

EUROPEAN
CONTEXT OF
THE 20th CEN
TURY ART IN
VOJVODINA

EUROPEAN
CONTEXT OF
THE 20th CEN
TURY ART IN
VOJVODINA



MUSEUM OF CONTEMPORARY ART VOJVODINA

EUROPEAN CONTEXTS OF THE 20TH CENTURY ART IN VOJVODINA
The Museum of Contemporary Art Vojvodina, Novi Sad, 2008

Book Concept:

Miško Šuvaković i Dragomir Ugren

Editors:

Miško Šuvaković i Dragomir Ugren

Editorial Staff:

Živko Grozdanić, Ješa Denegri, Vladimir Mitrović, Miško Šuvaković i Dragomir Ugren

Authors:

Marija Cindori, Ješa Denegri, Nevena Daković, Nikola Dedić, Milica Doroški, Sanja Kojić Mladenov, Slobodan Ivkov, Olga Kovačev Ninkov, Kristian Lukić, Jelena Matić, Nebojša Milenković, Vladimir Mitrović, Miroslav Mušić, Ferenc Nemet, Gordana Nikolić, Tijana Palkovljević, Lidija Prišing, Milica Radulović, Miško Šuvaković, Slađana Varagić, Ana Vilenica, Suzana Vuksanović

Original text selection:

Miško Šuvaković

Review:

dr Aleksandar Ignjatović i dr Nikola Šuica

TABLE OF CONTENTS:

Vojvodinian Art Space 7

Ješa Denegri

**The 20th Century Art in Vojvodina: Contradictions
and Hybrid Characteristics of the 20th Century Art in Vojvodina 13**

Miško Šuvaković

Vojvodinian artistic space

It should be said at the very beginning that the use and the advocacy of terms such as “Vojvodinian art”, “art in Vojvodina”, “Vojvodinian art scene”, “Vojvodinian artistic space”, “Vojvodinian visual arts space” and of **similar ones does not** have any connotations relating to everyday politics, particularly those coming from the **standpoints of “autonomy” or “secession”** from the Serbian or Belgrade artistic situation, nor does it intend to **suggest the relationship between the “margin” and the “center” from which this supposed margin tries to break free** and separate. Contemporary pluralism-based history of **modern art** gladly discusses “comparative histories”, “parallel narratives”, “separate worlds”, “equal-footed developments”, and each of these (histories, narratives, worlds or developments) in such a framework has its own **specific features. Nothing else and nothing more** is required from the artistic issues and artistic production **that originate in the geographical and cultural sphere of Vojvodina**, only that they are recognized and appreciated – by themselves and by others – as specific, unique, different, in other words, as an artistic situation **independent and equal to all others** both in principle and in its starting point, within the widest possible present-day global and multicultural context.

To discuss the specific qualities of modern/contemporary Vojvodinian art does not mean to discuss its predefined or predetermined identity (which was once **believed to respond to “lowland painting” or the “landscape of plains”**, in the sense of the imperative of “rootedness in homeland”), nor should one insist on the particular qualities that arise from different ethnic communities, their traditions and mentalities, which indeed are characteristic of Vojvodina’s multinational, social and cultural configuration. For, when modern and contemporary art are concerned, differences between one **environment and another originate primarily in the individual traits of the artists themselves as the indisputable protagonists of the artistic world, whose artistic profiles, the ways in which they are formed and the problems they deal with in their work are always significantly and exclusively individual**, simply because in **modern and contemporary art** only as such, individual, can they ever exist.

Artists from several consecutive generations, with their own characteristics and personal obsessions, challenges, re-

sults, in a word – their own opuses, artists as unique personalities – everywhere, and in Vojvodina as well – represent the key indicator of artistic processes and artistic values. Only from an *a posteriori* understanding of these processes and values, and not from an *a priori* constructed model of its supposed characteristic qualities, can realistic insight into the identity of each separate cultural and artistic environment ensue.¹

Comprehensive, diverse and indispensable material for the understanding of the genesis and the developmental currents of different language modalities and ideological standpoints within the modern/contemporary art in Vojvodina was collected and analysed in the catalogues to the following exhibitions: *Slikarstvo u Vojvodini 1900-1944 (Painting in Vojvodina 1900-1944)*², *Likovna umetnost u Vojvodini 1944-1954 (Visual Arts in Vojvodina 1944-1954)*³, *Slikarstvo u Vojvodini 1955-1972 (Painting in Vojvodina 1955-1972)*⁴, *Skulptura u Vojvodini (Sculpture in Vojvodina)*⁵, *Grafika u Vojvodini (Graphic Arts in Vojvodina)*⁶, *Grupa KÔD (Э-KÔD (The Group “Code”, “(Э”, “Э-Code”))*⁷, *Aktuelnosti u slikarstvu Vojvodine 1973-1993 (Current Issues in the Painting of Vojvodina 1973-1993)*⁸, *Centralnoevropski aspekti vojvodanskih avangardi 1920-2000 (Central European Aspects of the Vojvodinian Avant-Garde)*⁹, and *Fatalne devedesete (Fatal Nineties)*¹⁰, all of them organized by the Gallery of Contemporary Visual Arts, later renamed Museum of Contemporary Art of Vojvodina in Novi Sad. Numerous other solo, monographic and retrospective exhibitions of leading protagonists of the Vojvodinian art scene represent another source of this material, along with a number of thematic and authorial critical exhibitions, but the data on these would be simply impossible to quote here.

Any future historicization of artistic events within the geographical and cultural space of Vojvodina must take into account all of this material provided by art history, and even from the most superficial of insights into these events a conclusion unavoidably suggests itself: what is at hand is a rich and fertile continuity of artistic life, lasting over a hundred years, with an array of generations of artists during this period, and each of these generations internalized current artistic experiences in their closer or wider environment, in accordance with

the possibilities and circumstances of the given historical context, and performed its own creative undertakings. Exactly in these undertakings lies the origin of the entire issue of Vojvodinian art or art in Vojvodina throughout the 20th century.

The prevailing stereotype concerning modern art in Vojvodina is the model of art that exists in a small multinational and multicultural environment, in which this art comes to life at the intersection of different influences that originate in larger neighboring sources. These influences initially came from Munich and Budapest, their sources then transferred to Zagreb and Belgrade as centers of education, where Vojvodinian artists stayed for shorter or longer periods and exhibited their work, while all of these influences in fact shared the common root in the experiences of visual arts aesthetics of Paris, as the capital of European Modernism in the first half of the 20th century. In the second half of the 20th century, Vojvodinian artists were influenced primarily by local artistic schools, in Belgrade and more recently Novi Sad, only a few of them in Zagreb or Sarajevo, or, on the other hand, came from circles outside of the profession, like many members of the Conceptualist groups. In the context of such a complex and in many ways distinctive social and cultural background, during a century of existence there emerged in Vojvodina an artistic scene of unique composition, within which the reactions to outer stimuli were signified by the appearance of a number of original and valuable individual and sometimes group artistic forms.

Regardless of a certain local significance of the art of the “prelude period” (as M. Arsić terms the period in Vojvodinian art roughly between 1890 and 1920), a modern typology of painting based on Western European, primarily Parisian artistic achievements, adopted directly or indirectly, was achieved in the 1920s, within the circle of authors with strikingly modernist features, who were active in Vojvodina or were native Vojvodinians, including Dobrović, Šumanović, Konjović, Radović, Balaž and Tabaković. The receptions and realizations in question were those of moderately Cubist and Cubist-Expressionist experiences, further explorations of Lhote’s version of post-Cubism, the application of the technical operations of the Cubist collage, the resonances of Hungarian Modernism of the group “Osmorica” (“The Eight”) and the social art in the spirit of the German *New Reality*; that is to say, they were renderings of quite different, yet pronouncedly European artistic expressions. Consequently, owing to the wide knowledge, curiosity and courage of several leading young artists, the processes of modernization in the Vojvodinian artistic space spread considerably and quickly joined the contemporary international artistic developments of the time.

The extreme position of historical Avant-garde movements within international contextualization stems from how surprisingly up-to-date the appearance of activist and Dadaist

practices in several Vojvodinian towns were, in places recently torn from oblivion and illuminated to the smallest details owing to extensive historiographic research.¹¹ Based on this research, after more than seven decades, what surfaces is an exciting atmosphere sparked by the publication of the magazine *Ut* in Novi Sad between 1922 and 1925, pervading the matinees in Novi Sad (held to mark the publication of the first issue of *Ut* on 1st April 1922), and in Subotica (9th November 1922), in Veliki Bečkerek, and perhaps in Sombor and Srbobran (there is no reliable data about the last two). All of these can be seen as an integral part of the spiritual climate and public appearances by the representatives of the Hungarian activist and Dadaist movement, led by Lajos Kassak and Sandor Bart.

The period from mid-1930s onward and throughout the 1940s is referred to in the entire European historical and artistic periodization as the period of “return to order”, with many variations in each of the separate local cultural scenes. Essentially identical or similar processes were in motion within the Serbian artistic scene and the Vojvodinian scene as well as its component, and the painting practices within them are termed by our historiography “Expressionism of color, coloristic Realism, Intimism and poetic Realism” (M. B. Protić).¹² These terms are more or less suitable for naming a conceptual turn towards subjective painting that relied on the artist’s personal experience of the nature that surrounded him, his own living environment, his outlook on the people, objects and scenes from the everyday, all of this artistically shaped by the cultivation of pictorial culture according to the ideals of spirit and taste of the Parisian school in the period between the two world wars. This type of domestic painting was seen, in the sociological sense, as “the highest expression of citizen art” (L. Trifunović).¹³ The advance of such a notion of painting in the corpus of Serbian modern art was announced by *The Sixth Yugoslav Exhibition*, held in Novi Sad in 1927. Leading artists of this style of painting, who were tied to the Vojvodinian artistic environment in the 1920s and 1930s by being and exhibiting in Vojvodina, included the coloristic Dobrović and Konjović, the neo-Classicist Šumanović, the Intimist Radović, the late Šumanović of the Šid period, Pomorišac with his *Self-portrait* from 1932, Tabaković, who precisely during his stay in Novi Sad between 1930 and 1937 renounced the ideas of social art, which had its peak in the exquisite painting *Genius* from 1929, and came closer to a certain type of Intimism, with a climax in *Blue Inn* from 1937, and finally Šerban and Šuput, whose dramatic *Skulls* from 1939, immediately before the outbreak of World War II, symbolically put an end not only to a period in painting and art, but a historical period as well.

Similarly to other art environments in post-war Yugoslavia, the socialist Realist episode did not miss the Vojvodinian scene of the time either, manifesting itself in ideologically motivated

writings about the function of art, rather than in the humble artistic production. Amidst this intolerant situation there was Konjović, who, despite trying to adjust his distinctive artistic language to the new **subject matter (in his paintings *Liberation of Sombor*, 1944 and *Construction of the Bridge near Bogojevo*, 1947)**, was not spared from contestations and accusations on the part of the propagators of **socialist Realism**. **In an altogether different social and political climate after 1948**, with his exhibition *Ljudi (People)*, 1951, Konjović **secured the priority of the visual over the thematic approach to painting**, as was indicated in his two *Still Lives*, 1953, **emblematic of that time**. **From the mid-1960s onward there was in Vojvodina an onset and spread of the predominance of moderate “socialist Modernism” rendered in practice by a growing artistic class gathered under the institutional wing of the Association of Fine Artists**. The manner of organization of artistic life in the 20th century particularly characteristic of the Vojvodinian scene of the 50s was the **emergence of numerous painting colonies**, whose activities had controversial results.¹⁴

It has been observed that **the phenomenon of the domestic “moderate Modernism” “met the requirements of artistic autonomy, but also the need of the ruling political and party system to neutralize art in the aesthetic, cultural, social and political sense.”**¹⁵

This observation corresponds in principle to the debate concerning the appearance and the notion of “socialist Aestheticism”, as this characteristic art form is ambiguously interpreted, that is, both positively and negatively, in Serbian post-war criticism by M. B. Protić and L. Trifunović.¹⁶ This was, namely, the mainstream in the visual art disciplines, that is, painting, sculpture and graphic arts, on the Serbian art scene of the 50s and 60s, **with numerous individual examples in the Vojvodinian artistic situation of the time as well**.

The following remark of M. Arsić is indicative when it comes to the modernization of Vojvodinian painting between 1955 and 1972: “Painting in this region did not lose the traits associated with Vojvodinian idiosyncrasies, **but it did not gain** (as it was at one political point wished and demanded) the meaning of **autonomous Vojvodinian painting**. **Painters from Vojvodina always formed a relatively defined and, speaking in terms of visual arts and their program, articulated artistic circle of several generations of painters with different orientations**. The painters in question **have a similar repertoire of motifs**, like a constant of Antaeus-like nature, as part of a crucial connection **between them and their invariable readiness to respond to the challenges of the landscape spaces and atmospheres of Vojvodina.**”¹⁷ Outside of this dominant local artistic climate, there existed only rarely single lonely variations **that explored possible answers to more urgent and radical artistic enquiries**.

Such was the case with the **appearance of Informel and Matter painting at the beginning of the 1960s in Vojvodina**, which, primarily due to the lack of timely support in theory and promotional criticism, remained until recent historical revalorizations unjustly overshadowed by the related phenomenon of Informel in Belgrade.¹⁸ In the chronicles and the history of Informel painting in Serbia, several key developments are associated with the events hosted in Vojvodina: the first solo exhibition of the leading representative of Serbian Informel painting, B. Protić, was held at the Tribina mladih (Youth Tribune) in Novi Sad in November 1959, featuring a group exhibition entitled *Dokonda nije ona ista (Gioconda Is Not Who She Used to Be)* in 1962, as a joint appearance of the members of Belgrade Informel and the *Mediala*; at the same time, in Sombor, an exhibition was organized under the name *Dvadeset sedam savremenih slikara (Twenty-Seven Contemporary Painters)*, with participants from Yugoslavia, **which was the last date in the ascending trajectory of this innovative trend in domestic artistic conditions, right before the famous political attack on abstract art.**¹⁹ Along with the early Novi Sad phase of B. Protić, **who went on to realize most of his opus in Belgrade**, other crucial chapters in the history of Vojvodinian Informel painting and Matter painting were contained in the mutually separate and independent contributions of Acs, Petrik and Bogdanka Poznanović.

