

DISPLAYING SOCIETY: CROATIAN MUSEUMS AND GALLERIES BETWEEN PEDAGOGY AND PERFORMATIVITY

Preliminary communication

Submitted: 3. 1. 2019.

Accepted: 20. 2. 2019.

DOI: 10.15176/vol56no103

UDK 069:37(497.5)

338.483.12:069(497.5)*

7.038.53

EWA WRÓBLEWSKA-TROCHIMIUK

Institute of Slavic Studies Polish Academy of Sciences, Warsaw

The aim of the paper is to present selected Croatian museum and gallery exhibitions in the light of the phenomenon of museum transformation from the pedagogical into the performative model. Contemporary museums and art galleries initiate new forms of activity. In the old pedagogical model (dominant in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries) art institutions pretended to be neutral and specified education as their main task. This model has been replaced by a performative one which emphasizes cultural relativism, and focuses on the sensory aspect of perception, highlighting the role of the embodied and the sensual. This paper focuses on examples of three Croatian exhibitions: "Socijalizam i modernost. Umjetnost, kultura, politika 1950-1974" (Socialism and modernity. Art, culture, politics 1950-1974) (2011-2012), "Kome treba poduzeće? Slučaj Borovo 1988-1991" (Who needs a company? The case of Borovo 1988-1991) (2016), "Kako živi narod - izvještaj o pasivnosti" (How the people live - a report on passivity) (2016). I intend to show that in spite of widespread opinions to the contrary, museums have not moved away from their original pedagogical task. They still shape reception and they are still deeply interested in power. However, they do this by using modern performative tools - by creating a neural, haptic and multi-sensory relation between the recipient and the object.

Keywords: performative museum, pedagogical museum, Croatia, art

Over the years, we have been witnessing a fundamental change taking place in museums all over the world. This change, however, is unrelated to the museums' exterior or the fact that an increasing number of modern and architecturally attractive buildings have been built to house museums and galleries. Furthermore, it is unrelated to the fact that the already existing "temples of art" have been undergoing extensive façade renovations

or changes to their visual identity (incidentally, such changes are usually announced as “upgrades”). What I mean are profound transformations going back to the very ontological foundations of these institutions, effecting change to the very idea of the museum (Grewcock 2013: 171–172). These transformations are defined and described in different ways, and nearly every evaluation additionally identifies a change within the institution’s functions. Therefore, there seems to be a shift from the elite concept of museums to the concept of an inclusive learning place (Jung 2014), the idea of a critical museum (Piotrowski 2011), the postmuseum phenomenon (Duclos 1994; Hooper-Greenhill 2000) and, finally, the phenomenon of a performative museum (Patraka 1999; Illeris 2006; Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 2000; Garoian 2001).

Reflections on the performativity of museums are most often connected with the difference, described by the historian Dipesh Chakrabarty, between two not mutually exclusive ways of understanding the idea of democracy: the pedagogic one and the performative one (Chakrabarty 2002). The pedagogical approach assumes that the status of a citizen and a rightful participant of culture together with the various related rights is achieved through the educational process provided by institutions such as universities, museums and libraries. A key aspect of education is the acquisition of the skills of abstract conceptualisation and rationalisation i.e., the skills necessary to create and understand imaginative, cohesive and uniting categories, such as *nation* or *identity*. Referring to Homi Bhabha (Bhabha 1994), the researcher also presents the performative approach to democracy. The fundamental difference here is the conviction that the status of being a citizen and a participant of culture is inherent to a human being, and does not result from the educational process seen as an “adaptation” mechanism. In the performative approach, politics is inherently ascribed to an individual: being human means being political. Rationality is supplanted by embodied knowledge, subjective experience and a search for one’s own identity; this is the reason why cultural relativism plays such an important role in performative democracy.

This binary distinction has become a reference system for the evaluation of the situation in museums. Pedagogical museums, being mainly oculo-centric institutions, dominated until the mid-twentieth century. They had an educational, teaching and preparatory function, and their primary task was to provide a monolithic and top-down controlled narrative. Therefore, in a pedagogical museum, visitors are observers following a predefined and preset system of meanings. It is worth adding that this narrative often takes on a false stance of neutrality and disengagement. In contrast, the performative model of an exhibition institution shifts from oculo-centricity towards multisensory perception and embodied experience. Similarly, as is the case in performative democracy, individual experience plays an important role. The reception of the presented material is designed to include space for individual exploration, based on one’s own cognitive interests and, above all, to allow the audience to create its own meanings. An important aspect in this kind of perception is to engage audience embodiment in the process of creating the meaning of the perceived content. Visitors are no longer merely observers of an exhibition; they become its participants, while the previously dominant visual contact is replaced by multisensory

experience (Siepmann 2003: 6). Performativity is understood here as a consequence of the assumption that language (including the language of an exhibition) does not only present reality, but also shapes it, causing it to change. Furthermore, certain phenomena exist only in their act of performance, so they are uncertain, ambiguous, difficult to grasp, and experienced differently by each visitor to an institution (Garolan 2001). The performative model of the exhibition space is strongly related to the changes taking place within culture, and to the strong presence of critical pragmatism resulting in the conviction that our choices, beliefs, values and discursive practices require a critical approach and reevaluation.

