

ART

in CONTEMPORARY
CULTURAL SYSTEMS

CENTRAL and EASTERN EUROPE

Eds. WALDEMAR KULIGOWSKI
AND ADAM POMIECIŃSKI



WYDAWNICTWO NAUKA i INNOWACJE
Poznań 2014

Copyright © by Waldemar Kuligowski, Adam Pomieciński i Autorzy, 2014
Copyright © by Wydawnictwo Nauka i Innowacje sp. z o.o., Poznań 2014

Recenzenci

Prof. dr hab. Janusz Barański

Prof. dr hab. Dorota Brzozowska

Koordinacja prac redakcyjnych

Ryszard Wryk

Projekt okładki

Jacek Grześkowiak

Publikacja dofinansowana przez Ministra Nauki i Szkolnictwa Wyższego oraz
Uniwersytet im. Adama Mickiewicza

ISBN 978-83-63795-34-4

Wydawnictwo Nauka i Innowacje sp. z o.o.

ul. Rubież 46 A/216

61-612 Poznań

tel. 61 62-26-961, fax 61 62-26-962

e-mail: wni@ppnt.poznan.pl, www.wni.com.pl

Contents

WALDEMAR KULIGOWSKI, ADAM POMIECIŃSKI, Art in contemporary cultural systems: introduction	7
-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---

Part I

ART, ETHNICITY AND CULTURE CHANGE

MICHAEL SELIVATCHOV, Folk art of 20 th century in the ethnically mixed areas (Bessarabia, Bucovina, Left Bank of Dniester)	13
NURIYA AKCHURINA-MUFTIEVA, Crimean Tatar ethnic motives in modern decorative arts of Crimea	31
OKSANA KOSMINA, Ukrainian ethnic design: problems and prospects	41
ANNA WERONIKA BRZEZIŃSKA, Made in "Polish village" – modern ethno-design vs. traditional culture of Polish countryside	49
JAKUB HOLAS, Traditional folk art as pursued by Hungarian minority in the Bohemian lands	63
MARKÉTA BEZOUŠKOVÁ, Art in ethnic Ukrainian associations in the Czech Republic at the beginning of the 21 st century	73
EUGENY KOTLYAR, The Jewish folk style in the wooden synagogue wall paintings of Eastern Europe	83
JUOZAPAS BLAŽIŪNAS, Restoration of paintings in churches and monasteries of Vilnius city from the beginning of the 19 th century till the beginning of the 20 th century	97

Part II

ART, DEMOCRACY AND NEW FORMS OF EXPRESSION

RAFAŁ KLEŚTA-NAWROCKI, Democratic art space	115
ADAM POMIECIŃSKI, Art and new social movements	129

CONTENTS

- WALDEMAR KULIGOWSKI, 33 meters of sacrum. The analysis of discourses surrounding the statue of Christ the King of the Universe in Świebodzin 137
- ALENA KRIŽOVA, From folk art to pop-culture. Finding the subject of research in the Czech ethnology of the 20th century 149
- GALYNA SKLYARENKO, Games with history in the contemporary Ukrainian art 157
- TATIANA KOCHUBINSKA, The appeal to fairy tales in art as the way to express the idea of national spirit (On the example of the exhibition "Fairy Tales", Kiev National Museum of Russian Art) 169
- AGATA STANISZ, The uses of culture and metanarratives on culture: when anthropology and art meet 183

Democratic art space

My interest in the presented topic is far from being accidental. Since 2008, I have been doing the research into poetry slam in Poland. Observation and involvement in the task led me to seek a broader context for this phenomenon. Even though, poetry slam itself will not be a subject in this article, but it is worth emphasizing that this form of art to much extent manifests an ideal of democracy. Or we should rather say that the slam itself is the practice within which one can perceive democracy in action.

This is how I approach the issues of art and its relations with democracy. I do not intend to refer solely to ideological manifestos, neither am I going to quote what art and artists say about democracy in intellectual terms. In fact, I perceive art as a specific cultural sphere, similar to other spheres, within which understanding of democracy and its sense is established, developed and applied through cultural practices. It is within art's domain, on the level of particular works, performances, concepts etc., that clashes, disagreements and conflicts take place, which are democracy in themselves. Democratic art space, to my mind, is not merely some abstract space which is to be formed outside, in society, state, and which should secure an opportunity for art to develop and act. It is a specific space created by artists, critics and audiences, the space which can be reconstructed, investigated and interpreted.