An entirely independent development **within newer Vojvodinian art**, once placed within the realms of the so-called “Naive painting” (whose leading representative is still Feješ), and today explored in the light of “individual mythologies”, is the **“Bosilj phenomenon”**. This “affair”, which remains unsolved and unsolvable before the history of modern art and art criticism, despite all interpretative effort, confirms, in a truly surprising manner, that the source of remarkable art can appear where it is least expected according to the usual predictions.²⁰ A separate contextualization of Bosilj’s artistic standpoint is suggested in the provisory phenomenon of the “Šid Trio” (Šumanović, Bosilj, Mangelos).²¹

A development on the Vojvodinian art scene **that represented a decisive step away from the local moderate Modernism, and the local Informel, and which, as a result, represented within its environment a radical “epistemological cut” in favor of neo- and post-Avant-garde formations**, was the phenomenon of Vojvodinian Textualism and the Post-Object and Conceptual art of the *Bosch+Bosch* group from Subotica (Matković, Szombathy, Szalma, Czernik; Kerekeš, Ladik and others), the groups *KÓD* (Radojičić, Bogdanović, Mandić, Vranešević, Tišma, Kocijančić) and *∃* (Kopić, Raković, Drča, Živanović) from Novi Sad, and finally the authorial duo under the name of *Verbumprogram* (Kulić-Mattioni), active in Ruma. This “cut” was contained, above all, in the changed status of the artistic product, which was transferred from the aesthetic object, a painting,

sculpture or **graphics, into the realms of mental propositions**, bodily actions, interventions that took place outside the gallery, in nature or in the city, including the social critical **behavior of** the artist, who spoke in the first person, challenging, as a result, a whole myriad of adverse repercussions, misunderstandings, resistances, prohibitions, and drastic jailing measures against two members of Novi Sad's Conceptualist groups, incomprehensible even today. This leads to a justified conclusion that the developments in question had, or exhibited, subversive traits with direct or indirect political implications. **At the moment of** their emergence, these developments were altogether ignored by the professional artistic class and the critics **favorable towards** it, only to witness over time no less than three waves of historical revalorization, the first with the exhibition *Nova umjetnička praksa 1966–1978 (New Artistic Practice 1966–1978)* in Zagreb in 1978²², then in the retrospectives of the groups *KÔD* and *(K)* (*Ξ-KÔD* and the *Verbumprogram* duo in 1995²³, and finally with the exhibition *Centralnoevropski aspekti vojvođanskih avangardi 1920–2000*, in 2002²⁴ and, in its wake, the monographic publications on three protagonists of the Vojvodinian new art of the 1970s – Matković, Szombathy and Kopić.²⁵

Vojvodinian Textualism and Conceptualism (to use these terms, which are often in use but are in fact **inappropriately and overly simplified**) represented an integral part of a wider, related Yugoslav artistic situation of **the 1970s, and together they took** part in the spiritual and cultural atmosphere created as a result of the refusal of youth and intellectual minorities to accept in advance the existential conditions that were given or forced upon them. In such a boiling social and **political atmosphere**, there emerged in Vojvodina the new art of the **seventies as a** problem phenomenon synchronous with international artistic currents and events, independent of the Belgrade artistic scene, which it even preceded slightly and differed from strikingly in character and in the **consequences of its artistic orientations**. This was art created by theoretically educated and ideologically aware young authors, whose education, erudition and skill (in the areas of literature, linguistics, philosophy, architecture, rock music) radically changed the image of the modern artist, from someone well-versed in **formative techniques, into a** self-confident critical intellectual and a willing outcast from the ruling cultural, social and political currents, which they strove to oppose and create a countercultural position, generationally interconnected, in the spirit of the **“new sensibility”** of 1968 and its corresponding microcollectives with shared lifestyles and socialising habits. Thus, when Vojvodinian neo- and post-Avant-garde movements are concerned, **they cannot be seen** as a single artistic trend, new for its time, but rather a special social and cultural **phenomenon that transformed the notions** of contemporary art within its surroundings in many ways, causing considerable repercussions, **both in the questioning**

and revalorization of earlier artistic developments, as well as in redirecting **those that were to yet to come**.²⁶

Towards the end of **the 1970s and in the early 1980s, the** world of contemporary art and culture on the whole was deeply affected by another significant change of the overall paradigm: this was the period of the emergence and unstoppable spread of a spiritual climate we call “postmodern”. The reasons for this landmark change were many, ranging from **political and economic**, to civilizational and cultural. The symptoms of this change within the area of **visual arts manifested themselves as** the “revival of painting” and the “return to painting”, led by the German neo-Expressionism and the Italian trans-Avant-garde, and the specific modalities of such a turn towards one's tradition – **justified by the idea of genius loci** – did not miss almost any of the local artistic environments. The Vojvodinian art scene of the eighties was no exception, and it also featured numerous representatives and followers of this unburdened pluralist mood, characterized by “the need for a painting.”²⁷

Like once with **moderate Modernism, one could speak of** moderate Postmodernism, or even **anti-Modernism, Retro-garde and retro-Avant-garde. In such a situation, authors** who brought into their painting the existential input and the operational experience of the art of the seventies were rare, but precisely these artists **were the sole entirely original exponents** of the life and artistic mood expressed through a psychosis of authentic traumatic “**horrors of the language of the painting**”, as was the case with two former members of Subotica's group *Bosch+Bosch*. One of them was Kerekeš, as the first and existentially justified convert from the new art of the early 70s into the new painting of the late 80s, **and the other was Matković** in his **dramatic confessional epilogue in small format drawings and oil pastels** in the cycle titled *Ja tako slikam (I paint like that)*, from the last years of his life.²⁸

Finally, the 90s, **the last decade of the previous century, the** period of the Serbian and Vojvodinian art scene, **which is called** “**the art of post-socialism, the epoch of entropy**”²⁹, for now conclude the **entire centennial flow of artistic events of the region**, explored in these considerations. This is a situation, **which**, observed from every expected point of view, seems **paradoxical, almost impossible and abnormal. Namely, in the time of a** complete crisis of the Serbian society in the 90s, **which naturally** affected Vojvodina as well, we can observe an unusually fertile artistic climate, in artistic **production itself as well as in the** organization of numerous events, and in the ideas and practical undertakings of the critics.³⁰ This production was characterized by pluralistic “complete immensity” of language, media, acts, separate authorial poetics and standpoints, among which one should mention Szombathy, Ugren, Grozdanić, Santrač, Kulić, Mrđa-Kuzmanov, Škulec, Jelenković, Kojić, Antić, Pavlović, Markuš, Grubanov, V. Tokin, N. Teofilović, *Asocijacija Apso-*

lutno, and *Led Art*. Among these one should point to the profile of artists equally devoted to their own production and to activist behavior as they ran galleries and museums, started and edited magazines, exhibited engaged political viewpoints that enabled them to resist the adverse position of “art within a closed society”, such as Ugren or Grozdenović. Events that marked the developments on the Vojvodinian art scene of the 90s included numerous exhibitions in the Contemporary Gallery in Pančevo³¹, the Biennial of Young Artists in Vršac, launched and subsequently held several times, and other exhibitions in the Konkordija Center in Vršac, including *Energije – savremena umetnost u Vojvodini* (*Energies – Contemporary Art in Vojvodina*) in 1995 and *Prestupničke forme* (*Transgressive Forms*) in 1998³², exhibitions held in the Museum of Contemporary Art of Vojvodina, the Zlatno Oko cultural center, the Most Gallery, all of the exhibitions in Novi Sad, and some of those held in Kikinda and Apatin. Critical theses that contributed to the understanding and interpretation of the situation present on the Vojvodinian art scene of the 90s are “discreet Modernism” (Stepanov)³³, “regional-universal” and “open sensitivity” (Mladenov)³⁴. Like never before, there was a rich publishing production, in the form of catalogues and magazines (*Košava*, *Zlatno oko*, *Projekta*t*, *Transkatalog*, *Artcontext*). Owing to all these intensive and high-quality artistic developments, during the nineties in the region of Vojvodina a decentralized, polycentric and demetropolized art scene established itself irrevocably, which in effect results in Belgrade’s no longer being the sole complete and unquestionable center, and in turn terms like “contemporary Vojvodinian art”, “Vojvodinian art scene”, “Vojvodinian visual arts space” along with the artistic developments understood by these terms, have definitely won the right to their own legitimate identity as a separate issue.

- 1 As the starting premise in relation to artistic developments in Vojvodina in the second half of the 20th century, this principle is propounded in the collection of essays *Fragmenti – šezdesete–devedesete. Umetnici iz Vojvodine*, Novi Sad, Prometej, 1994.
- 2 *Slikarstvo u Vojvodini 1900-1944*; contents: M. Arsić, *Slikarstvo u Vojvodini 1900-1944*, R. Kulić, *Slikarstvo u Novom Sadu 1900-1944*, M. Džepina, *Slikarske škole u Novom Sadu 1900-1944*, J. Knežević, *Slikarstvo u Zrenjaninu 1900-1944*, S. Mihajlović-Radivojević, *Slikarstvo u južnom Banatu 1900-1944*, H. Hofman, *Slikarstvo u Somboru 1900-1944*, A. Baranji, *Slikarstvo u Subotici 1900-1944*; Novi Sad, June-August 1991.
- 3 *Likovna umetnost u Vojvodini 1944-1954*, introduction by M. Arsić, Novi Sad, 1980.
- 4 *Slikarstvo u Vojvodini 1955-1972*, introduction by M. Arsić, Novi Sad, June-August 1989.
- 5 *Skulptura u Vojvodini*, introduction by Lj. Ivanović, *Razvoj skulpture u Vojvodini 1895-1980*, Novi Sad, December 1984 – February 1985.
- 6 *Grafika u Vojvodini 1900–1985*, introduction by M. Arsić, Novi Sad, June-August 1985.
- 7 *Grupa KÖD, (E-KÖD)*, introduction by M. Šuvaković, Novi Sad, May 1995.
- 8 *Aktuelnosti u slikarstvu Vojvodine 1973–1993*, introduction by M. Arsić, Novi Sad, December 1994.
- 9 *Centralnoevropski aspekti vojvodanskih avangardi 1920-2000: granični fenomeni – fenomen granice*; contents: M. Šuvaković – D. Šimić, Introduction; J. Denegri, *Primeri istorijskog modernizma*; S. Vuksanović-Soleša, *Fenomen pomeranja granica stvarnosti i umetnosti do granice saznanja i tajni* (Ivan Tabaković, Genius); M. Cindori, *Aktivistička dadaistička matineja u Subotici*; J. Denegri, *Enformel i slikarstvo materije*; M. Šuvaković, *Individualne mitologije: šidska trojka ili logika granice*; J. Denegri, *Postenformelna reduktivna apstrakcija*; D. Đurić, *Vojvodanski tekstualizam*; N. Milenković, *Umetnost kao istraživanje umetnosti*; N. Milenković, *Mail-art – umetnost postumetničke ere*; M. Šuvaković, *Ženski performans: mapiranje identiteta*; N. Milenković, *Neoekspresionizam: užasi jezika slike*; S. Vuksanović Soleša, *Prostori slike: mišljenje slikarstva*; M. Šuvaković, *Umetnost postsocijalizma: epoha entropije i brisani sablasni tragovi*; Novi Sad, September 2002.
- 10 *Fatalne devedesete: strategije otpora i konfrontacije – Umetnost u Vojvodini na kraju XX*

- veka i početkom XXI veka*; contents: J. Denegri, *Opstanak umetnosti u vremenu krize*; N. Milenković, *Ludi zburjeni i još neki...*, *Jedan mogući pogled na vojvodansku umetnost devedesetih*; S. Mladenov, *Neizolovani proctor*; S. Stepanov, *Devedesete i godine posle. Umetnost u zatvorenom društvu. Poricanje zatvorenog sistema umetnosti*; S. Vuksanović Soleša, 1999-2001. *Verzije: Kraj. Početak*; J. Denegri, *Vojvodanski umetnički prostor devedesetih. Modeli lokalno-globalno u uslovima tranzicije*; M. Šuvaković, *Umetnost i fatalne slabosti kulture. Rasprava o statusu i funkcijama "umetnosti" i "kulture" na kraju XX i početkom XXI veka*; Novi Sad, September 2001.
- 11 V. Golubović, *Dada u Subotici*, a section in *Književnost*, 7-8, Belgrade, 1990, pp. 1383-1423; M. Cindori, *Aktivistička dadaistička matineja u Subotici*, in *Centralnoevropski aspekti vojvodanskih avangardi* (exhibition catalogue), Novi Sad, September 2002, pp. 30-49.
- 12 M. B. Protić, *Srpska umetnost XX veka*, I. Belgrade, Nolit, 1970, M. B. Protić, *Četvrta decenija: ekspresionizam boje, poetski realizam, intimizam, koloristički realizam*, in *Četvrta decenija – ekspresionizam boje – poetski realizam* (exhibition catalogue), Belgrade, Museum of Contemporary Art, June-July 1971.
- 13 L. Trifunović, *Srpsko slikarstvo 1900-1950*, Belgrade, Nolit, 1973.
- 14 B. Duranci, *Umetničke kolonije*, Subotica, Osvit, 1989.
- 15 M. Šuvaković, *Pojmovnik suvremene umjetnosti*, Zagreb, Horetzky, 2005, p. 646.
- 16 J. Denegri, *Šta je to (bio) socijalistički estetizam?*, *Dnevnik*, 1965, Novi Sad, 13th January 1999; J. Denegri, *Kontroverze oko "socijalističkog estetizma"*, *Sveske*, 45-6, Pančevo, 1999, pp. 135-140.
- 17 M. Arsić, *Slikarstvo u Vojvodini 1995-1972*, Novi Sad, 1989, p.7.
- 18 J. Denegri, *Enformel u Vojvodini*, in: *Šezdesete – teme srpske umetnosti*, Novi Sad, Svetovi, 1995, pp. 48-54; J. Denegri, *Enformel i slikarstvo materije*, in *Centralnoevropski aspekti vojvodanskih avangardi* (exhibition catalogue), Novi Sad, 2002, pp. 52-53; J. Denegri, *Koincidencije i paralele: enformel u Španiji i u Srbiji*, *Annual Zbornik katedre za istoriju moderne umetnosti Filozofskog fakulteta*, Belgrade, 2006, pp. 21-31.
- 19 *Dvadeset sedam savremenih slikara*, II Likovna jesen, Participants: Acs, Bajić, Baretić, Bogojević, Božićković-Popović, Dogan, Horvat, Jemec, Kalina, Knifer, Kotnik, Kregar, Kulmer, Mjer, Marković, Meško, Murtić, B. Omčikus, Pavlović, Perić, Popović, B. Protić, Sablić, Srnec, Todorović, Turinski, Vozarević. Sombor, Town Museum, November-December 1962.
- 20 D. Bašičević Mangelos, *Moj otac Ilija, Nacrt za antimonografiju*; edited and published by V. Bašičević; contributions: G. Gamulin, B. Tomić, V. Đurić, J. Denegri; Novi Sad, 1995; *Svet po Iliji*; contributions: N. Milenković, J. Denegri, J. Kallir; publisher: V. Bašičević, Novi Sad, 2006.
- 21 M. Šuvaković, *Individualne mitologije: šidska trojka ili logika granice*, in *Centralnoevropski aspekti vojvodanskih avangardi* (exhibition catalogue), Novi Sad, 2002, pp. 64-65.
- 22 M. Radojčić, *Aktivnost grupe KÖD. Umetnička aktivnost van grupa u Novom Sadu*; B. Szombathy, *Značajni momenti u radu grupe Bosch+Bosch*; R. Kulić – V. Mattioni, *Verbumprogram*, in *Nova umjetnička praksa 1966-1978* (exhibition catalogue); Zagreb, Gallery of Contemporary Art, 1978, pp. 36-47, 48-50, 64.
- 23 M. Šuvaković, *KÖD, (E-KÖD)*, Novi Sad, Gallery of Contemporary Visual Arts, May 1995. J. Denegri, *Verbumprogram*, Gallery of Contemporary Visual Arts, Novi Sad, March-April 1995.
- 24 D. Đurić, *Vojvodanski tekstualizam*; N. Milenković, *Umetnost kao istraživanje umetnosti*, in *Centralnoevropski aspekti vojvodanskih avangardi* (exhibition catalogue), Novi Sad, 2002, pp. 84-86, 90-95.
- 25 Authorial exhibitions of N. Milenković at the Museum of Contemporary Art in Novi Sad: S. Matković, 2005; B. Szombathy, 2005; V. Kopicl, 2007.
- 26 For more on these developments in a wider Yugoslav cultural and political context of 1970s, see the recent publication *Izostavljena istorija*, a transcript of a debate held on 18th November 2005 at the Museum of Contemporary Art in Novi Sad, to mark the exhibition titled *Trajni čas umetnosti. Novosadska avangarda 60-ih i 70-ih godina prošlog veka*; participants: Ž. Žilnik, M. Šuvaković, L. Perović, Z. Maković, B. Szombathy, L. Stojanović, ed. Kuda.org, Novi Sad, 2006.
- 27 S. Stepanov, *Potreba za slikom*, Pančevo, Contemporary Gallery of the Olga Petrov Cultural Centre; 1988.
- 28 N. Milenković, *Neoekspresionizam, Užasi jezika slike*, in *Centralnoevropski aspekti vojvodanskih avangardi* (exhibition catalogue), Novi Sad, 2002, pp. 180-185.
- 29 M. Šuvaković, *Umetnost postsocijalizma. Epoha entropije i brisani sablasni tragovi*, in *Centralnoevropski aspekti vojvodanskih avangardi* (exhibition catalogue), Novi Sad, 2002, pp. 180-185.
- 30 S. Stepanov, *Destrukcija, dekonstrukcija, konstrukcija ili o umetnosti na prekretnici vekova*, in *Regionalno-univerzalno*, texts from a conference, Novi Sad, Zlatno oko Cultural Centre, December 2006, pp. 35-41; S. Stepanov, *Ideje i akcije likovne kritike u Vojvodini tokom devedesetih*, in *Regionalno-univerzalno*, texts from a conference, Pančevo, Gallery of Contemporary Art, June 2002, pp. 75-93.
- 31 S. Stepanov, *Ka univerzalnim poukama. Autorske i promotivne izložbe u Savremenoj galeriji Centra za kulturu u Pančevu tokom osamdesetih i devedesetih godina*, in *Regionalno-univerzalno*, presentations at a conference, Pančevo, Gallery of Contemporary Art, May 2001, pp. 27-45.
- 32 *Galerija Konkordija 1994-2000. – Izlagačka praksa kao kulturno-politička strategija*, Vršac, June 2004.
- 33 S. Stepanov, *O diskretnoj obnovi modernizma*, in *Tendencije devedesetih: diskretni modernizam* (exhibition catalogue), Novi Sad, Zlatno oko Centre for Visual Culture, 1996, reprinted in *Hijatusi modernizma i postmodernizma*, a theoretical controversy, *Projekta*t*, 11-15, Novi Sad, 2001, pp. 298-303.
- 34 S. Mladenov, *Regionalno-univerzalno*, in *Regionalno-univerzalno*, Gallery of Contemporary Art, Pančevo, 2001, pp. 9-17; S. Mladenov, *Regionalno-univerzalno*, in *Regionalno-univerzalno*, Novi Sad, Zlatno oko Centre for Visual Culture, 2005, pp. 3-11.

