

DEBATA.

institucionalnom tretmanu
rada

"Cigani i psi"

Zorana Todorovića

ii psi"

DEBATE on

the institutional treatment of the
work of art

"Cigani i psi" (Gypsies and Dogs)

by Zoran Todorović

Tekstovi učesnika i učesnica pisani nakon debate u
Kulturnom centru REX 27. aprila 2012.

Essays by participants were written after the debate held in
Rex Cultural Centre on April 27th 2012

Sadržaj / Contents

Najava debate – Debate Announcement	2
Jelena Vesić	
Ko voli slobodu umetnosti – mrzi Rome	
Ko voli ljudska prava – mrzi Art.....8	
Anyone who believes in freedom of art – hates Roma	
Anyone who supports human rights – hates Art11	
Mia David	
Cigani i psi ili Romi i kućići14	
Gypsies, and Dogs or Roma People and Hounds16	
Milan Antonijević	
Komentar / Comment.....18	
Sunčica Ostoić	
Okupirati agalmu / To Occupy Agalma	24
Suzana Milevska	
Questioning the Viability of the Concept of Autonomy of Arts in the Context of Politically Concerned Art30	
Ispitivanje održivosti koncepta autonomije umetnosti u kontekstu politički angažovane umetnosti33	

**tek
sto**



texts

V

Jelena Vesić

KO VOLI SLOBODU UMETNOSTI – MRZI ROME KO VOLI LJUDSKA PRAVA – MRZI ART

Kao zagovornica *kontekstualnosti* događaja i *metoda konkretne analize*, ne mogu braniti autonomiju umetnosti po sebi, iako mislim da umetnost i filozofija poseduju relativnu autonomiju u sferi mišljenja i jezika, u svojoj sposobnosti da apstrahuju realnost i prikažu je iz manje vidljivih perspektiva. Isto tako, ne mogu po sebi braniti ni svaku intervenciju civilnih borbi za prava potlačenih, potisnutih i isključenih, iako mislim da su ove borbe ključne u promišljanju politika jednakosti i da se univerzalna emancipacija ne može misliti apstraktno, izvan partikularnih borbi.

S jedne strane, izvesno je da savremeni evropski rasizam i globalna desna politička kretanja najviše pogađaju one koji su najmanje zastupljeni u istrošenom i iskompromitovanom sistemu parlamentarne demokratije. S druge strane, pitamo se koliko alternativni pokušaji borbi za prava manjinskih zajednica u civilnom aktivizmu ili kritičkim umetničkim praksama uspeavaju da izbegnu i prevaziđu ovu "tamnu stranu reprezentacije" koja prati parlamentarističku političku logiku? Ako su tokom poslednje dekade romske zajednice bile surovo izložene zakonskim protokolima deportacije i repatrijacije – kako u okviru pojedinačnih država, tako i u političkom kontekstu EU – pitamo se čemu bi vodila ponovna viktimizacija Roma u prostoru umetnosti i umetničkog aktivizma? Da li rasprave umetnika, kritičara i aktivista oko prvenstva, prava i ispravnosti reprezentacije kreiraju nekakav plodan teren političkih borbi u transformativnoj kontra-javnosti ili je reč o procesima koji u svojoj konačnoj instanci služe "spiranju grehova" i "umirenju društvene savesti"? Nisu li sami subalterni priklješteni u tesnacu nemoći između čekića i nakovnja – između hegemonih ukaza progonitelja i navodno kontra-hegemonih utrka pobunjenih za pravo i prvenstvo reprezentacije?

Potrebu za ovim deklarativnim redovima nalazim upravo u nedostatku konkretne analize, a višku opinionizma u svrhu odbrane različitih pojedinačnih interesa koji su pratili nikada dovoljno elaborirane rasprave o radu "Cigani i psi" umetnika Zorana Todorovića. Kada kažem elaborirane – ne mislim na akademske, studijske ili bilo koje druge ekspertne analize, već na bazično poštovanje fakata i dokaza, ukoliko je reč o pravnom domenu, ili, pak, na uspostavljanje koherentnog diskursa i stava, ukoliko je reč o kritičkoj analizi umetnosti. U proizvoljnoj manipulaciji činjenicama, nedovoljnoj upućenosti u istoriju rasprave i diskurzivnoj nedoslednosti, na žalost, mogu da vidim samo privatne

interese – ili, ako ništa drugo, onda barem interese "egzibicionizma bez pokrića" bliske kvazi-polemičkim i estradnim formama debata, karakterističnim za domaće medije.

Novi krug rasprave oko institucionalnog tretmana rada "Cigani i psi", pokrenut u okviru KC Rex, ticao se preseka gore navedenih domena Umetnosti i Prava. U ovom konkretnom slučaju, intervencionistički gest dolazi iz pravnog domena i iznose se tvrdnje da je umetnik eksploatisao romsku decu, da ih je prisiljavao na nelegalni čin prošnje i da je slobodno njima raspolagao, bez zakonski propisane konsultacije sa roditeljima. Intervencija se, dakle, odnosi na način proizvodnje, a ne na neposredno značenje i interpretaciju umetničkog dela. Ipak, bez obzira na navodnu nebitnost umetničkog rezultata, izgleda u najmanju ruku čudno da većina žestokih kritičara Zorana Todorovića, zapravo nije pogledala rad kao očito jedini izvesni *corpus delicti* u ovom procesu (a da pritom nije reč o konceptualnom činu protesta u stilu Serge Deney-evog odbijanja da pogleda Pontecorvov "Capo" ili odbijanja Pavla Levija da pogleda "Aždahu" Srđana Dragojevića).

Ne zgražavam se unapred nad simboličkim (ili realnim) suđenjem umetničkom delu, kako je reagovao veliki broj kulturnjaka protivci se najavljenom raspravi u KC Rex – naprotiv, teorija umetnosti je puna policijskih, detektivskih, sudskih i forenzičkih termina i metoda (Erwin Panofsky bi tu bio klasičan primer sa svojom postavkom "istorije umetnosti kao humanističke discipline" i centralnom figurom "istoričara umetnosti-kao-detektiva"). Ono što me zbunjuje jeste izvođenje suda bez konsekvantnih dokaza: ukoliko govorimo o kulturnoj reprezentaciji – tome mora predhoditi diferencirana analiza umetničkog dela, ukoliko govorimo o transferzalnom preseku umetničkih, pravnih i institucionalnih procedura – tome mora predhoditi stabilni činjenični uviđaj iz kog se onda izvodi tvrdnja o kršenju zakona.

Misliti umetnost u okviru pravnih normi i moralnog *decorum*-a značilo bi njenu pacifikaciju i normalizaciju, drugim rečima – ukidanje samog mišljenja. Isto tako, proizvodnja društvene provokacije, prekršaj normi, proizvodnja zazornog, začudnog, bizarnog i brutalnog, završava se u velikom broju slučajeva javnim pozivom umetnosti na društvenu odgovornost - a takav poziv bi, rekla bih, morao biti ukalkulisan u izbor ovakvih iskaznih procedura.

Rad Zorana Todorovića je uokviren naslovom "Cigani i psi" kao, po svedočenju umetnika, namernom oznakom govora mržnje. U ovaj "okvir" su postavljene dve "poluprazne" pokretne slike snimljene CCTV kamerama koje su nosila romska deca i psi lualice – ponovo po svedočenju umetnika, slike su namerno zamrljane i nejasne kako bi ostavile prostor za upis individualnih značenja, interpretacija i pozicija samih posetilaca. Rad je svojevremeno izložen na Oktobarskom salonu,

kao značajnoj umetničkoj manifestaciji koju finansira grad Beograd, i to izlaganje je koincidiralo sa proterivanjem i ograđivanjem žicom Roma naseljenih u blizini kvarta Belvil koje su brutalno sprovele vlasti grada Beograda uoči Univerzijade, a pod reklamnim sloganom "Očistimo Srbiju". U tom kontekstu nije neobično, niti preterano, očekivati pozivanje umetnosti na *društvenu odgovornost*, ali ne i bez određene zapitanosti – kome je ovakav stejtment ("Cigani i psi") upućen, kako je upućen i zašto, ko se na njega odazvao, ko se nije odazvao i zašto?

U izostanku konkretne analize ostali smo priklješteni u tesnacu dvostruke ucene: ili zastupamo slobodu umetnosti, a bezosećajni smo spram progona Roma, ili zastupamo ljudska prava, a očekujemo servilnost i utilitarnost umetnosti u ovom domenu. Proizvedena u nizu internih i javnih rasprava, opinionizma i pritisaka koje su prethodile debati u Rexu, ova ucena je blokirala mogućnost svakog diferenciranog zaključka i svaku izjavu sortirala u jednu od dve već otvorene fijke: pro-art & anti-roma, ili pro-roma & anti art. Ne znam kako drugačije odgovoriti na ovu ucenu, osim da je postavim u ogledalnu refleksiju i dam neku vrstu bumerang-izjave: *Ukoliko će osuda rada "Cigani i psi" Zorana Todorovića vratiti Rome u Belvil (ili gde god da se osećaju kao kod kuće) – rado ću se pridružiti gonjenju!*

Jelena Vesić

ANYONE WHO BELIEVES IN FREEDOM OF ART – HATES ROMA ANYONE WHO SUPPORTS HUMAN RIGHTS – HATES ART

As a proponent of the *contextuality* of events and the method of *concrete analysis*, I can not defend the autonomy of art *per se*, even though I believe that art, as well as philosophy, possesses a relative autonomy in the sphere of thought and language – in as much as they both have an ability to approach reality conceptually, to think reality through abstractions and to present it from less evident perspectives. Likewise, I cannot defend every intervention of the civil struggle for the rights of oppressed, suppressed and excluded, although I believe that these struggles are important for thinking the *politics of equality* and that universal emancipation cannot be thought of as abstract – as beyond the particular struggles.