According to many, democracy in art is still a question of future, a sphere to be, when favourable conditions for its development occur, a space, which needs to be cultivated if art is to reveal its full democratic potential. Putting aside such approaches and showing how democracy in art is being encouraged, I find opinions about utopian nature of such expectations to be a part of democratic processes.

Because democracy as understood in this article is not my notion of democracy (my own ideas are not of great interest to me), I am trying to avoid any substantial, specified settlements. Playing games, art attempts to define meanings of democracy, and those meanings differ depending on who, what for, or why starts the game? In a way, the game itself becomes an action within democracy and therefore defines its frames and rules.

For my own purposes, I selected a definite set of values which seem to be important with reference to democracy, and which are subject to tensions when democracy is being defined. That set is rather formal in nature. Thus I neither define democracy nor the values, leaving them ready to be filled in with some specific social and cultural content. In this case, the content is negotiated in the art discourse. The essence of democracy lies in choice, which is defined by such values as a people, equality, liberty, plurality and difference. I do not treat these values as unquestionable units, but rather as certain principles which are filled with content only in intellectual and practical disputes. Their meanings are being negotiated and played in conceptions, theories, writings, institutions, procedures, behaviour, and individuals.

While investigating poetry slam, I found out that in a way this form of art meets the needs of democracy; moreover it somehow embodies democracy. This conclusion led me to inquire and search for some general tendencies which would tie democracy and art in a similar manner. By participating in various events, I started to gather examples in order to discover what game for democracy is being played in them. Finally, I regarded this participation as an alternative form of reconstruction of senses and views beyond plain, direct, and dominating political references. In this sense art is a rewarding object of study, because then its content is not expressed directly and *expressis verbis* but it exceeds intellectual and material manifestations, and works of art. Over these works and artistic activities, criticism, theory and intellectual interpretation are being built and may provide fuel for another level of analysis.

Since the material I have gathered is plentiful, my review will be selective and by far inadequate. I hope, however, that it will illustrate a fundamental course of my disquisition. To reconstruct certain tendencies in art and to indicate how in its realm a democratic sphere is being formed, some questions regarding the values specified above (a people, equality, liberty, plurality and difference) will be asked:

Can anybody create art and be a recipient of art?

Is there opportunity equality in creating and experiencing art?

Is there liberty in creating and experiencing art?

Is there plurality in creating and experiencing art?

Is there variety in creating and experiencing art?

However, one should not expect or even hope for the answers to these questions. Instead let us see what problems arise in connection with them. Such questions are asked openly in the field of modern art, also in Poland, and as one can expect, they focus on various problems: autonomy of art, a work of art, an artist, a choice of artistic tools, and difficulties connected with financing of artistic activities. For this article is limited in its volume, I will “melt” all these questions into a single narration and refer to them here and there.

Different institutions and artistic undertakings aim at reaching outside, with “outside” being often understood literally as “outside of the museum building”, and become known in public space. The public space itself (for instance an urban space) is to be created in accordance with principles accepted in democracies. Museums attempt to attract the audience and engage them in their actions. Art like that is not supposed to be elitist but rather to share the spirit of egalitarianism.

In her famous essay *Agoraphobia* Rosalyn Deutsche wrote “...on one point nearly everyone agrees: supporting things that are public promotes the survival and extension of democratic culture. Judging, then, by the number of references to public space in contemporary aesthetic discourse, the art world is taking democracy seriously”.¹ Piotr Piotrowski, an outstanding expert in the field, confirms these words in a Polish context: “Therefore any debate on the place of art in a public space that was taking place in the USA in the eighties, as well as the less or more intensive debate that has been held in Poland since 1989, are the debates on the shape of democracy”.² In fact, any references to public space or public art are connected with democracy. Additionally, one should remember that in this public space contradictory interests intersect. Various groups, by referring to different concepts

¹ R. Deutsche, ‘Agoraphobia’, In *Eviction. Art and Spatial Politics*, Cambridge, 1996, p. 269.

