ACO DIVAC

King's College London, Great Britain

DOI 10.5937/kultura1444302D
UDK 73/76.021.3
73/76.049
73/76:069.9(410.111.11)"2013/2014"
stručni rad

ART ATTACK – CURATING VIOLENCE IN ART

Abstract: *This paper aims to show how new and challenging trends in art generate and redefine ways of curating: It examines three trends. Firstly, the art being violently attacked; Secondly, the art incorporating violence and destruction as a part of its being; And thirdly, the art that attacks or fights back. The relationship between art and violence is conceptualised through the phenomenon of iconoclasm and the transformation of its meaning over time. Iconoclasm as a common name for acts of violence against works of art gradually evolves towards a positive meaning referring to innovation and avant-garde in art. Firstly, a brief history of violence surrounding art is discussed by examining two recent contemporary London exhibitions (Art under Attack: Histories of British Iconoclasm at Tate Britain and La Fine di Dio, Maurizzio Cattelan Lucio Fontana at Gagosian Gallery, London). Attacks on art were rarely driven by strictly aesthetic concerns; they were often motivated by ideological, religious and political values. Although iconoclast attacks were unique events they all include the same elements: an artwork, an artist, an iconoclast, an owner and an audience. The paper further explores a relatively recent trend where art begins to incorporate violence and destruction as a part of its discourse form. In the final section, the art that attacks examines art itself as an attack on contemporary issues or icons.*

Key words: *new ways of curating; traditional practices of exhibition vs modern; violence towards art and destruction in art; destruction as art; iconoclasm*

This paper aims to show how new and challenging trends in art generate and redefine ways of curating. We addressed some of the key issues that arise in a new way of curating by exploring recent museum /galleries practice of two eminent London galleries.

History of violence surrounding art is discussed by examining two recent contemporary London exhibitions (Art under Attack: Histories of British Iconoclasm at Tate Britain and La Fine di Dio by Maurizzio Cattelan and Lucio Fontana at the Gagosian Gallery, London).

It examines three trends: Firstly the art being violently attacked by conceptualising the relationship between art and violence through the phenomenon of iconoclasm and the transformation of its meaning over time. Iconoclasm as a common name for acts of violence against works of art gradually evolves towards a positive meaning referring to innovation and avant-garde in art.

Secondly the art incorporating violence and destruction as a part of its discourse and thirdly the art as an attack on contemporary issues or icons, art that fights back.

A curator and curating art are considered to be a fairly new practice and profession. Contemporary art and artists moved beyond the simple production of art objects towards more complex assembling and arranging installations that galvanize an entire exhibition space and beyond. A curator's role expanded, changed with the changes in art.

Short cuts in a long history of violence against art – curator's perspective

This paper aims to show how new and challenging trends in art and the way it is practiced have generated and redefined ways of curating artworks. In this essay I will discuss how the presentation of ephemeral, live or time-based works challenges traditional practices of curating and display in art museums[1].My focus will not be on the challenges caused by fragile or living nature of exhibits and objects, but more on social, political and ethical challenges and issues often brought by exhibiting contemporary art, installations and live performances. Since Duchamp's Urinal/Fountain presented almost a hundred years ago, in 1917, bringing everyday objects into galleries and museums has become a common and accepted practice, but not without its social political and ethical challenges.

From a curator's position, these artefacts and artworks, ephemeral, live, everyday objects and industrial mass products raise rather practical, technical, ecological and even health and safety issues. They all come loaded with significant emotional,

1 This paper is a shorter version of the one which was a part of the seminar "Towards Tomorrow's Museum" jointly organised by King's College London /MA in Cultural and Creative Industries and Public programme team at the Tate Modern during spring term 2014.

social and political layers of meaning or charges: i.e. images of notorious criminals, dictators, explicit violence, war massacres. By provoking strong reaction from the public, attacks in the media, and even physical damage or destruction, they bring significant challenges for curators.[2]

This paper aims to show how new and challenging trends in art and the way it is practiced have generated and redefined ways of curating: From an art that is both abstract and figurative, being violently attacked, to the art incorporating violence and destruction as part of its discourse.