On the one hand, it is certain that modern European racism and global right wing political movements affect the most those who are least represented in the worn-out and compromised system of parliamentary democracy. On the other hand, we wonder if the alternative attempts to fight for the rights of minorities through civil activism, or through critical art practices, are able to avoid and overcome this "dark side of representation", which follows the parliamentary political logic? If, during the last decade, the Roma communities were severely exposed to legal protocols of deportation and repatriation in the political context of the EU – where would re-victimization of Roma in the space of art and artistic activism lead to now? Is discussion between artists, critics and activists regarding the right and rightfulness to represent the oppressed, able to create the transformative counter-public, or do such processes, in their ultimate instances, serve only to "soothe social conscience"? Are not subalterns themselves jammed into a narrow passage between the rock and a hard place – the hegemonic proclamations of pursuers on one side and fierce counter-hegemonic chase for the rights to the representation on another?

The need for such declaratory words has emerged from the lack of concrete analysis, as well from the surplus of opinionated input and an overzealous defense of various individual interests that has followed the seemingly never sufficiently elaborated discussions regarding the artwork "Gypsies and Dogs" by Zoran Todorović. When I say "elaborate", I am not talking about the academic or any other sort of expert analysis. I am talking about the basic respect for facts and evidence – when

contemplating the issue from a legal viewpoint, or, again, about the need to establish a coherent discourse and attitude – when approaching the issue from the standpoint of critical analysis of art. Arbitrary manipulation of facts, a lack of familiarity with the “contextual history of this debate”, various inconsistencies in the discourse – all these to me, regretfully, only reveal a certain confusion in regard to the question: whose interests are at stake?

A latest round of debate about the institutional treatment of “Gypsies and Dogs” that took place at the Cultural Centre Rex was focused on the intersection of the above mentioned realms of Art and Law. In this new round, an interventionist gesture came from the legal domain, amounting to the assertion that the artist has exploited the Roma children, that they were forced to beg and commit illegal acts and that he had them at his disposal, without obligatory consultation with their parents. This intervention therefore focuses on the mode of production of the work of art and not its meaning and interpretation. However, despite the alleged irrelevance of artistic results, it seems at least a little strange that the fiercest critics of Zoran Todorović did not really look at the artwork itself as the only certain and apparent *corpus delicti* in this process (and we are not talking about a conceptual act of protest in the style of Serge Deney’s refusal to look at Pontecorvo’s “Kapo” or Pavle Levi refusing to see “Saint George Shoots the Dragon” by Srđan Dragojević).

I am not aghast in advance because of this symbolic (or real) “trial to an artwork”, as has been suggested by a reaction of a large number of cultural workers who were vehemently opposed to the announced debate in Rex Cultural Center – on the contrary, the theory of art is well equipped with police, detective, forensic and legal terms and methods (Erwin Panofsky would be a classic example, with his ideas of “art history as a humanistic discipline” and his central figure of “art historian-as-detective”). I am confused here because the trial had commenced without any proof that would be of consequence: if we are talking about cultural representation – it must be preceded by a differentiated analysis of the artwork; if we are talking about the transversal intersection of art and relevant legal and institutional procedures – we must first have an overview of the facts, from which the claim that the law has been broken is carried out.

To think of art in the framework of legal norms and moral *decorum* would mean its pacification and normalization, in other words – the abolition of imagination and thought itself. Also, production of social provocation, transgression of norms, production of *different*, of *nonsensical*, of *bizarre* and *brutal*, in many cases ends in public outcry and a call for social responsibility in art – and possibility of this call, I would say, must be considered when opting to enter into such critical venture.

The work of Zoran Todorović was titled “Gypsies and Dogs” as a deliberate label of hate speech, as we’ve been told by the artist. It was juxtaposed with two “half-empty” moving images captured by CCTV cameras carried by Roma children and stray dogs, their fuzziness leaving the space for each individual observer to fill it in with her own meaning and interpretation. The work was on display at the October Salon in Belgrade, an important artistic event, funded by the city of Belgrade, which coincided with the expulsion and fencing of Roma from the residential neighborhood of Belville, brutally carried out by city authorities shortly before the Belgrade Universiade, all under the advertising slogan of “Let’s clean up Serbia”. In this context it is not unusual or excessive to expect that art will be called to social responsibility, but not without a certain wonder in regards to the recipients of such a statement, “Gypsies and Dogs” – to whom it may concern and why, who responded to it, who did not and why?

In the absence of specific analysis, we remain stuck between a double blackmail of sorts: we either stand for “freedom of art”, and therefore are insensitive towards the persecution of Roma, or we advocate human rights and expect servility and utility of art in this regard. A result of a series of internal and public debates, opinionated stances and pressure that preceded the debate in Rex, this blackmail has blocked any chance of a differentiated conclusion. It has pigeonholed every statement into one of two pre-opened drawers: either pro-art & anti-Roma, or pro-Roma & anti-art. I don’t know how else to respond to this sort of blackmail but to place it in a sort of a mirrored reflection and provide a kind of a boomerang-statement: *If condemning “Gypsies and Dogs” by Zoran Todorović will bring back Roma families to Belville or wherever they feel at home – I will gladly join its prosecutors!*

CIGANI I PSI ILI ROMI I KUČIĆI

Rad Zorana Todorovića „Cigani i psi“, kao i mnogi drugi umetnički radovi napravljen je da bi isprovocirao publiku. Sudeći po reakcijama, ovaj rad je vrlo uspešan. Ipak, ako umetnost ne posmatramo tako cinično, već dozvolimo mogućnost da umetnik stvara iz potrebe da nešto kaže, da pozove na dijalog ili bar u želji da „ispriča“ svoj unutrašnji dijalog, pitanje je koliko je rad uspešan. Da, izazvao je polemike, ali, čini mi se, na pogrešnim mestima.

Kada je rad završen i izložen, više nema razloga da umetnik tumači šta je hteo da kaže. On je svojim delom rekao šta je rekao, a ko je šta razumeo ostaje da se vidi. Po mom mišljenju, kao publike, ovo je izuzetno važan rad. Zato što govori o stanju države u kojoj živimo, o tretmanu ljudi koji su svuda oko nas, a nevidljivi i tretirani kao psi. Da li je politički korektno to reći / prikazati na ovaj način? Ne znam. Zaista, ne znam. Ali kao građanin mislim da je mnogo važnije da li je politički, a pre svega ljudski, pustiti te ljude da tako žive, a ne (u)činiti ništa. Mislim da je rad Zorana Todorovića konstatacija činjenica. Za nekoga je šamar otrežnjenja, za nekoga uvreda. Uvredili su se Romi, a trebalo je da se uvrede političari. Zato mislim da je tribina održana u Rexu povodom ovog rada, teksta Nikole Dedića i reakcija na taj tekst, zapravo promašena tema. Ako govorimo o ovoj temi. Ako govorimo o ličnim obračunima na sceni, onda je, za nas koji ne pripadamo ni jednoj strani, gubljenje vremena.

Međutim, na ovu tribinu nisam pozvana kao publika. Pozvana sam jer predstavljam instituciju koja je organizator Oktobarskog salona na kome je rad izložen i koja dodeljuje nagradu „Lazar Trifunović“ koju je dobio Nikola Dedić za tekst o ovom radu. U oba slučaja sam Kulturni centar Beograda nema ulogu nekoga ko odlučuje. Kustosa Oktobarskog salona bira Savet salona, u kome sam ja jedan od pet članova i to član po funkciji. Uloga KCB-a, a time i moja uloga, je da obezbedimo što bolje uslove za rad kustosa u šta svakako spada i njegova/njena potpuna autorska sloboda. Ako bi se uočili „problemi“ opet bi Savet bio taj koji bi trebalo da donese odluku o „problematičnom“ sadržaju a ne ja, niti KCB. Nagradu „Lazar Trifunović“ dodeljuje KCB, ali ta nagrada ima nezavisni žiri koji zapravo odlučuje kome će nagrada biti dodeljena.

Posle dodele nagrade Nikoli Dediću oglasilo se jedno od romskih udruženja. Čitava prepiska sa njima je objavljena na sajtu KCB-a i bila je, i još uvek je, dostupna javnosti.

Ovde se ne radi o ignorantskom, ili prepotentnom stavu Kulturnog centra Beograda već o iskrenom uverenju da umetniku moraju da se garantuju slobode dok god te slobode ne ugrožavaju druge. Da li su ovde ugrožene slobode ili prava Roma, romske dece ili zajednice u celini pitanje je tumačenja rada.

Ja mislim da nisu. Ali ostavljam prostor da nisam u pravu. Samo pitam, ko je legitiman da da čitanje umetničkog dela.

Mislim da je prava tema tribine u Rexu trebalo da bude položaj romske zajednice kod nas. Raseljavanja sa jedne strane, i stalna upotreba reči inkluzija sa druge. I to što na ta dva kraja „evropskih vrednosti“ nigde nema Roma i toga šta oni hoće i šta njima odgovara.