² P. Piotrowski, ‘Agorofobia po komunizmie’, In *Sztuka według polityki. Od melancholii do pasji*, Cracow, 2007, p. 227.

of democracy, or even without referring directly to them, but performing diverse actions, present different needs and possible solutions. Decisions about architectural designs, erecting a monument, opening a park, or even functioning of an art centre or a museum, are sometimes taken in a unique manner, but they are usually legitimized through “democratic” procedures and the needs of residents, citizens and a people are taken into account. Arguments for or against are usually determined by group interests and circumstances and they refer selectively to the concepts of direct, representational, deliberative, radical or any other democracy. I have had an opportunity to eye witness such processes in the case of Bydgoskie Przedmieście housing estate (in Toruń). The ongoing discussion is progressing between city authorities, conservators, historians of art, developers, road builders and representatives of the local housing community³. Then even concepts of the “public space” are appropriated, as Rosalyn Deutsche notices, at the same time opting for “democratizing public art discourse.”⁴ Contrary to ideal models of public space as an area of harmony, consensus, coherence, and universalism, she appeals for divisions, variety and pluralism. That is why statements such as: “Public art would be democratic ‘except’ that it is controversial”⁵, are paradoxical. An it is this dispute that is constitutive for democracy. Art perceived this way does become an area of dispute. It becomes democracy in itself.

Art that wants to enter public space and to be public art makes numerous inviting gestures and its target is the audience which is attracted and engaged. Apart from this art also involves public discussions, also those of political nature.

The educational section in the Centre of Modern Art (CSW) in Toruń, the first in the post-war history of Poland state gallery of modern art built from scratch in 2008, announces on its website: “We want education to transform CSW into a tame place, place where everyone can find something for himself and place where they will come back to create a collection of personal experiences.”⁶ The museum organizes events addressed to children

³ See <http://bydgoskie.blox.pl/html>, [accessed 29/03/11].

⁴ R. Deutsche, *Agoraphobia*, op. cit., p. 280.

⁵ *Ibidem*, p. 282.

⁶ <http://csw.torun.pl/edukacja/misja>, [accessed 15/03/11].

and other very diversified audiences, offering projects open to many participants. One of them is a joint project *Art!kulinaria – an Alternative Panorama of Toruń* and is described as follows:

“During the third edition of *Art!kulinaria*, which took place on the 28th of November, children were creating an alternative panorama of Toruń made of jelly. Colourful solidified material turned out to be a very flexible medium. Colourful food jelly turned out to have many properties which we tried to exploit, while forming shapes suggested by imagination.”⁷

In turn, the workshops accompanying an exhibition *Spaceship Earth!* is addressed to kindergarten and primary school children and focuses on ecological problems⁸. Such educational socially committed events the change museum into an active institution where art exhibitions are one of many other areas of activity.

Piort Piotrowski’s “critical museum” project, which was an unfulfilled (due to the director’s resignation and some unacceptable circumstances and incidents⁹) vision and strategy for revival and development of the National Museum in Warsaw, aimed at creating an institution which would involve current political and social debates. That project was somehow in accordance with the spirit of Polish critical art, whose adherents provoked controversies arousing press and public opinion. Works by Zbigniew Libera, Grzegorz Klaman, Katarzyna Kozyra, Alicja Żebrowska, Artur Żmijewski, Robert Rumas, Dorota Nieznalska stirred and still do a diverse range of emotions and disputes that sometimes must be settled down in the court. Works by these artists illustrate a certain trend in the Polish art, they refer to and discuss various social issues, and become a unique barometer of the Polish transformation processes after 1989.

In his work *Leninplatz-projektion* (1990),¹⁰ Krzysztof Wodiczko considers the issue of freedom under the newly established democratic system.

⁷ <http://www.csw.torun.pl/edukacja/galeria/art-kulinaria-alternatywna-panorama-torunia>, [accessed 15/03/11].

⁸ <http://csw.torun.pl/edukacja/warsztaty/dla-szkol-i-przedszkoli/warsztaty-do-wystawy-statek-kosmiczny-ziemia>, [accessed 15/03/11].

⁹ See D. Jarecka, ‘Dymisja w Muzeum Narodowym’, *Gazeta Wyborcza* 13.10.2010, p. 14.

¹⁰ See J. Zydorowicz, *Artystyczny wirus. Polska sztuka krytyczna wobec przemian kultury po 1989 roku*, Warsaw 2005, p. 7; P. Piotrowski, *Agorafilia. Sztuka i demokracja w postkomunistycznej Europie*, Poznań, 2010, pp. 62-67.

