

područje umjetničkog kritičkog djelovanja izazvalo već tih godina zasigurno je pojava novih izložbenih modela, kao i reakcija na napuštanje ustaljenih izložbenih prostora i izlazak u javni prostor te naglašavanje izložbe kao diskurzivne forme koja isto tako može biti ulična intervencija koliko i stranica u knjizi ili predavanje. Gotovo istovremeno pojavljuju se i samostalni modeli kustoskog djelovanja. Kustos se odvaja od muzejske zbirke, izlazi iz „sjene” umjetničke institucije, sve je više orijentiran na usku suradnju s umjetnicima te s vremenom postaje jedan od glavnih protagonista u produkciji, prezentaciji i distribuciji umjetničkog djela (i općenito unutar polja suvremenih umjetnosti).³ Pozicija Haralda Szeemana⁴ se u internacionalnim okvirima navodi kao paradigmatika za taj „slobodni pad” – točnije emancipaciju kustosa/ice kao samostalnog izložbenog *Ausstellungsmachera*. Bruce Altshuler će to razdoblje nazvati i razdobljem izdizanja kustosa kao stvaratelja (*rise of a curator as creator*)⁵ koje se vrlo često navodi i uz tadašnje djelovanje izložbenih organizatora Pontusa Hultena, Setha Siegelabua, Kaspera Königa. Tijekom 90-ih, posebice na internacionalnoj umjetničkoj sceni, bilježi se „kustoski boom”. Po mnogima kustoske prakse devedesetih godina označavaju utjecaj, moć i hegemoniju muzejskih i izložbenih institucija te mreža institucija (muzeji moderne i suvremene umjetnosti, trijenali, bijenali) na aktualne nacionalne i internacionalne umjetničke pojave. Dominacija kustoskih praksi tog razdoblja pretvara se u strukturirani profesionalni kustoski interes, što znači da kustoske politike utječu na karakter suvremene umjetnosti i formiranje kustoskih zvijezda unutar sustava i šire.⁶ Mnogi će isto tako reći da nakon eksperimentiranja koje se događa 70-ih i 80-ih godina kustosi u 90-ima biraju temu i problematiziraju je preko umjetnika/umjetničkih radova. To protagonističko kuriranje je, po mišljenju Carolyn Christov-Bakargiev, buduće direktorice izložbe koja označava sam vrh „kustoskog panteona” – *Documente*, dovelo i do mijesanja granica te

artistic conceptions, and questioning institutional venues. Among the changes that the field of art criticism caused in those years, a particularly important one was the emergence of new exhibition models, as well as the reaction to the abandonment of established exhibition venues and coming out into public spaces, with an emphasis on exhibition as a discursive form that can be a street intervention, but also a book page or a lecture. Almost at the same time, one could witness the emergence of independent models of curatorial work. The curator had become emancipated from the museum collections, he or she had stepped out of the “shadow” of art institutions and was now more oriented towards collaboration with artists, becoming with time one of the main agents in the production, presentation, and distribution of artworks (and generally one of the main figures in the field of contemporary arts).³ The position of Harald Szeeman⁴ has been mentioned internationally as a paradigm of that “free fall” – more precisely, of the curator’s emancipation as an independent *Austellungsmacher*. Bruce Altshuler once wrote that it was an era of the rise of a curator as creator⁵ and that statement has often been associated with the activity of exhibition organizers such as Pontus Hulten, Seth Siegelaub, or Kasper König.

During the 1990s, one could witness a “curatorial boom”, especially on the international art scene. It has been generally observed that the curatorial practices of the 90s reflected the influence, power, and hegemony of museums and other exhibition venues, as well as institutional networks (museums of modern and contemporary art, biennials, triennials) with respect to the contemporary national and international phenomena in art. The domination of curatorial practices was gradually turned into a structured, professional interest of curators, which meant that the curatorial strategies influenced the character

problematiziranja podjela kustoskih i umjetničkih uloga.⁷

No, nedostatak jasno definiranih metodologija, kustoskog teorijskog diskursa, kao i nedovršena i fragmentarna povijest kustoskih praksi tih istih devedesetih, potiču kustose na auto-referencijalnost i introspekciju, na potrebu za preispitivanjem i istraživanjem postojećih kustoskih i izlagačkih praksi, prvenstveno u obliku seminara, konferencija i diskusija. Raste broj kustoskih edukacijskih programa,⁸ ali i arhiva o kustoskim praksama.