Mia David

GYPSIES, AND DOGS OR ROMA PEOPLE AND HOUNDS

The work of Zoran Todorović "Gypsies, and dogs", like many other works of art, was created in order to provoke the audience. If judging by reactions to this work, it was very successful. However, if one does not view art from such a cynical perspective, if one allows the possibility that the artist creates urged by the need to say something, to call for dialogue, or at least the desire to "speak" his/her's inner dialogue, the success of this work of art can be questioned. Yes, it has sparked controversy, but it seems to me, it has done so in wrong places.

When a work of art is completed and put on display, there is no need for the artist himself to interpret what he wanted to say. He has said what he had to say with the work of art itself, and all that remains to be seen is - who understood what from it. In my opinion, as a member of the audience, this is an extremely important work of art. Because it talks about the state of the country we live in, the treatment of people who are all around us, invisible and treated like dogs. Is it politically correct to say/demonstrate those things in such a way? I do not know. I really do not know. But as a citizen, I think that the important question here is whether it is politically right and, above all, humane, to allow these people to continue living that way and not do anything about it. I think that the work of Zoran Todorović is purely a statement of facts. For some it is a sobering slap, for some it is an insult. Roma themselves were offended, but it was the politicians who were supposed to feel insulted. So I think that the discussions held at the Rex Cultural Centre regarding this work, the article by Nikola Dedić and reactions to the article, actually missed the point - if the idea was to *talk about this subject*. If the point was to talk about personal conflicts on Belgrade art scene - then it was a waste of time, at least for us who do not belong to any side.

However, I was not invited to this debate as a member of the audience. I was invited because I represent an institution that organizes the October Salon, where the work was exhibited and which has awarded the "Lazar Trifunović" award to Nikola Dedić for his article about this work of art. In both cases, the Cultural Centre of Belgrade does not assume the role of an arbiter. The curator of the October Salon is selected by the Council of the Salon, where I was one of five members - and an *ex officio* member at that. The role of the Cultural Centre of Belgrade, and therefore my role, is to provide best possible working conditions for the curators, which definitely includes his/her complete freedom of authorship. If any "problems" were to emerge, it would once again be the Council who would make a decision

regarding the "problematic" content, not me or the Cultural Centre of Belgrade. The "Lazar Trifunović" award is awarded by the Cultural Centre of Belgrade, but an independent jury decides who will be the recipient.

After the award was given to Nikola Dedić, one of several Roma People Associations sounded their opinion regarding the decision. The entire correspondence with them has been published on the Cultural Centre of Belgrade website and is still available to the public there.

This is not about some ignorant or arrogant attitude displayed by the Cultural Centre of Belgrade, but rather about a honest belief that artistic freedom must be guaranteed as long as that freedom does not infringe on others. Were freedoms or rights of Roma people, Roma children and the community as a whole violated in this case? That is a question of interpretation.

I think they were not. But I allow that I could be wrong. But I have to ask - who, then, is legitimate to provide a "reading" of this work of art?

I think the real topic of discussion in Rex should have been the position of the Roma community in our country. Their displacement on one side and constant use of the word inclusion on the other. And the fact that at these two extremes of "European values" there is no place for Roma people, for what they want and what best suits them.

Pet godina nakon izrade umetničkog rada i tri godine nakon njegovog predstavljanja na Oktobarskom salonu u Beogradu, a samo nekoliko nedelja pre predsedničkih, parlamentarnih i lokalnih izbora, dobio sam poziv iz REXa da ponovo učestvujem u razgovoru o radu.

Prvo sam obnovio sećanje na sam rad i razloge koji su ga doveli u žižu interesovanja.

Potom prolazim kroz arhivu YUCOM-a i podsećam se: kako smo reagovali, na šta konkretno, koje organizacije su nas podržale, kako su mediji o tome pisali, kome smo se obraćali, da li je bilo adekvatnog odgovora?

Rad sračunato provokativnog naziva "Cigani i psi" izazvao je tada oprečne reakcije. Govorilo se o sadržini rada i njegovoj "političkoj nekorektnosti" što je i naglašeno kao izuzetna vrednost u pozitivnim kritikama rada. Naime, u obrazloženju prilikom dodele nagrade za umetničku kritiku Kulturnog centra Beograda navedeno je da ovaj rad "odbacuje sve stereotipe političke korektnosti kao oblika bavljenja socijalnim problemima" (kritika iz koje je citat je napisana od strane istoričara umetnosti Nikole Dedića koji je za taj tekst dobio najvažniju ovdašnju nagradu za likovnu kritiku "Lazar Trifunović").

Vidim i da smo tada reagovali na dodelu nagrade za kritiku koju sam vam citirao, na rad nismo reagovali.

REX, 27. April.

Kao pravnik, pozvan sam na debatu da dam to usko, nerazumljivo tumačenje zakona i prava, unesem elemente ljudskih prava, a posebno prava dece. Podsetiću vas da se rad sastoji iz dva odvojena snimka: iz perspektive romskog deteta i iz perspektive psa lualice. Kamere su bile okačene i na dete i na psa i paralelno prikazuju "radni" dan jednog i drugog.

Ono što sam tokom rasprave naglašavao je da pravo, čak i ovako nesavršeno kao u Srbiji, ne može da predstavlja branu za umetničke slobode. Koketiranje sa zabranjenim je dozvoljeno, ali umetnik mora da bude svestan da u svakom trenutku s razlogom može biti pozvan da pojasni svoje postupke, kao i svaki građanin. Ne bih se ovde skrivao iza međunarodnih dokumenata, konvencija, Ustava, jer umetnik jednostavno mora poštovati neke vrednosti, i to ne zato što sistem želi da ga sputa i ograniči, već da bi se zaštitili drugi, ranjivi, marginalizovani.

Ukoliko u svom radu ugrozite prava građana, niste abolirani samim tim što ste umetnik i sa tim stavom smo se načelno složili, a umetnici uvek mogu koristiti usluge pravника iz organizacije iz koje dolazim i drugih koje se bave ljudskim pravima.

Klizaviji teren predstavljaju pitanja: da li sam rad ima elemente koji su diskriminatorски i da li se podilaženjem stereotipima o romskoj deci kao prosjacima, šalje poruka koja nije prikladna. Takođe, tokom rasprave postavljeno je i pitanje konkretne odgovornosti za navođenje maloletnika na prošenje, što uistinu i jeste definisano kao krivično delo.

Tu je sada neophodno umešati realnost.

Srbija, 2012. godina, prema manjinama, a naročito Romima se još uvek izuzetno loše postupa, prisutna je diskriminacija, nasilje. Setimo se samo dešavanja u selu Jabuka (ukoliko ne znate šta je tamo bilo, potražite na internetu). Društvo koje je u krizi, pa i ekonomskoj ne može imati sluha za poštovanje prava. Neophodno je dati mu impuls, dati podsticaj da se probudi humano, osećaj za druge.

Ta ista realnost nas na mnogo brutalniji način nego ovaj rad, podseća da pored nas žive, u uslovima krajnje bede, ljudi, deca, stari u neformalnim naseljima, lišeni mnogih prava. Da li će nas ovaj rad podstaći da o njima više brinemo ili je njegova svrha da podstakne raspravu dva podjednako zatvorena kruga, kruga umetnika i onih koji se bave zaštitom ljudskih prava. Ukoliko u tome uspe, postigao je uspeh, doista očekivan i ograničen, ali potrebno je otvoriti i druga pitanja, tražiti rešenja za sklanjanje dece sa ulica, za kažnjavanje onih koji ih navode na prošenje. Ne može nam izgovor biti da oni to žele, radi se o deci, neretko mlađoj od deset godina. Niko ne može govoriti o tome da su ta deca svesno želela da im detinjstvo prođe na ulici, van škole i svega onoga što bi im omogućilo da napreduju.

Stoga, ono što je meni daleko zanimljivije od rada je odnos institucija prema ovom i svakom drugom umetničkom radu, bilo to slikarstvo, pozorište, film. Da li institucije prepoznaju ove probleme, da li su dužne u svakom konkretnom slučaju da reaguju, da li su pre dodele nagrade, ili posle dodele nagrade mogle pokušati da pronađu dete koje je bilo predstavljeno u radu i pomoći mu. Imali su šansu da pokrenu centre za socijalni rad, da alarmiraju javnost. Ta šansa je bila propuštena.

Pred kraj debate u REX je došao i umetnik - postao je "prisutan" i rekao nam je da se rad kroz debate nastavlja i da će debata na kojoj smo učestvovali biti deo rada. Razgovor o radu, iz ugla kritičara, umetnika i ponekog pravника postaje umetnost.

Studenti okupljeni u REXu pružili su podršku svom profesoru, a kako vidim i snimali su debatu. Pojedini učesnici debate su se osetili iskorišćeno i zloupotrebjeno, ali to je već tema za drugu raspravu i obećavam da je neću započinjati ovde.

REX 4. jun

Umesto zaključka, želim da podelim sa vama i da je tokom pisanja ovog teksta u istom prostoru REXa održana kabaretska predstava koja prikazuje život transeksualaca koji pružaju seksualne usluge i žive u istom gradu u kojem živimo i mi. Predstavu su između ostalog radili Olga Dimitrijević, Ilija Milošević, Vladimir Bjeličić, Draško Adžić i drugi, a glume transeksualci.