Toying with the past and future, the artist asked important questions about the present, its shapes and directions of transformation. At the background of Lenin's monument in Leninplatz in Berlin, Wodiczko projected a picture of a Polish tradesman pushing a shopping cart filled with consumer goods, RTV gear, and the Aldi's supermarket plastic bag. The figure is wearing a striped uniform of concentration camp prisoners. No doubt, in 1990 not many including humanists and social scientists dared to express such a critical image of transformation.

As many of these works entered "the media scandal" circulation, they acquired additional meanings and helped form a certain kind of complex artistic communication. As Jacek Zydorowicz points out, this time the media were used for the sake of art: "the mass media were not subject to radical criticism, on the contrary, they were deliberately turned to good account".¹¹ Works close to that orientation criticise a consumerist life style (Libera); tangles in the authority discourse (Klaman), gender and body abuse, biased transsexuality (Kozyra, Żebrowska, Żmijewski), religion, the sacrum, Polish traditional religiousness (Kozyra, Rumas Nieznalska). The article like this does not aspire to carry out a detailed analysis of these works, and after all it is art critics who are entitled to express any qualitative opinions, for instance Piotr Piotrowski, Izabela Kowalczyk and Jacek Zydorowicz.¹² However, easy noticeable are the games that these works play with democracy, and as a result they create it. They make art a public issue, provoke and seek for the audience and often co-authors, and juggle with forms. On the level of forms they often try to go beyond conventions of image and fixed perceptual habits. In a way we can talk here about "democratization of the aesthetic order,"¹³ mentioned by Izabela Kowalczyk.

¹¹ J. Zydorowicz, *Artystyczny wirus. Polska sztuka krytyczna wobec przemian kultury po 1989 roku*, op. cit., p. 194.

¹² I. Kowalczyk, *Ciało i władza. Polska sztuka krytyczna lat 90.*, Warsaw 2002; I. Kowalczyk, *Niebezpieczne związki sztuki z ciałem*, Poznań, 2002; I. Kowalczyk, *Podróż do przeszłości. Interpretacja najnowszej historii w polskiej sztuce krytycznej*, Warszawa, 2010; J. Zydorowicz, *Artystyczny wirus. Polska sztuka krytyczna wobec przemian kultury po 1989 roku*, op. cit.; P. Piotrowski, 'Sztuka według polityki', In *Sztuka według polityki. Od melancholii do pasji*, Kraków, 2007, pp. 181-207.

¹³ I. Kowalczyk, 'The allure of power (on dispersed power, ideology and seeing)', In I. Kowalczyk (ed.) *Uroki władzy (o władzy rozproszonej, ideologii i widzeniu)*, Poznań, 2009, p. 33.

Reception of these works is diversified, and Jacek Zydorowicz writes that it can even take a form of a “cold war with society”.¹⁴ In some sense, this war is a desired game, even though the conflict parties frequently refer to entirely disparate definitions of democracy. Mostly rightists protests, often circles affiliated with the Maryja Radio, accuse these works of an offence to religious feelings which should be esteemed in democracy. They want their rights to be respected in the name of invoked values. Forming occasional self-organized pressure groups they take part in a democratic game, although the Church hierarchy seems to present ambiguous attitudes to this activity. Artists, provocatively or in self-defence, refer to an artistic licence, the freedom of expression, the autonomy of art, and the fact the protesters misinterpret their artistic intentions. Another curious aspect of these events is the critics’ approach. On the one hand, they assume that critical art ought to be united with life and does not require any special preparation or education from its participants because in its form it makes use of legible and universal codes, “kidnapped from universal language,” but on the other, under circumstances of tension they again resolve to arguments for autonomy of art and necessity reveal some deeper meanings of the controversial works. Nonetheless, in the name of democracy, freedom of art and its circulation within society is being emphasised, and the Catholic Church is being criticized as an undemocratic institution.

Sometimes these disputes prevent state, municipal and private institutions from exhibiting, and more important, from financing such controversial works as a possible cause of conflicts. Sometimes confusion increases to a degree when parties get lost amidst it, and no one knows what is going on. That was the case with a sculpture of a Czech artist David Černý, which was erected in a promenade along Marcinkowski Avenue in Poznań. The problem was that the sculpture of *Golem*¹⁵ was not placed in the middle of a pedestrian route, but on the lawn among young trees, whereas the artist,

¹⁴ J. Zydorowicz, *Artystyczny wirus. Polska sztuka krytyczna wobec przemian kultury po 1989 roku*, op. cit., pp. 185-206.