Changes within museums that have been taking place for over two decades are related to the so-called *bodily turn*, taking place in culture since the late 1980s, as a result of which the body has become a subject of research as historically variable and shaped by culture, language and ideologies (Laqueur 1990; Canning 1999; Butler 1993).¹ The concurrent evaluation of a somewhat similar affective turn (Ahmed 2004; Ahmed 2013; Felski 2008) sheds new light on bodily experience in exhibition spaces. This has led to the relinking of art with experience and life, resulting in changes in institutional practices, leading to the abandonment of the primacy of the “independent” eye and its reintroduction into the experiencing body.

In this article, I will discuss two issues. Firstly, the extent to which Croatian museums and galleries respond to the changes that are taking place with respect to exhibition trends and the idea of the museum. Zagreb exhibitions selected for analysis are examined with the following question in mind: are they still a modernist treasury whose dominant feature is rationality, objectivity and distance, or are they exhibitions celebrating diversity and negotiating meanings and, therefore, places where individual experience is more important (Hooper-Greenhill 2000: 151–163)? Secondly, is the museum which presents such specific exhibitions displaying a collection of artefacts or is it, rather, using these artefacts as an impulse to multisensory experience and, as a result, to deeper processes taking place in the audience and extended outside the museum space? Based on three case studies, I will try to determine the place of three Croatian exhibitions between the pedagogical and the performative model, and then examine whether performativity is identical with interactivity and inextricably linked with technological advancement.

For this purpose, I have selected three exhibitions prepared by different teams of authors and presented in Zagreb. They illustrate the process of negotiating the role of a museum and the path of changes from the pedagogical model to the performative model: “Socijalizam i modernost. Umjetnost, kultura, politika 1950–1974” (Socialism and modernity. Art, culture, politics 1950–1974) (2011–2012, Museum of Contemporary Art), “Kako živi narod – izvještaj o pasivnosti” (How the people live – a report on passivity), a communication project and exhibition by Kristina Leko (2016, Museum of Contemporary

¹ This direction was already heralded by works of Mary Douglas (Douglas 1966) and Michel Foucault (Foucault 1976, 1975).

Art) and “Kome treba poduzeće? Slučaj Borovo 1988–1991” (Who needs a company? The case of Borovo 1988–1991) (2016, Galerija Nova). Furthermore, the common denominator of the above-mentioned exhibitions is the conviction, incorporated into these initiatives, that it is necessary to find a better understanding of the world and more conscious participation in it, which is what the exhibitions are supposed to guarantee.

THE *MISE-EN-SCÈNE* OF SOCIALISM

The exhibition entitled “Socijalizam i modernost. Umjetnost, kultura, politika 1950–1974” (Socialism and modernity. Art, culture, politics 1950–1974) was held in late 2011/early 2012 in the Museum of Contemporary Art in Zagreb. It was the end result of a four-year research project carried out by an interdisciplinary team.² The information that the exhibition was part of the scientific project was emphasised not only by the project organiser, but also by the media promoting the initiative. The article promoting the exhibition, published in the newspaper “Vjesnik” with a significant title: *Objektivno i analitički o socijalizmu* [Objectively and analytically on socialism], seems symptomatic here; in the article, the author quotes the words spoken at the opening of the exhibition, saying that the main purpose of the project was an objective and analytical discussion of the topic (Kalle 2011). More than three hundred exhibits from over thirty museums and galleries in Croatia and private collections were presented at the exhibition. The thematic and formal range of these materials was so extensive that any systematisation or enumeration was hardly possible: there were various posters; interior reconstructions of the Moša Pijade Workers’ University; illustrations from the then popular encyclopaedia for children: *Svijet oko nas* [The world around us]; covers of well-known magazines created by renowned Croatian artists and designers (e.g. Aleksander Srnec); architectural designs; objects of everyday use, such as the typical Pony bicycle; household appliances; the Fičo car popular at the time; and interior furnishings standard for the period. According to Ljiljana Kolečnik, the team wanted to present the most complete picture of the time; therefore, it was decided that popular culture would also be included and presented in three thematic and formal categories: the city, the newspaper kiosk and the TV (Ožegović 2011: 72). The exhibition also included graphics, sculptures, audio and video materials. These exhibits were mixed with reconstructions of exhibitions taking place in 1950–74, such as the reconstruction of the Salon 54 exhibition, the first exhibition of abstract art “Didaktička izložba” [Didactic exhibition] in 1957, which travelled from Maribor to Skopje, or the ephemeral initiative “At the moment”, which was held in 1971 in Zagreb. In short, visitors to the museum had the opportunity to become acquainted with a plethora of representations of the socialist