20TH CENTURY ART IN VOJVODINA

CONTRADICTIONS AND HYBRIDITIES OF THE 20TH CENTURY ART IN VOJVODINA

1. "History was not given to us, we are asking you to help us construct it".

Irwin, NSK

2. Once there lived two flies in a large box. One of them lived in the center of the box, flew around constantly, buzzing: "I am free!"

The other lived on the inner wall of the box and constantly screamed in tears: "I am a prisoner."

3. "Sade¹ is a materialist because he substitutes the language of a secret with the language of practice: he does not conclude a scene with the revelation of truth (gender), but with pleasure."

Roland Barthes

Introduction: Towards a new museum² and
towards new history (Serbian edition, p.21)

We are talking, by all means, about fascinations and yearnings of a new or a different view of the art of the 20th century. The new museum – the Museum of Contemporary Art in Vojvodina – appears to be expecting a new exhibit as well, or a new project that would perform, recycle, reconstruct and once again analyze and interpret art in Vojvodina during the 20th century. It is about the demand for knowledge and with knowledge about art and in art, in local, small, dynamic surroundings. History is not provided, we need to reconstruct it and to introduce the discourse of culture. A small museum in a small province/region in the center of Europe requires a thorough process of reexamination, choosing, reordering, signing in, placing and reading about the manner in which art took place, appeared and vanished.

The new exhibit of art of the 20th century must be some kind of a rebellion. It is, in fact, a *rebellion of knowledge!* Not as much against particular pieces, but against the consequences of

certain and uncertain hierarchies of beliefs in what Vojvodina art represents here and now, with all its historic, political, ideological and esthetic narratives. For this reason, the first step is a move from "Vojvodinian art" towards "art in Vojvodina." As if there were more than one art in Vojvodina?! This step is a step away from narratives on centralizing *identification qualities of art* towards temporary, changeable and unexpected functions of art as an instrument, a token, a mediator or an accidental "index" in the performance of a complex de-centered and temporally changeable identification matrix. In this social, cultural, and political space we call Vojvodina, what took place were complex struggles, changes, productions, interpretations, and, ultimately, constitutions of a cultural practice in which *life shaped* itself, becoming visible, accessible to senses, an identifiably attractive and present world between *The Law* and *The Desire*, in other words *The Truth* and *The Pleasure*.

Fascination of and yearning for "art" is not a simple turn towards great, exquisite and above all authentic *masterpieces*, it is an obsessive search for the unexpected, hidden, repressed, crossed out or forgotten riddle between art and life. The discovery of the *unexpected*, in the struggle to understand and interpret in an *expected* way, represents a contradiction, which leads every historical overview or movement through the past. However, turning towards the past does not simply represent receiving "gifts" – taking from tradition. On the contrary, turning towards the past is always and solely a present act of constructing a contemporary subject and relationship between subjects that will use and rename out of oblivion what is offered to memory as a present picture for a dramatic and contradictory now. This is exactly what has been said in the sense in which it has been indicated in the studies of culture that "tradition" is the representative face of the canon. Culture and art in the form of tradition participate in the social regulations of current events, in other words, they participate in the establishment of a social and political hegemony. That is why tradition is not *what* the past leaves behind as "heritage" to the present and the future. Tradition is always a current "choice" or "a current tradition" between a variety of possibilities. It is established as dominant, hegemonic, in social struggles for the

1 Sade – this refers to the pornographer, the raconteur, the philosopher and the political thinker Marquis de Sade (Donatien Alphonse François, Marquis de Sade; June 2nd 1740 – December 2nd 1814).

2 *New Museum – The Museum of Contemporary Art of Vojvodina*, Novi Sad, 2007.

articulation of the current. For example, the English cultural theoretician Raymond Williams defines tradition as,

“[a]n intentionally shaped version of the past and reshaped present, which is powerfully operational in the process of social and cultural determination and identification.”³

Tradition, for this reason, shows its own unavoidability by annulling or hiding the fact that it is derived as a selection from different practices, meanings and identifications of gender, class, ethnicity and race. This is why Williams⁴ underlines that what can be said of any tradition is that it is an aspect of a contemporary social and cultural organization derived from the interest of domination of a specific class, which, we could add, establishes its power over the field of existence.

What does it mean to remember amidst a practice we recognize as a curatorial undertaking led by the history of art? What does it mean to conjure the memory an image, a sound, a smell, a word, a touch, an identification, a rejection, a moment of pleasure or a time of despair in the derivation of a narrative on a complex and hybrid cultural space? What is a memory? It is shaping a screen full of bluntness and blurriness that refers to something in the past. However, memory is not a certain and frozen “clue” in the past, but an uncertain intervening and interpretive *event* within the field of culture – a field which appears to be quite autonomous within society, when, in fact, it is not autonomous in any respect. Memory is woven into a vast weaving of differences that change from case to case, from signing in to conjuring and from conjuring to erasing in any, never simply given context. Memories seem to be and resemble “texts”, but they do not possess stability, or durability of the texts in a library or paintings in a museum. This is because memories represent one of the events through which the expectation of my current “I” is played out, and this “I” must create an interpretive field to even recognize within itself the “I”. That is why I must distant myself from psychoanalyzing self-existence through cultural analysis and move towards social analysis that will attempt to demonstrate how “memories” in a public event relate to contradictory “paradigms” or “images” of modern, postmodern and global art.

That is my first task: to construct a complex and hybrid map or, merely, a pattern of “memories” of the art in Vojvodina in the 20th century.⁵ This map or pattern of “memories” is a kind of a text that will be realized in the form of a book and in the manner of an exhibition.

The exhibition and the book, which should be forerunners of the permanent exhibit of the future Museum of Contemporary Art of Vojvodina, are not conceived as a presentation of masterpieces from the museum collection or as a careful artistic, historic and aesthetic analysis of the collection (the archive and the depot) of the museum, but as an *optimum projection* of the future interdisciplinary and inter-media exhibit of the museum and its dynamic relation towards masterpieces, canonical realizations, normative – average – productions, unexpected and provocative excesses and transgressions, but also towards the oh-so important and determining forgetfulness, impossible subversions, and current contradictions in the struggle for visibility, the struggle for being present in contemporary art and culture. Derivation of the *optimum projection* of a dynamic and open exhibit of the museum is based on documents from the history of society, on one side, and on the other, on the documents and art productions of cultural and artistic practices, such as: painting, sculpture, graphic art, photography, performance, experimental literature, film, architecture, experimental music and pop-rock music. It is not possible to locate a *single* ideal and autonomous art practice, rather one must go through inter-exchanges and circulations between arts. Moreover, the selection of pieces for the exhibition and the book was guided not only by the possible availability of pieces in the territory of Vojvodina, but also by the external marks of *Vojvodinian art* or *art from Vojvodina* in “external” collections, in Belgrade, Zagreb, and Budapest. Attention was also given to authors who were born in Vojvodina but who established their careers in Hungarian, Austrian, Serbian or ex-Yugoslav space.

Relations – of openness, dynamics and the inner and outer – are important for the understanding of dynamics and the character of the appearance of modern art during the 20th century. This book and exhibition have been made for the following three reasons:

1. To recognize, index, distinguish and present dynamic “images” and “narratives” related to artistic and cultural practices in the 20th century in Vojvodina;
2. To *once more*⁶ conduct an investigation, analysis and interpretation of the character of the great Modernism and local Modernisms on an exceptionally “problematic” ground such as artistic, cultural and social space of Vojvodina both diachronically and synchronically; and
3. To make visible the possibilities of the *optimum projection* of a complex and multi-connotative presentation of the

3 Raymond Williams, “Traditions, Institutions, and Formations”, - *Marxism and Literature*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 1977, pp. 115.

4 Ibid, pp. 116.

5 Systematic investigation of the Vojvodina Modernisms and Avant-gardes began with the following projects: Miško Šuvaković (ed.), *Retrospektiva: Grupa KŌD, (E i (E-KŌD)*, Contemporary Visual Art Gallery, Novi Sad, 1995; and Dragomir Ugren (ed.), *Centralno evropski aspekti vojvodanskih avangardi 1920.-2000. ... Granični fenomeni, fenomen granica*, Museum of Contemporary Visual Arts, Novi Sad, 2002.

6 See in bibliography a list of catalogues edited by art historian and longstanding curator of the Gallery and the Museum of Contemporary Art of Vojvodina Miloš Arsić (1941). His thorough analysis of historic, artistic and bibliographic “material” represents a valuable starting point for any researcher and interpreter of 20th century art in Vojvodina. See numerous studies, essays, introductions, journals and memories of art historian Bela Duranci (1931). Bela Duranci worked as a curator of the City Museum of Novi Sad and was an associate of the “Likovni susret” Gallery in Subotica (1959-1962).

relation between artistic and cultural practice in Vojvodina – in fact, a search for the indicative visibility of relations in 20th century art represents the basic task of this endeavor.

This book and exhibition, therefore, represent a sensual and intellectual presentation of *invisible* interconnections of productions and narratives that compose *art life* or *the world of art* in this borderline area between Europe and the Balkans.

Rebellion of knowledge, or On the relations of local knowledge and the imperial, international, and global knowledge “about” and “in” art (Serbian edition, p.24)

In what way are we supposed to understand a given history of art, and even an open, dynamic history – for instance, the history of 20th century art in Vojvodina?

Of course, there is a field of analysis of “artistic”, “cultural” and “social” *facts* of art there and there, since then and then. This positive field of indexation and description leads towards a history that relies theoretically on the autonomy of art within culture and the autonomy of art within conditions and circumstances of a historical society. The notion of a “fact” is normatively set and leads to the recognition of certain and uncertain representations of *events*, *subjectivity* and *products* of art in Vojvodina in the 20th century.

However, it is necessary to distinguish a different field of important differences of art in Vojvodina, which is determined by projects of development, interruption, passing over, censorship, innovation or annulment within imperial, provincial, international, national, multinational and global models of modernity, and, ultimately, contemporariness in art. Unlike Serbian, Croatian or Hungarian art of the 20th century, art in Vojvodina does not have a uniform, cohesive flow of development of national modernity or of the development of national modernity with regards to international productions. It is rather a matter of hybrid relation of the dynamics of national cultures with the changeable artistic, cultural and social centers of power and dominance, and with the important interruptions of these and such developments and relations in local excesses, above all, excesses that were the products of Dada, Textualism and conceptual art, that is, postmodern and global art. These local excesses signified an important passing over or a step forward from the dominant meta-language of a culture towards international acceleration of contemporariness in Modernism and Avant-garde and in expansive divergence in post-Modernism. Discourse of art in Vojvodina is, therefore, not determinable by a single canonized story, but rather it is possible by mapping cases of singular events that assume artistic, cultural and social positions with regards to local narratives, and external contextualization by the Austro-Hun-

garian and Hungarian imperialism, Serbian Modernism and nationalism, Croatian reception and canonization of European modernity, etc.

Every chapter of this book represents a re-activation of local – minority – knowledge of art in Vojvodina, and the assertion of cross-references, overlaps and inter-weavings of those local practices in different diachronic and synchronic potentials. This “local” knowledge is not a narrative merely on provincial isolation of small communities, but also on the potentials of local knowledge to overcome boundaries of norms and canons of a larger culture by “getting on board” with international production of Modernism, post-Modernism and the global age. Today, however – by today we mean the last decade of the 20th century and the beginning of the 21st century – the situation has changed with regards to triangles and overlaps of the local, the close dominant and the international, since we are dealing with models and, thus, with protocols of the performing vastness of hybrid localities and multi-totalizing globalities.

Politics, culture, geography, history and art – territorialization and deterritorialization ⁷ (Serbian edition, p.24)

Whenever we are discussing societies, cultures and arts in 20th century Vojvodina, it is necessary to define the concept and the term of “Vojvodina”. ⁸ It is a changeable cultural and geographic paradigm. The name *Serbian Vojvodina* refers to the autonomous region in the Austrian empire in the revolutionary period of 1848 and 1849. *Serbian Vojvodina* included: northern Srem, Banat and Bačka with the towns of Ilok and Ruma. Major cities of the Duchy were Sremski Karlovci, Zemun, Veliki Bečkerek (Petrovgrad or Zrenjanin) and Timișoara. This region was transformed into *Serbian Vojvodina* and *Tamiš Banat* in 1849 and existed until 1869. *Serbian Vojvodina* and *Tamiš Banat* was a Duchy within the Austrian empire, and the Emperor himself wore the title of the *Grand Duke of the Serbian Duchy* (*Großwoiwode der Woiwodschaft Serbien*). Territories of *Serbian Vojvodina* and *Tamiš Banat* were annexed to the Hungarian kingdom (Banat and Bačka) in 1867. Srem was annexed to Slavonia in 1860, and with the unification of Slavonia and Croatia in 1868, it became a part of this new autonomous community. Following a contract between the Croatian-Slavonian kingdom and the Hungarian kingdom during 1869, an autonomous part of the Austro-Hungarian kingdom by the name of *Translitania* was created. Srem became a part of

⁷ Dimitrije Boarov, *Politička istorija Vojvodine: u trideset i tri priloga*, European consulting, Novi Sad, 2001.

⁸ See maps of Vojvodina taken from site Wikipedia: <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Vojvodina>.

the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes on 29th October 1918. The Republic of Banat was formed in Timișoara on 31st October 1918. The Assembly of Serbs, Bunjevci and other peoples pronounced the unification of Vojvodina (Bačka, Banat, Srem) with the Serbian Kingdom on 25th November 1918. The Serbian-Hungarian Republic of Baranja (Baranya – Baja) was founded, or, in other words, self-proclaimed on 14th August 1921. The Republic was composed of the territories of Baranja and northern Bačka.⁹ The president of this country was modernist painter Petar Dobrović.¹⁰ The capital was Pečuj. The Baranja Republic was an area under the control of the Serbian army after the breakdown of Austro-Hungary, though, at the same time, under the control of the left-wing Hungarian republicans.¹¹ This paradoxical double government turned this territory into an uncertain free zone. This is where many left-wing Hungarians, communists and revolutionaries sought refuge after the counter-revolution of Admiral Miklós Horthy. The territory of the Republic of Baranja was divided between Hungary and the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes on 21st-25th August 1921. The Republic was stifled by the intervention and the pressure of western forces of the Entente, which gave their support to Admiral Horthy against the Hungarian left-wing revolution. In the time of the formation of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, there was some political fighting between Serbian politicians and, above others, Croatian politicians on the question of whether there would be an annexation of Vojvodina to Serbia within the Kingdom of SCS or if there would

be unification of Serbia and the regions that were a single entity under the Austro-Hungarian rule.¹² This political controversy remained open throughout the 20th century. Vojvodina became a part of the Kingdom of SCS on 1st December 1918. After state reorganization of the Kingdom of SCS into the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, Danube Banovina, comprising of Srem, Banat, Bačka, Šumadija and Braničevo, was formed, with the regional capital in Novi Sad. Danube Banovina existed until the beginning of World War II in 1941. During World War II, Bačka and Baranja became part of Hungary, Srem was under the rule of the Independent State of Croatia, Banat was an autonomous province under German rule, and Danube Banovina formally included Banat, but in reality Šumadija and Braničevo, with the center in Smederevo. Srem, Banat and Bačka were, after World War II, under the name of Vojvodina, proclaimed an Autonomous Province of Vojvodina within the People's Republic of Serbia. The capital of AP Vojvodina was and is Novi Sad. The Yugoslav part of Baranja was annexed to the People's Republic of Croatia in 1945. The Socialist Autonomous Province of Vojvodina received significant political constitutional autonomy in the constitution of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia in 1974.¹³ A large part of that autonomy was lost during the period of dictatorship of Slobodan Milošević in 1990. With the beginning of armed conflict in SAO East Slavonia, Baranja and west Srem was formed on the territory of the second Yugoslavia, by war separation from the Republic of Croatia in 1991. These areas were a part of the Republic Srpska Krajina between 1991 and 1995. The area Srem-Baranja was under the administrative government of the United Nations between 1995 and 1997. The county of Osijek-Baranja has been a part of the Republic of Croatia since 1997.