¹⁵ Jehuda Löw ben Bekalel, who was a rabbi in Poznań and Prague in the 16th century, is said to have been a creator of Golem. In this way his person joins the two cities. Both the Jewish scholar and a fictional character of Golem have numerous meanings, that with a little dose of imagination and biased interpretation they could evoke controversies and disputes.

who unveiled it personally, wanted his work to 'walk' together with other passer-bys. Since other works by David Černý (such as the famous *Entropie* exhibited in the European Union Council hall under presidency of this country; in this work, the image of Poland includes a potato field and figures of priests running up a rainbow-coloured flag, a symbol of the gay movement), were perceived as scandalous in Prague, the municipal authorities might have felt alarmed. Even though they were not fully aware what to be worry about, the sculpture was not placed as planned. Finally, *Golem* was moved and found its place in the middle part of the promenade. This case well illustrates tensions and strains that art evokes and may evoke in public space. It also exemplifies the "playing it safe" behaviour and attempts to avoid possible controversies and conflicts. Examples of sculptures stashed away sculptures or cancelled exhibitions would be multiplied, and sometimes become topics of urban anecdotes and legends.

In fact, decision-makers (also galleries and museums), being financially dependent on the public money, are cautious, avoid hazards which would affect exhibitions and show non-committal attitude. Dismissals, management's recalls, and personal conflicts which may result from an inappropriate decision are factors that determine their behaviour. Under such circumstances, there appear opinions which question liberalization of art and the way it is financed. In its website, the Index 73 initiative keeps a *Chronicle of Censor's Cases* that include visual art, theatre, publications and music.¹⁶ In her article, *The discrete allure of power*, Ewa Majewska writes about "the visible and invisible aspect of economic censorship." In fact, she claims, allegedly non-financial censorship, in fact proves to be of economic nature. "Actually, however, the religious censorship of art in Poland is economic in nature, and the strongest manifestation of the phenomenon is the risk of losing state subsidies faced by local public institutions."¹⁷ Thus quite complicated circumstances make certain artistic events more hazardous, particularly, when the state subsidies are at stake. At the same time, in public debates arguments are used that art may contribute to the development

¹⁶ http://www.indeks73.pl/pl_web_journal,_50,_142.php, [accessed 28/03/11].

¹⁷ E. Majewska, 'The discrete allure of power. The visible and invisible aspect of economic censorship', In I. Kowalczyk (ed.), *Uroki władzy (o władzy rozproszonej, ideologii i widzeniu)*, op. cit., p. 52.

of the state and local economy, to forming civil society and pro-democracy attitudes. Actually, legitimization of art through economic and social factors is not unambiguous. What is economically advantageous is not necessarily socially and artistically valuable, and vice versa. However, it is amazing, that numerous projects and debates in which the most vital issues of social existence of art are discussed, its contribution to building up an open, participating, and democratic society are constantly emphasized. Any way, the rough marriage between artists and the state shows how democracy is being used while the battle over money is fought. Certainly, institutions that decide about mundane financial aspects of art cannot be accused of mere cynical intentions, and I am far from this. However it is worth mentioning, that whether the never intentions are noble or not, the essence of the game is building pro-democratic attitudes through art, and principles of financing are to reflect the shape of postulated democracy. Since opinions referring freedom of art, financial security of artistic events, independence of galleries, etc., will inevitably clash with those on spending public money on “mediocre” works of art that challenge “commonly shared values.” And both of them are voiced in the name of differently comprehended democracy.

So called “new media”, and particularly, the internet which gives hope for interactivity, pluralisation, and democratization of art, are to help overcome most of these problems. Although for many the internet is a medium that makes dreams of democratic, available and diverse art, come true, it has its own deficiencies. First of all, it should be mentioned that the internet is not yet commonly accessible and some artists’ attitude towards it is often ambiguous. However, the most important questions are, whether the new media encourage or discourage passive consumerism of culture, and whether the activity options and opportunities of presentation increase or decrease. The debate itself quite accurately diagnoses dilemmas and doubts connected with democratic character of the new media and the values mentioned previously in this article. So far, many experiments carried out with the use of mass media displayed triviality. For Jacek Zydorowicz, many of them have gone beyond the level of computer games for children.¹⁸

¹⁸ J. Zydorowicz, *Artystyczny wirus. Polska sztuka krytyczna wobec przemian kultury po 1989 roku*, op. cit., p. 220.