Kustoske prakse danas su rastuće polje znanja, na što ukazuje i proliferacija kustoskih programa i publikacija koje ponajprije u ciklusima intervjua donose fragmente o onome što bi moglo predstavljati tu profesiju. No, gotovo većina tih izdanja preispituje prostor bavljenja „zapadne“ scene u koju se ne uklapaju lokalne prakse kustosa s naših prostora. Zbog toga i u ovom broju časopisa *Život umjetnosti* donosimo niz priloga koji doprinose široj lokalnoj kulturnoj sceni u ciklusu intervjua pod nazivom *Razgovori – strategija približavanja kustoskih praksi*, unutar kojih sugovornici odgovaraju na određeni broj pitanja, što ukazuje na višeslojnost i višeglasnost njihovih pozicija i pristupa, ali i na specifičnost konteksta u kojem rade.

RELACIJA KUSTOS – UMJETNIK

Historiziramo izložbe kao društvene činjenice, ali se premalo bavimo kontekstualizacijom umjetničkog rada osviještenom još od Duchampa. Pored toga, danas je potrebno odmaknuti fokus od rada i usmjeriti ga na relacijsku socijalnu produkciju, čiji je glavni proizvod izložba. Naravno da nema kustosa bez umjetnika, ali ta afirmacija funkcionira i u drugom smjeru. Ovdje se odbija govoriti o tom suodnosu iz perspektive bilo kakve ovisnosti, osim one vezane uz umjetničku produkciju kojom oba barataju. Ne može se reći da suodnos kustosa i umjetnika ne počiva na

of contemporary art and the creation of curatorial celebrities, both within the system and beyond.⁶ Many would say that, after the phase of experimentation in the 70s and 80s, the curators of the 90s were now able to select their topic and make it an issue through artists and artworks. That authorial curatorship has, according to Carolyn Christov-Bakargiev, the future director of the exhibition that marked the very pinnacle of the “curators’ pantheon” – *Documenta* – resulted in blurred borders, initiating a debate on the division of roles between curators and artists.⁷

However, the lack of clearly defined methodologies and theoretical curatorial discourse, as well as the incomplete and fragmentary history of curatorial practices in the 1990s, motivated the curators to engage in self-referentiality and introspection, questioning and exploring the existing curatorial and exhibition practices, primarily in the form of seminars, conferences, and round tables. This resulted in an increase in educational programmes for curators,⁸ as well as archives specialized in curatorial practices.

Today, curatorial practices are a growing field of knowledge, which is indicated, among other things, by the proliferation of curatorial programmes and publications, which use mainly series of interviews in order to present the profession, at least in fragments. However, most of these publications thematize the “Western scene” and the local practices of our region barely fit in. Therefore, this issue of *Život umjetnosti* includes a number of contributions discussing the broader and local cultural scene through a set of interviews entitled *Conversations – Strategy for Rapprochement with Curatorial Practices*, in which various curators respond to questions regarding their multifaceted and multi-voiced positions and approaches, but also the specificity of the context in which they are working.

tenzijama. Kako onih koje im izvana servira sada već poprilično jasna društvena određenost njihovih profesija, tako i onih na ljudskoj razini. No, isto tako ne može se reći da ne postoji potreba za jednim i drugim akterom u onome što bismo označili pojmom umjetničkog svijeta-sustava. Umjetnost postoji kao društvena praksa i bazira se na interakciji simboličkih odnosa. Ako je kustoski koncept performativno polje uspostavljanja i razmjene simboličkih odnosa, gdje postoji i simbolički, ali i ekonomski kapital kao okvir, sam kustos izvodi manipulaciju u artikulaciji. On radi s društvenim odnosima. I zapravo je ponajprije kulturni radnik koji doprinosi oblikovanju društvene svakodnevnice. On istovremeno radi i na proizvodnji znanja i na umrežavanju, te stvara društvenu matricu. Umjetnik također sudjeluje u iscrtavanju te iste matrice, u kreativnom suodnosu s gore navedenim. A publika ih, kao što i sama riječ govori, prati u ispisivanju novih, zajedničkih matrica.