Very different national and ethnic groups have lived in such a hybrid and unstable society and cultural space: Serbs, Hungarians, Slovaks, Croats, Bunjevci, Romany, Germans, Romanians, Ukrainians, Rusyns, Czechs, etc. The cultural influences were different – and if one follows the field of visual art, one could speak, first and foremost, of the influences of the Austrian, Hungarian, Serbian and Croatian cultures throughout the 19th and 20th centuries, that is, of the cultural dominance and impact of cities such as Vienna, Budapest, Belgrade and Zagreb. In that sense, the theses¹⁴ on “central-European” aspects of Vojvodina Modernisms and Avant-gardes are quite justifiable.

9 Leslie C. Tihany, “The Baranja Republic and the Treaty of Trianon” and Mária Ormos, “The Hungarian Soviet Republic and Intervention by the Entente” – Béla Király, Péter Pásztor, Ivan Sanders (eds.), *War and Society in East Central Europe*, Vol. VI *Essays on World War I: Total War and Peacemaking, A case study on Trianon*, <http://www.hungarian-history.hu/lib/tria/tria00.htm>; Dimitrije Boarov, “Trijanonski ugovor”, from: Dimitrije Boarov, *Politička istorija Vojvodine: u trideset i tri priloga*, European consulting, Novi Sad, 2001, pp.113–118.

10 Petar Dobrović, “Uprava u Baranji”, *Jedinstvo*, Novi Sad, November 7th 1919, 145, 1; and Petar Dobrović, “Uprava u Baranji”, *Jedinstvo*, Novi Sad, November 20th 1919, 155, 1. Republished in: Olga Dobrović (ed.), *Dokumentacija o stvaralaštvu Petra Dobrovića III, Likovne kritike, intervjui, politički članci, pisma*, Matica srpska Gallery, Novi Sad, 2002, pp. 109–113 and 114–119.

11 The breakdown of Austro-Hungary happened in the summer of 1918. There was an outburst of demonstrations against the Austrian emperor-king and the Habsburg monarchy in October 1918. The radical bourgeoisie, led by Mihály Károlyi, formed the National Council of Hungary on 25th October. Simultaneously with formation of the National Council, the Workers' Soviet was formed in Budapest, which acted on securing power of soviets in factories and in the country. The Republic was declared on 16th November. The Communist party under the leadership of Béla Kun was formed. The Communists prepared for the armed rebellion. The Entente sent an ultimatum to the Hungarian government. The Entente army occupied Debrecen and its surroundings. The Romanian army was given the right to enter 100km into the Hungarian territory. In this situation Károlyi resigned. The Communist-directed democratic revolution towards a communist one. The Temporary Revolutionary Council was formed. The following was issued in the decree of the revolutionary government: “The Hungarian proletariat will fight against imperialism alongside the Russian Soviet Republic and the proletariat of the world, alongside all those who realize that for the victory of socialism there is no other way than a common revolutionary action of workers, soldiers and peasants.” On 25th March all private mining, industrial and commercial companies, with more than 20 workers a company, were transformed into public property. An international military intervention followed. Béla Kun with a majority of associates ran to Vienna on 2nd August, where they were interned by the Austrian authorities. The Romanian army entered Budapest. The Hungarian commune lasted for 130 days, and it was replaced by the white terror of the occupation forces and troops of Admiral Miklós Horthy.

12 Ivan Meštrović, “Propast Austro-Ugarske monarhije”, from *Uspomene na političke ljude i događaje*, Matica hrvatska, Zagreb, 1969, pp. 99–102.

13 Dimitrije Boarov, “Stvarna autonomija napokon”, from: Dimitrije Boarov, *Politička istorija Vojvodine: u trideset i tri priloga*, European consulting, Novi Sad, 2001, pp. 201–206.

14 Miško Šuvaković, Darko Šimičić, “Uvodni tekst – Centralnoevropski aspekti vojvodanskih avangardi 1920–2000. Granični fenomeni, fenomeni granica”, from: Dragomir Ugren (ed.), *Centralnoevropski aspekti vojvodanskih avangardi 1920–2000. ... Granični fenomeni, fenomeni granica*, Museum of Contemporary Visual Arts, Novi Sad, 2002, pp. 8–13.

Confrontations and overlaps, colonization and exodus of cultural identities make this space so characteristic and different from any other, and yet, more or less, all important appearances of European Modernisms can be recognized in the culture of Vojvodina and its specific localizations, provincialisms and, as opposed to them, in internationalisms and globalizations. It is, therefore, possible to talk about an imperial relation of Austrian and Hungarian culture towards the regional culture of Vojvodina, and, particularly, towards Serbian culture from the turn of the 20th century until the end of World War I and the creation of the Kingdom of SCS, and the Kingdom of Yugoslavia. However, it is also possible to talk about the dominance of the Serbian national modern culture over ethnic and national minorities after 1918. By all means, a paradoxical moment of political-demographic “turn” in Vojvodina after 1990 can be identified, when the paradigm of Serbian national culture became established as an unquestionable criterion of identification, but when simultaneously, “contemporary art of Vojvodina” became, in its vital appearance, global, in conceptual, new-media and culturally oriented productions.

Art of the 20th century: open and closed borders (p.28)

Art of the 20th century in Vojvodina is the art of noticeable emancipation and confrontation with imperial (Romanticism, Scholastics, Secession) and international (Impressionism, post-Impressionisms, Expressionism, Cubism, Futurism, Abstraction) projects of great modernity. What could also be distinguished are local and provincial modifications of projects of great modernity with different forms of civic and national Romanticism and Realism, and modernist Intimism. Avant-garde tendencies (Cubism, Dada, SurRealism) are visible simultaneously as “forerunners” or “forbearers” of modernist emancipation, but also as criticisms of establishing Modernism in moderate modernist and provincial practices. What is characteristic is the poetics and ideology of anti-modernist-and-yet-modernist (Neoclassicisms, the return to order, new objectivity) reactions to an optimistic increase of rate or a critical slowing down of international and local Modernism. Also important are the narratives on facing international processes of deriving social and socialist art from reflections of art and graphics in national-bourgeois society (social Realism, socially engaged art), through party-guided and controlled Realism (socialist Realism in the national fight for liberation and during the first years of a revolutionary government), on to party-tolerated and supported socialist Modernism (socialist Aestheticism, moderate Modernisms, high Modernism). After all that, there are numerous, mostly Avant-garde (Textualism, Land-art, Interventionism, process art, body-art, performance

art, political art) reactions to moderate Modernisms and fetishes of indifference of modern art in self-governing socialist conditions of highly-bureaucratized and technocratized society. Characteristic anarchist and underground criticism of local and international Modernisms is connected with the appearance of Neo-Avant-garde and conceptual art. Then, problems of Modernisms are displayed using deconstructionalist tactics of post-Modernisms during the 80s. Postmodern deconstructions of Modernism were realized by means of eclectic self-criticisms and provocations of the autonomies of great Modernism, but also by means of demystifications, of excessive mystifications of illusions and traps of *artistic freedoms* in socialist Modernisms of the 60s and the 70s. Post-Modernisms appeared as problematic and many-meaningful:

a) Tendencies of the move towards Western proposals of overcoming modernity (trans-Avant-garde, neo-Expressionism, *bad art*);

b) Tendencies of artistic and cultural confrontations with the limits of socialist Modernism (new decorative-ness, neo-geo, post-pop-art, new sculpture, Modernism after post-Modernism);

c) Tendencies of building art of the late socialism and post-socialism (retro art, neo-conceptual art, new political art).

Art in Vojvodina in the 20th century was, in fact, caught in a fatal modernist web made by the Austro-Hungarian and Hungarian imperialism, Hungarian nationalism, Serbian nationalism, European modernist internationalisms, socialist Modernism, and, finally, by today’s neo-liberal, trans-economic and multimedia globalism.

Institutions of culture, art, modern everyday life – art in the century of institutionalization of artistic practices (p.30)

The creation of an “artist” and “art” in Vojvodina, just like anywhere else on the planet, was connected with the creation of city – urban cultures (Novi Bečkerek, Subotica, Sombor, Novi Sad, Vršac, Bela Crkva, Bačka Palanka, Bačka Topola, Bački Petrovac) and the creation of the “worlds of art” and the “institutions of art”, that is, with the development of an urban and bourgeoisie middle class in Hungarian, German, and consequently, Jewish, Serbian, Slovak and Bunjevac society.¹⁵

Urbanization of Vojvodina can be viewed simultaneously in the sphere of “basis” (industrialization) and “superstructure” (establishment of cultural institutions and politics). At the symbolic plain, it is possible to say that the industrial architecture, for instance in Veliki Bečkerek: the brewery, the sugar

15 Bela Duranci, “Buržoaski realizam s prekretnice vekova”, from: *Slikaar Stipan Kopilović 1877–1924*, NIO Subotičke novine, 1991, pp. 13–28.

factory, the slaughter house, the mill etc. points to the transformation of the rural, Panonian plains society into a modern industrial European society. This transformation took place during the late 18th, throughout 19th, and during the beginning of the 20th century.¹⁶ What is an issue here is the derivation of the ideology of modernity in everyday life with which a new subject is realized.¹⁷ The issue is the complex urban everyday life¹⁸ that transforms all forms of late feudal and class-bourgeoisie sociality into a modern industrial consumer society. What follows is a thorough restructuring of a feudal “tribe” family into a bourgeoisie *two member family* with immediate offspring. Mechanical aesthetics of a Secessionist industrial architecture was derived as a promise of a new world based on industrial production and modern life. Modern life is seen in media (media, magazines, posters), in public professional schooling of men and women from different classes, in clothing fashion. Modern life is actualized in popular culture of entertainment, sexuality/eroticism and sports. Grooming of one’s body, visibility of eroticism (from private eroticism to pornography), and, of course, sensual structuring of economic, political, national, social and cultural power, all of it became visible. Models of racial, national, class, gender and generation identities became differentiated. In fact, what we are talking about is the spectacularization of, until then, invisible forms of life in public media and a consumer society.¹⁹ In the media scene, besides the appearance of daily newspapers and magazine, the role of the political, advertising, sports, entertainment cultural-artistic poster as a communication means is also very important.²⁰ One should also look at postcards with state school pupils, for instance, *Privrednikove pitomice u Somboru sa glavnim poverenicom gđom Julčikom Polček* (*Privrednik’s female students in Sombor with headmistress Mrs. Julčika Polček*) – Sombor, 1911. Those photographs display the establishment of appearance, that is, of the visibility of the female figure in public business and professional life and work within class distinguishing bourgeoisie society. A woman is no longer just connected, or placed into the private life of a family or spaces designated for women in religious and normative tradition, on the contrary, she becomes a *public figure*. An athletic body as a political national body can be seen, for example, on the *Srpski sokoli* (*Serbia’s pride and joy*) postcard (Zemun, 1910). Derivation of pan-Slavic and Serbian national modern identity was

conducted by pointing to the collective role of a sports society and its social relation to a potential hierarchal and paramilitary structure. On the contrary, there is a postcard that depicts a scene from a “female” ice-rink in Veliki Bečkerek (Jégpàlya) and which shows a moment of civic (bourgeoisie) individualized relaxation in sports as entertainment or in sports as public social entertainment of individual participants. Sport is also seen as an area of shaping and beautifying an individual body – for example, the “athletic photograph” of Dr. Milan Đuričić, a citizen of Vršac, taken in the photo-studio “Pojmerac” in Zagreb, during the late 1920s. For instance, sports competitions – “Sports games” – were first held in Subotica in 1880. Lajos Vermes was a versatile sportsman: a gymnastics champion, a runner, a wrestler, a swordsman, cyclist, an ice-skater and an organizer of sporting events (summer Palić games) and sport life in Subotica. He also built *Luiza*, *Anna* and *Bagoljvar* mansions, as well as the first cycling track on Lake Palić. Sport became a sign of modernity: of speed, and of the relationship between the bodies of a machine and of a man. For instance, Ivan Sarić (Subotica, 1876-1966) was one of the pioneers of aviation, a cyclist and a car racer. He was the champion at the races in the Kingdom of Hungary (1897, 1898) and the Kingdom of Serbia (1910). He constructed the one-wing aircraft “Sarić 1” in 1910 and aircraft “Sarić 2” with a personally constructed engine in 1911. He experimented on aircraft and “helicopter” prototypes during World War I.

At the beginning of the 20th century, the culture of taking holidays was establishing itself, for instance, the photograph taken by a Venetian photographer on a beach in 1912 shows a family from Vršac whilst sunbathing. Showing life within everyday life proves to be a significant model for deriving modernity and a “new world” and a “modern subject” that is being promised throughout the 20th century.

Developmental directions of bourgeoisie art and art production at the end of the 19th century can be seen in individual exhibitions of Kálmán Mesterházi in Subotica in 1881, Uroš Predić in Novi Sad in 1882, Antal Streitmann and László Kézdi Kovács in Veliki Bečkerek in 1895, and the sculptor Đorđe Jovanović in Novi Sad in 1895, etc. Antal Streitmann founded the *Torontal Society of Crafts* in Veliki Bečkerek in 1880. The first art school was opened in Subotica in 1825. The first gallery is the *Art Salon Friedman*, opened in Subotica in 1886. During the same period, the bookshop-stationery shop Schlessinger was in business, selling art supplies and oleo-graphics. An art-studio²¹ was built for a painter from Budapest, Pál Vágó (1853-1928), in Veliki Bečkerek. It was the first art-studio in Vojvodina. The studio was built so that the painting *Defile*

16 Miroslav Timotijević, *Rađanje moderne privatnosti – Privatni život Srba u Habsburškoj monarhiji od kraja 17. do početka 19. veka*, Clio, Belgrade, 2006.

17 Louis Althusser, “Ideologija i državni ideološki aparati – beleške za jedno istraživanje”, *Marksizam u svetu*, No. 7–8, Belgrade, 1979, pp. 77–119.

18 Henri Lefebvre, *Kritika svakidašnjeg života*, Naprijed, Zagreb, 1988.

19 Jonathan Crary, *Suspension of perception – Attention, Spectacle, and Modern Culture*, The MIT Press, Cambridge MA, 1999.

20 Dr. Drago Njegovan, *Politički plakat u Vojvodini (1848-2003)*, Museum of Vojvodina, Novi Sad, 2004.

21 Vukica Popović (ed.), *Velikobečkerečki slikarski ateljei*, National Museum, Zrenjanin, 1969.

banatskih spahija pred carem Franjom Josifom (*The procession of land-owners from Banat before Emperor Franz Joseph*) could be completed, which was supposed to represent Veliki Bečkerek at the Millennium exhibition in 1896. Artists who worked in the studio included Aladár Edvi Ilés, Lajos Németh and one of the first photographers, István Oldal. Dr. Joca Milekić founded the “Bačka Museum” in his home in Subotica in 1926. He was also in charge of the “Bačka Gallery” on Lake Palić until the 1950s. *The Vojvodina Society of Artists* was founded in 1919 in Novi Sad. *The Society of Artists of Vojvodina* was founded on 29th November 1923 in Subotica. It remained active until the mid 1930s.