Iz autentičnog ugla, identifikovali smo se sa ljudima koji su skrajnuti i kojima sistem za sada ne pomaže u dovoljnoj meri. Ono što su uspeli da urade za nepunih sat vremena na sceni REXa jeste da od seksualnih radnica, kakve su u realnom životu, postanu glumice koje nam dočaravaju težak život, osećanja, strahove. Poneka suza u publici pokazala je da umetnost može da šokira, da nas izvede iz naše rutine, obaveza, opčinjenosti novcem i zadovoljstvima.

Ovde se sa margina ljudi izvode na scenu, daje im se prostor. Ne bih da zvučim patetično, ali daje im se i druga šansa.

Sa druge strane, svako romsko dete, ne samo u umetničkom radu, ostaje u senci. Ne zna se šta se sa njim desilo i da li je vraćeno u svoju rutinu.

Sudbinom ovog deteta i svakog drugog „objekta“ korišćenog u stvaranju nekog dela zasigurno ne mora da se bavi umetnik. Ne mora biti njegova uloga da ispravlja socijalne nepravde i sklanja decu sa ulice. Sve institucije, samim tim i institucije kulture su dužne da bar pokušaju da isprave socijalne nepravde, da koriste afirmativnu akciju, da promovišu inkluziju i toleranciju.

YUCOM 6. jun

Ostaje da se vidi da li će umetnici biti zadovoljni što njihov rad i dalje živi u tekstovima, i to ne u tekstovima umetnika i profesionalnih kritičara umetnosti, već pravnika.

Milan Antonijević

Five years after the creation of “Gypsies, and Dogs” and three years after its premiere at the October Salon in Belgrade, only a few weeks before the presidential, parliamentary and local elections, I received a call from REX to participate again in a conversation regarding this work of art. First, I restored the memory of the work itself and the reasons that brought it into the spotlight.

Afterwards, I was going through the archives of YUCOM and I began recalling: how we had reacted, to what specifically, which organizations had supported us, how the media had wrote about it, whom we had addressed and whether there had been an adequate response?

The work of art with the calculated, provocative title „Gypsies, and dogs“ had caused contradictory reactions. There was talk about the content of the work and its „political incorrectness“ which was highlighted as an exceptional value in positive reviews. Specifically, the opinion accompanying the award for art criticism of the Cultural Centre of Belgrade stated that this work „reject all stereotypes of political correctness as a form of dealing with social problems.“

I also see that we had reacted to the award for *criticism* of the work which I have cited, and not to the work itself (the quoted critique was written by Nikola Dedić, an art historian, and has received the most important local award for art criticism, „Lazar Trifunović“).

REX, April 27th.

As a lawyer, I was invited to attend the debate in order to provide a narrow, obscure interpretation of law and legislation, to introduce the elements of human rights, especially the children's rights. Let me remind you that the work consists of two separate recordings - one from the perspective of Roma children and another from the perspective of a stray dog. The cameras were placed on the child and the dog, in parallel recording of the “working” day of the two.

What I stressed during the debate was that the legal system, as imperfect as it is Serbia, cannot be a barrier to artistic freedom. Flirting with the forbidden is allowed, but the artist must be aware that at any time he may be legitimately asked to explain his actions, like any citizen could be. I do not wish to seek refuge behind international documents, conventions, the Constitution, simply because the artist has to respect certain values, not because the system wants to hamper and restrict, but rather to protect others, those vulnerable and marginalized.

If your work interferes with the rights of citizens, you are not absolved if you are an artist, and we have all in principle agreed with that position, and the artists can always use the services of lawyers in my organization or other similar organizations dealing with human rights.

The slippery terrain begins with the questions regarding whether the work itself has elements that are discriminatory and whether, by pandering to stereotypes of Roma children as beggars, it sends a message that is not appropriate. Also, during the discussions, the question of responsibility for goading juveniles on to panhandle has been asked, which indeed is defined as a criminal offense.

That is the point at which reality must intervene.

In Serbia in 2012, minorities, especially Roma, are still in a very bad position, suffering discrimination and violence. Just look at the events in the village of Jabuka (if you do not know what happened there, do a quick internet search). A society in crisis, be that economic or some other crisis, cannot show much respect for rights. It is necessary to provide the impulse, to give impetus to awaken the humane feeling for others.

That very same reality reminds us in a much more brutal way than this work does that right next door to us there are those living in conditions of extreme poverty - people, children and elderly in informal settlements, deprived of many rights. Will this work encourage us to pay more attention and provide more care to them, or is its purpose to stimulate a discussion between two equally closed circles - that of artists and that of those involved in the protection of human rights? If it succeeds in that respect, it has achieved success, although somewhat expected and also limited in scope. But other issues should also be resolved; solution for the removal of children from the streets and punishment of those who lead them towards panhandling should be sought. Saying "they want to do it" should not be an excuse for us, for this is about children, often under the age of ten. No one can claim that these children consciously choose to spend their childhood on the streets, outside of the school system and all that which would enable them to thrive.

So, the thing that is far more interesting to me than the work of art itself is the attitude of institutions towards this or any other work of art, be it painting, theater or film. Do the institutions recognize these problems; are they required to act in each case, could they have tried to find the child who has been represented in the work and help him, be that before or after the award was announced? They had an opportunity to establish new centers for social work, to alarm the public. That opportunity was missed.

Towards the end of the debate in REX, the artist had joined us - he had become "present" - and told us that his work continues through the debate and that the debate in which we participate is to be part of the work.

Discussing the work, from the perspective of critics, artists and assorted lawyers becomes art.

The students gathered in REX have supported their professor, and as I have noticed, they have also recorded the debate. Some participants in the debate felt that they were exploited and abused, but that's another topic for discussion, and I promise that I will not start it here.

REX 4th of June

Instead of a conclusion, I want to share something with you that: during the writing of this article, a cabaret performance that depicts the life of transsexuals who provide sexual services and live in the same city in which we live, took place in REX. The artist involved, among others, were Olga Dimitrijević, Ilija Milošević, Vladimir Bjeličić, Draško Adžić and others, with all the actors being transsexual.

From an authentic point of view, we have identified with people who are sidelined and whom the system currently does not help sufficiently. What they succeeded in less than an hour on the stage of REX is to turn sex workers, such as they are in real life, into actresses that conjure up images of a hard life, feelings and fears. Tears that could be seen on faces in the audience showed us that art can indeed shock us out of our routines, duties, pleasures and fascination with money.

Here are marginalized people going on stage, given space. I do not mean to sound pathetic, but this also gives them a second chance.

On the other hand, the Roma child remains in shadows - not only in artistic work. Nobody knows what happens to it and whether it has returned to its routine.

The fate of that child and any other "object" used in the creation of a work of art certainly does not have to be the provenance of the artist. His role need not be to correct social injustice and keep the children from the streets. All institutions - and therefore cultural institutions, too - are obliged to at least try to correct social injustice, to use affirmative action to promote inclusion and tolerance.

YUCOM 6th of June

It remains to be seen whether artists will be pleased that their work lives on in texts - and not in texts of professional artists and art critics, but rather lawyers.

OKUPIRATI AGALMU

Kao kustosici koja je pristala postati integralni dio umjetničkog rada Zorana Todorovića *Agalma*¹, što je podrazumijevalo kupanje u kadi s kolegicom-kustosicom pred fotoaparatom u sapunu načinjenom od sala i kože autora te dijeljenje dara, agalme, onog najvrednijeg, s budućom publikom u vidu pranja njihovih ruku ili čitavog tijela istim sapunom, ponovni susret s Todorovićevom projektom uvijek je uzbuđljiv i pun iščekivanja, istodobno pričinjavajući visoki stupanj zadovoljstva i nelagode. Dok je *Agalma* uključivala mogućnost izbora oko sudjelovanja, rad *Cigani i psi*² postavlja drugačije zakonitosti: on okupira. Zauzima bez konsenzusa nestabilne točke društva kao što je primjerice politika inkluzije manjina, u ovom slučaju utjelovljena kroz Rome. Okupacijski karakter se može ili ne nekome sviđati te se možemo braniti da na njega ne pristajemo jer nas to nitko nije pitao no rad isključuje autonomnu odluku o daljnjoj participaciji čim osvoji naš intelektualni i emotivni teritorij. Time nas može staviti u predvidljivu poziciju: pobune prema nametnutom. Isto se tako bune Romi u Beogradu jer ih se deteritorijalizira silom, seleći ih iz jednog naselja u drugo. No njih je zahvatio okrutniji projekt, onaj kapitala koji surađuje s vlastima. Kapital i siromaštvo: vrlo popularna tema u globalizacijskim i antiglobalizacijskim diskursima.

Kad su u pitanju manjine, postoji određeni manjak ili, preciznije, negativni višak koji treba regulirati, višak negativnog odnosa. Kako se isključeni uključuju? Pristupi najčešće uključuju lažni humanitarizam,

¹ Vidi: http://www.zorantodorovic.com/agalma_sr.htm.

² O radu Zorana Todorovića *Cigani i psi* vodi se višegodišnja polemika čiji se dio može pronaći na Todorovićevoj internetskoj stranici. Elektronski dostupni tekstovi i prepiske postaju integralni dio projekta odnosno umjetnikove "knjige utiska" koja se stalno nadopunjuje. Vidi: *Cigani i psi II: Simptomi i tragovi javne recepcije*: http://www.zorantodorovic.com/gypsies_and_dogs_sr.htm (25.05.2012.). Ozbiljna analiza rada i proizvedenih učinaka koja se može naći u spomenutom dokumentu je tekst Tamare Đorđević: *Efekte i konsekvence Denkverbot-a: Hoćemo li zvati umetnike na "informativni razgovor"*.