“Izložba koju kurira umjetnik nikada nije toliko dobra kao ona koju kurira kustos, ali je uvijek produktivnija od loše kustoske koncepcije”, kaže Liam Gillick. Dijaloška forma i suradnički princip su neupitni. Povjerenje također. Pa krenimo u suodnose...

IZLOŽBA KAO PORUKA

Odnos između umjetnika i kustosa danas je vidljiv baš u samoj izložbi. Linije kretanja suvremene umjetnosti možemo promatrati i preko povijesti izložbi.⁹ No, još od paradigmatičkih promjena izazvanih dematerijalizacijom umjetničkog objekta izložba je za nas puno više od *white cube/black box* prezentacije. Ne znači da se kao takva nije radila i prije, no bitna je razlika da se tek od 60-ih godina takvom i poimala. Nije zbog toga niti čudno da se kustoska autoreferencijalnost, teorijska proizvodnja diskursa i veća društvena vidljivost profesije dogodila upravo tada. Po Groyso, prolazeći

THE CURATOR-ARTIST RELATIONSHIP

We tend to historicise exhibitions, but we deal rarely with the artwork contextualisation and relations that have been emphasized by Duchamp. Also, one should detach the focus from artwork in order to focus on the relational social production, the main product of which is the exhibition. Clearly, there are no curators without artists, but this assertion also functions in the opposite direction. Here we will avoid discussing that correlation from any perspective of dependence, except for the one that is linked to the artistic production managed by both sides. One could not say that the relationship between curators and artists is free of all tensions. Some of them are imposed from the outside, by the social determination of their professions, which has become sufficiently clear by now, while others take place on the personal level. However, one must also say that there is a need for both of these agents in what we may define as the art world/art system. Art exists as a social practice based on the interaction of symbolic relations. If the curatorial concept is a performative field for establishing and exchanging symbolic relations, with a symbolic and also economic capital as its framework, then the curator performs manipulation in articulation. The curator works with social relations. Therefore, he or she is above all a cultural worker, contributing to the formation of everyday life in a given society. At the same time, the curator works on producing knowledge and on networking, creating a social matrix. The artist participates in outlining the same matrix, in a creative correlation with the above mentioned. The public, as implied by the very term, follows them by inscribing new, common matrices. According to Liam Gillick, “a show by an artist can never be as good as a really good show by a curator, but it’s always more productive than a bad show by a curator.” The form of dialogue and the principle of collaboration are undeniable. And so is trust. So let us correlate...

kroz 20. stoljeće izložbena je povijest nedjeljiva od povijesti umjetnosti i izložba postaje medijem u kojemu je većina umjetnosti vidljiva – ona administrira kulturno značenje umjetnosti.¹⁰ Izložba je kompleksni medij u kojem svi elementi svjesno ili nesvjesno sudjeluju u produkciji značenja, kulturna praksa koja objedinjuje – konvergira norme i vrijednosti, dakle implicitno i ideološke koncepte.

No govorit će i o neupitnoj promjeni izložbene paradigme. Teoretičarka Irit Rogoff u tekstu *Zaokret* tako progovara o edukacijskoj platformi i prostoru za debatu, kao srži onoga što čini današnju *mostru*. Isto tako, događajni princip je nešto što obilježava izložbu danas.¹¹