Important institutions for modern, postmodern and contemporary art were being founded throughout the 20th century in Vojvodina.²² Matica srpska Gallery was established in 1847.²³ The city museum of Vršac was founded in 1882. It was originally established as a national museum, but renamed as a city museum in 2002. A municipal museum in Sombor was established in 1904. A national museum in Pančevo was opened in 1923. The city museum in Bečej was opened in 1952. “Sava Šumanović” gallery in Šid was opened in 1952. A naïve artists’ gallery in Kovačica was opened in 1955. Contemporary gallery of the art colony Ečka was founded in 1958. The Pavle Beljanski Memorial Collection was opened in 1961.²⁴ “Likovni susret” Gallery in Subotica was founded in 1962. A sculptures collection in the town area in Apatin was opened in 1963. “Milan Konjović” art gallery in Sombor was first opened in 1964. The Museum of Contemporary Art in Vojvodina was established in 1966 in the form of the Gallery of Contemporary Visual Arts. The gallery was renamed the Museum of Contemporary Visual Arts in 1996, after which it was informally called “The Museum of Contemporary Visual Arts” in 2003-2004, after which it was finally renamed The Museum of Contemporary Art in 2006.²⁵ The City Museum in Subotica was opened in 1968. “Lazar Vozarević” Gallery in Sremska Mitrovica was opened in 1973. The Gallery of Fine Arts - Gift Collection of Rajko Mamuzić was opened in 1974. The Contemporary Gallery of the Center for Culture in Pančevo was opened in 1976. The Biennale of the Yugoslav Sculpture in Pančevo first took place in 1981. Arts and applied arts agency “Tera” in Kikinda was founded in 1982. The Center for Visual Culture “Zlatno oko” in Novi Sad was established in 1993. The center for the contemporary culture “Kon-

kordija” in Vršac was first opened in 1994.²⁶ The Center for New Media _kuda.org was founded in 2001 in Novi Sad.

Magazines also have had an impact on art life in Vojvodina. Before World War II in Vojvodina there were daily newspapers and magazines, mostly in Hungarian and Serbian: *Torontal* in Veliki Bečkerek, *ÚT* in Novi Sad, *Vojvođanski Grafičar* in Novi Sad, *Hir lap* in Subotica; *Híd* was first published in Subotica in 1934, *Letopis Matice srpske* has been published continuously since 1824. For instance, *Vojvođanski Grafičar* magazine with the subtitle “Bulletin of the Federal Organization of the Union of Graphic Workers of Yugoslavia in Novi Sad” was first published in 1939. The magazine represented “board” which organized graphic workers in terms of guild and social class. It was published in Serbo-Croatian, Hungarian and German.²⁷ After World War II up until the end of the 20th century, literary, culture and art magazines, such as *Letopis Matice srpske* (Novi Sad), *Index* (Novi Sad), *Polja* (started in 1955 in Novi Sad), *Új Symposion*, Novi Sad and *Košava* (established in 1992 in Vršac) began being published, as well as the specialized magazines for arts and visual art *Projekta*t* (1993-2001, Novi Sad), *ArtContext* (founded in 2001 in Vršac) and others. The magazine *Polja* had a prominent role in establishing an open and communicative intellectual atmosphere in Novi Sad during the 1950s, 1960s and the early 1970s. The magazine was published by NIP “Progres” between 1955 and 1965. The role of the publisher was then taken up by *Tribina mladih* in April 1965, which remained unchanged until the present period. The magazine was edited by Miroslav Egerić, Gojko Janjušević, Želimir Petrović, Mileta Radovanović (editor-in-chief), and Laslo Kapitanj until June-July 1965. At that time the editorial board was expanded to include Pero Zubac and Gligorije Zaječaranović. In October 1965 Petar Milosavljević became the new editor-in-chief. Pero Zubac, Boško Ivkov, Jaroslav Turčan, Jovan Zivlak, Franjo Petrinović and Laslo Blašković were all at one time editors-in-chief of *Polja* magazine between the late 1960s and now.

A controversy: from art colonies, over communes, to centers for art, culture and new media (Serbian edition, p.40)

Art colonies have represented a special institutionalization of the life of an artist and the artistic life. A famous colony in Nagybanya, which anticipated the possibility of modern autonomous art production, was an important role model for

22 Vladimir Mitrović, Lidija Mustedanagović (eds.), *Vodič kroz muzeje i galerije Vojvodine*, Bulevar, Novi Sad, 2002.

23 *Matica Srpska Gallery*, Matica srpska, Novi Sad, 2001.

24 Vera Jovanović (ed.), *Spomen-zbirka Pavla Beljanskog*, Pavle Beljanski Memorial Collection, 1988.

25 Dragomir Ugren (ed.), *Neuporedivi identiteti – Kolekcija vojvođanske umetnosti za Muzej XXI veka*, Museum of Contemporary Visual Arts, Novi Sad, 2003; *New Museum – The Museum of Contemporary Art Vojvodina*, Museum of Contemporary Art of Vojvodina, Novi Sad, 2007.

26 Dragomir Ugren, Ješa Denegri, Živko Grozdanić (eds.), *Deset godina Konkordije – Izlagačka praksa kao kulturno-politička strategija*, Center for Contemporary Culture “Konkordija”, Vršac, 2004.

27 Magazine *Vojvođanski grafičar* was issued twice a month. Ivan Meštrović from Novi Sad was representing the owner and editorial board.

establishing new colonies.²⁸ The first *Yugoslav Art Colony* in Sićevo was founded by a painter Nadežda Petrović (1873-1915) in 1905.²⁹ Two events that took place between World Wars were the founding of the Association of Artists in Subotica (1923) and the setting of the initiative to start a colony in Bačka Topola (1922-1923). An attempt to start a colony took place in Veliki Bečkerek in 1931.³⁰ One of the first colonies after World War II was founded in Lake Palić during the summer of 1950.³¹ The first more permanent post-war art colony in Vojvodina was established in 1952 in Senta, following the initiative of a painter József Ács. After that, colonies in Bačka Topola, Bečej, Ečka near Zrenjanin, Mali Idoš, etc., were founded as well.³² A network of art colonies was created between the 1950s and the 1980s.

Art colonies were formed during the 1950s, when new art centers, which became places of gathering of artists during summer and winter months, started to appear in smaller communities. To organize a colony in those days meant to adopt modern, freethinking ideas of art creation and to abandon the dominant social Realism of the time. By founding numerous colonies in Vojvodina, a network of institutions was created, which anticipated and encouraged growth of “Vojvodina art” with all the characteristics of a regional and/or provincial art production in a wide array, from academic landscape Modernism of Milivoj Nikolajević – *Motives from Ečka* (1955?) and precise illusionists scenes of Karlavariš – *Motives from Ečka – The Road* (1960), to the abstract-expressive approaches – *A Vision over the Plain* (1967) by Konjović. The explanation for the expansion of colonies in socialist Modernism points towards different quests and struggles for the appropriate funding of “artistic life”. We are dealing with the way of finding the most appropriate forms of *funding* art within developed and relatively liberal conditions of self-governing socialism:

Thus, the formula for potential colonies could have been: *to bring the art closer to the people by creative undertakings of artists by means of finding most appropriate forms of “socialist patronship.”*³³

Colonies were, at the same time, products of real socialist hypocrisy: calling forth the socialist-oriented integration of art and everyday life, but also creating existential-artistic oases/reservations for the development of an autonomous art, and opening public spaces that would allow the artists free summer work with relaxation and fun. The contradictory³⁴ role of colonies led to a somewhat uniform development of artists who turned, in their work, towards landscape art and reminiscence of home. On one side, colonies enabled the opening of creative public space in front of modern art and its autonomies, independent from the suggestions and orders of the government. Colonies, on the other side, facilitated meetings of Yugoslav artists and the creation of the a “Yugoslav” atmosphere of socialist Modernism. Finally, colonies were the places where the dominant and subordinate discourse of the moderate socialist Modernism was established and from which it spread – from centers, mostly Belgrade, towards the provinces. The illusion of freedom led towards the creation of a specific cultural-artistic canon. It is these contradictory relations of struggle for the autonomy of art and canonization of a moderate Modernisms that can be seen in the examples of art colonies “Ečka”³⁵, the art colony in Bačka Topola³⁶ or the painters’ colony in Senta.³⁷ For instance, the colony in Bačka Topola was created with the ambition to renew collective artistic work that was initiated by historic “colonies” or “communities” of artists from the Barbizon school (1850), over the colony in Nagybánya in the late 19th century, to the colony in Sićevo (1904). After the failed attempts to establish a painters association and colony in Bačka Topola in 1914, and 1924, “The Colony” was founded in 1953. József Ács and Đerđ Bošan were among the initiators for the creation of the colony. What also characterized the colony was the demand for the “synthesis” of art, sculpture and architecture. Plastic synthesis was set as a utopian goal within the esthetics of the socialist Modernism and as an attempt to cross the boundaries of a “moderate modernist” intimacy. The project of “synthesis” employed József Ács (frescos, mosaics, compositions, ceramics), József Ács and Kosta Đodrević (wall decoration and ceramic masks), Miloš Bajić (frescos, mosaics and a obelisk: *Obelisk*, ceramics, 1965), Miloš Gvozdenović (mosaics), Zoran Petrović (wall paintings, sculptures, metal wall applications), Dragoslav Stojanović Sip and József Togyerás (ceramics on façads), Imre Šafranj (applications), and Istvan Zsáki (a wall painting).³⁸ Contributions of József Ács can

28 Bela Duranci, “Nađbanja i umetničke kolonije u Mađarskoj” and “Nađbanja (Nagybánya – Baia Mare in Romania)”, from: *Umetničke kolonije*, Osvit, Subotica, 1989, pp. 15–16 and 17–19.

29 Bratislav Ljubišić, *Likovna kolonija Sićevo: 1905–1995*, Direction for public city events, Niš, 1995.

30 Bela Duranci, “Prilike u Vojvodini (Bačka Topola, Veliki Bečkerek)”, from: *Umetničke kolonije*, Osvit, Subotica, 1989, pp. 48–53.

31 Bela Duranci, “Subotička inicijativa – Kolonija na Paliću”, from: *Umetničke kolonije*, Osvit, Subotica, 1989, pp. 59–61.

32 The following art colonies are among the more important ones: “Art colony Ečka near Zrenjanin”, “Art colony Bačka Topola”, “Art colony Bečej”, “Graphic art atelier of Likovni susret” in Subotica, “Art colony Deliblatski pesak” from Pančevo, “Karlovac art workshop” in Sremski Karlovci, “Art colony Senta”, “Art colony Lazar Vozarević” in Sremska Mitrovica, Agency for Visual and Applied Arts “Terra” from Kikinda.

33 Bela Duranci, “Razlozi formiranja prvih posleratnih kolonija”, from: *Umetničke kolonije*, Osvit, Subotica, 1989, pp. 65–67.

34 Bela Duranci, “Umetnička kolonija Ečka”, from: *Umetničke kolonije*, Osvit, Subotica, 1989, pp. 76–79.

35 Tihomir Savić, *Ečka / Umetnička kolonija*, Forum, Novi Sad, 1965.

36 Imre Dević, *Dvadeset godina Umetničke kolonije u Bačkoj Topoli 1953–1973*, Forum, Novi Sad 1962.

37 József Ács, *Slikarska kolonija u Senti*, Forum, Novi Sad, 1962.

38 “Dela bačkotopolske sinteze”, from: Imre Dević, *Dvadeset godina Umetničke kolonije u Bačkoj Topoli 1953–1973*, Forum, Novi Sad, 1962, pp. 111–113.

be seen behind other projects of colonies in Vojvodina as well, for instance, the work of EK group in the colony in Senta. EK group was composed of Jožef Beneš (1930), Atila Černik (1941), Jožef Markulik (1935-1994), Pal Petrik and József Ács.³⁹

The cultural, political and artistic concept of colonies in socialist Vojvodina was directly questioned for the first time with the appearance of Neo-Avant-garde artists and conceptual artists in the late 1960s and early 1970s (KÓD group, groups *January* and *February*, group (Ξ, *City commune in Novi Sad*). This questioning occurred with the separation of art practices from “public” and “dominant” discourse of socialist Modernism and the confrontation of alternative artistic gatherings (groups, movements, communes) with the models of artistic gatherings supported by the state. Colonies were, in fact, the “topoi” of the *flowering of thousands of flowers* within the proclaimed socialist pluralism. Artists did not go to colonies based on their artistic or poetic choices but based on the cultural protocols of the super-poetic cooperation. Neo-Avant-garde and conceptual art questioned the *illusions* of a socialist pluralism refusing the non-interest and non-political participation in the work of colonies. The artists of the Neo-Avant-garde and conceptual art did not strive to adjust to the discourses of the art of the cultural-political center of Yugoslavia – Belgrade, on the contrary, they strived towards the direct involvement in the international artistic practices.⁴⁰ The new left-wing approach of proanarchistic direct self-government confronted the bureaucratized mediatory, ostensibly plural organization of artistic life.

The model of the artistic self-organization and extra-institutional institutionalization of artistic and cultural work within postsocialist transition was anticipated and realized through the work of the *Apsolutno* group and the *Center for New Media_kuda.org*, as well as through the longstanding work of the *Center for Contemporary Culture “Konkordija”* in Vršac.

The *Center for New Media_kuda.org* was created during the period when the “socialist sponsorship” disappeared and when NGOs⁴¹ started to form, which acted in the environment of the neoliberal market and foundation art funding. The *Center for New Media_kuda.org* is a collective dedicated to new technology, art, activism, and social and cultural politics. The center is an organization that gathers artists, theoreticians, media activists, researchers and audiences in the field of information

and communication technologies (ICT), new cultural relations and social theory⁴²:

The *Center for New Media_kuda.org* is an organization that gathers artists, theoreticians, media activists, researchers and a wide audience in the field of information and communication technologies (ICT). In that sense, *kuda.org* is dedicated to the exploration of new cultural relations, contemporary art practice and social topics.

The activity of *kuda.org* is dedicated to the questions of the influence of electronic media on society, on the creative use of new communication technologies and on contemporary culture and social politics. Some of the main topics are the interpretation and the analysis of history and the significance of the information society, the potential of the information itself and the width of its influence on the political, economic and cultural relations in contemporary society. The *Center for New Media_kuda.org* opens up the space for the culture of a dialogue, the alternative methods of education and research. Social questions, the culture of the media, new technologies, art, the free software principle and the open code principle are the areas of interest for *kuda.org*.

Programs of kuda.org:

Kuda.info/info center

Gives information in the area of new media culture, contemporary art and social phenomena; enables research and education through a library, media-files and archives from this area.

Kuda.lounge/presentations and lectures

Contains lectures, interviews, public presentations of artists, media-activists, art theoreticians, scientists, researchers and engineers (exhibitions, presentations, platforms, symposiums, lectures are a place of an active dialogue and interaction that contribute to the creation of a new quality core on both sides: the audience and the lecturer).

Kuda.production/ production and publishing

Provides conditions for non-profit art creation in the field of new media and technology; *kuda.org* as a producer, co-producer provides conditions for inter-disciplinary research and experiments.⁴³

The *Center for New Media_kuda.org* is performing an important transformation of art work and autonomous creation into and artistic/curatorial and organizational work on contradictory cultural and social fields. The intervening and production, and commercial registers of and artist's work – a curator's or an artist's – a culture worker, are being set up. What is specific is that, over the last few years, there has been a redefinition of the *ontology of an art piece* in the art-curatorial project, which does

39 Olga Kovačev Ninkov, “Geneza programskog stvaralaštva Umetničke kolonije Senta”, a manuscript.

40 Mirko Radojičić (ed.), “Konceptualna umetnost” (temat), *Polja*, No. 156, Novi Sad, 1972; or N. Auberger, C. Millet, A. Pacquement (eds.), “Concept”, from: *Septieme Biennale de Paris*, Paris, 1971.

41 NGO=Non Governmental Organizations.

42 Divanik – Razgovori i intervjui o medijskoj umetnosti, kulturi i društvu, *kuda.org.new media center*, Novi Sad, 2004; *Tetonik – Nova društvena ontologija u vreme totalne komunikacije*, *kuda.org.new media center*, Novi Sad, 2004; *Bitomatik – Umetnička praksa u vreme informacijske/medijske dominacije*, *kuda.org.new media center*, Novi Sad, 2004; Oliver Resler, *Alternativne ekonomije, alternativna društva*, *kuda.org.new media center*, Novi Sad, 2005; Felix Stalder, *Open Cultures and the Nature of Networks*, *kuda.org.new media center*, Novi Sad, 2005; *Trajni čas umetnosti – Novosadska neoavangarda 60-ih i 70-ih godina XX veka*, *kuda.org.new media center*, Novi Sad, 2005; *Izostavljena istorija / Omitted History*, Revolver, Frankfurt am Main, 2006.

43 See: <http://www.kuda.org>

not result in a “piece” but in production relations in culture. This *new art* exists between the criticism and the apology of *social reality*, it is the sole constitutive offer of reality as an imaginary and as a symbolic way of representing the possible *global co-existence* of different racial, ethnic, class, generation, gender or professional identities and their unstable relationships.