Novi materijali za *artist-book* su nastali i na ovoj debati: "Debata o institucionalnom tretmanu rada *Cigani i psi* Zorana Todorovića" koja se u travnju ove godine održala u beogradskom Kulturnom centru Rex kao dio njihovog programa *MISLI O DRUGIMA – MISLI O SEBI* koji ima namjeru "da podstakne kritičku debatu o reprezentaciji nacionalnih manjina u političkom i kulturnom životu u Srbiji i da promovise socijalnu pravdu, solidarnost, jednakost i jednaka ljudska prava za sve građane i građanke Srbije.", iz: <http://www.rex.b92.net/sr/ovogmeseca/tribineDebate/story/4250/MISLI+O+DRUGIMA+-+MISLI+O+SEBI%3A+Deb%00%B0t%00%B0+o+institucion%00%B0lnom+tretm%00%B0nu+r%00%B0d%00%B0+%E2%80%9DCig%00%B0ni+i+psi%E2%80%9D+Zor%00%B0n%00%B0+Todorovi%C4%87%00%B0.html> (25.05.2012.).

ideologiju inkluzije i viktimizacije u kojima drugi treba ostati drugi, žrtva, bez stvarne moći i pozicije iz koje djeluje. Kao razrješenje te situacije i usmjeravajući na stvarni problem Žižek predlaže da: "(...) suočeni s etničkom mržnjom i nasiljem, treba da u potpunosti odbacimo standardnu multikulturalističku ideju da, nasuprot etničkoj netoleranciji, treba da se naučimo da poštujemo i živimo sa Drugošću Drugog i da razvijemo toleranciju za različite stilove života – način da se doista borimo protiv etničke mržnje nije kroz njen neposredni pandan, etničku toleranciju; naprotiv, ono što nam treba jeste još više mržnje, ali prave političke mržnje: mržnje uperene prema zajedničkom političkom neprijatelju."³

Todorovićev projekt *Cigani i psi* ne koristi eksplicitno nabranje problema izmičući se na taj način iz polja izravno aktivističkog i moralističkog. Nejasan, tranzitan sadržaj dvokanalne video instalacije ostavlja praznog prostora koji popunjava publika postajući integralni dio rada tako da on "funkcioniše kao izvedba publike smeštene između slike i teksta."⁴ Djelovanje rada uspostavlja se kroz namjerno okrutan, provokativan i diskriminacijski naslov *Cigani i psi*, međutim: "Ovakav naslov nije bio u funkciji sadržaja, odnosno, nije sugerisao njegovu suštinu kao ni ideološki stav autora već je koncipiran da stvori očekivanje nekog rasističkog diskursa kod publike koja je na tom osnovu tumačila slike."⁵

Uključimo u diskurs i djecu jer se u reakcijama na rad sugeriralo kako je umjetnik počinio krivično djelo navodeći djecu na prošnju na što su institucije/društvo ostale pasivne i licemjerne. No treba li rad u kojem autor zauzima, prema vlastitim riječima, poziciju "aktivne indiferentnosti", instrumentalizirati za borbu protiv poticanja djece na prošnju ili za ukazivanje na neodgovornost institucija vlasti jer dopuštaju takav umjetnički rad, ili pak prozivati instituciju koja je rad izložila. Bi li možda trebalo napraviti policijsku istragu kako je umjetnik pristupao djeci⁶ ili bi umjetnik trebao raditi projekt s odvjatnikom uz sebe. To dovodi umjetnost do apsurdna, promovirajući uplitanje zabrane/zakona u umjetnički rad, nametanjem sustava ljudskih prava, političke korektnosti i moralnosti, što blokira mogućnost autentičnog umjetničkog čina⁷ i njegovih poželjnih učinaka, sužava područje mogućih komunikacija o

³ Slavoj Žižek: *Manje ljubavi – više mržnje!*, Beogradski krug, Beograd, 2001., str. 159.

⁴ Zoran Todorović: *Rad Cigani i Psi*, http://www.zorantodorovic.com/gypsies_and_dogs_sr.htm (25.05.2012.).

⁵ Ibid.

⁶ "Ako se koristi policijska perspektiva, može se reći da sam ja decu 'ozvučio' i da su ona tu u ulozi mojih saradnika insajdera (industrija prošnje je komplikovana organizacija s puno različitih aktera). Zahvaljujući ozvučenoj deci publika svedoči mo menat prošnje, ona (publika) je u ulozi svedoka. Međutim ta uloga je neprijatna i neki aktivisti žele da je zamene za ulogu islednika koji paradoksalno želi da isleđuje onoga ko je postavio kameru.", privatna komunikacija s umjetnikom.

⁷ "Autentični čin narušava temeljnu fantaziju napadajući je sa stanovišta 'društvenog simptoma...', Slavoj Žižek: *Manje ljubavi – više mržnje!*, Beogradski krug, Beograd, 2001., str. 142.

simptomati vlasti, društva i pojedinaca koja počinje curiti iz rada te podržava famozni status quo što zasigurno ne doprinosi tome da djeca prestanu prositi.

No, sve optužbe i obrane ne umanjuju moć rada već ju uvećavaju. Upravo njegova ne-pozicioniranost pridonosi stalnoj proizvodnji napetosti, aktiviranju nelagode i moralnoj panici. Od kada je izložen na Oktobarskom salonu 2009. godine⁸, rad stvara neprestani nesporazum, sukob, nemir i po pitanju čime se bavi, zagovara li jezik mržnje, je li njime prekršen zakon. To se odvija kroz stalne rasprave između onih koji smatraju da je rasistički i onih koji to opovrgavaju tvrdeći da upravo destabilizira značenjsko polje koje se čini samorazumljivim, ukazuje na probleme rasizma, kako onog kojeg društvo obznanjuje da postoji tako i onog skrivenog, koji upravo konstituira društvo te da se bavi problemom depolitizacije kojom se kastrira progresivno djelovanje. No, nitko projekt ne uspijeva aropriirati i on ostaje neintegrirana smetnja društvu. *Cigani i psi* stalno sklizu kroz ruke sistema države, prava, aktivista, kulturnih radnika, i samo potvrđuju da Zoran Todorović nije humanitarni radnik, ni aktivist, ni moralist, ni pravnik, pa konačno ni umjetnik koji se legitimira kroz politički korektno. On zadržava autonomnu umjetničku poziciju te otvara prostor mogućim političkim subjektima provocirajući ih da redefinišu svoju utemeljujuću istinu, svoje tajno blago – agalmu.⁹

svibanj 2012.

⁸ Godina nastanka rada je 2007.

⁹ Još jedan mogući završetak: "Pretpostavimo da je svijest koja Cigane pridružuje psima, 'prije' nego što je vidjela u jednim i drugima nešto što treba izolirati ili zbrinuti, u njima istovremeno vidjela nešto uznemirujuće, nesjedilačko, nešto što remti poredak, ukoliko nešto lutalačko. Todorovićev rad prikazuje lutanje Cigana i pasa lišeno svake romantične iluzije, repetitivno 'gluvarenje'. No ipak, ako njegov rad ne gledamo kao prazan okvir nego kao svojevrsno metaforičko ogledalo, ne poziva li nas (ili bar mene poziva) da zajedno s Ciganima i psima odlutamo nekamo posve drugdje," privatna komunikacija s anonimnim autorom.

Sunčica Ostoić

TO OCCUPY AGALMA

As a curator who has agreed to become an integral part of the artistic work by Zoran Todorović titled "Agalma"¹⁰, which entailed bathing in a tub in front of the camera, together with a fellow-curator, and using soap made from fat and skin of the author - thus sharing the gift of agalma, that which is most valuable, with the future audience, by washing their hands or their entire body with the same soap - a reunion with Todorović's new project is always exciting and brimming with equal parts anticipation, pleasure and discomfort. While "Agalma" included the possibility of choosing to participate, the work "Gypsies and Dogs"¹¹ sets different principles: it occupies. It occupies unstable points of society without consensus, such as the policy regarding the inclusion of minorities, in this case embodied in Roma people. One can like or dislike its "occupational" nature and we can try and defend ourselves from it by stating that we do not accept it - because no one asked us to participate - but this work excludes an autonomous decision regarding future participation as soon as it enters and conquers our intellectual and emotional territory. In this way it can put us in a predictable position: rebellion against that which is imposed. In the same way, Belgrade Roma revolt because they are being de-territorialized by force, moved from one part of the city to another. But they have been caught in project that is more cruel, one made up of capital in cooperation with the authorities. Equity and poverty: a very popular theme in the discourses of globalization and anti-globalization.

Whenever minorities are concerned, there is a deficit or, more precisely, a negative excess that should be regulated, an excess of negative attitude.

¹⁰ See: http://www.zorantodorovic.com/agalma_sr.htm.