² The team consisted of: Ljiljana Kolečnik (art historian, author of the concept), Sandra Križić Roban (art historian responsible for the architecture segment of the project), Tvrtko Jakovina (historian), Dean Duda (literary and cultural expert, responsible for the popular culture segment), and Dejan Kršić (art historian, mainly dealing with design and industrial design).

culture that the authors of the exhibition categorised as carriers and symbols of modernity. The museum and the exhibition curators expressed one of the guiding principles of modern museums: the idea of a connection consisting of creating a dialogic, democratic, catalytic and creative space that explores diversity and authenticity (Grewcock 2013: 172). Therefore, the exhibition can be compared to EXPOs, i.e. large world exhibitions presenting cultural, scientific and technological achievements of a given country, surpassing others in terms of presentation of technological, architectural and engineering innovations. Barbara Kirshenblatt-Gimblett shows that several paradigmatic shifts occur in this type of museums, with the most important one for the discussed exhibition being the shift from the transfer of information about objects to the possibility of experiencing them, including haptic or tasting experience; from staging to *mise-en-scène*, i.e. creating a kind of a theatrical set design for the message; shifting the emphasis from things to stories; and, therefore, preferring feelings over thinking; ultimately, abandoning the practice of creating identity in favour of the possibility of identification with the object of the exhibition (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 2000: 4). Apart from the basic means of communication being a single exhibit, the information function is vested in the entire groups of exhibits, organised in line with a guiding principle, as well as the architectural and plastic decoration and all kinds of accompanying materials whose function is to complement and explain a relevant exhibit (Unger 1988: 17); according to this principle, the Zagreb museum followed the idea of a world museum, focusing on multidisciplinary knowledge and various activities, becoming not so much a medium, but rather a mediator of a certain language the understanding of which was to be the result of the project (Folga-Januszewska 2015: 9).

The combination of the different kinds of artefacts originating from all possible layers of culture also had another function: it united the fragmentary world preserved not in the official, but rather in private memory, into a continuous image explaining reality. Furthermore, the exhibition that had been developed in this way presented modernity as an idea realised on many planes of social life, whereas the socialist culture – as a total project encompassing all areas of human life. As emphasised by Anna Ziębińska-Witek: “creating a museum exhibition is an act of creation: a new meaning, a new understanding, a new interpretation, or a new world that in fact may have never existed, which we may refer to as *negotiated reality*” (Ziębińska-Witek 2014a: 43). Therefore, a curator’s task is to transpose the exhibit from its original context into a new narrative, while at the same time transforming its meaning according to the desired concept. Apart from works of high art, this exhibition also features objects of everyday life that were supposed to refer to the daily experience of exhibition audiences and affect their senses in this way. The memory of the past connected with the routine of everyday life is strongly integrated with embodied experience. Therefore, it is not surprising that a bottle of Cokta, the Yugoslavian version of Coca-Cola, was handed out together with exhibition tickets: everyone who remembered the times presented at the exhibition also remembered the taste of the drink. This was summed up perfectly by Tihana Bertek who wrote in her exhibition review: “All in all, the Socialism and Modernity exhibition may serve as a satisfactory time machine for those who want to remember the times gone by, Fićo cars and posters of *Yugocockta* or *Labud*” (Bertek 2016).

REPORTS ON DISENGAGEMENT: EXHIBITION ON ACTIVITY

In 2016, the same museum hosted the exhibition “Kako živi narod – izvještaj o pasivnosti” (How the people live – a report on passivity). Its author, Kristina Leko, a Croatian artist residing in Berlin, undertook the task of creating an interdisciplinary project that directly referred to Rudolf Bičanić’s work “How the People Live” published in 1936. In the 1930s, this Croatian economist, Doctor of Law and sociologist, went on a walking tour of the regions referred to as “passive regions” (“pasivni krajevi”). The term designates the difficult geographical and climatic conditions prevailing there, resulting in the areas being less developed in economic and industrial terms. Leko decided to “reenact” Bičanić’s journey in order to observe the lifestyles of people living in these areas, and to conduct interviews with them, additionally creating photographic documentation and recording video materials. Like her predecessor, the artist assumed that these people showed above-average ability to self-organise and had business acumen, and hence knew much better than political decision-makers how to go about solving their burning issues. In this case, the performative aspect appears already at the level of collection and preparation of materials for the exhibition. We are dealing here with the phenomenon known in the performance art as *reenactment*, i.e. replaying or reconstructing the original journey in changed social, political and economic circumstances (after the period of socialist modernisation and then after the transformation).