*ART CLINIC*⁴⁴ is a utopian and alternative project of a group of citizens with the multimedia center LED ART⁴⁵. The project leader is artist, performer and activist Nikola Džafo (1950). *ART CLINIC* started working in the late 2002 in Novi Sad. This alternative institution was founded as a response to the “diseased society we are living in”, with the conviction that art can heal and change the world. The *ART CLINIC* project is conducted as a multimedia process within which independent exhibitions in the SHOCK GALLERY (the intensive care ward of *ART CLINIC* – the smallest gallery in the Balkans with 2m²); “Evening act” – public drawing and sculpting classes; film programs and video projections; lectures, platforms, discussions, performances; workshops; and there is a space within *ART CLINIC* for selling art products. By means of permanently open competitions for exhibiting in the SHOCK GALLERY and for creating personal flags, *ART CLINIC* is insisting on a dialogue, accepting well-intentioned suggestions, whereas the exhibitors are chosen by the Art Council. By promoting artists with fresh and provocative approaches towards the realization and presentation of art work, *ART CLINIC* is trying to encourage young artists, above others, to find their own path through art and the world we are living in. Through cooperation with individuals and similar organizations, *ART CLINIC* is participating in the creation of a network with the goal of changing the inefficient and autistic cultural politics on a local level, and beyond.

Imperialisms and modernity (Serbian edition, p.47)

Austro-Hungarian⁴⁶ and Hungarian imperialism in culture and art are a part of social politics and political conflicts within the Austrian Empire, and, later on, the Austro-Hungarian “dual” monarchy. In the second half of the 19th century and during the first decades of the 20th century, the Austro-Hungarian Empire underwent a transformation from a developed hierarchical and bureaucratized feudalism into a bourgeoisie, multinational, industrialized and urban society. Capitalist forms of production were conducted in a planned manner over a period of fifteen years. Economic development was concen-

trated around Vienna, in Austria (present-day territory of Austria), the Alps, Bohemia (Czech Republic), and at the end of the 19th century there was also a strong industrialization of central Hungary and the Carpathian region. The area of present-day Vojvodina remained dominantly agricultural, with a certain influence of the industrialization and, certainly, with an indicated, faster urbanization. Two connected, even though different imperialisms represented the cultural politics of the empire: Austrian imperialism connected with the Austrian, and hence German cultural hegemony, and the Hungarian imperialism derived from the “Austrian national” imperialism and developed in the direction of the national-bourgeoisie domination of the Hungarian community above minorities and minority cultures in the empire. This dualism points to the relationship of the “universalism” (Austro-German) and national “particularization” with hegemonic potentials (Hungarian). Austro-German universalism was constituted in the 19th century, with regards to art, around the style patterns of the evolution of church and political art into prototypical style models of allegoric Romanticism and bourgeoisie Realism, which led towards the creation of the Academic Realism in painting and sculpting, as an originator of learned and canonic modern autonomies of art. On the other hand, reactions to Academic Realism came about because of the establishment of “new tendencies” at the end of the 19th century, which were, in part, Secession⁴⁷ (*jugendstil*, *art nouva*), symbolism and Impressionism, bearing in mind that Secession had its Austro-German, or Viennese, *source* of modernization and search for new art and new unity of craft via open concept of art, architecture and material production. Secession in national variants (Austrian Secession, Hungarian Secession, Serbian Secession, Croatian Secession) kept the international style constant of the representative universal modernity. Symbolism and Impressionism appeared as international art movements that surpassed the interest contexts of Austro-Hungarian monarchy and Austro-Hungarian cultural hegemony, bearing in mind that symbolism is connected in certain aspects with Secession and, not rarely, with bourgeoisie Realism, which created a new model for a modern style and potential evolutions of Academic Realism. Impressionism, and later on, post-Impressionisms (Cézannism, above others) were a part of an immanent painting experiment and innovation within the autonomy of the art of painting and the development of art formalism.⁴⁸

44 See: http://www.ledart.org.yu/artklinika/o_nama.htm.

45 Vesna Graničević (ed.), *Led Art: Dokumenti vremena: 1933–2003*, MMC Led Art and Samizdat B92, Belgrade, 2004.

46 John W. Mason, *The Dissolution of the Austro-Hungarian Empire 1867-1918*. Second Edition. London and New York: Longman, 1997.

47 Bela Duranci, *A vajdasági építészeti szecesszió – Secesija u vojvođanskoj kulturi*, Forum, Novi Sad, 1983; and Bela Duranci, *Arhitektura secesije u Vojvodini*, Grafoprodukt, Subotica, 2005.

48 Petar Dobrović, in an analytically accurate manner, analyzed the dynamics of the relation of modern Academisms and growing Modernisms in his essay: “Slikarski pravci XIX i XX veka”, *Dan*, No. 9–10, Belgrade and Novi Sad, November 1st – 15th 1919. Published in: Olga Dobrović, “Dokumentacija o stvaralaštvu Petra Dobrovića III: Likovne kritike, intervjui, politički članci, pisma”, Matica sprska Gallery, Novi Sad, 2002, pp. 18–21.

Hungarian imperialism is known by its complex hegemonic aspirations in the processes of constitution and development of the Hungarian modern bourgeoisie capitalist nationalism. Hungarian imperialism was created as a transformation of a feudal-agrarian society into a national bourgeoisie capitalist industrial society. Modern art was, within that framework, represented as an evolution of Academic Realism via national and academic subject matters realized in a *realistic style*. During the same period, a 19th century Academic Realism was transformed into a modernized version of a realistic, Secessionist, symbolic, impressionist derivation of a “work of art” as an autonomous work of art beyond the reach of direct political and religious demands. One of the great cultural-political projects of the modernization of the national bourgeoisie culture and its imperial expectations was the *Millennium Exhibition*⁴⁹ held in Budapest between 2nd of May and 3rd of November 1896.

The *Millennium Exhibition* was held to commemorate one thousands years of the Hungarian nation. The concept of the exhibition was in a formal sense close to the model of the, then popular, “world” and “national” exhibitions, which means that it was prepared as a hybrid exhibition of social, cultural and art productions. The exhibition spanned over 520,000m² and over additional 120,000m² of the pavilions with over 21,000 exhibitors, 1,390 pavilions, an ethnographic village with 28 houses, etc. Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia and Slavonia had their pavilions. Serbs did not have their own pavilion; most of the ethnic and religious artifacts were exhibited in the Croatian and Slavonian pavilions, whereas a painting by Paja Jovanović was displayed in the main pavilion.⁵⁰ The concept of the exhibition signified in political terms the building and the derivation of the “narrative of national legitimacy” and “imperial domination” that was reflected in the integration of the Pannonian and Carpathian ethnic groups and peoples in the context of social and cultural hegemony of the Hungarian culture. The spirit of *fin-de-siècle* was marked by the project of “Hungarization” in the sense of creating a hegemonic, strong national country. On the other hand, a nationalist pro-imperial model implied modernization, which means, industrialization and urbanization of the Hungarian society: *a new Hungarian Weltanschauung*.⁵¹

The *Millennium Exhibition* had a double effect on Vojvodina: as a symbolic and pragmatic call for the participation

in establishing the Hungarian empire, and as a call for the modernization, that is, industrialization and urbanization of a predominantly agricultural “province”. In a political sense, the *Millennium Exhibition* marked the transition from a feudal heterogeneity of societies submitting to the sovereign into a bio-political organization, control and supervision of “life”: race, nation, ethnicity, micro-community, macro-community, the individual. In that context, numerous bi-national⁵² public activities of artists and architects can be viewed. For instance, the work of painter and politician Petar Dobrović (Hungarian name: *Péter Dobrovits*) or of architect Dragiša Brašovan (Hungarian name: *Szilárd Brassován*) is very characteristic.⁵³ The development of the towns in Vojvodina and social classes in them, particularly in Veliki Bečkerek⁵⁴ (Petrovgrad, present-day Zrenjanin),⁵⁵ Subotica,⁵⁶ Novi Sad,⁵⁷ Sombor,⁵⁸ and Vršac, Bela Crkva and Pančevo,⁵⁹ at the turn of the 20th century led to the creation of cultural communities, and, through education and art colonies, to the beginning of an art life. Modern painting culture and “art life” began in the Hungarian community⁶⁰ in a complex process of the reception of art from the capital cities, Vienna and Budapest, but also in the reception of a pro-modern art from Nagybanya. For instance, artists from Veliki Bečkerek that were guests in Nagybanya were: Antal Štrajtmán (1850-1918), József Várkonyi (1879-1938), Péter Schneider (1886-1944) and Emil Ženar (1886-1954). Lajos Németh, an artist from Budapest, tried to establish an art colony on the banks of the Begej River around 1904. What became apparent was that the modern art climate was spreading by means of art education in primary and secondary schools, with the establishment of art schools⁶¹, and, finally, with the establishment of art colonies. One of the first impressionist exhibitions, entitled *Impressionist of Veliki Bečkerek*, was held

49 *The Millennium of Hungary and the National Exhibition*, William Kunosy and Son, Budapest, 1896; as well as the catalogue: *Lélek és forma. Magyar művészet 1896-1914*, Budapest, A Magyar Nemzeti Galéria kiadványa, 1986.

50 Miodrag Jovanović, “Milenijumska izložba u Budimpešti 1896. godine”, *Sentandrejski zbornik* 2, Belgrade, 1992, pp. 171.

51 Péter Hanik (ed.), *One Thousand Years. A Concise History of Hungary*, Corvina, Budapest, 1988, pp.148.

52 Christopher Long, “East Central Europe: National Identity and International Perspective”, *The Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, Vol. 61, No. 4, December 2002, pp.519–529.

53 These artists assumed a Hungarian artistic identity. For instance the work of painter Petar Dobrović is often identified as belonging to the Hungarian painting until 1918, and to the Serbian painting after 1918.

54 Jelena Knežević, “Slikarstvo u Zrenjaninu 1900–1944”, from: Miloš Arsić (ed.), *Slikarstvo u Vojvodini 1900–1944*, Contemporary Visual Arts Gallery, Novi Sad, 1991, pp. 41–49.

55 The name of the town was Veliki Bečkerek until 1935, between 1935 and 1946 it was Petrovgrad, and from 1946 it has been known as Zrenjanin.

56 Ana Baranji, “Slikarstvo u Subotici 1900–1944”, from: Miloš Arsić (ed.), *Slikarstvo u Vojvodini 1900–1944*, Contemporary Visual Arts Gallery, Novi Sad, 1991, pp. 59–64; Bela Duranci, Sándor Torok (eds.), *Likovno stvaralaštvo – Subotica 1945–1970*.

57 Ratimir Kulić, “Slikarstvo u Novom Sadu”, from: Miloš Arsić (ed.), *Slikarstvo u Vojvodini 1900–1944*, Contemporary Visual Arts Gallery, Novi Sad, 1991, pp. 31–40.

58 Hedviga Hofman, “Slikarstvo u Somboru 1900–1944”, from: Miloš Arsić (ed.), *Slikarstvo u Vojvodini 1900–1944*, Contemporary Visual Arts Gallery, Novi Sad, 1991, pp. 54–59.

59 Svetlana Mihajlović Radivojević, “Slikarstvo u južnom Banatu 1900–1940”, from: Miloš Arsić (ed.), *Slikarstvo u Vojvodini 1900–1944*, Contemporary Visual Arts Gallery, Novi Sad, 1991, pp. 50–54.

60 Bela Duranci (ed.), *Likovno stvaralaštvo Mađara u Vojvodini 1830–1930*, City Museum, Subotica, 1973.

61 Mirjana Džepina, “Slikarske škole u Novom Sadu 1900–1940”, from: Miloš Arsić (ed.), *Slikarstvo u Vojvodini 1900–1944*, Contemporary Visual Arts Gallery, Novi Sad, 1991, pp. 40–41.

in 1910 in the town hall in Veliki Bečkerek. Antal Štrajtmán, Emil Ženar, József Várkonyi, and Jenő Wälder among others took part in the exhibition.

Marked Hungarian national identification models were involved in establishing art practices in cultural centers and in the transference of the “competency” of an autonomous art creation from the center towards the margins. Feudal art, at the beginning of the 19th century, had characteristics of a craft directed towards the religious and political – portrait and historic painting. Until the middle of the 19th century there were no art schools in Hungary. Art education was connected with the Viennese Academy (Akademie der Bildenden Künste Wien). In the second half of the 19th century and at the beginning of the 20th century, art education was conducted, most often, in Budapest, Vienna, Munich, Prague and Zagreb, with unavoidable influences of Italian and French art schools and artists. Certainly, one of the important events, artistically, culturally and politically, was the establishment of the art colony in Nagybánya⁶² (present-day Bai Mare in Romania) on 6th May 1896. The colony was founded by a group of young artists educated in Munich in the school of Simon Hollósy. The idea behind the creation of the colony was formulated by young painters István Réti, János Thorma, Károly Ferenczy and Béla Grünwald Iványi. Work in the Nagybánya colony led to the modernization of Hungarian art and, indirectly, to the influences on artistic environment and culture in Vojvodina. The Munich art school became influential in art education through their innovative character and emancipative differences with regards to the Viennese Academy and art schools of Pest. There was a change in the system of values – from the concept of a traditional craft and canonic religiously or politically functional composition, there was a shift towards modernist emancipation from the traditional, towards the mimesis of the established craft and the non-canonic promises of a modern, autonomous artistic expression. Instead of the historic and allegoric images, what was offered were the “images” of everyday life, primarily, the representations of the sensory perception of a landscape (*plein air* movement). Influences of the French Modernism, from the Barbizon school to Impressionism and post-Impressionism became important. István Réti (1872-1943), János Thorma (1870-1937), Károly Ferenczy (1862-1917) and Béla Grünwald Iványi (1867-1940) founded an open art school in 1902. Since then, Nagybánya began influencing the art scene of Vojvodina and the reception of the Barbizon school, Impressionism, post-Impressionism, and later on, Fauvism. Artists and intellectuals striving for a modern expression appeared with the Nagybánya colony. Fülep Lajos (1885-1917, Budapest) spent his childhood and early

adult years in Veliki Bečkerek. His high school teacher was Antal Štrajtmán. He started writing when he was a high school senior with the *Nagybecskereki Hírlap* paper in 1902. One of his first articles was “Agyermekek” (child drawing), written to mark the exhibition of Antal Štrajtmán, the pedagogue of the modern orientation. He worked as a journalist in Budapest from 1904. He wrote art reviews, and in 1906 he wrote about Endre Adi, describing him as “a tomorrow’s hero”. From Paris, he reported on the work of Cézanne. He studied in Florence and Rome from 1907 to 1914. Upon his return to Hungary, he worked with Đerđ Lukač. During his lifetime he was a diplomat, a protestant minister, a historian and an art theoretician, a university professor, and an academic.⁶³ Pászék Jenő (Senta, 1895 – Bai Mare 1848) studied painting at the Pest Academy from 1912/13. He was in Nagybánya for the first time in the summer of 1914. He studies with Károly Ferenczy and, later on, with István Réti. Because of the War, he did not finish his studies until 1919. He belonged to the circle of the activists of Lajoš Kašák, and worked part time for the *Tett* paper. He was friends with Petar Dobrović. He permanently settled in Nagybánya after World War I.⁶⁴ Pászék’s paintings *Self-Portrait* (1928) and *Nagybánya Square* (1928) are important, if not manifest, pieces. Laslo Kezdi Kovač⁶⁵ (1864-1942) is a painter self-didactic close to painter Karoly Ligeti (1890-1919), who was his painting teacher. As an archivist of the Torontal County, he lived in Veliki Bečkerek from 1885 until 1892. The following year he moved to Budapest, where, besides painting, he also wrote art and theater reviews. He was a member of the Veliki Bečkerek impressionist community. He produced landscapes and scenes from nature. He won a silver medal at the *Exposition Universelle* (World Fair) in Paris (1900), a gold medal in London (19??), a silver medal at World Exhibition in Barcelona (19??), and the “Parley” Salon prize in Budapest (19??). He had solo exhibitions since 1891. Painters from Vojvodina József Pechán, Béla Farkas (1894-1941),⁶⁶ Sándor Oláh⁶⁷ (1886-1966), Zora Petrović, Ivan Radović, Árpád G. Balázs and others, also worked in Nagybánya.

