

DALYVAVIMO ESTETIKA: ANALITINIŲ IR KRITINIŲ PRIEIGŲ PAIEŠKOS

Lina Michelkevičė

VILNIAUS DAILĖS AKADEMIJA

Maironio g. 6, LT-01124 Vilnius

El. p. lina.michele@gmail.com

Straipsnyje iš teorinių pozicijų aptariamas vienas svarbiausių šiuolaikinio meno aspektų – dalyvavimo tendencijos. Trumpai apžvelgiama šią problemą nagrinėjanti literatūra, jai nusakyti vartojamų terminų įvairovė. Straipsnyje siekiama įvardyti kai kurias teorines ir praktines šio reiškinių atsiradimo prielaidas ir pristatyti pagrindinius teorinius-kritinius požiūrius į dalyvaujamojo meno praktikas (Nicolas Bourriaud, Grant Kesterio, Claire Bishop), aptarti jų sąsajas ir skirtumus, iškelti trūkumus ir naujas problemas, su kuriomis susiduria tiek dalyvaujamojo meno teoretikas, tiek kritikas.

REIKŠMINIAI ŽODŽIAI: dalyvavimas, dalyvaujamasis menas, santykių estetika, dialoginis menas, socialinis menas, etinis posūkis.

„Dalyvavimas“, „įsitraukimas“, „socialumas“ – tokiais reikšminiais žodžiais vis dažniau apibūdinamas šiuolaikinis menas. Suintensyvėjus individualistinė (menininko, kaip vien savo asmenine pajauta (talentu, įkvėpimu) besivadovujančio kūrėjo) nuostatos, kuria rėmėsi modernistinė meno samprata, kritikai, meninė kūryba virsta veikiau dialogu, kūrėjo ir žiūrovo bendradarbiavimu. Tokia dalyvavimo estetika skatina ne tik žiūrovo įsitraukimą į meno kūrimą, tapimą jo bendraautorium arba dalimi, bet ir, savo ruožtu, paties menininko įsitraukimą į įvairias bendruomenes.

Dalyvaujamojo meno kūrinių banga¹ pastaraisiais dešimtmečiais skatina menotyrininkus ieškoti naujų meno analizės ir vertinimo kriterijų. Kartu iškyla poreikis ne tik sintetinti skirtingas teorijas ir kurti naujas

¹ Plg. tokių užsienio menininkų kaip Rirkritas Tiravanija, Santiago Sierra, Adrian Piper, Suzanne Lacy, kolektyvų „Group Material“, „WochenKlausur“, „Oda Projesi“ ir kt. darbus. Lietuvoje dalyvavimo strategijas savo projektuose taiko Nomedas ir Gediminas Urbonai, Artūras Raila, Gintaras Makarevičius, jaunosios kartos menininkai Andrius Rugevičius, Eglė ir Goda Budvytytės. Paminėtini ir keli kuruoti projektai, kuriems buvo svarbus dalyvavimo aspektas – *Butas'99* (1999, kuratorius Algis Lankelis), *Identifikacija* (1999, kuratoriai Laima Kreivytė, Kostas Bogdanas, Rokas Dovydenas).

PARTICIPATORY AESTHETICS: IN SEARCH OF ANALYTICAL AND CRITICAL APPROACH

Lina Michelkevičė

KEYWORDS: participation, participatory art, relational aesthetics, dialogical art, socially-engaged art, ethical turn.

SUMMARY

Participation, involvement, sociability are the keywords more and more often applied to contemporary art. Art practices today turn more into dialogue, artist and audience collaboration, rather than being expression of individualistic experience, and art critiques therefore are induced to search for new critical criteria. While in West Europe discussions on *participatory art* practices have started already in the end of 90's, Lithuanian critics are still behind in using and questioning these theoretical positions. This article aims to present most vivid theoretical and critical approaches to participatory practices of contemporary art, to discuss relations and differences between these standpoints as well as their lacks, and to bring forward new questions and problems.

Neither contemporary participatory art practices nor the need to deal with them theoretically arose in the last decade of 20th century: it was rather coherent continuation of changes throughout the history of art and aesthetic thought. The article starts with presentation of most important premises of the phenomenon – that of poststructuralist approach towards art-work, the dematerialization of art, institutional theory of art and Institutional Critique, and critique of art space. Attempts toward changing the relation between art institution and everyday life prompted artists to focus on the viewer, the mediator between these two social spaces, and to rethink her/his relation to the work of art.

One of the key notions in participatory art theory today is the one of *relational aesthetics* by Nicolas Bourriaud – which is true also because of vast critique towards it. Bourriaud takes contemporary art for the field of researching and producing human interactions and its social context: art projects focus on their effect on public or

this 'effect' is the work of art itself. Nevertheless the critics like Claire Bishop and Hal Foster criticize the notion of relational aesthetics and relational art due to its overall unconcernedness: participation for the participation's sake, relations for the relations' sake seem to be enough, while the real problems concerning social relations are left behind.

Grant Kester meanwhile is interested in socially-engaged art projects, which define dialogue as their aesthetic core, and the artist is taken for facilitator of the dialogue among diverse communities, and context provider. But Kester as well as other critics comes to the dead-end while attempting to judge *dialogical art* projects. Bishop calls this dead-end *ethical turn*, since aesthetic criteria are replaced by ethical ones, based on equality and democracy towards non-artist communities participating in the art projects. The artist is as far conceived as social worker, therapist, or cultural animator.

These problems in art critique force us to doubt the use of this new genre system. Perhaps renounced to manipulate the terms like relational, participatory, community-based, dialogical etc. we can focus not on the *participation* itself, but on significant whole of the work of art and the contribution of participation to it. There can be however no doubt, that participatory aspects of contemporary art-works change the whole institution of art: the concept of the gallery, the exhibition format, curatorial role, the way artists work, art politics, art critic's way etc. – and these are still waiting for investigations. One more waymark for researchers is the need to look at post-*communist* countries in regard of their way of understanding *community* strategies in contemporary art field.