¹¹ The work of Zoran Todorović, "Gypsies and dogs" has been the subject of an on-going debate that has spanned several years, a part of which can be found on the artist's website. Electronically available texts and correspondence become an integral part of the project and the artist's "book of impressions" that is continually being updated. See: the project and the artist's "book of impressions" that is continually being updated. See: *Gypsies and Dogs II: Symptoms and Signs of Public Reception*: http://www.zorantodorovic.com/Gypsies_and_Dogs_Serbian.pdf (05/25/2012.). A serious analysis of the can be found in the above document, more precisely in the text by Tamara Đorđević: *The effects and consequences of Denkverbot: Should artists be detained for police questioning?* New materials for this artist-book have been created in this debate: "The debate about the institutional treatment of 'Gypsies and dogs' by Zoran Todorović," which took place at the Rex Cultural Center in Belgrade in April 2012, as part of their *Think About Others - Think About Yourself* program that is intended "to stimulate critical debate on the representation of national minorities in the political and cultural life in Serbia and to promote social justice, solidarity, equality and equal human rights for all citizens of Serbia." From: <http://www.rex.b92.net/sr/ovogmeseca/tribineDebate/story/4250/MISLI+O+DRUGIMA+-+MISLI+O+SEBI%3A+Deb%D0%B0t%D0%B0+o+instituci on%D0%B0nom+tretm%D0%B0nu+r%D0%B0d%D0%B0+%E2%80%9DCig%D0%B0ni+i+psi%E2%80%9D+Zor%D0%B0n%D0%B0+Todorovi%C4%87%D0%B0.html> (05/25/2012).

How to include the excluded? Approaches usually involve a kind of false humanitarianism, an ideology of inclusion and victimization in which the other should remain the other, that is, the victim, with no real power and position from which it operates. One resolution of the situation and a means of focusing on the real problem is proposed by Žižek: "(...) confronted with ethnic hatred and violence, one should thoroughly reject the standard multiculturalist idea that, against ethnic intolerance, one should learn to respect and live with the Otherness of the Other, to develop a tolerance for different lifestyles, and so on--the way to fight ethnic hatred effectively is not through its immediate counterpart, ethnic tolerance, on the contrary, what we need is even more hatred, but proper political hatred: hatred directed at the common political enemy."¹²

Todorović's project "Gypsies and Dogs" does not use an explicit inventory of problems, thus evading the entire field of direct activism and moralizing. Unclear, transitional position of his dual-channel video installation leaves enough of an empty space for the audience to fill up by becoming an integral part of the work so that it "operates as a performance of the audience situated between the images and the text."¹³ The effect of the work is established through a deliberately cruel, discriminatory and provocative title "Gypsies and Dogs". However: "This title is not a function of the content, that is, it does not suggest its essence or ideological views of the author, but rather is designed to create an expectation of a racist discourse within the audience, which would then interpret the images on that basis."¹⁴

Let us also engage children in this discourse, because some reactions to this work of art suggested that the artist committed the criminal offense of goading children to beg, about which institutions/society remained passive and hypocritical. But should the work in which the author takes up, in his own words, the position of "active indifference" be instrumentalized in order to fight against incitement of children to beg, or to indicate a lack of responsibility by the government institutions seeing that they allow such a work of art to be created, or should we maybe denounce the institution that has exhibited the work? Perhaps a police investigation should be made into how the artist approached the children¹⁵ or maybe the artist should have created the project with his legal counsel present? This leads art towards the absurd, promoting

12 Slavoj Žižek: *The Fragile Absolute*, Verso, 2001, p11

13 Zoran Todorović: "Project Gypsies and Dogs", http://www.zorantodorovic.com/Gypsies_and_Dogs_Serbian.pdf (25/05/2012)

14 Ibid.

15 "If we try to seeing things from a police perspective, it could be said that I have 'wired' the kids and that they are there in the role of my associate insiders (the pan-handling industry is a complicated organization with a lot of different actors). Thanks to wired children the audience plays witness to the moment of solicitation, they (the audience) are the witness. But this role is awkward and some activists want to replace it with the role of an investigator who wants to paradoxically investigate the one who set up the camera." Private communication with the artist.

involvement of prohibition/law in art, by imposing a system of human rights, political correctness and morality, which blocks the possibility of authentic artistic acts¹⁶ and their desired outcomes, narrowing the scope of possible communication about symptoms of government, society and the individual that starts to leak from the work of art and thus supporting the infamous status quo, which certainly does not contribute towards stopping children from begging.

But all the charges and defenses do not diminish the power of this work of art, but rather increase it. It is its very non-positioning that contributes to the constant production of tension, the activation of discomfort, of moral panic. Since it was exhibited at the Belgrade October salon 2009¹⁷, the work has been creating constant disagreement, conflict and unrest in terms of what it achieves. Does it advocate hate speech, has violated the law? This is done through ongoing debate between those who believe that it is racist and those who oppose such claims, upholding the position that it destabilizes the semantic field that seems self-evident, that it points to the problems of racism - be that open racism, declared by society or hidden racism, the one that constitutes a society - and that it addresses the problem of de-politization which castrates progressive action. But nobody has succeeded in appropriating the project and it remains an unintegrated nuisance to society. "Gypsies and Dogs" always slip through the hands of the state system, the law, the activists, the cultural workers, and only confirm that Zoran Todorović is not a humanitarian worker or an activist or a moralist or a lawyer, and ultimately not an artist who seeks legitimacy through political correctness. He retains an autonomous artistic position and opens up a space for possible political entities by provoking them to redefine their foundational truth, their hidden treasure - their *agalma*.¹⁸

May 2012

16 "The authentic act violates the fundamental fantasy, attacking it from the point of the 'social symptom' ..."; Slavoj Žižek: *The Fragile Absolute*, Beogradski krug, Belgrade, 2001, p. 142

17 The work was created in 2007

18 Another possible conclusion: "Let us suppose that the mind that puts Gypsies together with dogs, before it saw in both of them something to be isolated or taken care of, has seen in both something disturbing, non-sedentary, something that disrupts the order, in short, something vagrant. Todorović's work shows the wanderings of Gypsies and dogs devoid of any romantic illusion, as repetitive loitering. But still, if we don't view his work as an empty frame but as a metaphorical mirror of sorts, doesn't it then call us (or at least, me) to wander somewhere else entirely, together with Gypsies and dogs?" Private communication with an anonymous author.

QUESTIONING THE VIABILITY OF THE CONCEPT OF AUTONOMY OF ARTS IN THE CONTEXT OF POLITICALLY CONCERNED ART

The issue of autonomy of art is one of the most paradoxical issues in contemporary culture today, and it has always been surrounded with controversies ever since it first emerged (according to Theodor Adorno art that is an end in itself emerged towards the end of 18th century when artist became free of the patronage of the church, aristocrats and the state).

Ever since the basic conditions for autonomy emerged the paradoxical nature of autonomy of art stems from several different definitions of autonomy that are interweaved and contradict to each other because of different positions of the ones who claim such autonomy. One of the biggest paradoxes from this starting period is that art became autonomous only because it became commodified (so yet not completely independent) through its involvement in the capitalist market system and exchange of symbolic values.

When addressing different claims to autonomy that were instigated in the context of the project "Cigani i psi" by Zoran Todorovic (during the Debate on the institutional treatment of the work "Cigani i psi" by Zoran Todorović) I managed to list at least six different positions in regard to autonomy, and I am sure there were some more of which I was not aware when writing this text.

1. The first was the clear claim to autonomy of art that came from the artist, and he used this claim when speaking and writing in public about his work.
2. The second claim to autonomy of art came from several institutions that were responsible for the production and presentation of the work. They mostly claimed that they took the responsibility to protect the autonomy of artist and the art work from the intrusion from different sources.
3. The third was the position of the published art criticism (the text that claimed the right to autonomy was even awarded).

4. The fourth position was the one of the independent art scene and activist organizations of different provenience that was, importantly to state, not unified, but there were claims to autonomy there too.
5. The call for autonomy of the subjective as a position in the legal, societal and political context is of course the most complex to discuss because this is never clearly stated and defended by the state but it often served to different purposes if its derailment starts threatening the state itself and its interests.
6. And finally, the claim of the Roma organization(s) to autonomy of Roma that ultimately is in direct collision with the first claim to autonomy of art – the one proclaimed by the artist.

Actually all these different positions at certain extent overlap each other but they are also obviously in contradiction to each other because they are the result of different interests. The questions that remain unanswered, if one accepts the general assumption that autonomy is still needed and unresolved contradiction of art work's structure is what kind of autonomy and for whom, and why artists and institutions claim the rights to autonomy even in contexts where they already accepted different alliances with the world and its political and economical powers.

A more general division inside of autonomy could clarify the inner paradox of the claim to art's right to autonomy: the obvious distinction between the social and aesthetical autonomy wherein the artist and his/her art work belong to different and often contrasted registers of autonomy. At first it sounds as when the artist claims the need for a social autonomy the aesthetical autonomy of the art work slips under the same rubric of autonomy but when the artist claim that the work is also socially engaged than the claims become contradictory and diminish each other's strength.

However, there is a dialectical relation between social and aesthetical autonomy just as between autonomy and commodification which should not be forgotten and the artists are free to choose their paths and to diversify their justifications for different positions when calling for art for art's sake, whether based on the need for a formalist separation of aesthetic from moral values, or because of giving superiority to aesthetic values above all other values, or because of claiming to distanced and disinterested Kantian aesthetics, or even because of claiming that art is completely independent of life and is subjected to completely independent rules of development.

Regardless of the justification for claims to autonomy that is going to be used, the only thing that has to be clearly emphasized is that picking one of these stances may ruin the artist's right to claim as well another justification without sending out a ridiculously emptied out and contradictory message, e.g. that although the artist is politically engaged and interested in society and its dramas he/she asks for the rights to be disengaged from any responsibility about this drama even when the work directly interferes with all causes and end results of this drama.