Kristina Leko’s project is not so much a conventional museum practice, but rather a socially engaged project familiar from contemporary art. The author herself refers to her project as a didactic exhibition; therefore, she situates it in the pedagogical model. Nevertheless, we can distinguish some performative features.

The narrative presented in the museum is determined by the stories of eight families from Croatia, and Bosnia and Herzegovina, consisting of conversations about everyday life and the financial situation of a given household, descriptions of the family history of the interviewees, and visual documentation. This does not only make it possible to get to know their current status, but also to determine their cultural capital and situate their family history against the background of turbulent political events of the twentieth century. Each narrative revolves around video material (two films, thirty or so minutes in length each) that significantly engages not only the sense of sight, but also the sense of hearing. Focusing the audience’s attention on the film, which is the starting point of each story, engages their sight as well as their entire body in extended contact with the characters of the stories. Museum visitors have to immerse themselves in the film and focus on it more than if the same story were told through still images. Leko strengthens this kind of intimate physical contact by delineating boundaries of each family’s house on the floor, as in the “Dogville” film, and by reducing light intensity. Within the boundaries of the house there are also photographs (in fact, deceptively reminiscent of works by Zofia Rydet, an outstanding Polish photographer) – portraits taken by Leko (resembling wedding or family portraits hanging on the walls of rural houses), and a few objects of everyday life, as

the attributes of a given family characterising their lifestyle or profession. The artist does not try to provide generalised conclusions; on the contrary, she allows visitors to make a dissection of each family's life. This is additionally possible thanks to huge blackboards included in each story (followers of Leko's work know that she has already used this trick in the "America" project) that feature the family history. The fact that these stories can be wiped out by one stroke of the hand is meaningful. Furthermore, the blackboards allude to school blackboards from which pupils have to read and learn.

In addition to engaging the audience in the process of establishing the meaning of each family's story, in addition to moving within their home and history and, in this way, defining their problems and possibilities of solving them, what is also evident in the exhibition is a change of the idea of the museum as a medium. It ceases to be "about art" and becomes "for art" or "art itself". It is no longer a treasury in the Enlightenment sense, but becomes an indicator of social problems. The didacticism of this exhibition does not prevent it from being considered a so-called participatory exhibition (Simon 2010), creating a space for dialogue. Leko strived to create a space for communication with the audience, which was also supported by scheduled museum lessons. Therefore, her audience changes from passive consumers into active project participants. Allan Kaprow recognises the shift of emphasis in the process that takes place around objects of the exhibition as denying art the right to imitate (Kaprow 1993). In the case of Leko's project, we are dealing not so much with art that imitates, but rather with art that creates and negotiates meanings.

Given that Leko's project also has a historical aspect, thanks to the reference to Rudolf Bičanić's work, the audience become witnesses and transform memory into historical memory; therefore, they do not consume the message, but actively affect it (and the message affects them); thus, we can talk about the existence of a "performative environment" (Patraka 1999). The emphasis on processuality on many levels, which is visible in Leko's exhibition, gives rise to the conclusion about a perfect combination of pedagogical and performative elements. Thus, the exhibition becomes an open work; its activity should go beyond the space of the museum. Therefore, it sets new standards in the Croatian exhibition industry in terms of museum participation and interactivity of exhibitions.

PERFORMING THE PAST

A completely different, but no less interesting project is the exhibition entitled "Kome treba poduzeće? Slučaj Borovo 1988–1991" (Who needs a company? The case of Borovo 1988–1991), which presented a short segment from the life of Borovo, a Croatian company producing a range of rubber products, which was founded in the 1930s. After World War II until the end of the 1970s, it was one of the most successful companies in the former Yugoslavia. The exhibition presented three years of Borovo's operation: between 1988, when the first strike began, and 1991, i.e. the breakup of Yugoslavia. It featured many symbolic representations, including the closure of the factory weekly newspaper (in

fact, the authors of the exhibition used the newspaper as a significant source of material). Borovo was referred to as Yugoslavia in miniature not only because representatives of 23 ethnic groups worked there, but also because Yugoslavian flagship idea – workers' self-management (*radničko samoupravljanje*) – was practiced there for a long time. Furthermore, the factory was almost a state within a state: it had a social base, a heat and power plant, workers' flats and a health care system. When the state was forced to repay huge debts, financial provisions of the factory were used and, thus, the idea of workers' self-management was rejected; the role of workers in deciding the fate of the factory was limited and marginalised, which ultimately led to strikes breaking out in the factory, becoming the symbol of the beginning of the end of Yugoslavia.