DODATAK

Sagledavamo li kustoske prakse u hrvatskom kontekstu 70-ih godina, afirmacija kustoske pozicije ostaje vezana uz umjetničke institucije,¹² ali se pojavljuje i velik broj samoorganiziranih umjetničkih kolektiva/interesnih skupina koje se bave i kuriranjem te koje pokreću i vode alternativne izložbene prostore.¹³ Isto tako sama izložba se redefinira i u lokalnom kontekstu: izlazi u izvaninstitucionalni i urbani prostor. Te se akcije provlače i u osamdesetima, dok se u ratnim i tranzicijskim 90-ima događa nagli prekid. Nakon tog razdoblja, usred normativnih procesa koji vode k liberalnom kapitalizmu, vidljiva je odsutnost jasnih mehanizama umjetničkog tržišta, ali i modernističko strujanje postojećih institucijskih modela. Nezavisne organizacije koje se bave jezikom i načinima kulturne produkcije od kraja 90-ih redefiniiraju i uvijek iznova osvježavaju kustoske aktivnosti na lokalnom polju uvodeći međudisciplinarnu suradničke modele i konstantno preispitivanje uloga i mapa kretanja kulture. Princip samoorganiziranosti i kritičkih pozicija je u dijaloškom nastavku kritičkih umjetničkih praksi 70-ih, na što ukazuje i tekst Ane Dević,

EXHIBITION AS A MESSAGE

The correlation between artists and curators is today visible in the exhibitions as such. The history of contemporary visual arts can also be viewed through the history of exhibitions.⁹ However, since the paradigmatic change was caused by the dematerialisation of art objects, exhibitions have become far more than mere white-cube/black-box presentations. It does not mean that they were not produced that way before, but the essential difference is that this fact has only been understood since 1960s. Therefore, it is small wonder that the beginnings of curatorial self-referentiality, theoretical discourse production, and the increased social visibility of the profession can be dated precisely to those years. According to Groys, throughout the 20th century the history of exhibitions was indivisible from art history and the exhibition was the medium through which most art gained its visibility – it administered cultural significance to art.¹⁰ Exhibition is a complex medium, in which all elements – consciously or unconsciously – contribute to the production of meaning, a cultural practice that unites/converges norms and values, which implicitly includes ideological concepts. However, he or she will also speak of the indubitable change in the exhibition paradigm. In her essay entitled *Turning*, theoretician Irit Rogoff discusses educational platforms and spaces for debate as the essence of that which constitutes the present day *mostra*. Likewise, the principle of event is something that marks the exhibitions of today.¹¹

AFTERWORD

If we look at the curatorial practices in the Croatian context of the 1970s, we can see that the affirmation of the curatorial position remained tied to art institutions,¹² but that there was also

Politicizacija kulturnog polja: mogućnosti kritičke prakse.

Također, važno je naglasiti da afirmaciju kustosa kao bitne karike u procesu izgradnje sistema vizualne umjetnosti lokalni širi društveni kontekst još nije dovoljno prepoznao. Institucije (od muzeja do fakulteta) koje bi trebale biti glavni posrednici između javnosti i vizualne umjetnosti prilično su nevidljive. Upravo tim nedostatkom razumijevanje kustoskih praksi i saznanja o njima ostaju nepoznati, odnosno ostaju ukalupljeni u ustaljeno modernističko shvaćanje samodovoljnosti umjetnika čiji radovi komuniciraju nužno bez posrednika, a time i bez daljnje kontekstualizacije. Da li je odgovornost kustosa formirati i određivati poziciju umjetnosti? Koliko umjetnost možemo održavati političnom ukoliko njezine strukture podrške, ali i opće javno mnijenje nameću strogu depoliticizaciju?

U ovoj publikaciji fokus usmjeravamo na razmjenu iskustava uz inzistiranje na singularnim pristupima, koji ponekad dovode do određenih preklapanja. "Stoga vjerujemo umjetnosti, ne diskursima koji ju navodno generiraju. Pitajmo se koji potencijal umjetnost nosi ne svodeći ju na tržište, trendove i brendiranje. Vježbajmo našu intuiciju i stavimo se u poziciju nepripremljenog gledatelja. I ne zaboravimo, avantura tek započinje s izložbom."...¹⁴

¹ Miško Šuvaković, *Pojmovnik suvremene umjetnosti*, Horetzky, Zagreb, 2005., 338.

² James Bladwin, Charles Harrison, Mel Ramsden, "Povijest umjetnosti, likovna kritika i objašnjavanje", u: *Umjetničko djelo kao društvena činjenica*, Ljiljana Kolečnik (ur.), Institut za povijest umjetnosti, Zagreb, 2005., 281.