A brief history of violence surrounding art is discussed by show casing two recent contemporary London exhibitions in Tate Britain and Gagosian Gallery, London.[3]

Art under attack

Art under Attack: Histories of British Iconoclasmat Tate Britain was the first exhibition of its kind exploring the history of physical attacks on art in Britain from the 16th century to the present day.

Tabitha Barber, the curator of the exhibition says: 'When putting the exhibition together, we wanted to find out what it is that compels people to carry out attacks on art and whether these motives have changed over the course of 500 years. To help visitors understand more about the topic, we've divided the exhibition into three parts: religion, politics and aesthetics.

Visitors were not only able to see the level of damage that was inflicted upon the works of art but were also able to examine the religious, political and aesthetic motives for these assaults.[4]

2 A painting of the notorious serial killer Myra Hindley by Marcus Harveywas seriously vandalised with ink and eggs thrown all over it during the 1997 Sensation exhibition at the Royal Academy of Arts in London. The image was made up of copies of children's handprints creating a mosaic of the infamous photograph taken of Hindley after her arrest. Several Royal Academics resigned in protest over its inclusion into the exhibition, and gallery windows were broken by protesters.

3 Established in 1897 as a National Gallery of British Art, it changed its name to Tate Gallery in 1932 and became Tate Britain in 2000. It is the oldest gallery in the Tate family housing displaying UK collections of historical and contemporary British art from 1500. It is part of the Tate network of galleries in England, with Tate Modern, Tate Liverpool and Tate St Ives. Gagosian Gallery is a contemporary art gallery founded, owned and directed by Larry Gagosian. There are currently eleven gallery spaces from New York, London and Los Angeles to Rome, Athens, Paris, Geneva and Hong Kong.

4 Barber T. ed. (2013) *Art under Attack: Histories of British Iconoclasm*, exhibition catalogue Tate Britain

One of the most fascinating impressions from the exhibition was that it reflects a century's long history of acts of physical destruction of works of art in Britain that is traditionally praised for tolerance and sensibility towards heritage and art.

By putting back together all the damaged pieces that survived and those saved by some miracle, one could almost write a parallel history of art. There were a significant number of pieces in the exhibition that have never been displayed in the public realm before.

The history of violence towards art could be traced back to the 8th century in Byzantine, through the origins of the concept of iconoclast as it became a common name for all the acts of violence and destruction of works of art. The term derives from the Greek words image (*eikon*) and breaker (*klastes)* meaning 'image breaking'. At the time there was a rift whether icons should be venerated or not as the undercurrent fear was that they could be equated with pagan idols. This conflict ended with a conclusion and the order of the Seventh Ecumenical Council that icons should be venerated because piety is not delivered to the painted presentation but to the archetype symbolizing the visual presentation.

Interestingly, the concept evolved over time and is currently regarded as a positive term referring to any innovation that is pushing boundaries, breaking rules, being at the cutting edge or outside mainstream, avant-garde. There is almost a danger of it expanding towards justifying violent acts as creative.

Those attacks on art were rarely driven by aesthetic concerns but more often based on ideological, religious and political motives. The destruction of art in the name of ideological beliefs was not unique to Christianity and western culture – all cultural traditions and religions were embracing the phenomenon of the iconoclasm. These campaigns of destruction were carried out in a comprehensive, systematic and highly administered way.

It is important to mention that this is not a thing of the past or typical of zealot ideologies but a very contemporary phenomenon.

The exhibition presents a selection of strategies behind attacks on art in three broad chronological sections: Religion, Politics and Aesthetics.[5]

The section on religion looks at the 16th and 17th centuries including the dissolution of the monasteries under Henry VIII, the Reformation and Puritan iconoclasm in the Civil War.

5 Ibid, p. 8.

The first sections of the exhibition explored the beginnings of state-administered iconoclasm under Henry the VIII with attacks on religious art that began with the Reformation, and the expansion of its targets by later rulers and Puritan reformers who feared idolatry.