Undoubtedly, for many of its users, the Internet fulfilled a dream that anyone could be an artist. What interesting, in a newly started social networking service <http://www.talent.pl/>, one can read that it “was created to inspire, and wake up an ‘Artists’ in any of us, it gives an opportunity to all Artists to become known and to make their dreams come true; it is the biggest Polish social networking service dedicated to Artists, fans, and patrons of art”.¹⁹ The portal includes such categories as music and singing, dance, film and animation, acting, photography, painting and graphic art, digital art, handicraft, and fashion design. Within these categories anybody can present their abilities if only they have the Internet access. In a sense, this portal meets the democratic needs of art half way. Literally anybody can present their workshere and anybody can become their audience. The term ‘anybody’ constitutes a kind of a key word when democratic tendencies are considered and is extremely frequently used in various advertisements or accounts of artistic events. Interesting enough, elitist or niche strategies also apply this kind of democratic rhetoric. However, the latter strategies emphasize the variety of the offer and the opportunity for “anybody” to find something suitable. Both institutions and organizers of artistic events use the notions of variety and “anybody” in their own specific way.

Obviously, art open to anybody and the claim that anybody can be an artist results in some worthwhile projects. Undoubtedly, one of them is Cornelius Cardew’s²⁰ project. This composer, musician and social animator, an assistant of Karlheinz Stockhausen, was disappointed with many restrictions and approaches accepted in the world of music. Therefore he objected to the perfectionism in music, hierarchy and a dominant status of the conductor who imposed his individual idea which interpretation of a given piece of music is the only correct and right one and what route is the most adequate for a given musician. His *Scratch Orchestra*²¹ tried to meet the needs of ordinary people, they played in the streets, outside shops, in the forest clearings, at schools. They consciously distanced themselves

¹⁹ <http://www.talent.pl/portal/index>, [accessed 18/04/2011].

²⁰ Here I would like to express my gratitude to Michał Libera, whose lecture on Cornelius Cardew I could listen to, who I could talk to and who shared part of his material with me.

²¹ See C. Cardew, *A Scratch Orchestra: Draft Constitution*, In Ch. Cox, D. Warner (eds.), *Audio Culture: readings in modern music*, New York, London 2004, pp. 234-238.

from musical establishment, and unprofessional musicians were to play in the orchestra under the same terms and conditions.²² As Cardew declared, *Scratch Orchestra* would function in a democratic manner: its members (in turn) were granted the right to schedule an individual concert, and if anybody failed, a concert program was decided about through drawing or voting²³. *The Great Learning* composed by this musician-sociologist in 1969 is his opus magnum. The title itself, as well as the length of this few hours' piece (which consists of seven paragraphs) indicates the nature of participation the performance this work involves. In fact, Cardew focuses less on designing parts of instruments or voices than on shaping behavior, and it is not the piece of music but the formation and functioning of a community that interests him most. The attempt to perform *The Great Learning* was made in the Residential Arts Centre in Wigry and White Synagogue in Sejny between 18th and 24th July 2010,²⁴ and the outcome of this attempt is four CDs with almost five-hour-long recording.²⁵ The topic of building up a community and its functioning is present in any of the paragraphs. Paragraph seven, frequently referred to, is particularly interesting.²⁶ The score of this fragment consists of 24 phrases which include from one to three words each, together with a determined number of repetitions. Performers repeat each phrase a proper number of times at the same pitch within the breath span. No one own's sound can be repeated. Several tens of people, walking next to one another, start with articulating the phrases at various pitches, then listen to one another in order to share and take over the sounds. Thus the complexity (dissonance) is being reduced and unity becomes possible, even though not necessarily achieved. The power of this work results from the balance between plurality and diversity, from free choice of a sound pitch, from unique equality of participants and relationships that develop and transform the aggregate of musician into a community. Cardew, both on formal and performance levels, asks both himself and consecutive perform-

²² See M. Libera, 'Pięć i pół porażki Corneliusa Cardew', In A. Kwiecińska (ed.), *Nowa muzyka brytyjska*, Craców 2010, p. 171-172.