Hungarian national culture was “reproduced” in the art of painting in Vojvodina through three simultaneous processes: the transference of the Austro-Hungarian and Hungarian Academic Realism, important for the traditional late-feudal

63 Fülep Lajos, *Magyar muvészet* (Hungarian art), 1923; Fülep Lajos *A muvészet forradalmától a nagy forradalomig*. Cikkek, tanulmányok, I–II. Magvet Könyvkiadó, Budapest, 1974.

64 Szabo Julia, *A magyar aktivizmus története. Művészettörténeti füzetek 3*, Akadémiai Kiadó, Budapest, 1971; *Nagybánya. Nagybányai festészet a neosok feilépéséig 1944-ig*. Szerkesztettek: Jurecsko László, Kishonthy Zsolt, MissionArt Galéria, Miskolc, 1992. (Muradin Jend: Rovid čletrajzok, str. 169–70.)

65 Szika Popović, *Velikobekerečki slikarski ateljei*, National museum, Zrenjanin, 1969; and Vukica Popović, *Mađarski slikari u Banatu*, National museum, Zrenjanin, 1979.

66 Bela Duranci, *Farkas Béla*, Forum, Novi Sad, 1999.

67 Baranyi Anna, *Oláh Sándor (1886–1966)*, Forum, Novi Sad, 1986.

62 Irén Kirimi Kisdéginé (ed.),

and early-bourgeoisie modernity (Uroš Predić, Paja Jovanović), the emphasized national concept of the developed Academic Realism, Romanticism and Realism in religious and national-political painting from the *Millennium Exhibition* period and through the emancipation and the transformation of the “national elite modernity” into the “national bourgeoisie” and “internationalized Modernism” of Nagybanya. Modernity in Vojvodina was realized, primarily, by means of civic painting (religious subject matters, historical-allegoric subjects and portrait painting), which means that the development of modernity in art was connected with the economic strengthening of towns and by the separation of a new bourgeoisie upper class, as an autonomous class with regards to aristocracy. Modernism, on the contrary, first took place in the Hungarian national context by shifting the “target group” of artists and consumers-audience of art from the higher-leading class to middle class, and later on through the internationalization of the Hungarian “art” identity. Internationalized Hungarian art identity became a role model for building a “tacit” Serbian national cultural politics at the beginning of the 20th century.

József Pechán ⁶⁸(1875-1922) was a particularly influential Hungarian-German artist. He was born in Čibo, studied painting at the Academy (Akademie der Bildenden Künste München, 1889-1892) and in the private school of Simon Hollósy (1904) in Munich. He met Hungarian artists Sándor Ziffer (1880-1962) and Ernő Götz who had connections with Nagybanya. He spent time in Paris, worked in Budapest, where he was one of the founders of the “Independence Club” (Művészház), and under the patronage of the “Independence Club” he had independent exhibitions in Vrbas, Kula, Palanka and Sombor. After World War I, he lived in Vrbas, where he was painting, sculpting, composing, and designing buildings and interiors. In his development as a painter, József Pechán went from modern Academic Realism to symbolism, Secession with certain influences of Impressionism: *The Landscape* (1903), *Daydreaming* (1910), (1911) or *The Garden* (1913).

It is characteristic that at the turn of the 20th century, there was an appearance of photography, and later on of film, new media by means of which a modern social visibility, or in other words, spectacularity was projected. ⁶⁹ Firstly, through photography, the world became visible and recognizable. Human subjects could be seen, by oneself and by others, in a framed space of a photograph. The visibility and the power of the external classification of the visible demanded specific attention and affectation, which redirects the modern subject in the

“subject of the visual mediation”. There is a famous line from *Danica ilirska* magazine: ⁷⁰

In that manner an entire transformation of the art of painting and engraving will take place, consequences of which are still unimaginable.

That same year, the *Magazine for Literature and Fashion* (5th April 1839), which was published in Serbian, brought the news of the discovery of the photograph. Names of the first photographers appeared, such were the Jew Joseph Wippler, who probably worked on photography around 1840 in Veliki Bečkerek, Serbian photographer Anastas Jovanović, who took the first photos of the Petrovaradin Fortress in 1850. István Oldal opened a painting-photo art studio in 1854 in Veliki Bečkerek, where he worked until 1902, when István Henrik Oldal took over the shop and managed it until 1921. ⁷¹ With the technical development of photography from the daguerreotype to the industrial production of the “mechanical picture”, the photograph became a means of artistic, documentary, and most certainly ideological ⁷² work in the construction and the representation of the image of everyday life. The process of the separation of photography from painting can be seen in the photographic evolution of the Oldal studio. Even a glance at the photographs of interiors, exteriors, family portraits, portraits, sports and army photographs, travel, beach photographs, photographs of art studios, etc., indicates the power and influence of a new kind of “mechanical picture”. ⁷³ The ideological effect of the social and cultural subjectivity can be seen in almost any photograph that evolves from the individual view into a public, “objective” image. For instance, two photographs by István Oldal, showing children, in an important manner show racial, ethnic and class distinction between those “little, innocent creatures”. The first photograph, *Fotografija Marka Mirča* (*The Photograph of Marko Mirč*, 1904), shows a boy, between three and four years old, wearing a traditional garment, in a relatively abstract environment. The second photograph, *Egyik cigányképe* (around 1910) shows eight naked Romany boys and girls in a landscape. This distinction in treatments of the public body creates an ideological horizon of understanding the individual as a social subject. Every one of these readings can lead to different influences of photographic work and its transformation from private, documentary characteristic into a cultural-political work on structuring life. Others photographers

⁶⁸ Bela Duranci, Bordás Győző (eds.), *A két Pechán – Dva Pehana*, Forum, Novi Sad, 1982.

⁶⁹ Jonathan Crary, *Suspensions of Perception – Attention, Spectacle, and Modern Culture*, The MIT Press, Cambridge, 2001.

⁷⁰ *Danica ilirska*, Zagreb, April 6th 1839; see: Nada Grčević, *Fotografija devetnaestog stoljeća u Hrvatskoj*, Zagreb, 1981, pp. 9.

⁷¹ Bela Duranci, Zoltan Kalapiš – Bečkerečki svetlopišac, Photo-cinematic association of Vojvodina, Novi Sad, 1986.

⁷² Here the concept of the “ideological work” is used in the sense of deriving social and cultural subjectivity of the individual.

⁷³ Németh Ferenc, *A Bánáti fényképészet története 1848–1918*, Forum, Újvidék, 2002; Ozren M. Radosavljević, “Pomenik belockrvanskih fotografa”, from: *Belockrvanske sveske*, II, Kulturno-prosvetni centar, Bela Crkva, 1988.

that work at the turn of the 20th century are: Georgije Knežević in Novi Sad, Stefan Wulpe, Ignatz Reisz etc.⁷⁴ Photography was being developed in the towns of Vojvodina, Banat and Bačka, in the range of professional photographic work, over amateur photo clubs to the private photography, and the introduction of photography in publishing (postcards, newspapers, magazines and other graphics designs). Professional photography differentiated itself during the 20th century from the commercial photography of the studios, over newspaper, documentary and scientific photography, to art photography.

The spectacular character of the new image is also distinguishable and improved with media such as film. Cinematographic history can be followed from the Vršac spectacle of moving “panorama” and “stereoscopes” (1862), over news presentations on Edison’s kinetoscope (1897) and the first projection of a part of the film about the Russian-Japanese War (1906), to the first projection halls/cinemas (1906-1907) and, finally, to the first film review, which Boško Tokin wrote on the film *Crveni zec* (*Red rabbit*) in a cinematographic column in *Progress* newspaper in Belgrade, in 1920.

The Hungarian “national model” also included the ideological point of view that the local-national-Hungarian-identity in Vojvodina, the local-national-Serbian-identity and the local-national-other-identities are subordinate with regards to the “imperial” power center, that is, with regards to the Hungarian-center-national-state as the paragon of society and culture. During the 19th and at the beginning of the 20th century, a process of establishing hegemony started taking place, followed by the imperial establishment of the Hungarian identity within the Austrian Empire, which resulted in its transformation into the Austro-Hungarian monarchy. Hungarian nationalism was soon set forth – and proven itself – through Hungarian imperialism. After World War I, the “Vojvodina Hungarian identity” changed from a dominant to minority identity of one of the diasporas oriented towards the center, that is, towards the mother country. During World War II, there was a renewal of the imperial Hungarian national and social identity because of the military camaraderie of Hungary and Nazi Germany. That is when the idea of the return of the “southern Hungarian parts” to the motherland is introduced. The book *A Visszatért Délvidék*⁷⁵ was a project of the promotion of the idea of social and cultural return of the “southern parts” to the motherland, that is, to Hungary. The book was edited by Zoltán Csuka, and it included texts by Árpád G. Balázs. On the cover illustration there was a *national-realistic* image representing the act of the “return” when people address Admiral Horthy. It is very

indicative that two radical left-wing and “anti-Horthy” artists, from the 1920s, during the 1940s advocated for the right option of national unity within the Nazi project of the new organization of Europe. During the war, between 1941 and 1944, there was an intense exhibition work of a few artists: Árpád G. Balázs, Sándor Csávosi (1885-1954), Lajos Husvéth (1894-1956), András Hangya (Subotica, 1912 – Zagreb, 1988 [1989]), Ivan Jakobčić (1912-1997), Milan Konjović, Lukács Gyelmis (1899-1979) and others, gathered around the *Association of Painters from Southern Hungary*. They had exhibitions on Novi Sad, at Lake Palić, in Sombor, Budapest and Szeged.⁷⁶ After World War II, the Hungarian national identity was reconstituted as a minority identity, following the model of the socialist “equal nationalities” in the Autonomous Socialist Province of Vojvodina. After the break up of SFRY in 1991, there was a change in the ethnic structure of Vojvodina, and the emigration of the Hungarian population, which is now, at the turn of the 21st century, is seen as a marginal “national minority” within the unstable transitional Serbian society and its political, social, and rarely, cultural processes of establishing hegemony. The history of Hungarian art in Vojvodina can be followed through the entire 20th century, from Modernism, over Avant-gardes and Neo-Avant-gardes, to post-Modernism and the age of globalism.

The case of Paja Jovanović: visibility of social power (p.58)

An exceptional example of the imperial and central-European “inscription” of the Austro-Hungarian – Viennese identity on the life and work of artists who came from Serbian culture is, by all means, the work of painter Paja Jovanović (Vršac, 1859 – Vienna, 1957). Paja Jovanović graduated from the Academy of Fine Arts in Vienna in 1880, under the mentorship of professors Christian Griepenkerl and Leopold Carl Miller. The teachings of Leopold Carl Miller were directed towards romantic and realist painting with historical and oriental subjects. Jovanović spent most of his life working between Vienna, Belgrade and Vršac. Important exhibitions in which he took part, at the turn of the 20th century, were the *Millennium Exhibition* in Budapest, where he showed his *Vršac Triptych* (1896), and the *Exposition Universelle* in Paris, where he displayed his *Proclamation of Dušan’s Law* (1900). Both exhibitions were a part of his artistic and political determinedness with imperial policies of Austro-Hungary and with Serbian national politics. His artistic “mode” was an expression of the Austrian *fin-de-siècle*, which refers to the rational association of painting Real-

74 Sava Stepanov, “Utkana u kulturu – Vojvodina, 1840–1989”, from: Miodrag Đorđević (ed.), *Fotografija kod Srba 1839–1989*, Gallery of the Serbian Academy of Arts and Science, Belgrade, 1991, pp. 45–56.

75 Csuka Zoltán (ed), *A Visszatért Délvidék*, HK, Budapest, 1921

76 According Miloš Arsić’s citation from, “Slikarstvo u Vojvodini 1900–1944”, footnote 71, from: *Slikarstvo u Vojvodini 1900–1944*, Contemporary Visual Arts Gallery, Novi Sad, 1991, pp. 30; and “Pregled grupnih izložbi sa bibliografijom – izbor”: Years 1941–1944, pp. 210–211.

ism with late-Romanticism representable historic, allegoric and oriental atmospheres and subjects matters and occasional symbolic anticipations (*Parsifal*, 1920-1926). Jovanović painted by commission works with Serbian, Hungarian-Austrian (*The Wedding of Prince Ferry IV with Elisabeth the Habsburg*, 1901) and German (*Furor Teutonicus*, 1900) themes. He developed an international career working for the London art dealers Wallis and Tooth. He spent time in France, the USA, Turkey, Egypt, Morocco, etc. For a while, he lived in Paris and Munich (1884-1895), however, he permanently longed for Vienna and the Viennese style and Viennese “orientalism”.⁷⁷

Typically, he showed both “Serbian” and “Balkan” subjects (*Wounded Montenegrin* 1882, *The Fencing Lesson* 1884, *Arbanas* 1884-1886, *The Traitor*, or *The Lady in an Oriental Gown* 1884-1888, *The Cockfighting* 1920-1926) in a pictorial discourse of the orient-set Western romantic painting, which underlines the duality of his *artistic identity*: particularly national with regards to themes and universally imperial-colonial with regards to painting models of expression and techniques. The oriental style of his painting, even when he actually worked on truly oriental themes *From Morocco* or *A Lion Tamer in Morocco*, is not extra-European or provincial, but represents a European-colonial painting construction of exotic visibility of the oriental identity.⁷⁸ That is why his “Serbian paintings” are an example of power of the European colonial standpoint to adopt the other through universal “models of expression”.

The relation of the national theme and the *imperial composition* can also be seen on monumental paintings such as the *Migration of the Serbs* (1896) or the *Proclamation of Dušan's Law* (1900), *The Coronation of Emperor Dušan* (after 1900), *Miloš, Marko and the Fairy* (1906). What is particularly interesting is that the *Migration of the Serbs* was supposed to be exhibited at the *Millennium Exhibition* but it was replaced by another painting. The painting *Vršac Triptych* was exhibited in hall five of the central exhibition area of the *Art Pavilion* at the *Millennium Exhibition*. The concept of the painting *Migration of the Serbs* was supposed to show and advocate the national-political Serbian identity in Hungarian society and culture. It was realized in three versions – sketches. The composition was in the genre of the national-historical romantic painting, and, of course, under certain compositional influence of the monumental work of Árpád Feszty *Árpád Conquers Hungary* or *The Arrival of Hungarians in the Pannonian Plain*⁷⁹ (1893). It is a monumental painting, 120 x 15m in scale. It is exhibited in the

Ópusztaszer national memorial park. Jovaović's “composition” refers to the final composition part (the arrival of the people) of Feszty's painting. However, the commissioner, Patriarch Grigorije Branković, asked Jovanović to remove the “flock of sheep” from the painting and to emphasize the warrior-like character of the Serbian people, as Hungarian military allies. The exhibited painting, *Vršac Triptych* (1895) was commissioned by the town of Vršac. Three themes were realized: a field-harvest with Serbs, a vineyard-harvest with Serbs and Germans and a fair, in others words, the painting showed social relations in the arts of commerce, wine-making and agriculture. The painting was eclectic in style, with, at the time, a brave combination of Realism, Symbolism and Impressionism. Jovanović's paintings with national themes were very popular in the folk culture of the time and were reproduced in large numbers and published as oleographs⁸⁰ or reproductions.

Paja Jovanović, as a city painter and a master of realist academic craft, focused most of his painting opus to “social” and “political” painting. His portraits are precisely that kind of painting constructions and representations of *pictorial figures of power* in an economic, social-class, political and cultural sense. For instance, *Portrait of Mihajlo Pupin* (1903) is a construction of the physical appearance of a respectable cosmopolitan scientist of Serbian heritage, whereas the portraits of Gideon Dunderski, Sofija Dunderski and Teodora Dunderski (1916, 1916, 1916-1920) are explicit painting constructs of class identity of a new Serbian aristocracy within Austro-Hungarian, and later on, Serbian society. *Portrait of Prince Aleksandar I Karađorđević* (1913), *Queen Marija Karađorđević* (1925) or *Nikola Pašić* (1922-1926) and the sketch-portrait of *Marshal Tito* (1947) are quite rare examples of creating and modifying Academic Realism in representation of the main figures of the direct and sovereign bourgeoisie-absolute and sovereign communist revolutionary political power. It is as if power is given a pictorial visibility in his paintings. His representation of power also, on the other side, brings the visibility of Balkan, Serbian or communist power down to the *discourse of the European painting*.