Political iconoclasm encompasses the symbolic statue-breaking that represented political differences and the targeted attacks on cultural heritage by the Suffragettes demanding political change."Gallery directors discussed proposals to ban women from their institutions, introduced plain-clothes policemen and circulated surveillance photographs of known militants; women were asked to leave muffs, bags and umbrellas at the entrance."[6]

Esthetic iconoclasm reflects the fact that many damage artworks in public collections declare themselves unhappy with the artwork or with the ideas it represents. The exhibition presented the work previously shown at the Tate Britain through the 1950s, 70s and 80s that was subjected to attacks in the press and to the damage and physical destruction. It was both abstract and figurative art that attracted such violent reactions. The exhibition moves on to look at contemporary works of art that have been attacked, such as the famous 'Tate Bricks' (Carl Andre's *Equivalent VIII*) which had food dye thrown over it.

The rationale for each attack was politically motivated, but each iconoclast was responding to the aesthetics or appearance of the artwork. Even though iconoclastic attacks on art were unique events, they all involved the same elements: an artwork, an artist, an iconoclast, an owner and an audience. When an individual attacks a work of art, the reasons can seem rational to the attacker, but irrational to the others and sometimes impossible to understand. Verbal attacks in the press can stimulate a debate about an object but can also lead to a physical attack that becomes sensationalized and mythologized.

Aesthetics: Destruction in art

"Destruction is also creation." Marcel Duchamp

This is the trend where art begins to incorporate violence and destruction as part of its form.

From individual anarchic, liberating acts over satiric nihilistic destructive surreal Dadaist actions to direct action and social and political engagement and movement.

6 Ibid, p. 12.

Across the centuries images of the human body remain a consistent target for the iconoclast. This selection of work from the last twenty-five years expands the scope of iconoclasm to include a range of exploratory and transformational practices applied by artists themselves to portraits and other types of representation of the human form. Some start with a reproduction of an artwork, while others begin with an original work that they own or have made. They then dismantle, mark, edit or reconfigure the material with different implements – including pencil, paint, fire, blades, a punch, and software – to transform images into new works with new meanings. The practices encompass acts of aggressive play, dramatic defacement, and careful cutting. For example, the works of Douglas Gordon, Lucy Skaer and John Stezaker reflect that tradition by removing parts of images while Jake and Dinos Chapman and Kate Davis mark over and subvert images, Michael Wilkinson unspools videotape and turns it into a sculpture.

The work of Lucio Fontana (1899-1968) represents one of the most telling examples of the practice of Destruction in Art. *Spatial Concept, Waiting* is one of a series of works Fontana made in Milan between 1958 and 1968. These works collectively known as Taglie/Cuts consist of canvases slashed once or more. Considered together they are Fontana's most extensive and varied group of works and they have come to be seen as emblematic of his gestural aesthetic.

Fontana first began puncturing the surface of a paper or canvas in the late 1940s blurring the distinction between two and three-dimensionality. Recognising the importance of this innovation he continued to seek different ways of developing the hole as his signature gesture. The first *Tagli* comprised of small often diagonal incisions composed in groups over unprimed canvases. These tentative slits evolved into single more decisive slashes. Each cut was made with a single gesture using a sharp blade, and the canvases were then backed with strong black gauze giving the appearance of a void behind. In 1968 Fontana told an interviewer, 'My discovery was the hole and that's it. I am happy to go to the grave after such a discovery'.

Fontana experimented with both the size and shape of the Tagli and painted a number of the canvases in bright monochrome colours. From the earliest works in the series he wrote, on the back of all the canvases, the word 'Attesa' meaning expectation or hope with one cut and 'Attese' (plural) on all those with multiple cuts. This added a temporal dimension to the generic title 'Spatial Concept' which he gave to all his works from the late 1940s. In 1966 Fontana presented an entire room of white Tagli at the Venice Biennale claiming that he had found a way

of ‘giving the spectator an impression of spatial calm, cosmic rigour and serenity in infinity’.[7]

In the instances where Fontana slashed an unpainted canvas there is a particular affinity between the rawness of the surface and the primordial character of the gesture itself. Destruction and creation were bound together in these works, the same gesture that negated the canvas as a purely pictorial vehicle also opened up its sculptural possibilities. ‘Art dies but is saved by gesture’, Fontana wrote in 1948[8]. Such rhetoric was characteristic of *Spazialismo,* the movement he founded in 1947 when he returned to Milan after spending the war years in Buenos Aires.[9]

