has also sought to draw the attention of readers and potential collaborators on projects initiated by the Regional Centre to at least some of the actual, shared problems of art history and emphasize the importance of that collaboration. The experience of independent cultural scene manifestly shows that this collaboration is almost always possible, despite and regardless of the irrational political elites, who – as it seems – remain a destiny of South-Eastern Europe.

Praxis (4/6, 1966., 639–643). Posebno aktivna tijekom 70-ih godina, od početka 80-ih Katedra sporije reagira na suvremene teorijske paradigme, pa tako i one koje su vodile artikulaciji studija vizualne kulture kao zasebnoga, nad-disciplinarnoga studijskog područja, pa se njezina aktivnost postupno gasi. Pojam vizualnih komunikacija zadržao se, međutim, u kurikulumu zagrebačkoga Odsjeka do danas, no prije kao *homage* jednom od blistavijih trenutaka u njegovoj 136 godina dugoj povijesti, nego kao područje sustavnih, kontinuiranih istraživanja.

⁷ Važan doprinos kulturnoj sceni 1960-ih bilo je i pokretanje glasila Novih tendencija, časopisa *Bit international*. Njegov zadnji broj, objavljen 1969. godine (ur. Vera Horvat Pintarić), jedan je od najranijih zbornika posvećenih umjetničkim i društvenim aspektima medija televizije u Europi.

⁸ Za detaljnije objašnjenje tvrdnje vidi: Aleš Erjavec, „Introduction“, u: A. Erjavec et al., *Postmodernism and the postsocialist condition: politicized art under late socialism*, University of California Press, Berkeley, 2003., 13.

⁹ Aktivističkim aspektom poslijeratne kulturne politike mogu se objasniti izložbe moderne umjetnosti i koncerti ozbiljne glazbe u tvornicama, formiranje tvorničkih zbirki moderne umjetnosti (Željczara Sisak, tvornica „Đuro Đaković“, INA), predavanja, putujuće izložbe i edukativne inicijative poput programa edukacije i kulturnog odgoja

radnika, zasnovanog na načelima sociologije i andragogije Radničkog sveučilišta „Moša Pijade“. RANS-ov inovativni program likovnoga obrazovanja Radovana Ivančevića 1955.–59. uključuje teme suvremenog industrijskog oblikovanja, umjetničke fotografije, filma i plakata. Tekstovi Ivančevićevih predavanja objavljeni su (1959.–1962.) u časopisu Radničkog sveučilišta *15 dana*.

¹⁰ U poslijeratnom razdoblju mnogi hrvatski povjesničari umjetnosti uspjeli su steći međunarodnu reputaciju, a među njima treba posebno spomenuti prof. dr. Milana Preloga, jednog od osnivača Instituta za povijest umjetnosti (1961., s Grgom Gamulinom), suosnivača Instituta za društvena istraživanja (1964.) i Centra za poslijediplomski studij u Dubrovniku (današnji IUC), člana UNESCO-vog komiteta za zaštitu kulturne baštine, dr. Cvita Fiskovića, najuglednijeg konzervatora bivše Jugoslavije, dugogodišnjeg člana internacionalnih komiteta ICOMOS-a i CIHA-e, dobitnika UNESCO-ve povelje za zaštitu kulturne baštine (1976.), prof. dr. Radovana Ivančevića, UNESCO-vog eksperta za vizualno opismenjavanje, člana međunarodnoga uredništva *Svjetske enciklopedije umjetnosti i znanja* (1983.–1990.), predsjednika INSE-e (2001.–2004.) i prof. dr. Veru Horvat Pintarić, dobitnicu Velike nagrade Venecijanskoga bijenala za likovnu kritiku 1956. godine, predavačicu na europskim sveučilištima, zahvaljujući čijoj mreži inozemnih kontakata su zagrebački studenti između kraja 1960-ih i početka 80-ih

¹ For detailed information on the motives behind the foundation of the Regional Centre, its working plan, and its organizational structure, see: <http://www.iahregio.org>

² The first exhibition of modern European art, *French Modern Art*, took place in 1952 in Zagreb, Belgrade, and Ljubljana. It was followed in 1950s by the exhibitions of Italian, American, Swedish, Danish, Dutch, Polish and Czech modern art, and in the 1960s and 1970s – along with the West and East European art production – with the exhibitions of Iranian, Tunisian, Indian and modern art of other Non-Aligned countries.

³ Among the international authors who were particularly influential in Yugoslav art-historical circles between the mid-1950s and the 1970s, one should mention H. Read, P. Francastel, R. Huyghe, E. Gombrich, H. Lefebvre, L. Goldmann, and G. C. Argan, and somewhat later U. Eco, F. Menna, G. Celant, and R. Barthes.

⁴ Yugoslavia became a member of AICA very early (the first AICA Congress in Yugoslavia took place in 1957 in Dubrovnik), and also of INSEA (its 21st World Congress took place in 1972 in Zagreb), and on March 31st, 1950 it became a member of UNESCO.