The curators responsible for the concept of the exhibition, Katarina Duda and Mirna Ruž, were faced with a difficult historical and documentary subject, seemingly non-artistic and “not suitable for exhibiting”. The burden was certainly even greater because the exhibition was the outcome of the research project devoted to class conflicts entitled “Kontinuitet društvenih sukoba 1987.–1991. Kombinat Borovo” (Continuity of social conflicts 1987–1991. The Borovo industrial system) conducted by Sven Cvek, Snježana Ivčić and Jasna Račić. This difficult-to-define status of the exhibition, being something between an artistic, scientific and documentary project, turned out to be its asset – an opportunity to create its own field of interpretation and better communication, going beyond the academic and artistic field (MAZ 2016). The exhibition revolved around a line going through the gallery space, delineating the chronology of events, around which archival photographic and audio-visual materials were organised, together with detailed descriptions of the factory's economic situation, as well as descriptions of strikes, and of the legal and political context of its operation. The descriptive and textual nature of the exhibition imposed the use of pictograms indicating, for example, the time of factory downtime (a clock) and subsequent protests (figures of people with banners). The exhibition contained QR codes linking to the project website which complemented the exhibition. Although this is nothing new in a museum, it enabled expanding the exhibition space and “taking it with you”, so to speak. From the point of view of performativity of museum exhibitions, what seems of particular significance is a special issue of the weekly “Borovo”, one of the most important workers' newspapers, published specially for the project. It contains a dozen or so texts selected from the original weekly from the period encompassed by the exhibition that, according to the authors, best illustrate the issues raised at the exhibition. In this way, the audience were given the opportunity to play the role of a worker reading the newspaper. Therefore, it was a kind of reenactment of the past; an opportunity to experience the most intense moments of the past reality condensed into an amalgam. In this case, the tension between the present and the past is performative. Video footage showing recorded interviews with former factory employees also served a similar function. The performative space is an extension of the concept of experience design, recognising that the body plays an essential role in the process of cognition. The “performing autobiography” concept also plays a considerable role; according to it, personal memories and stories that the audience bring to the museum determine the reception of the exhibition and allow them to speak

in the first person. According to Garoian, “By performing the museum, viewers bring their personal identities into play with the institution’s dominant ideologies. In doing so, they are able to imagine and create new possibilities for museums and their artefacts within their contemporary cultural lives” (Garoian 2001: 236). Meanwhile, they remain hidden in the pedagogical concept of the exhibition.

I see the performativity of this exhibition on two main levels. Firstly, in the so-called “social objects” present (Engeström 2005) that, contrary to appearances, do not have to be artefacts at all – they may also be tasks or narratives. They have the power to create a conceptual structure in the society, and create tension and relationships among people, forcing them to give meaning by responding to these objects. The so-called “object-centred sociality” process is, therefore, one of the steps towards performativity. Referring to linguistics, Dorus Hoebink distinguishes between constative, object-centred exhibitions in which the authenticity of artefacts is of key importance, and performative exhibitions in which experience and narration are crucial. Performative presentations, such as the discussed exhibition, “are not aimed at truths, but at experiences. It is not a question of one true story, but of various perspectives, stories, types of expertise. It is not the objects that are focused on, but the story told with the aid of objects – stage properties. A constative exhibition is characterized by material authenticity, a performative one by a narrative authenticity” (Hoebink 2011: 188).

Secondly, performative features can be attributed to the gallery itself as a medium. Although it offers seemingly sterile, white walls, the authors of the exhibition do not treat it as a natural carrier of information; they are aware of the fact that it will allow to go further than merely exhibiting this project anywhere else. It becomes not so much a place, but rather a set of skills, techniques or media (Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 2000: 11). The choice of Galerija Nova as the exhibition venue is by no means accidental: it was founded by artists Ljerka Šibenik and Mladen Galić in 1975, and used to be part of Zagreb’s Centre for Cultural Activities of the Socialist Youth. On the artistic map of Zagreb, it has been marked as a place of radical artistic gestures, an area for presentations of avant-garde artists, and a peculiar playground for visual practices and exhibition strategies. In this case too, Galerija Nova was both the exhibition space and the experimental playground. Not only did it integrate documentation, archives, narration and their audio-visual articulations, but it also brought them into the social space and engaged visitors in the process of assigning meaning to this collection of artefacts, especially in relation to the dominant narratives (including those in the national formula) about the break-up of Yugoslavia. From this viewpoint, this exhibition also determined the role of the gallery as a medium through which social meanings are created.

BETWEEN PEDAGOGY AND PERFORMATIVITY

All three exhibitions propose new approaches to the presented topics. They shift the centre of gravity from a top-down interpretation, replacing it with the joint creation of meanings in relation to diverse experience of the audience. The content of the exhibition

must be embodied, so that it can then return as the key to understanding oneself and the community in which the audience operate.

Certainly, a novelty in the discussed cases is also the departure from the national formula as the dominant narrative. It is displaced by assembling categories from different areas: the idea of modernity, the issue of social class, economic issues, problems of exclusion, self-organisation. New light is more frequently shed on the experience of diversity and diversity of experience, rather than on forcing homogeneity.