Lucio Fontana Spatial Concept ‘Waiting’ 1960Artist Lucio Fontana 1899–1968 Title Spatial Concept ‘Waiting’ Concetto spaziale ‘Attesa’ 1960 Medium Canvas Dimensions Unconfirmed: 930 x 730 mm frame: 1161 x 982 x 86 mm Collection Tate ,Acquisition Purchased 1964 ,Reference T00694 On display at Tate Modern Theme: Level 4: Energy and Process;Room: Beyond Painting (Room 2); http://www.tate.org.uk/art/artworks/fontana-spatial-concept-waiting-t00694

7 Crispoliti, E. (1999) *Fontana*, Milan, p. 38.

8 The curating at Tate modern doesn’t follow a common pattern of chronologically displaying collections, instead it focuses on a major art movement or a theme exploring its origins and how contemporary artists have responded to these ideas. For example, Fontana’s “Waiting” is displayed in room named Beyond Painting, alongside representatives of Arte Povera,Niki de Saint Phalle and Richard Serra curated under the theme of Energy and Process juxtaposition theme Structure and Clarity.

9 Whitfield, S. (1999) *Lucio Fontana*, exhibition catalogue, London: Hayward Gallery, p. 31-34.

Many of Fontana's marks - slashes, gouges, and puncturing - evoke pain, and in particular suggest wounds to the skin. His *Nature* series of sculptures clearly reference female genitalia and the *Tagli* can also be interpreted in this light.

Label guide for viewers of Fontana's Spatial Concept "Waiting" exhibited at Tate Modern, is written by professor Colin Blakemore, a leading British neuroscientist, who writes: "A canvas slashed in the Tate Modern but don't call the police, instead reflect on the nature of the picture. Fontana teases the brain, he glorifies an anarchic act of violence against nothingness, he challenges our comfortable notion of what a work of art is."[10]

One of the more significant manifestos of auto-destructive art was published by Gustav Metzger in 1959, in which he argued that it 'is not limited to theory of art … it includes social action. Auto-destructive art is committed to a left-wing revolutionary position in politics and to struggles against future wars.' Metzger was a founding member of the Committee of 100 - a group dedicated to achieving nuclear disarmament through non-violent direct action – a cause for which Metzger was sent to prison.

In the pursuit of this socially and politically engaged public art, Metzger initiated the Destruction In Art Symposium (DIAS) in 1966 - a month of events by a range of artists with a three-day symposium as its focus. Some fifty avant-garde artists from ten countries took part, as well as scientists, philosophers and psychoanalysts, to link theoretical instances of destruction with actual instances of destruction taking place in society, in science as well as art. The continuing significance of DIAS can be recognized in the extent to which it provides a marker for an art that rejected the objectified image in favour of the dynamics of the event, underscoring an engagement with social and political forces.

Another example of auto destructive art can be found in the work of Jean Tinguely (1925 –1991) a Swiss painter and sculptor. He is best known for his sculptural machines - "useless machines" or kinetic art, following the Dada tradition. Known officially as metamechanics they are machines producing random drawings or self-destructive machines. Tinguely's art satirized the mindless overproduction of material goods in an advanced industrial society.

10 The Bigger Picture labels project at Tate Modern - offering alternative views of the works on display. Series of labels in which non-artistic experts offer new ways of looking at artworks on display, either from a personal perspective or a professional one from another discipline.

His best-known work, a self-destroying sculpture titled *Homage to New York,* was only partially self-destructed at the Museum of Modern Art in New York, but his later work *Study for an End of the World No. 2* detonated successfully in front of an audience in the desert outside Las Vegas.[11]

Art fights back – art transformed

The work of Maurizio Cattelan represents one of the most provocative examples of this trend. He belongs to a long tradition of artists who have made names for themselves by pursuing controversy. His best known works include an effigy of the Pope John Paul II struck down by a meteorite, a life size figure of J.F. Kennedy lying in the coffin, dead - horses hanging from the ceiling, staffed/ taxidermic animals. His work reflects images that confront themes of death, history and religion with the brevity and wit of a cartoonist.[12]

Throughout his career Cattelan has become notorious for pranks and provocations generally targeted at the art world itself. For example, he persuaded a gallerist to dress as a giant penis with rabbit ears and cocooned a dealer to the wall with adhesive duct-tape. On another occasion he invited important art-world figures visiting the Venice Biennale on an exclusive jaunt to Palermo where he had constructed a replica of the Hollywood sign above a rubbish dump.