³ *Curating Degree Zero*, kustoski arhiv, tekst izložbenog deplijana, Ana Janevski, Ivana Meštrović, GMK, Zagreb, 2008.

⁴ „Kustos danas mora ispuniti brojne zadaće”, rekao je Szeeman, koji je svojim osobnim pomacima kustosku poziciju zasigurno učinio ponajviše vidljivom od kraja šezdesetih do danas. Hans Ulrich Obrist tvrdi da je kustosko eksperimentiranje započelo već ranih dvadesetih godina 20. stoljeća, iako su po kustoskom diskursu u nastajanju prvi vidljivi kustosi zasigurno bile muške figure s kraja šezdesetih.

⁵ Bruce Altshuler, *The Avant-Garde in Exhibition: New Art in the 20th Century*, Harry N. Abrams, New York, 1994., 236.

a considerable number of self-organised artistic collectives or interest groups that engaged, among other things, in curating, opening, and managing alternative exhibition venues.¹³ It was also a time of exhibitions as street interventions, which brought about the redefinition of exhibitions in the local context. Those actions and intentions remained present throughout the 1980s, but this process was abruptly halted in the 1990s because of the war and the transition. After that period, due to the normative processes leading towards liberal capitalism, one could observe the absence of clear mechanisms in artistic market, but also modernisation currents in the existing institutional models. Independent organisations involved in the language and the models of cultural production have been redefining and renewing the local curatorial activities since the late 1990s, introducing interdisciplinary collaboration models and constantly questioning the roles and maps of cultural movements. The principle of self-organisation and the critical positions are evident in the continuation of dialogue between critical artistic practices from the 1970s, an issue discussed in the article on *Politicization of the Cultural Field: Possibilities of a Critical Practice* by Ana Dević.

Moreover, it must be emphasized that the affirmation of the curator, as an important link in the process of building up the system of visual arts, has not been sufficiently recognised in the local broader cultural context. Institutions that should be the principle mediators between the public and the visual arts (from museums to the universities) have remained rather invisible. It is precisely because of this deficiency that the understanding and knowledge of curatorial practices has remained rather scarce or petrified in the pre-established, modernist notion about the self-sufficiency of the artist as someone whose work necessarily communicates without an intermediary and can therefore dispense with all further contextualisation.

- ⁶ Miško Šuvaković, *Pojmovnik suvremene umjetnosti*, Horetzky, 2005., 338.
- ⁷ Susan Hiller (ur.), *The Producers: Contemporary Curators in Conversation* (4), Baltic, Newcastle, 2001., 16.
- ⁸ Kustoske su prakse od kraja osamdesetih postale etablirana profesija koju prati popratni rast edukacijskih programa. Prvi kustoski programi, kao na primjer Whitney programme i Le Magasin (1986.), vezani su uz galerije i muzeje, dok se od devedesetih nadalje usustavljaju i na sveučilištima (ICS-Zurich, Bard, Goldsmiths, Royal College of Arts).
- ⁹ "Uvriježeno je misliti da povijest umjetnosti druge polovice 20. stoljeća nije povijest umjetničkih radova nego povijest izložbi. No, tu je povijest još potrebno ispisati. Urgentnost dolazi i iz toga što ta ista povijest koincidira s pojavom nove profesije, one kustoske.", u: Florence Derieux (ur.), *Harald Szeeman, individual methodologies*, JRP|Ringier, Zürich, 2007.
- ¹⁰ Boris Groys, "The Curator as Iconoclast", u: *Cautionary Tales: Critical Curating*, Apexart, New York, 2007.
- ¹¹ Izložba je ponajprije diskurzivni prostor čiju formu može preuzeti i nematerijalna bijela stranica ili otvoreni javni prostor. Osim prostornog opisivanja, ono što ju izravno određuje i vremenski je faktor, tako da možemo govoriti o nekim projektima u više sekvenca, koje ne određuju samo prostor i vrijeme bavljenja, nego se upisuju u društveni krug u vremenski dužem razdoblju. Svojevremeno je to popratnim izložbenim publikacijama, izložbi kao umjetničkoj knjizi, privremenim ili stalnijim umjetničkim intervencijama u javnom prostoru, itd.
- ¹² Želimir Košćević u Studentskom centru u Zagrebu, Davor Matičević i Marijan Susovski u Galeriji suvremene umjetnosti u Zagrebu.
- ¹³ Studio G, Haustor (veža u Frankopanskoj ulici br. 2, Zagreb, 1969.), Podroom (Mesnička ulica 12, Zagreb, 1975.–1980.), PM (Starčevićev trg 1, 1981.–1991.).
- ¹⁴ Jean Christophe Ammann, *Words of Wisdom 2 – a Curator's Vade Mecum on Contemporary Art*, Independent Curators International (ICI), New York, 2001.