However, the shift to the performative model is neither smooth nor unambiguous. Museums and galleries continue to shape reception and are interested in power over the audience: naming; giving meaning; the power of representation; creating an official version of history; the power to recognise burning social issues (Hooper-Greenhill 2000); and, therefore, everything that Vivian Patraka, a performance theoretician, considers to be museum's oppressive historical pedagogy and hegemonic narration of the institution (Patraka 1999). It should be noted that the pedagogical model still appears in certain aspects of the institution's activity, especially when it emphasises certain issues in a didactic manner, pointing its finger at them for the fear of overlooking something and explaining what might be unintelligible. However, I have the impression that, in the discussed cases, it is not so much about the hegemony of narration (although, according to Anna Ziębińska-Witek, by redefining themselves in the changing social reality, museums want to preserve both their cultural authority and the functions that were "assigned" to them in late nineteenth century [Ziębińska-Witek 2014: 295]), but rather about the lack of trust in the competence of the audience.

Obviously, none of the exhibitions mentioned above is fully interactive with respect to the technology applied; they do not make full use of the available opportunities (e.g. virtual touch, kinetic interfaces). However, museum's performativity is not only about making everything move and be interactive, but also, or above all, about creating dynamic space where it will be possible to negotiate the meaning of the collection that is in contact with the audience. The exhibitions do not present interactive artefacts, but sequences of repetitive, moving meanings that the audience also perceive in motion. Therefore, performativity becomes a kind of strategy of resistance to the pedagogical museum's monopoly regarding meaning, to the Enlightenment epistemological model.

However, there are opponents to such a broad understanding of performativity of the exhibition space. Anna Ziębińska-Witek, a Polish researcher, questions the blind categorisation of museums as performative. She believes that these features (perception in motion; elimination of the boundary between the proscenium and the stage; theatricality) characterise the exhibitionary environment from the very beginning of its existence. She also challenges the argument regarding museum's performativity as a medium. In her opinion, performativity means an interactive contact with an exhibition/object, leaving the audience with space not so much for the interpretation or reinterpretation of a finished work, but rather with the activity without which the work would not exist (Ziębińska-Witek

2014b). Ziębińska-Witek refers to the traditional understanding of performativity by Erica Fischer-Lichte, according to which the idea of performance is a newly defined relation between the object and the subject, the viewer and the viewee, the audience and the performer. This definition perfectly describes what was presented at the three discussed exhibitions. It also makes sense because none of the exhibitions sought to present a work that had a fixed form, but rather showed certain social ideas whose understanding changes in time and that are established in space shared with the audience.

Ziębińska-Witek is right when she claims that an exhibition of a performative nature should not be considered a finished work, but “should rather be considered the audience’s field of activity, acquiring full meaning only as a result of their participatory behaviour. In this way, the audience would become participants, performers and co-creators of the exhibition. At the same time, this would mean that curators would give up on communicating a prefabricated and pre-selected message to the audience, instead offering them the opportunity to participate in a kind of a game enabling them to independently assign meanings to individual objects and the entire exhibition” (Ziębińska-Witek 2014b: 297). The feature of performative events is that they operate long after they have ended. An individual is a kind of conductor for them. In the discussed cases, exhibition organisers do not give up on providing a predefined message. However, by using performative tools, they allow the audience to arrive at the message in many different ways, following one’s own path. They propose not one, but many possible interpretations of both the more distant past (the socialist modernity may be the object of mockery or nostalgia) and the more immediate past (recalling that the break-up of Yugoslavia need not necessarily be analysed according to the national formula, as well as showing its effects other than the war); and, ultimately, they engage the audience in solving social and economic problems.

There is yet another notable aspect of exhibition perception and the reproduction of its content. Meaning creation by the visitors is not a process that takes place in isolation from the other audience members. Visitors to a gallery/museum are usually aware of the attention and presence of others, so their behaviour and reactions take on a certain aspect of activity (William, Kabisch and Dourish 2005). The reception is “autistic” because museums are shared spaces where an audience is somehow always present (Sparacino, Davenport and Pentland 2000). Therefore, the audience are not only walking viewers absorbing images (Griffiths 2008: 216), but also their producers. According to Dernie, “Visitors become quasi-performers themselves, in a sense, spectators and part of the spectacle, moving through a topography of overlaying sounds and images in an architecture which is constructed by relationships between the moving bodies in the space” (Dernie 2006: 14).

In this paper, I have attempted to show that the three analysed exhibitions – which occupy a significant place in the Croatian cultural life – are at the intersection of pedagogical and performative exhibition strategies. Technical as well as, in all probability, financial constraints made it difficult to make a complete transition into the performative model.