In 1996 Cattelan produced works referring to Fontana's Spatial concepts 12 Untitled monochrome canvases, different in sizes, all slashed in a shape of a letter Z.

Cattellan has repeatedly exposed the vanity and superficiality of the art world which in return adores him.

Curator's connection or conscious coupling

A new trend is emerging with a curator generating artistic context by joining up different artists, like Francesco Bonami who brings together Fontana and Cattelan bycurating "La fine di Dio" at the Davies Street Gallery in London earlier this year.[13]

11 Even though I singled out Fontana, Metzger and Tinguely they should be regarded as part of independent group's efforts to develop "action art" or something close to the concept art=life. The most prominent groups are Arte Povera, Viennese Actionism, The Situationist International, Fluxus or CoBrA group.

12 Extensive list of Cattelan's works at least until 2003 you can find in: Bonami, F., Spector, N., Vanderlinden, B. and Gioni, M. (2003) *Maurizio Cattelan*, Phaidon, London, p. 193-212.

13 Francesco Bonami is a provocative Italian artist, art curator and writer who is currently the Artistic Director of Fondazione Sandretto Re Rebaudengo in

Bonami sets the context for the "La fine di Dio" by telling us a story: "A few years ago I was in the storage of the US Army Center of Military History in Washington DC and the curator showed me a painting by Hubert Lanzinger *The Standard Bearer* from 1935[14]. The subject was a disturbing portrait of Adolf Hitler as Joan of Arc, but what was most striking was the deep gash under his eye. In any other case that act would have been considered simple vandalism but in this case, considering the subject, it was an act of freedom expressed by an American soldier who was enraged by not having the real Hitler in front of him. Lucio Fontana's actions against the holy space of the canvas could be also seen as vandalism but rather they are a gesture to free and open up the history of painting. Both Hitler and Fontana envisioned the end of God but from completely opposite positions. Hitler created the most diabolical horror witnessed by humankind in modern times; Fontana worshipped and found inspiration in the marvels of the universe, that infinite space where even God could disappear. It dawned on me that these two different fini (ends) of God find perfect synthesis in Maurizio Cattelan's HIM. The exhibition puts in play two key artworks by two epochal artists who have probed the inextricable relationship of the sacred and profane to dramatic effect – Lucio Fontana, with his radical spatial propositions in the post-war period, and Maurizio Cattelan, with his dystopian pranks for the new millennium.

"The exhibition takes its title from Fontana's climactic painting of the early sixties, its hot pink, egg-shaped surface savaged by the thrusts of a sharp knife. Here *Concetto spaziale, La fine di Dio* is the altar at which Cattelan's *HIM*, the figure of a small boy visible only from the back, turns out to be none other than Adolf Hitler, kneeling in impossible supplication before an impossible atonement. With a single, deft juxtaposition, the history of iconoclasm takes an exponential leap."[15]

Turin.He curated 50th edition of Venice Biennale in 2003.

14 To find out more about this amazing museum (9250 pictures from German Nazi era including watercolours by Hitler) see article or go online. Maertz,G, The Invisible Museum: Unearthing the Lost Modernist Art of the Third Reich, *Modernism/modernity* ,New York, Volume 15, Number 1, January 2008, p. 63-85.

15 Bonami, F. (2014) *La Fine di Dio*, London: MaurizzioCattelan, Lucio Fontana; Press Realise,Gagosian Gallery, p. 1-2.

Epilogue(s)

A few more short cuts

Cut/ No1

A curious incident in the gallery in a broad day light. Last attack on art in Tate Modern happened on 7th October 2012. Following the incident the gallery issued a statement: "Tate can confirm that at 15.25 this afternoon there was an incident at Tate Modern in which a visitor defaced one of Rothko's Seagram murals *Black on Maroon*, by applying a small area of black paint with a brush to the painting. The police are currently investigating the incident."[16] The perpetrator explained this act by saying that he and a fellow artist developed a movement *Yellowism* described as "neither art nor anti-art" in Cairo in 2010.