Is the curator responsible for shaping and determining the position of art? How long can we keep art political if its structures of support and general public opinion impose strict de-politicization?

This publication focuses on the exchange of experiences with an insistence on individual approaches, which sometimes leads to an overlapping. "So let us trust art, not discourses that generate art. Ask what potential art has, not what redundancy (market, trends, name dropping) it transports. Train your intuition and put yourself in the role of an unprepared viewer. Remember that the adventure merely begins with the exhibition."...¹⁴

¹ Miško Šuvaković, *Pojmovnik suvremene umjetnosti* (Lexicon of contemporary art), Horetzky, Zagreb, 2005, p. 338.

² Michael Baldwin, Charles Harrison, and Mel Ramsden, "Art History, Art Criticism, and Explanation," in: *Art History and Its Methods: a critical anthology*, ed. by Eric Fernie, Phaidon, London, 1995, p. 265.

³ *Curating Degree Zero*, a curatorial archive, exhibition text by Ana Janevski, Ivana Meštrović, G-MK, Zagreb, 2008.

⁴ "Today the curator must fulfill many tasks," as Szeeman once said as the person whose personal shifts have certainly given most visibility to the curatorial position since the late 1960s. Hans Ulrich Obrist claims that curatorial experimentation began as early as the beginning of the 1920s, even though, according to the emerging art discourses, the first visible curators were certainly men from the late 1960s.

⁵ Bruce Altshuler, *The Avant-Garde in Exhibition: New Art in the 20th Century*, Harry N. Abrams, New York, 1994, p. 236.

⁶ Miško Šuvaković, *Pojmovnik suvremene umjetnosti* (as in n. 1), p. 338.

⁷ Susan Hiller (ed.), *The Producers: Contemporary Curators in Conversation* (4) (Newcastle: Baltic, 2001), p. 16.

⁸ Since the late 1980s, curatorial practices have become an established profession, accompanied by an increased number of educational programmes. Among the first curatorial programmes, one should mention the Whitney programme and Le Magasin (1986), associated with galleries and museums, whereas during the 1990s and later, some were also organized through the various universities (ICS-Zurich, Bard, Goldsmiths, Royal College of Arts).

⁹ "It is now widely accepted that the art history of the second half of the 20th century is no longer a history of artworks, but a history of exhibitions. However, this critical history still largely remains to be written. The question

MEŠTROY I RICHTER SU OSNIVAČICE I VODITELJICE PROGRAMA *KUSTOSKA PLATFORMA* (2008.–2009.) PILOT-PROGRAMA ČIJI JE CILJ OMOGUĆITI DODATNU TEORIJSKU I PRAKTIČNU EDUKACIJU IZ PODRUČJA SUVREMENE NACIONALNE I MEĐUNARODNE LIKOVNE UMJETNOSTI.