Complete transition was additionally hindered by the fact that the discussed exhibitions were temporary, and might have been easier to make if the exhibitions had been permanent. Be that as it may, organisers used modern performative tools, and created neural, haptic and multisensory relations between the audience and the objects, probably realising that they could reach their visitors better this way.

Charles R. Garoian uses the term “performative museum pedagogy”: he does not deny the museum’s pedagogical function, but rather notes that this function is fulfilled thanks to the performativity of the museum. According to Garoian, performing means that the museum “re-positions viewers as critical participants and enables their creative and political agency within museum culture” (Garoian 2001: 235). Then, visitors’ agency makes it possible to treat what “happened” in the museum as the source for creating new social images, performing new memory and new myths.

REFERENCES AND SOURCES

- Ahmed, Sara. 2004. “Affective Economies”. *Social Text* 79/2: 117–139. https://doi.org/10.1215/01642472-22-2_79-117
- Ahmed, Sara. 2013. *The Cultural Politics of Emotion*. New York, London: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203700372>
- Balzola, Andrea and Paolo Rosa. 2011. *L'arte fuori di sé. Un manifesto per l'età post-tecnologica*. Milano: Feltrinelli.
- Becker, Karin. 2004. “Perspectives for the Study of Visual Culture”. *Nordisk Pedagogik* 24/4: 242–249.
- Bertek, Tihana. 2016. “Socijalizam i modernost, ili puno buke nizašto” [Socialism and Modernity or Much Ado about Nothing]. Available at: www.kulturpunkt.hr/content/socijalizam-i-modernost-ili-puno-buke-niza%C5%A1to (accessed 28 April 2018).
- Bhabha, Homi. 1994. *The Location of Culture*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Butler, Judith. 1993. *Bodies that Matter. On the Discursive Limits of “Sex”*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Chakrabarty, Dipesh. 2002. “Museums in Late Democracies”. *Humanities Research* 9/1: 5–12.
- Cirifino, Fabio, Elisa Giardina Papa and Paolo Rosa, eds. 2011. *Studio Azzurro. Musei di narrazione: percorsi interattivi e affreschi multimediali*. Milano: Silvana Editoriale.
- Canning, Kathleen. 1999. “The Body as Method? Reflections on the Place of the Body in Gender History”. *Gender and History* 11: 499–513. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-0424.00159>
- Dernie, David. 2006. *Exhibition Design*. Laurence King Publishing.
- Douglas, Mary. 1966. *Purity and Danger. An Analysis of Concepts of Pollution and Taboo*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Duclos, Rebecca. 1994. “Postmodern/Postmuseum. New Directions in Contemporary Museological Critique”. *Museological Review* 1/1: 1–13.
- Duncan, Carol. 1995. *Civilizing Rituals. Inside Public Art Museums*. New York: Routledge.
- Engeström, Jyri. 2005. “Why Some Social Network Services Work and Others Don’t. Or: the Case for Object-centered Sociality”. Available at: <http://www.zengestrom.com/blog/2005/04/why-some->