He acted almost like a social commentator by drawing attention to some of the relevant issues in contemporary art. He later reported in a statement: "I believe that if someone restores the [Rothko] piece and removes my signature, the value of the piece would be lower but after a few years the value will go higher because of what I did. Also I was expecting the security at Tate Modern to take me straight away as I signed the picture in front of a lot of people, their lack of vigilance was shocking."

He said that he admired Rothko, describing him as one of the great figures in art of the last century; he also compared himself to Marcel Duchamp, the French artist who shocked the art establishment when he signed a urinal and put it on display in 1917.

Thanks to modern surveillance and security technology we are now able to have the exact time and a full picture of events, which is like a video footage of a rather peculiar performance.

Curiously this last attack on art at Tate's own soil hadn't been included in Art under Attack exhibition.

Cut /No2

Art Attack at Tate Britain was followed by exhibition *Ruin Lust* that offers a guide to the mournful, thrilling, comic and perverse uses of ruins in art from the seventeenth century to the present day. The exhibition is the widest-ranging on the subject and includes over 100 works by artists such as : J.M.W. Turner, John

16 Marsden, S. (2012) Rothko vandal arrested over defaced painting, *The Telegraph*.

Constable, John Martin, Eduardo Paolozzi, Rachel Whiteread and Tacita Dean.

The exhibition begins in the midst of the craze for ruins that overtook artists, writers and architects in the eighteenth century. J.M.W. Turner and John Constable were among those who toured Britain in search of ruins and picturesque landscapes, producing works such as Turner's Tintern Abbey: The Crossing and Channel, Looking towards the East Window, and Constable's Sketch for 'Hadleigh Castle'.

This ruinous heritage has been revisited – and sometimes mocked – by later artists. The exhibition explores ruination through both the slow picturesque decay and abrupt apocalypse. Curatorial team was led by the curator, writer and critic, Brian Dillon.[17]

Cut/No3

Cattalan's HIM (the effigy of Adolf Hitler as kneeling small boy) was back again as one of the main features at the exhibition *The Human Factor: the Figure in Contemporary Sculpture*, at Hayward Gallery at Southbank Center.[18]

International artists set up dialogues with modernist as well as classical and archaic models of art. These artists engage and confront the question of how we represent the 'human' today. Across their work, the figure is a catalyst for exploring concerns from political violence and mortality to sexuality and voyeurism.

The Human Factor surveys how artists over the past 25 years have reinvented figurative sculpture, looking back to earlier movements in art history and drawing on contemporary imagery. Exhibition had been curated by the Hayward Gallery Director, Ralph Rugoff.

Frame for TheBigger Picture

The global social and cultural dynamics of the 21st century provide a shifting and complex context for tomorrow's museum. Concern for the museum(s) as producers, as engines and large cultural institutions of the early 21st century is understandable .

What is and what can be the role of an art museum within shifting global landscape? How new demands and ambitions for the museum are identified and by who? New artistic practices demand new modes of display. Installation art, site-specific

17 Dillon, B., Chambers, E., Concannon and Ruin Lust, A. (2014) London exhibition catalogue, Tate Britain

18 Rugoff, R. (2014) *The Human Factor: the Figure in Contemporary Sculpture*, London: exhibition catalogue, South bank centre

works, performance, ephemeral and durational works raise questions of display, of documentation and conservation but also of acquisition and responsibilities. And how has it changed the museum's relationship to its public? Collecting and displaying the *New come with significant emotional, social and political layers of meaning and connotations.*

Why violence on art and violence in art? What is there to say for a century that began with iconic destruction of the Twin Towers on 9/11, then Afghanistan, Iraq, Darfur…But not everyone shares such opinion. Steven Pinker claims that we are living in an unusually peaceful time.[19]

He says: "Cultural memories pacify the past, leaving us with pale souvenirs whose bloody origins have been bleached away".[20]

We addressed some of the key issues that have arisen in new way of curating by exploring recent museum /galleries practices of two eminent London galleries. The two explored exhibitions challenge the relationship between art and violence in their specific way, still recollecting and representing a pretty long history of violence and art. They illustrate new ways of curating today, too.