IVANA MEŠTROY JE KUSTOSICA, LIKOVNA KRITIČARKA I JEDNA OD OSNIVAČICA UDRUGE ZA SUVREMENE UMJETNIČKE PRAKSE SLOBODNE VEZE. OD STUDENOGA 2009. ASISTENTICA JE NA ODSJEKU ZA POVIJEST UMJETNOSTI I TEORIJE LIKOVNIH UMJETNOSTI FILOZOFSKOG FAKULTETA U SPLITU. SUDJELOVALA JE U KUSTOSKO-ISTRAŽIVAČKOM PROGRAMU *ECOLE DU MAGASIN* 2002.–2003. GODINE, A 2008. GODINE U GALERIJI MIROSLAV KRALJEVIĆ KURIRALA JE S ANOM JANEVSKI ZAGREBAČKU PREZENTACIJU KUSTOSKOG ARHIVA *CURATING DEGREE ZERO ARCHIVE*. KUSTOSICA JE PROJEKTA UMJETNIČKIH INTERVENCIJA NA OTOKU ZLARINU POD NAZIVOM *ZELENA KARTA ZA ZLARIN* (KOLOVOZ 2009.), A OD LJETA 2006. REDOVITO OSTVARUJE I KUSTOSKE SURADNJE S FESTIVALOM AUDIO-VIZUALNIH MEDIJA *VIZURA APERTA*, MOMJAN. S NATAŠOM BODROŽIĆ (SLOBODNE VEZE) KURIRALA JE IZLOŽBE *FUTURE WAS YESTERDAY*, SAMOORGANIZIRANE UMJETNIČKE PRAKSE UKRAJINE (GALERIJE PM I GALERIJA SC, STUDENI 2009.) I CHIOSC (GALERIJA VN, STUDENI 2009.) OBJAVLJUJE TEKSTOVE U ZAREZU, KONTURI I NA 3. PROGRAMU HR.

MIHAELA RICHTER JE APSOLVENTICA NA ODSJEKU POVIJESTI UMJETNOSTI I ODSJEKU FILOZOFIJE NA FILOZOFSKOM FAKULTETU SVEUČILIŠTA U ZAGREBU. OD 2005. DO 2009. GODINE RADILA JE KAO STALNA SURADNICA KULTURE PROMJENE STUDENTSKOG CENTRA U ZAGREBU NA PODRUČJU VIZUALNIH UMJETNOSTI. KOORDINATORICA JE PROJEKATA PROTOKOLA SC (KIBORGEZIJA, PROTOKOL CENTRIFUGAL) I JEDNA OD SELEKTORICA I ORGANIZATORICA VIZUALNOG PROGRAMA FESTIVALA *VELESAJAM KULTURE SC* (2005.–2008.). U SURADNJI S VANJOM ŽANKO KURIRALA JE IZLOŽBE U *DRUGOM FILMU - 10 GODINA ZBIRKE SUVREMENE UMJETNOSTI FILIP TRADE* (MOTOVUN FILM FESTIVAL, 2008.), *FINALISTI* (SURADNJA SA SABINOM SALAMON, GRADSKA GALERIJA LABIN, 2009.) I IZLOŽBU *PUME 34 WHY SO SERIOUS?* (MOTOVUN FILM FESTIVAL, 2009.). U SUUREDNIVSTVU S KARLOM PUDAR UREĐUJE ČASOPIS *RADOVI STUDENATA POVIJESTI UMJETNOSTI* (2008., 2009.).

becomes all the more pressing as this history coincides with the appearance of a new professional category, that of the curator”, in: *Harald Szeeman, individual methodologies*, ed. by Florence Derieux, JRP|Ringier, Zurich, 2007).

¹⁰ Boris Groys, “The Curator as Iconoclast,” in: *Cautionary Tales: Critical Curating* (New York: Apexart, 2007).

¹¹ Exhibition is, first of all, a space of discourse, which can have the form of a non-material white page or an open public space. Beside the spatial description, it is directly defined by the time factor, so that one can speak of some projects in several sequences, which are not only determined by the space and time in which the activity is taking place, but are also inscribed in the social circle through a longer period of time. That is a feature of the accompanying exhibition publications, exhibition as an artist book, temporary or permanent artistic intervention in public spaces, etc.

¹² Želimir Koščević at the Student Centre in Zagreb, Davor Matičević and Marijan Susovski at the Gallery of Contemporary Art, Zagreb.

¹³ Studio G, Haustor (the gate at Frankopanska Street no. 2, Zagreb, 1969), Podroom (Mesnička Street no. 12, Zagreb, 1975-1980), PM (Starčevićev Square no. 1, 1981-1991).

¹⁴ Jean Christophe Ammann, *Words of Wisdom 2 – a Curator’s Vade Mecum on Contemporary Art*, New York, Independent Curators International (ICI), 2001.