⁵ The foundation of the Institute of Art History in Zagreb (1961) was motivated precisely by the need of defining the new, interdisciplinary and scholarly mode of researching the history of space, which also found its application in regional planning and the conservation of architectural heritage.

⁶ The article „Vizualna kultura i problemi vizualnih komunikacija“ [Visual culture and problems of visual communication] by Prof. Dr. Vera Horvat Pintarić, published in *Praxis* 4/6 (1966), 639–643, can be regarded as heralding the foundation of the Cathedra for Visual Communications and Graphic Design, the most exciting educational project on the Yugoslav academic art–historical scene in the 1960s. Especially active throughout the 1970s, the Cathedrae began to react more slowly to the contemporary theoretical paradigms in the 1980s, even to those that aimed at articulating the studies of visual culture as a separate, interdisciplinary field of research, and was thus gradually extinguished. The notion of visual communication was retained in the curriculum of Zagreb's Department of Art History, but as an homage to one of the most glorious moments in its 136 years of history rather than as a field of systematic or continuous research.

⁷ An important contribution to the cultural scene of the 1960s was the launching of *Bit International*, a journal of New Tendencies. Its last issue, published in 1969 (ed. Vera Horvat Pintarić), was one of the earliest theoretical publications in Europe dedicated to the artistic and social aspects of television as a medium.

⁸ For a more detailed explanation of this statement see: Aleš Erjavec, „Introduction“ in: A. Erjavec et al., *Postmodernism and the Postsocialist Condition: Politicized Art under Late Socialism* Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003, 13.

imali priliku čuti predavanja niza uglednih inozemnih povjesničara umjetnosti.

¹¹ Kao važne aktere permanentnog, praktičnog i teorijskog (političkog) obrazovanja unutar nezavisne scene treba posebno istaknuti Kustosku platformu i Multimedijalni institut MAMA.

¹² Multimedijalni institut MAMA najagilniji je izdavač suvremene teorijske literature u polju nezavisne kulture (biblioteke: *past.forward*, Mala Mamina biblioteka, *Basic*, Nova kritička teorija /suradnja s Beogradskim krugom/, Vizualni kolegij /suradnja s BLOK-om/).

¹³ W. J. T. Michell, "O vizualnoj kulturi i ikonologiji", u: *Život umjetnosti* 93, 2013., 111–119.

¹⁴ Senadin Musabegović, "Tradicija i kulturne institucije u BiH u raljama etnonacionalizma i neoliberalizma", u: *Život umjetnosti* 93, 2013., 22–35.

⁹ This activist aspect of post-war cultural policy can also explain the exhibitions of modern art and concerts of classical music held in factories, as well as the creation of factory collections of modern art (Sisak Ironworks, "Đuro Đaković" factory, INA gas company), lectures, travelling exhibitions, and educational initiatives such as cultural education programmes for workers, based on the principles of sociology and andragogy of the Workers' University "Moša Pijade" (RANS). Its innovative programme of art education designed by Radovan Ivančević (1955–59) included contemporary industrial design, art photography, cinema, and posters. His lectures were published in 1959–1962 in *15 dana*, journal of the Workers' University.

¹⁰ During the post-war period, a number of Croatian art historians achieved international recognition. Among them, one should particularly mention Prof. Dr. Milan Prelog, cofounder of the Institute of Art History (in 1961, together with Grgo Gamulin), cofounder of the Institute of Social Research (1964), and the Centre for Postgraduate Studies in Dubrovnik (presently Inter University Centre), member of UNESCO's committee for the protection of cultural heritage; Dr. Cvito Fisković, the most prominent expert on art conservation in former Yugoslavia, who was for years a member of the most distinguished committees of ICOMOS and CIHA, awarded with UNESCO's charter for the protection of cultural heritage (1976); Prof. Dr. Radovan Ivančević, UNESCO's expert for visual literacy,

member of the international editorial board of the *World Encyclopaedia of Art and Knowledge* (1983–1990), president of INSE (2001–2004); and Prof. Dr. Vera Horvat Pintarić, winner of the Grand Prize for art criticism at the Venice Biennial in 1956 and guest lecturer at a number of European universities. Owing to her network of international contacts, students in Zagreb had an opportunity to attend lectures held by a number of prominent international art historians in the period from the late 1960s until the early 1980s.

¹¹ Curatorial Platform and Multimedia Institute MAMA should be particularly mentioned as important providers of permanent education, both practical and theoretical, within the independent scene.

¹² Multimedia Institute MAMA is the most active publisher of contemporary theoretical literature in the field of independent culture (publication series: *past.forward*, *Mama Small Library*, *Basic*, *New Critical Theory* / in cooperation with the Belgrade circle/, *Visual Colloquia* /in cooperation with [BLOK]/).

¹³ W. J. T. Michell, "On Visual Culture and Iconology", *Život umjetnosti* 93 (2013), 111–119.

¹⁴ Senadin Musabegović, "Tradicija i kulturne institucije u BiH u raljama etnonacionalizma i neoliberalizma" [Tradition and Cultural Institutions in Bosnia and Herzegovina in the Jaws of Ethno-nationalism and Neoliberalism], *Život umjetnosti* 93 (2013), 111–119.