

DALYVAVIMO KONFLIKTAI: DARIAUS MIKŠIO PROJEKTAS UŽ BALTOS UŽUOLAIDOS

Lina Michelkevičė

VILNIAUS DAILĖS AKADEMIJA

Maironio g. 6, LT-01124 Vilnius

lina.michele@gmail.com

Straipsnyje analizuojama problematika, specifiškai susijusi su dalyvavimo strategijas taikančiomis meno praktikomis: dalyvavimo ir bendradarbiavimo skirtis, autoriaus pozicija ir suverenumas, žiūrovų-dalyvių vaidmuo ir jį grindžiantis sandoris, dvipusė (estetinė ir socialinė) dalyvavimo praktikų prigimtis. Preliminariai apibrėžtos sąvokos pritaikomos atvejo (Dariaus Mikšio projekto *Už baltos užuolaidos*, 2011) analizei, kuri savo ruožtu leidžia pagrįsti teorines sampratas ir kartu atskleisti prieštaravimus bei kvestionuoti išankstines nuostatas, sąlygojusias šio projekto vertinimą.

REIKŠMINIAI ŽODŽIAI: dalyvavimas, bendradarbiavimas, autorystė, dalyvių sandoris, estetinis ir socialinis įvykis.

Dalyvavimo praktikas galima pavadinti viena iš šiuolaikinį meną charakterizuojančių tendencijų, išitvirtinusių tiek, kad pats dalyvavimo (angl. *participation*) terminas tapo perdėtai populiariu ir ne visada pagrįstai vartojamu terminu menininkų, kuratorių ir meno kritikų žodyne. Gana įprasta kalbėti apie „dalyvaujimąjį meną“ (angl. *participatory art*) kaip apie tam tikrą žanrą ar judėjimą, net ir aiškiai suvokiant, kad dalyvavimo praktikų skirtingumas, tikslai, kurių jomis siekia menininkai, funkcionavimo kontekstas (meno institucijos ar socialinė sfera) neleidžia išvesti joms visoms bendro vardiklio, priskirti vienam žanrui. Todėl patikimiausias būdas išvengti išankstinių nuostatų ir primetamų dalyvavimo modelių būtų įvairias

dalyvavimo praktikas išanalizuoti ir pagrįsti teoriškai, įvardyti jų skirtumus ir pamatines nuostatas, suvokti, kokiais dalyvių lūkesčiais ir santykiais jos remiasi ar manipuliuoja. Šiuo straipsniu siekiama ne tik pateikti tokios konkrečiau atvejo analizės pavyzdį, bet ir empirine analize pagrįsti preliminariai įvardytus skirtumus tarp bendradarbiavimo ir dalyvavimo, skirtingų dalyvių tipų ir išplėsti keletą pamatinių sąvokų (tokių kaip dalyvių sandoris ir estetinis bei socialinis įvykis), palengvinančių bet kokio dalyvaujamojo meno projekto analizę.

CONFLICTS OF PARTICIPATION: DARIUS MIKŠYS PROJECT *BEHIND THE WHITE CURTAIN*

Lina Michelkevičė

KEYWORDS: participation, collaboration, authorship, contract between participants, aesthetic and social event.

SUMMARY

The article analyses the problems of participatory practices in contemporary art, which stem from poorly developed concepts, namely: what are the participants of an art project, what role do they play, and what is their relation to the artist. There is an ungrounded inclination in the art discourse to equate participation, collaboration, and collective work, and this may lead to an incorrect assessment when demands are raised for an artwork to adhere to certain a priori ethical and structural presumptions or a “correct” model of participation. Whereas, as the artist and art critic Dave Beech stresses, participants, as opposed to collaborators, don’t obtain the co-authors’ rights in regard to an artwork’s structure and implementation. The term ‘participation’, indicating the involvement of participants, also foresees a fundamental division between creator and spectator, author and participants, producer and consumer; this division is constantly reconsidered and redefined in art history, but never fully removed.

Participatory artworks are always based on an implicit *contract* between the artist and the participant, since the artist outlines, in a looser or stricter way, the possible actions of the participants or, more precisely, the field of their actions. The outstanding feature of these practices is that their process is influenced not only by a temporary “aesthetic” contract between the artist and participants, but also by models of social behaviour, attitudes, conventions, ethical presumptions, individual will – everything that regulates any mundane relation between

people. Participatory practices thus do not reproduce or illustrate outer reality but perform it by creating both a social (political) and an aesthetic event, which, although intertwined, operate in different regimes.

When analysing Darius Mikšys’ project *Behind the White Curtain* (2011), it is imperative to discuss its aesthetic and social parts, even though the latter may have not been projected or foreseen – i.e. negotiations with artists, the rehearsal of the project, and relating discussions. One can maintain that the main controversy was caused by the fact that Mikšys’ project invited artists as authors, and not persons, unrelated to the art scene, or professionals in other fields. The abundant criticism aimed at the project was mainly based on the hurried presumption that an artwork, employing participatory strategies, is a *collaborative* project. However, the artists agreed to participate in this project not as collaborators (since they didn’t perform the *labour* of the project development), but as *accomplices*, assisting the project in acquiring its performative and material form. The conflict between authorships here was based on the presumption of an artist as an autonomous creator. It seems that everyday creativity or displays of naïve art can be used as material for a professional artist’s practice, whereas professional art must remain autonomous, presuming that its usage in another artist’s project would lower it to the position of non-autonomous, socially determined everyday or naïve creativity. Though, from the spectator’s point of view it is clear that it is the author’s attention which bestows value on the collection of artworks by participating artists. Thus, Mikšys’ authorship here is a conceptual gesture, which in a rather simple form highlights factors that condition the cultural landscape in a post-Soviet state.