MEŠTROV AND RICHTER ARE FOUNDERS AND HEADS OF THE PILOT PROGRAM NAMED CURATORIAL PLATFORM (2008/2009), WHOSE GOAL IS TO PROVIDE ADDITIONAL THEORETICAL AND PRACTICAL TRAINING IN THE FIELD OF CONTEMPORARY NATIONAL AND INTERNATIONAL ART.

IVANA MEŠTROV IS A CURATOR, ART CRITIC AND ONE OF THE FOUNDERS OF THE ASSOCIATION FOR CONTEMPORARY ART PRACTICE NAMED LOOSE ASSOCIATIONS. SINCE NOVEMBER 2009, SHE HAS BEEN WORKING AS ASSISTANT AT THE DEPARTMENT OF ART HISTORY AND THEORY OF THE FACULTY OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES IN SPLIT.

SHE HAS PARTICIPATED IN THE CURATORIAL AND RESEARCH PROGRAM ECOLE DU MAGASIN (2002–2003). IN 2008, TOGETHER WITH ANA JANEVSKI, SHE CURATED ZAGREB PRESENTATION OF THE CURATORIAL ARCHIVES NAMED *CURATING DEGREE ZERO ARCHIVE* (IN THE MIROSLAV KRALJEVIĆ GALLERY).

SHE IS A CURATOR OF THE PROJECT OF ARTISTIC INTERVENTION ON THE ISLAND ZLARIN CALLED *GREEN CARD FOR ZLARIN* (AUGUST, 2009). SINCE SUMMER 2006 SHE HAS BEEN WORKING ON A CURATORIAL COLLABORATION WITH *VIZURA APERTA*, A FESTIVAL OF AUDIO-VISUAL MEDIA IN MOMJAN, ISTRIA (HEAD: DAVORKA PERIĆ).

WITH NATAŠA BODROŽIĆ (LOOSE ASSOCIATIONS), SHE HAS CURATED THE EXHIBITION *FUTURE WAS YESTERDAY*, PRESENTING SELF-ORGANIZED ARTISTIC PRACTICE OF UKRAINE (PM GALLERY AND GALLERY SC, NOVEMBER 2009) AND THE EXHIBITION CHIOSC (GALLERY VN, NOVEMBER 2009).

SHE HAS PUBLISHED TEXTS IN ZAREZ AND KONTURA, AS WELL AS ON THE 3RD PROGRAM OF CROATIAN NATIONAL RADIO.

MIHAELA RICHTER IS A GRADUATE STUDENT AT THE DEPARTMENT OF ART HISTORY AND THE DEPARTMENT OF PHILOSOPHY AT THE FACULTY OF HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES, UNIVERSITY OF ZAGREB.

FROM 2005 TO 2009 SHE WORKED AS PERMANENT ASSOCIATE OF CULTURE OF CHANGE AT THE STUDENT CENTER IN ZAGREB, VISUAL ARTS DEPARTMENT.

SHE WAS A COORDINATOR OF THE PROTOCOL SC PROJECTS (KIBORGEZIJA, PROTOCOL CENTRIFUGAL) AND ONE OF THE SELECTORS AND ORGANIZERS OF THE VISUAL PROGRAM FOR THE FESTIVAL VELESJAM KULTURE (CULTURE FAIR, 2005–2008).

WITH VANJA ŽANKO SHE CURATED THE EXHIBITION *OTHER MOTOVUN – 10 YEARS OF CONTEMPORARY ART COLLECTION FILIP TRADE* (COLLABORATION WITH 10TH MOTOVUN FILM FESTIVAL, MOTOVUN, 2008), THE EXHIBITION *FINALISTS* (TOGETHER WITH SABINA SALAMON, LABIN TOWN GALLERY, 2009) AND THE EXHIBITION OF PUMA 34 *WHY SO SERIOUS?* (MOTOVUN FILM FESTIVAL, 2009).

AS COEDITOR (WITH KARLA PUDAR) SHE EDITED THE JOURNAL RADOVI STUDENATA POVIJESTI UMJETNOSTI (STUDENT PAPERS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF ART HISTORY IN ZAGREB, 2008, 2009).