Curator and curating art are considered to be a fairly new practice and profession.Core of the work of contemporary curator remains surprisingly close to its Latin etymological root, curare: to take care of.[21]

Often singular figure, today many exhibitions are marked by collaboration between several curators, teams of curators, co-curators, assistant curators and artists.

Still, curator's role today combines four interwoven functions: preservation of artefacts; selection of new work; contributing to art history/scholarly research, and at last but not the least, displaying and arranging the art/the making of exhibitions.

This is the part/task, where an exhibition-maker, that has most come to define the contemporary practice, is departing from the traditional role of caretaking.

As artists themselves have moved beyond the simple production of art objects, and towards assembling or arranging installations that galvanize an entire exhibition space, their activity has in

19 Pinker, S. *The Better Angels of our Nature*, (2012) New York: Penguin, Penguin Group (USA), p. 1.

20 Ibid, p. 1.

21 Obrist, H. U. (2014) Ways of Curating, England: Allen Lane, Penguin Books, p. 24-25.

many cases become more consonant with the older idea of the curator as someone who arranges objects into a display."[22]

The artist Tino Sehgal has said that "notion of art generated in the early nineteenth century, and fully articulated and established by the 1960s is detaching itself from its material origins and venturing into the other realms in the twenty-first century. The exhibition-maker's role has expanded in turn. Curating changes with the change in art."[23]

They foreshadowed/predicted/suggested/foretold the late twentieth-century's understanding of gallery space and further expanded the meaning of the space so that artists began to treat rooms or even entire museums as the context for a work."[24]

Once considered a mere caretaker a civil servant for collections, the curator is now widely viewed as a globally connected auteur. Since 1990s, curatorial and artistic practice converged, blurring the distinction between artist and curator. O'Neill argues that this change in the understanding of curatorship was shaped by a curator-centred discourse that effectively advocated – and authorized – the new independent curatorial practice.[25] The prevailing contemporary model of a curator-as-artist defines our perception of contemporary, and not only, art.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

Bennett, T. (1995) *The Birth of the Museum: History, Theory, Politics*, London: Routledge.

Ciric, B. and Lai, S. eds. (2012) *Institution for the Future*, Manchester: Chinese Arts Centre.

Duncan, C. (1995) *Civilizing Rituals: Inside Public Art Museums*, London and New York: Routledge.

Blazwick, I. (2009) *In A Manual for the 21st Century Art Institution*, London: Whitechapel and Koenig Books.

Duncan, C. and Wallach, A. (1980) *The Universal Survey Museum. In Art History*, 3(4).

Morris, F. ed. (2010) From then to Now and Back Again. In *Tate Modern: The Handbook*, 10th Anniversary Edition, London: Tate.

Carrier, D. (2006) Conclusion: What the Public Art Museum Might Become. *In Museum Skepticism: A History of the Display of Art in Public Galleries*. Duke University Press.

22 Ibid, p. 33.

23 Ibid p. 33.

24 Ibid. p. 29.

25 O'Neill, P. *The Culture of Curating and the Curating of Culture(s)*; MIT Press, Mass 2012, p. 167.

Crimp, D. and Lawler, L. (1993) *On the Museum's Ruins*, Cambridge, Mass; London: MIT.

Pinker, S. (2012) *The Better Angels of our Nature***,** New York: Penguin, Penguin Group (USA)Inc.

Obrist, H. U. (2014) *Ways of Curating*, Allen Lane, Penguin Books, England.

Greenberg, R., Ferguson, B. W. and Nairne, S. eds. (1996) *Thinking About Exhibitions*, London: Routledge.

MacDonald, S. ed. (2010) Part VI: Culture Wars, Transformations, Futures. In *A Companion to Museum Studies*. Malden: Blackwell.

Mansfield, L. (2010) *Contemporary Art Society – The Guide to Public Collections of Art in the UK,* London: Contemporary Art Society.

McClellan, A. (2008) *The Art Museum from Boullée to Bilbao*, London: University of California Press.

O'Neill, P. The Culture of Curating and the Curating of Culture(s) in: *Tate Modern: The First Five Years*, Serota, N. et al. (2005), London: Tate MIT Press, Mass 2012.