²³ C. Cardew, 'A Scratch Orchestra: Draft Constitution', op. cit., pp. 234-235.

²⁴ See http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=3e70btV_njc, [accessed 16/03/2011].

²⁵ Cornelius Cardew, *The Great Learning*, Bôlt 2010.

²⁶ See B. Eno, 'Generating and Organizing Variety in the Arts', In Ch. Cox, D. Warner (eds.), *Audio Culture: readings in modern music*, New York, London 2004, pp. 226-233.

ers some vital questions concerning complexity and duration of communities based on the discussed values.

The play with democratic values, their content, can take variety of shapes. As we have seen, they may sometimes go to extremes on the verge of a joke. After all, these are the costs of democracy in art and its internal logic. The case of Freddie Linsky is a good example here. His paintings were placed at Charles Saatchi's Internet gallery. Besides his seven paintings, a profile of the artist containing some facts referring his creative activity and competencies, one could read such declarations as: "Also an art critic and a familiar face at press viewings at the major galleries and exhibitions in London", or: "Identifying with the space of history, Freddie engages in the task of painting European art over-and-over again".²⁷ The works presented included: *Sunrise, The Best Loved Elephant, Aggassi at Wimbledon, The Dance, The Serve, Leonard III, Homage to Michel Tapie*. All of them were accompanied with a few-sentence comments. Parts of these comments read: "Inspired by Monet's plain air habit of painting; examples of a primitive form of 'spot and blotch' were found in the cave paintings of Lascaux, France; The striking use of oriental calligraphy has the kanji like characters stampeding from the page, showing the new ascent of the East".²⁸ Thus a real professional context developed, and one can imagine the surprise of the audience when it appeared that the author of the paintings is a two-year-old toddler boy. His mother, an art-critic and journalist, decided to present her son's works, some of which were made with the use of ketchup.²⁹ This case, and many other, prove that both artists and audiences feel lost in the world of modern art. In this world, traditional clear hierarchies of high and low art, as well as categories of high and low culture are getting muddled. Both artists and audiences start games on the level of art's content and form which go beyond some simple generalizations what is and what is not art.

"Works of art" produced in the context of democracy, particularly those which play the game within this system, test its endurance and put to the

²⁷ <http://www.saatchionline.com/freddie>, [accessed 04/09/08].

²⁸ Ibidem.

²⁹ *Toddler fools the art world into buying his tomato ketchup paintings*, <http://www.dailymail.co.uk/news/article-499240/Toddler-fools-art-world-buying-tomato-ketchup-paintings.html>, [accessed 04/09/08].

test the “patience” of democratic solutions. They explore its limits and take advantage of its internal contradictions by using irony or resolving to a mere joke.

In the coil: artist-work-audience, there develop some interesting relationships, through which democracy can be observed and examined what are its practices. However, such approach requires some settlements, since art in such perspective is not perceived as an individual product but as an institution of artistic life and a social and cultural sphere. A work of art is interesting provided it is involved in modern social reception. Following the discussion on democracy in art, we focus not on art itself, but rather on democracy. The study of art gives an opportunity to reach the content which escapes the research directly connected with narrowly understood politics. What interesting, the above conclusions can be based on some scientific concepts within the history of art, which proves that this paradigm has also undergone democratization. However, this problem is another kettle of fish.

Rafał Kleśta-Nawrocki

DEMOKRATYCZNA PRZESTRZEŃ SZTUKI

Jak w kontekście współczesnej demokracji sytuuje się sztuka, jak „zabiera głos” i kształtuje demokrację? Jak w polu sztuki dochodzi do prodemokratycznych manifestacji, jak demokracja jest wykorzystywana i jakie są podejmowane gry z odbiorcą? W artykule zostają przywołane zagadnienia: przestrzeni i sztuki publicznej, finansowania i zarządzania, zaangażowania politycznego, nowych mediów itp. Wszystko po to, by wskazać na problematykę demokratycznej przestrzeni, w której sztuka funkcjonuje, i którą jednocześnie wytwarza. Artykuł przybiera formę rozważań dotyczących powyższych kwestii, ilustrowanych konkretnymi przykładami dzieł i działań artystycznych oraz toczących się wokół nich sporów. Pokazuje, jak w obrębie samej sztuki wytwarza się wewnętrzna przestrzeń sporu o demokrację.