- social-network-services-work-and-others-dont-or-the-case-for-object-centered-sociality.html (accessed 20 April 2018).
- Felski, Rita. 2008. *Uses of Literature*. Oxford: Blackwell. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444302790>
- Folga-Januszewska, Dorota. 2015. *Muzeum. Fenomeny i Problemy* [The Museum. Phenomena and Issues]. Kraków: Universitas. <https://doi.org/10.5604/04641086.1173559>
- Foucault, Michel. 1975. *Surveiller et punir. Naissance de la prison*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Foucault, Michel. 1976. *La volonté de savoir. L'Histoire de la sexualité*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Garioan, Charles R. 2001. "Performing the Museum". *Studies in Art Education* 42/3: 234–248. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1321039>
- Grewcock, Duncan. 2013. *Doing Museology Differently*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Griffiths, Alison. 2008. *Shivers down your Spine. Cinema, Museum and the Immersive View*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Hoebink, Dorus. 2011. "Closereading van 'Een monument vol verhalen". *Bulletin KNOB* 110/5: 187–191.
- Hooper-Greenhill, Eilean. 2000. *Museums and the Interpretation of Visual Culture*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Illeris, Helene. 2006. "Museums and Galleries as Performative Sites for Lifelong Learning". *Museum and Society* 4/1: 15–26.
- Jung, Yuha. 2014. "The Ignorant Museum. Transforming the Elitist Museum into an Inclusive Learning Place". In *10 Must Reads. Inclusion – Empowering New Audiences*. MuseumsEtc, ed. Boston: MuseumsEtc, 138–159.
- Kalle, Martina. 2011. "Objektivno i analitički o socializmu" [Objectively and Analytically on Socialism]. *Vjesnik* 3 December: 52.
- Kaprow, Allan. 1993. *Essays on the Blurring of Art and Life*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, Barbara. 1997. *Destination Culture. Tourism, Museums and Heritage*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, Barbara. 2000. "The Museum as Catalyst". *Museums 2000. Confirmation or Challenge*, 55–66.
- Kirshenblatt-Gimblett, Barbara. 2000. "Exhibitionary Complexes". In *Museum Frictions. Public Cultures/Global Transformations*. Gustavo Buntix, Rasool Ciraj, Karp and Corinne Kratz, eds. Durham, London: Duke University Press, 35–45. <https://doi.org/10.1215/9780822388296-002>
- Laqueur, Thomas. 1990. *Making Sex. Body and Gender from the Greeks to Freud*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- MAZ. 2016. *Kombinat Borovo. Iza pitanja zarada, krije se razoran eksploziv*. [The Borovo Combine. The Issue of Profit Hides a Powerful Explosive]. Available at: <http://www.maz.hr/2016/10/11/kombinat-borovo-iza-pitanja-zarada-krije-se-razoran-eksploziv/>.
- Ožegović, Nina. 2011. "Za apstrakciju, s Titom, naprijed!". *Nacional* 22. 11: 70–72.
- Patraka, Vivian. 1999. *Spectacular Suffering. Theater, Fascism and the Holocaust*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Siepmann, Echard. 2003. "Ein Raumverhältnis, das sich durch Bewegung herstellt. Die performative Wende erreicht das Museum". Available at: <http://www.kunsttexte.de/zusamm.php?artaus=1> (accessed 20 October 2018).
- Piotrowski, Piotr. 2011. *Muzeum krytyczne* [The Critical Museum]. Poznań: Rebis.
- Simon, Nina. 2010. *The Participatory Museum*. Available at: <http://www.participatorymuseum.org/> (accessed 20 October 2018).

- Sparacino, Flavia, Glorianna Davenport and Alex Pentland. 2000. "Media in Performance. Interactive Spaces for Dance, Theater, Circus, and Museum Exhibits". *IBM Systems Journal* 39/3.4: 479–510. <https://doi.org/10.1147/sj.393.0479>
- Unger, Piotr. 1988. *Muzea w nauczaniu historii* [Museums in Teaching History]. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Szkolne i Pedagogiczne.
- Williams, Amanda, Eric Kabisch and Paul Dourish. 2005. "From Interaction to Participation. Configuring Space through Embodied Interaction". *International Conference on Ubiquitous Computing*. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer, 287–304. https://doi.org/10.1007/11551201_17
- Ziębińska-Witek, Anna. 2014a. "Totalitaryzm w nowych muzeach historycznych" [Totalitarianism in New Historical Museums]. In *Historia Polski od-nowa. Nowe narracje historii i muzealne reprezentacje przeszłości* [Polish History A-new. New Historical Narratives and Museum Representations of the Past]. Robert Kostro, Kazimierz Wóycicki and Michał Wysocki, eds. Warszawa: Muzeum Historii Polski, 26–44.
- Ziębińska-Witek, Anna. 2014b. "Zwrot performatywny w muzeach. między teorią a praktyką" [The Performative Turn in Museums. Between Theory and Practice]. *Teksty Drugie* 1: 293–308.

PRIKAZIVANJE DRUŠTVA: HRVATSKI MUZEJI I GALERIJE IZMEĐU PEDAGOGIJE I PERFORMATIVNOSTI

Cilj je ovog rada prikazati odabrane izložbe u hrvatskim muzejima i galerijama iz perspektive transformacije muzeja iz pedagoškog u performativni model. Suvremeni muzeji i galerije uvode nove oblike aktivnosti. U starom pedagoškom modelu (dominantnom u devetnaestom i ranom dvadesetom stoljeću) umjetničke institucije hinile su neutralnost, određujući obrazovanje kao svoju temeljnu zadaću. Taj je model zamijenjen performativnim modelom, koji naglašava kulturni relativizam i usredotočuje se na senzorni aspekt percepcije, ističući ulogu otjelovljenja i senzornoga. Ovaj se članak bavi trima hrvatskim izložbama: "Socijalizam i modernost: umjetnost, kultura, politika 1950.–1974." (2011–2012), "Kome treba podužeće? Slučaj Borovo 1988.–1990." (2016) te "Kako živi narod: izvještaj o pasivnosti" (2016). U radu pokazujem da – unatoč prevladavajućim mišljenjima – muzeji nisu odustali od svog izvornog pedagoškog zadatka. Još uvijek oblikuju recepciju i još su uvijek duboko zainteresirani za moć. Ipak, to čine pomoću suvremenih performativnih alata – stvaranjem neuralnih, haptičkih i multisenzornih veza između primatelja i objekta.

Ključne riječi: performativni muzej, pedagoški muzej, Hrvatska, umjetnost