Sharmacharja, S. ed. (2009) *A Manual for the 21st Century Art Institution*, London: Whitechapel and Koenig Books.

Spalding, F. (1998) *The Tate: A History*, London: Tate Gallery.

Altshuler, B. ed. (2005) *Collecting the New: Museums and Contemporary Art*, Princeton, N. J.; Oxford: Princeton University Press.

Bishop, C. (2005) *Installation Art: A Critical History*, London: Tate Publishing.

Burton, J. et al. (2003) Behind the Scenes: A Round-Table Discussion, in: *Olafur Eliasson*: *The Weather Project*, London: Tate Publishing, pp. 65-94.

Duncan, C. and Wallach, A. (1980) The Universal Survey Museum, *Art History*, 3(4).

Graham, B. and Cook, S. (2010) *Rethinking Curating*, MIT Press.

Morris, F. ed. (2010) *Tate Modern: The Handbook 10th Anniversary Edition*, London: Tate.

Pollock, G. and Zemans, J. eds. (2007) *Museums After Modernism: Strategies of Engagement*, Oxford: Blackwell.

Rebentisch, J. (2012) *Aesthetics of Installation Art*. Sternberg Press, Berlin.

Serota, N. (1996) *Experience or Interpretation: The Dilemma of Museums of Modern Art*, London: Thames and Hudson.

Staniszewski, M. A. (1999) *The Power of Display: A History of Exhibition Installations at the Museum of Modern Art*, MIT Press.

MacGregor, N. and Serota, N. (2009) *The Museum of the 21st Century*, LSE, London. Available at:http://www2.lse.ac.uk/newsAndMedia/videoAndAudio/channels/publicLecturesAndEvents/player.aspx?id=374.

Laurenson, P. (2006) Authenticity, Change and Loss in the Conservation of Time-Based Media Installations. *Tate Papers*. Available at: https://www.tate.org.uk/research/tateresearch/tatepapers/06autumn/laurenson.htm.

Charmatz, B. (2012) Keynote. From *Collecting the Performative*. London: Tate. Available at: http://www.tate.org.uk/about/projects/collecting-performative [1:31:37].

Tate, About Tate Modern. *Tate Website*. Available at: http://www.tate.org.uk/about/who-weare/history-of-tate#modern.

Möntmann, N. (2006) *The Enterprise of the Art Institution in Late Capitalism*. transversal – eipcp multilingual webjournal. Available at: http://eipcp.net/transversal/0106/moentmann/en.

Ацо Дивац
King's College, Лондон, Велика Британија

УМЕТНОСТ НАПАДА ИЛИ КАКО ИЗЛОЖИТИ НАСИЉЕ

Сажетак

Рад истражује како и на који начин нови трендови и појаве у уметности производе и редефинишу рад кустоса и начине презентације уметничких дела. Као пример су представљене и анализиране две скорашње изложбе из две еминентне лондонске галерије. Однос уметности и насиља има дугу и сложену историју. Обе изложбе се на свој специфичан начин баве тим феноменом. Почетком ове године галерија Тејт Британија (Tate Britain) је представила изложбу *Угрожена уметност: историјски преглед иконоборства у Британији*. У исто време Галерија *Гагосијан* (Gagosian Gallery London) је представила дела двојице аутора Маурицијa Кателана (Maurizzio Cattela) и Лучија Фонтане (Lucio Fontana). Три су видљива тренда у односу уметности и насиља: Прво, грубо насиље према уметничким делима до уништења уметничких дела; друго, уметници и уметност користе различите акте насиља као део свог дискурса и језика; треће, уметност узвраћа ударац, напада и прозива доминантне друштвене теме, уврежена мишљења и предрасуде. Професија кустоса није јако стара, постоји тек неких двесто или више година. Дуго година главно занимање кустоса је било чување и периодично излагање поверених дела. Са свим променама које су се десиле и дешавају у савременој уметности захтеви који се постављају пред кустоса постају много сложенији. Улога кустоса се мења од ревносног чувара збирки све више постаје аутор и коаутор у презентирању уметничких дела.

Кључне речи: *кустос као креатор-аутор, нови начини постављања изложби и изложбених експоната, акти насиља према уметничким делима и акти насиља као стваралачки чин, иконоклазам/иконоборство*