Suzana Milevska

ISPITIVANJE ODRŽIVOSTI KONCEPTA AUTONOMIJE UMETNOSTI U KONTEKSTU POLITIČKI ANGAŽOVANE UMETNOSTI

Pitanje autonomije umetnosti danas je jedno od najparadoksalnijih u savremenoj kulturi, i kao takvo je prožeto kontroverzama od trenutka kada se prvi put pojavilo (prema Teodoru Adornu, umetnost koja je sama sebi svrha je nastala krajem 18. veka, kada je umetnik postao slobodan od pokroviteljstva crkve, aristokratije i države).

Paradoksalna priroda autonomije umetnosti potiče još od vremena kada su se pojavili osnovni uslovi za njenu autonomiju, a proističe iz različitih definicija autonomije koje se međusobno prepliću i suprotstavljaju, zbog različitih pozicija onih koji tu autonomiju zahtevaju. Jedan od najvećih paradoksa iz ovog početnog perioda jeste činjenica da je umetnost postala autonomna samo zato što je postala roba (pa stoga ne i u potpunosti nezavisna) kroz svoje učešće u kapitalističkom tržišnom sistemu i razmeni simboličkih vrednosti.

Kada se bavimo različitim zahtevima vezanim za autonomiju koji su podsticani u kontekstu projekta "Cigani i psi" Zorana Todorovića (tokom rasprave o institucionalnom tretmanu istoimenog rada) uspela sam da izdvojim barem šest različitih pozicija - a sigurna sam da postoje još neke kojih nisam bila svesna u trenutku pisanja ovog teksta.

1. Prva je ona autorova - čisti zahtev za autonomijom umetnosti - na koju se on oslanjao kada je javno govorio i pisao o svom radu.
2. Drugi zahtev za autonomijom umetnosti potiče od strane institucija koje su bile odgovorne za produkciju i izlaganje rada. Tu se uglavnom tvrdilo da su same institucije preuzele odgovornost da zaštite autonomiju umetnika i umetničkog rada od ometanja sa različitih strana.
3. Treća je pozicija štampane umetničke kritike (tekst koji je tražio pravo na autonomiju je čak i nagrađen).
4. Četvrta pozicija potiče sa nezavisne umetničke scene, kao i od

strane aktivističkih organizacija različitih provinijencija - i važno je napomenuti da ona nije bila jednoobrazna, ali da su i odatle stizali određeni zahtevi za autonomijom.

5. Poziv na autonomiju subjektivnosti kao pozicije u pravnom, društvenom i političkom kontekstu, je naravno najkompleksniji za diskusiju, s obzirom na to da nikad nije jasno izražen niti branjen od strane države, ali je često služio u različite svrhe ako se njenim "iskakanjem iz šina" stvarala pretnja samoj državi i njenim interesima.
6. I konačno, zahtev romskih organizacija za autonomijom Roma, koji je neizbežno u direktnom sukobu sa prvim zahtevom za autonomijom umetnosti - onim koji ispostavlja sam umetnik.

U suštini, sve ove različite pozicije se do određene mere međusobno preklapaju, ali su takođe u očiglednoj međusobnoj kontradikciji, budući da su posledice različitih interesa. Pitanja koja ostaju bez odgovora, ako prihvatimo opštu pretpostavku da je autonomija i dalje potrebna i nerazrešena kontradikcija strukture umetničkog dela, jesu sledeća: koja vrsta autonomije i za koga, kao i zašto umetnici i institucije zahtevaju pravo na autonomiju čak i u kontekstima u kojima su već prihvatili različite "saveze" sa svetom i njegovim političkim i ekonomskim silama?

Jedna opštija podela u okviru autonomije bi mogla da pomogne prilikom razjašnjavanja unutrašnjeg paradoksa zahteva za pravom umetnosti na autonomiju: očigledna razlika između društvene i estetske autonomije, pri kojoj umetnik i njegovo/njeno umetničko delo pripadaju različitim i često suprotstavljenim registrima autonomije. Isprva, to bi moglo zvučati kao da umetnik, kada iznosi svoju potrebu za društvenom autonomijom, u istu "rubriku" autonomije svrstava i estetsku autonomiju umetničkog dela, a da sa druge strane, kada tvrdi da je rad društveno angažovan, ta dva zahteva postaju kontradiktorna i umanjuju snagu jedan drugome.

Ipak, postoji dijalektički odnos između društvene i estetske autonomije, kao i između autonomije i komodifikacije, odnos koji ne bi trebalo zaboraviti. Umetnici su slobodni da odaberu svoj put i da diverzifikuju svoja opravdanja za različite pozicije kada zazivaju umetnost koja je sama sebi svrha, bilo to zasnovano na potrebi za formalnim razdvajanjem estetskih od moralnih vrednosti, bilo da se daje prednost estetskim vrednostima nad svim ostalima, bilo da se držimo distancirane i bezinteresne kantovske estetike - ili čak i zato što tvrdimo da je umetnost u potpunosti nezavisna od života i da se podvrgava potpuno nezavisnim pravilima razvoja.

Bez obzira na to koje opravdanje se koristi u zahtevu za autonomijom, jedina stvar koju treba jasno naglasiti jeste to da odabir jednog od ovih stavova može poništiti umetnikovo pravo da traži i neko drugo opravdanje, a da pri tom ne pošalje smešno ispraznu i kontradiktornu poruku, tj. da umetnik, iako politički angažovan i zainteresovan za društvo i njegovu dramu, takođe traži pravo da bude lišen bilo kakve odgovornosti u vezi s tom dramom, čak i kada se rad direktno prepliće sa svim uzrocima i konačnim ishodima te drame.

KRATKE BIOGRAFIJE / SHORT CVs

Jelena Vesić

je nezavisna kustoskinja, kulturna aktivistkinja, autorka, urednica i predavačica, koja živi i radi u Beogradu i internacionalno. Kourednica časopisa *Prelom* – Časopis za sliku i politiku, Beograd 2001-2009 i jedna od osnivača *Prelom Kolektiva*, Beograd 2005-2011. Jedna od osnivača mreže nezavisnih organizacija *Druga Scena*, Beograd, od 2005/6. Kourednica žurnala *Red Thread* – Žurnal za društvenu teoriju, savremenu umetnost i aktivizam, od 2009. i članica redakcije časopisa *Art Margins* za umetnost i teoriju (MIT Press) od 2011. Njeno istraživanje je posvećeno politikama reprezentacije u umetnosti i vizuelnoj kulturi, praksama samoorganizacije i politizacije kulturnog rada. U svojoj kustoskoj praksi često eksperimentiše sa različitim formatima, metodologijama, kontekstualnim i kolaborativnim aspektima umetnosti.

is independent curator, cultural activist, writer, editor and lecturer who lives and works in Belgrade and abroad. She was co-editor of *Prelom* – Journal of Images and Politics (Belgrade) 2001-2009, founding member of independent organization *Prelom Collective* (Belgrade) 2005-2010 and founding member of the network of independent organizations *Other Scene*, Belgrade since 2005/6. She is also co-editor of *Red Thread* – Journal for social theory, contemporary art and activism, (Istanbul) since 2009 and member of editorial board of *Art Margins* (MIT Press). Jelena Vesić's research is dedicated to the politics of representation in art and visual culture, practices of self-organization and politicization of cultural work. Her curatorial practice often experiments with frameworks, methodologies, and contextual and collaborative aspects of art.

Mia David

je rođena 1974. Završila Arhitektonski fakultet, a magistrirala i doktorirala na Univerzitetu umetnosti na Odseku za scenski dizajn. Član je NUNS-a, Društva arhitekata Beograda i Inženjerske komore Srbije. Bavi se istraživanjem prostora i njegovim oblikovanjem. Autorka je više izvedenih projekata iz oblasti arhitekture, scenografije, umetnosti, grafičkog i dizajna postavki izložbi. Izlagala je u zemlji i inostranstvu. Objavila je nekoliko tekstova u stručnoj literaturi i više od 150 tekstova u časopisima *Kemp*, *Ambijenti*, *Kvart*, *Politika*, *Oris*, *Elle*, i dr. U životu radi svašta i ponosna je na to. Trenutno je na poziciji direktorke Kulturnog centra Beograda.

was born in 1974. She graduated from the Faculty of Architecture in Belgrade and earned her Master's degree and a Ph.D. from the University of Arts, Department of Stage Design. She is a member of NUNS (Independent Journalists' Association of Serbia), Association of Architects of Belgrade and the Serbian Chamber of Engineers. In her work, she focuses on exploring and shaping spaces. She is the author of several design projects that have been implemented in the field of architecture, stage design, art, graphic and exhibition design. Her work was shown at exhibitions in the country and abroad. She has several papers published in professional

journals and more than 150 articles written for various magazines, including *Camp*, *Ambijenti*, *Kvart*, *Politika*, *Oris*, *Elle*, etc. She has been doing all sorts of stuff throughout her professional life and is proud of that. She is currently the director of the Belgrade Cultural Centre.

Milan Antonijević

je rođen 24. septembra 1975. godine. Završio Pravni fakultet u Beogradu, Odsek za međunarodno pravo. Školu ljudskih prava Beogradskog centra za ljudska prava, na kojoj danas predaje studentima, završio je 1999. godine. Od 2001. radi u Komitetu pravnik za ljudska prava – YUCOM, 2005. je imenovan za izvršnog direktora, a 2010. i za direktora YUCOM-a. Radio je na nizu zakona iz oblasti obrazovanja i socijalne zaštite usvojenih 2009. i 2010. godine, a učestvovao je i u izradi predloga izmena Krivičnog zakonika 2012. godine kojima su usvojene odredbe o kažnjavanju zločina iz mržnje. Pred državnim organima, domaćim i međunarodnim sudovima, u timu YUCOM-ovih advokata i pravnik, zastupa žrtve čija su ljudska prava ugrožena.

born on September 24th 1975, graduated at the Law Faculty at Belgrade University, and holds a degree of a section for International Law. As a UK Foreign Office Chevening Scholar attended Peace Studies at University of Bradford, with a thesis *Using Democracy for Peace in Serbia* (2010). Since 2001 works in Lawyers Committee for Human Rights - YUCOM, where he is currently on the position of Director. Through the Deputy Prime Minister's Poverty Reduction Strategy Implementation Focal Point as independent expert worked on drafting set of laws on educational system within the Ministry of Education (2009) and Law on Social Welfare (2010).

Sunčica Ostoić

(HR, 1976.) je povjesničarka umjetnosti, nezavisna kustosica i likovna kritičarka iz Zagreba gdje je na Filozofskom Fakultetu diplomirala povijest umjetnosti i filozofiju. Godine 2002. suosnovala je nevladinu kustosku udrugu KONTEJNER | biro suvremene umjetničke prakse koja se bavi istraživačkom umjetnošću na polju umjetnosti i tehnologije, umjetnosti i znanosti te tjelesne umjetnosti. Od 2000. godine do danas radila je u udruzi na više od sto projekata – izložbi, festivala, predavanja u Hrvatskoj i internacionalno: Zagrebu, Rijeci, Dubrovniku, Ljubljani, Beogradu, Skoplju, Glasgowu, Perthu, Sidneyu, San Franciscu, Pekingu, Tokiju itd. kroz autorske projekte: *Ekstravagantna tijela festival*, *Touch Me festival*, *Device_art festival* i produkcijsku platformu *Uradisam_ARTLAB*. Članica je Kulturnog vijeća za nove medijske kulture pri Ministarstvu kulture Republike Hrvatske, vijeća Galerije VN i HDD Galerije te AICA-e i ULUPUH-a.

(HR, 1976) is an art historian, independent curator and art critic from Zagreb. She graduated in Art History and Philosophy at the Faculty of

Philosophy and Social Studies in Zagreb. In 2002 she co-founded KONTEJNER | bureau of contemporary art praxis, an independent not-for-profit curatorial organisation promoting and producing investigative intermedia and interdisciplinary art in the field of art and science, art and technology, performance and body art. Since 2000 Ostoić accomplished the realization of over hundred projects within the organization – exhibitions, festivals, lectures, in Croatia and internationally (Ljubljana, Belgrade, Skopje, Glasgow, Prague, Perth, Sidney, San Francisco, Beijing...) through authorship projects: Extravagant Bodies Festival, Touch Me Festival, Device_art Festival and production platform DIY_ARTLAB.

Suzana Milevska

is a theorist and curator of visual art and culture. Her interests include postcolonial critique of hegemonic power regimes of representation, feminist art and gender theory, participatory and collaborative art practices. She holds a PhD in visual culture from Goldsmiths College London and was a Fulbright Senior Research Scholar (2004). She taught visual culture and gender at the Gender Studies Institute at the University Ss. Cyril and Methodius in Skopje (2013) and history and theory of art at the Faculty of Fine Arts – University Ss. Cyril and Methodius in Skopje (2010-2012). Her cross-disciplinary project The Renaming Machine (2008-2010) consisted of a series of exhibitions and discursive events and the Renaming Machine book. She also published the book Gender Difference in the Balkans (Saarbrücken: VDM Verlag, 2010). In 2012, Milevska received the Igor Zabel Award for Culture and Theory and in 2013 she was nominated the first Endowed Professor for Central and South European Art Histories at the Academy of Fine Art in Vienna.

je teoretičarka i kustoskinja vizuelne umetnosti i kulture. Među njenim interesovanjima su kritika hegemonističkih režima moći u domenu reprezentacije, feministička teorija umetnosti i roda i umetničke prakse zasnovane na učešću i saradnji. Doktorirala je iz oblasti vizuelne kulture na Goldsmiths koledžu u Londonu i bila dobitnik stipendije programa Fulbrajt namenjene naučnim istraživačima (2004.). Bila je predavač iz oblasti vizuelne kulture i roda na Institutu za studije roda Univerziteta Sveti Ćirilo i Metodije u Skoplju (2013), a istoriju i teoriju umetnosti je predavala na Likovnoj akademiji Univerziteta Sveti Ćirilo i Metodije u Skoplju (2010.-2012.). Njen interdisciplinarni projekat „Mašina za preimenovanje“ (2008.-2010.) obuhvatao je niz izložbi, diskusije i knjigu „Mašina za preimenovanje“. Takođe je objavila i knjigu „Rodne razlike na Balkanu“ (Saarbrücken: VDM Verlag, 2010.). 2012. godine, Milevska je dobila nagradu „Igor Zabel“ za kulturu i teoriju, a 2013. je bila nominovana za prvog profesora istorije umetnosti Centralne i Južne Evrope, na Likovnoj akademiji u Beču, čije se mesto na fakultetu finansira iz zadužbinarskog fonda.



Debata o institucionalnom tretmanu rada "Cigani i psi"

Zorana Todorovića /

Debate on the institutional treatment of the work of art

"Cigani i psi" (Gypsies and Dogs) by Zoran Todorović

Tekstovi učesnika i učesnica pisani nakon debate u Kulturnom centru REX
27. aprila 2012. /

Essays by participants were written after the debate held in Rex Cultural
Centre on April 27th 2012

Ova publikacija je nastala kao rezultat projekta "Raskršća istok zapad" koji je
Fond B92/Kulturni centar Rex realizovao u periodu od aprila 2011. do maja 2014.
godine u okviru projekta "Engine Room Europe" realizovanog zajedno sa još 11
centara iz Evropske mreže nezavisnih kulturnih centara - Trans Europe Halles.

This publication was created as a result of the Crossroads East West project,
realized by Fund B92/Rex Cultural Centre in the period of April 2011 to
May 2014 as a part of "Engine Room Europe", a project realized in coopera-
tion with 11 other centers in the Trans Europe Halles - European network
of independent cultural centers.

Tekstovi / Jelena Vesić, Mia David, Milan Antonijević,
Sunčica Ostoić, Suzana Milevska
Contributors:

Prevod / : Mihailo Tešić

Urednik / Editor: Nebojša Milikić

Izdavač / Published by: Fond B92

Organizacija i produkcija debata i publikacije: Fond B92/Kulturni centar Rex
Debates and publication produced and organized by:

Fond B92/Rex Cultural Centre

www.rex.b92.net

Koordinatori projekta / Project coordinators:

Dušica Parezanović i Nebojša Milikić

škart design

Izdavanje publikacije pomogli su Evropska komisija u okviru programa Kultura 2007 – 2013,
Ministarstvo kulture i informisanja Republike Srbije, kao i Ministarstvo za ljudska i manjinska prava
(debata je bila deo podržanog programa "MISLI O DRUGIMA - MISLI O SEBI").

This publication was made possible with the assistance of the European Commission, as a part of
Culture 2007-2013 programme, the Ministry of Culture and Information of Serbia, and the Ministry
of Human and Minority Rights (debate was a part of supported programme "THINK ABOUT
OTHERS - THINK ABOUT YOURSELF")

Beograd 2014.

CIP - Каталогизacija y publikaciji
Народна библиотека Србије, Београд

7.038.53/.54(497.11)"20"(082)
316.334(497.11)"20"(082)

DEBATA o institucionalnom tretmanu rada
"Cigani i psi" Zorana Todorovića : tekstovi
učesnika i učesnica pisani nakon debate u
Kulturnom centru Rex 27. aprila 2012. =
Debate on the institutional treatment of the
work of art "Cigani i psi" (Gypsies and Dogs)
by Zoran Todorović : essays by participants
werw writtwn after the debate held in Rex
Cultural Centre on April 27th 2012 /
[tekstovi, contributors Jelena Vesić, Mia
David, Milan Antonijević, Sunčica Ostoić,
Suzana Milevska]. - Beograd : Fond B92, 2014
(Beograd : Standard 2). - 41 str. ; 23 cm

Uporedo srp. tekst i engl. prevod. - Tiraž
300. - Napomene i bibliografske reference uz
tekst.

ISBN 978-86-89891-01-0

1. Уп. ств. насл. 2. Весић, Јелена [аутор]
а) Тодоровић, Зоран (1965-) - "Цигани и
пси" - Зборници

COBISS.SR-ID 206170636



FOND
B92



Република Србија
Министарство културе и наслеђа



Република Србија
МИНИСТАРСТВО ЗА ЉУДСКА И МАЊИНСКА ПРАВА
ДРЖАВНУ УПРАВУ И ПОКАЈНУ САМОУПРАВУ
УПРАВА ЗА ЉУДСКА И МАЊИНСКА ПРАВА

Powered by:

Engine
Room
Europe



Culture
Programme

"Engine Room Europe is a three-year programme (April 2011-May 2014) of activities dedicated to independent cultural workers and their creative processes. It is initiated by Trans Europe Halles (TEH) and co-ordinated by Melkweg (Amsterdam, The Netherlands) in association with 10 co-organizing TEH members. Engine Room Europe has been funded with the support from the European Commission. This publication [communication] reflects the views only of the author, and the Commission cannot be held responsible for any use which may be made of the information contained therein".