National cultures and art in Vojvodina (Serbian edition, p.62)

What is characteristic of Vojvodina at the turn of the 20th century, in the age of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, are the conflicts and contradictions between different national powers

77 Dejan Medaković, “Paja Jovanović”, from: *Paja Jovanović*, Prosveta, Belgrade, 1957, pp. 5–11.

78 Jill Beaulieu, Mary Roberts (eds.), *Orientalism's Interlocutors – Painting, Architecture, Photography*, Duke University Press, Durham, 2002; and Christine Peltre, *Orientalism*, Editions Terrail, Paris, 2004.

79 Szűcs Árpád and Wójtowicz Małgorzata, *A Feszty-Körkép*, Helikon Kiadó, Budapest, 1996

80 Oleography (chromolithography) was, between the middle of the 19th century and the beginning of World War I, a popular medium for *verbatim* reproduction of the painting original. Oleography played an important role in making art more popular, by means of various political, most often national projects, and preparing high art for the upcoming popular/mass culture.

– between Austro-German, Hungarian and Serbian social and cultural hegemony and integrative politics. National artistic Modernisms, primarily painting, proved to be complex identification models with the goal of establishing relations between central-national-identity and local-marginal-national-identity. This relationship was almost always a “vertical” relationship of the minority towards the dominant national center and only then a “horizontal” relationship towards the other minority and micro-social practices. National identity of any ethnic or national community in Vojvodina was not derived only as the “purified” national identity, but also as the structure of class, religious, gender, social, professional, and even “geographical” differentiation, association, mediation or representation of individual or collective *subjectivity* of a feudal, bourgeoisie, real-communist and transitional society. It was recorded that, throughout the 20th century, there lived around twenty-five ethnic groups, nations or other identification groups in Vojvodina: Serbs⁸¹, Hungarians⁸², Slovaks⁸³, Croats⁸⁴, Yugoslavs, Montenegrins, Romanians⁸⁵, Romany⁸⁶, Bunjevci⁸⁷, Rusyns⁸⁸, Macedonians, Ukrainians, Muslims, Germans, Slovenians, Albanians, Bulgarians, Checks, Russians⁸⁹, Gorani, Bosnians, Vlachs and others.

Slovak art in Vojvodina and the case of Karol Miloslav Lehotský: between Impressionism and Theosophical Symbolism (Serbian edition, p.63)

Throughout the 20th century, there were many Slovak professional and naïve artists who worked in Vojvodina. Slovak artists often worked in Vojvodina and Slovakia, creating an intercultural and central-European area for modern art. 20th century artists included: Karol Miloslav Lehotský, Zuzana Medved'ová, Andrej Labat, Ivan Grunik, Ana Piksajdesova, Jaroslav Šimović, Štefan Lacok, and the Kovačica school of naïve painters: Martin Jonas (1924-1996), Martina Paluska,

Zuzana Chalupová (1925-2001), Jan Sokol, Vladimír Bobos, Michal Bires, Jan Knazovic (1925-1985), Pavel Hrk, Jan Strakusek, Jan Venarsky, Alberta Cizikova, Katarina Karlecik and others. Contemporary Slovak artists in Vojvodina include Jan Agarsky (1962), Miško Bolf (1960), Mira Brtkova (1930), Ingrid Cickova (1970), Pavel Enji (1953), Vera Fajndovičeva-Sudova (1948), Maria Gaškova (1948), Michal Kiral (1955-1995), Martin Kizur (1957), Josef Klatik (1949), Ivan Križan (1944), Vladimír Labat-Rovnev (1944), Štefan Lačok (1933), Anna Malachova-Fajndovicova, Daniela Markova (1980), Miloslav Pavelka (1951), Katica Pavelkova Vukajličova (1954), Anna Pixiadesova (1924-2004), Pavel Pop (1948), Milan Sudi (1942), Jaroslav Supek (1952), Gyula Sánta (1969), Jaroslav Šimović (1931), Rastislav Škulec (1962), and Jan Triaška (1977).

Karol Miloslav Lehotský⁹⁰ (Lalić, 1879 – Brno, 1929) was born in a civic, intellectual family of Vojvodinian Slovaks. He finished crafts school in Sombor. He was preparing to enter the Academy in Prague from 1897. He began studying painting in Prague where he became friends with Jaroslav August and Gustáv Mallý. Upon his return from summer holidays in 1898 he enrolled in a special course under Maximilian Pirner (1854-1924). Pirner was influenced by German philosophy, primarily by the pessimism of Friedrich Nietzsche. His painting was characteristic by its dark colors and images of fantastic creatures from the underworld. Lehotský studied drawing and improved his use of colors under the influence of Professor Vlah Bukovac. Evolving from the color influence of Bukovac, he reached a specific variant of Impressionism. Today he is considered the creator of Impressionism in Slovak painting. During his studies, he came into contact with “spiritual teachings”, mainly theosophy, which led him to the search for the *spiritual* in painting. He spent a brief period of time in Vienna, studying old masters as a guest-student. He returned from Vienna to Lalić, spent time in Novi Sad in the 1900, and in Ružomberok in the summer of 1901. He suffered from melancholy. During his stay in Odžaci in 1902 he started doing portraits. Lehotský showed five paintings at an exhibition in Hodonin on the Morava River (3rd May – 2nd June 1902). Other Slovak artists exhibiting at that exhibition were: Andrašević, August, Hanula and Mitrovski. A lot of visitors saw the exhibition, including French sculptor Auguste Rodin. In the meantime, Lehotský did not go to the exhibition, but was preparing for a trip to Munich, Paris or London. He spent some time in Italy, in late 1902, where he painted several impressionist symbolic paintings, for instance *Faustus and Margarita* and *Venice at Night*. He declined an invitation from his friend Jaroslav

81 *Matica Srpska Gallery*, Matica srpska, Novi Sad, 2001.

82 Bela Duranci (ed.), *Likovno stvaralaštvo Mađara u Vojvodini 1830–1930*, City Museum, Subotica, 1973; Imre Bori, *Književnost vojvodanskih Mađara*, Matica srpska, Novi Sad, 1979.

83 See: <http://hr.wikipedia.org/wiki/Slovaci>.

84 Ante Sekulić, *Umjetnost i graditeljstvo bačkih Hrvata*, Matica hrvatska, Zagreb, 1998.

85 Petru Marina (Seleus, 1937), Dimitrije Ardeljan (1941-????), Viorel Flora (Banatsko Novo Selo, 1952), Gabriela Turturea (Bukurešt, 1974), Jonel Popović (), Dominika Morariu (1967), Daniela Morariu (1967) and others

86 <http://www.nshc.org.yu/romi.htm>

87 <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Bunjevci>; Ante Sekulić, *Bački Bunjevci i Šokci*, Školska knjiga, Zagreb, 1989.

88 Rysin artists: Stevan Bodnarov, Helena Sivč, Evgenije Kočiš, Vladimír Kolesar, Jakim Buljić, Andri Kočiš, Nikola Cverdelj and others.

89 This primarily refers to the Russian emigrant culture (Bela Crkva, Veliki Bečkerek, Pančevo, Novi Sad), which was established after the end of World War I and intensively developed until the end of World War II. Bibliography: Boris L. Pavlov, *Ruska kolonija u Velikom Bečkereku (Petrogradu, Zrenjaninu)*, National Museum, Zrenjanin, 1994.

90 Vladimír Valentík, “The Family Origin and Life Road of Karol Miloslav Lehotský”; see: http://www.vojvodinaslovakart.com/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=50&Itemid=32; i Ladislav Čáni, Vladimír Valentík, *Karol Miloslav Lehotský*, Kultura, Bački Petrovac and Dom zahraničných Slovákov, Bratislava, 2004.

August to show his work in Žilina in 1903. At the same time, he began with the preparation for his solo exhibition containing 50 works. The exhibition was held in *Meštanska beseda* in Uhersko Hradište. He worked with a group of *Slovak-Hungarian* artists around 1907. For the evangelist church in Petrovac, he painted by commission the *Last Supper*. He did portraits for William Pauliný Tóth, Ambre Pive, Pavol Mudre and Hurban Vajanský during 1912. He painted a portrait of the Serbian King Petar in Novi Sad. He did landscape painting on the banks of the Danube. He was forbidden to paint outside his place of living. Under pressure, he decided to go to Zagreb, where he organized a solo exhibition. He spent the war with his sister in Hložani. He was in favor of the Slovak national union. He organized the first exhibition of Slovaks from Vojvodina in Petrovac, during which the following artists, among others, exhibited their work: Zuzka Medvedová⁹¹, and two painters from Petrovac – Andrej Labat and Ivan Grunik. He began preaching his theosophical-messianic ideas around 1919. He printed flyers and tried to establish a spiritual society in Petrovac that would deal with the ideas of a secret organization, beauty and love. His theosophical activism did not receive understanding from his fellow neighbors. He wrote theosophically oriented essays during the early 1920s and tried to publish them. He did a portrait of the Czechoslovakian president Masaryk, as well as many other commissioned portraits, landscapes and religious paintings. He planned to permanently move to Bratislava. He spent some time in Brno, where he died of pneumonia in March 1929.

The painting of Lehotský went through several characteristic, often parallel, phases: symbolism and Secessionism (*Faustus and Margarita* in 1903, or *Slovak Heroism, a Portrait of Sam Tomašik* in 1913), Impressionism (landscapes: *The Environment Around the Hometown, Venice at Night*), Academic Realism (portraits of *Nikola Njegoš, King Petar, Masarik*), and, as can be seen in a few remaining drawing-sketches, theosophical mystic symbolism (*Prophets at Spiritual Heights*, undated; *Intoxication*, undated; *Horrors of War*, 1918-1919). These are the paintings, which, in a symbolic and pro-expressive manner, represent mystic visions and the spiritual atmosphere in those eclectic mergers characteristic of eclectic theosophical and antroposophical art at the turn of centuries.

Russian emigrant art in Vojvodina (Serbian edition, p.68)

One of the mythic-national fascinations in Serbian culture of the 18th, 19th and 20th centuries is that about Russian art: literature, music, architecture and painting. From icon paint-

ers and folk painters to modernists and Neo-Avant-gardists, a narrative was being built about the extraordinariness of Russian art as opposed to European Western art. One of the first critical studies was a discussion on the history of Russian painting written by Kosta Strajnić⁹² and published in *Letopis Matice srpske* in 1930. This text introduced a modern take on the history of Russian art and followed its development from the “Russian icon” to the painters of the *new Russia* in the Soviet revolutionary and post-revolutionary society.⁹³ Modern appearances of Impressionism and Symbolism followed by scenographic painting in connection with Russian ballet and ending in Futurism and Suprematism are being considered in this text in great detail. This text is concluded with an indicative statement:

Whereas the painting of France and Germany is developed in accordance with tradition, the painting of Russia is imbued with a radical idea: to inaugurate art that would be an expression of our age. So far, Russians have managed to give such an expression in architecture, theater, poetry and film, so perhaps, they will succeed in giving one in painting as well.⁹⁴

As opposed to the plurality projected by this text, the appearance of Russian emigration in Yugoslavia, Serbia and Vojvodina did not mark the beginning of radical art Modernisms but of stable, smooth and conservative modern views of art and culture. Emigrant Russian art was, therefore, quickly integrated into the national bourgeoisie models of Serbian modernity.

The appearance of Russian emigration⁹⁵ in European cultures was typical of the period after the Soviet bolshevik revolution in 1917 and the subsequent civil war. Russian emigrants came to Vojvodina around 1920. Russian refugees settled in Veliki Bečkerek, which was then called Petrovgrad, Bela Crkva, Pančevo and Novi Sad. The “school” *Cadet Corpus* was active in Bela Crkva, and there was a Russian colony, with about 500 residents, formed in Veliki Bečkerek. Russian emigrants were mostly members of upper social noble and civil classes, who, during the Soviet Bolshevik revolution, left Russia and the

92 Kosta Strajnić (Križevci 1887 – Dubrovnik 1977), a painter, a critic, a historian and a museologist. He studied painting in Vienna and Zagreb. He studied history of art in Vienna during World War I. He taught drawing in Zagreb and Belgrade. He lived in Belgrade until 1924. Between 1924 and 1928 he travelled throughout Europe (France, Poland, and Czech Republic). He lived in Dubrovnik from 1928 until his death. Between World Wars he published his articles in *Letopis Matice srpske*. He was one of the first art critics who wrote about the specifics of female painting: “Art and a Woman” (Zagreb, 1916).

93 Kosta Strajnić, “*Rusko slikarstvo*”, *Letopis Matice srpske* vol. 324 number 2-3, Novi Sad, May – June 1930, pp. 124-144.

94 “Dok se slikarstvo Francuza i Nemaca razvija u skladu sa tradicijama, slikarstvo Rusa prožeto je jednom radikalnom idejom: inaugurisati umetnost koja bi bila izraz naše epohe. Ovakav izraz Rusi su dosad savršeno dali u arhitekturi, pozorištu, poeziji i filmu, pa možda će uspeti da ga daju i u slikarstvu” – Kosta Strajnić, “*Rusko slikarstvo*”, *Letopis Matice srpske* vol. 324 number 2-3, Novi Sad, May – June 1930, pp. 144.

95 Miodrag Sibinović, Marija Mežinski, Aleksej Arsenjev (eds), *Ruska emigracija u srpskoj kulturi XX veka*, Faculty of Philology, Belgrade, 1994; *Ruska emigracija u srpskoj i drugim slovenskim kulturama*, Faculty of Philology, Belgrade, 1997; Petković, Tatjana (ed), *Ruska emigracija u Subotici između dva svetska rata*, Serbian Archive, Belgrade, 2000.

91 Ján Kišgeci, Vladimír Valentík, *Zuzka Medvedová – Likovno delo*, Kultura, Bački Petrovac, 1997.

countries that were later merged with the Soviet Union. Their political and cultural standpoint was mainly right-wing, and in the cultural and art domain, it circled around stable conservative esthetic and artistic views based on national Romanticism and bourgeoisie Realism, that is, modern Academic Realism.⁹⁶

The *Grand Exhibition of Russian Art* was held in Belgrade in March 1930, under the patronage of king Aleksandar I and Prince Pavle.⁹⁷ The executive board was comprised of Vasilije Baumgarten, the president of the Association of Russian Artists in Yugoslavia, and Dr. Sergej Alisov, Vladimir Baljcar, Roman Verhovskoj, Sergej Kučinskij, Boris Orješkov, Andrej Papkov and Ivan Rik. The exhibition showed works of a hundred Russian painters and sculptors who settled in Europe and Yugoslavia after 1920. Important representatives of the Russian Realism, Symbolism, Avant-garde and Modernism, such as Ilija Repin (1844-1930), Aljbert Aleksandrovič Benua (1897-1960), Natalija Gončarova (1881-1962), Mihail Larionov (1881-1964), Šaim Sutin (1893-1943), Grigorij Šiljitin and others, were among those who exhibited their work at this exhibition. The following artists worked in the first Yugoslavia: Jevgenija Andrić-Somonova (Belgrade), Ilija Ahmetov (Split), Vasilij Baumgarten (Belgrade), Aleksandr Bikovskij (Belgrade), Andrej Bicenکو (Belgrade), Roman Verhovskoj (Zemun), Vsevolod Volčanckij (Dubrovnik), Aleksej Ganzen (Dubrovnik), Ivan Dikij (Belgrade), Natalija Jermolova (Velika Kikinda), Jelena Kiseleva-Bilimović (Belgrade), Oljga Kovalevskaja (Belgrade), Ljudmila Kovalevskaja-Rik (Belgrade), Mitrofan Kosenko (Arandelovac), Stepan Kolesnikov (Belgrade), Pavel Kravčenko (Zemun), Vasilij Krasovskij (Dubrovnik), Vladimir Kuročkin (Novi Sad), Sergej Kučinskij (Belgrade), Aleksandar Lažečnikov (Veliki Bečkerek), Ipolit Majkovskij (Dalmacija), Nikolaj Mejndorf (Belgrade), Boris Obrazkov (Belgrade), Boris Pastuhov (Belgrade), Viktor Pastuhov (Belgrade), Andrej Papkov (Belgrade), Nikolaj Poljakov (Belgrade), Vladimir Predajevič (Belgrade), Ivan Rik (Belgrade), Petr Fetisov (Leskovac), Mihail Hrisogonov (Bosnia), Tatijana Čelnkova (Pančevo), Viktor Ševcov (Belgrade), Afanasij Šeloumov (Novi Sad), Larisa Baranovskaja Šramčenko (Belgrade), Sergej Alisov (Belgrade), Roman Verhovskoj (Belgrade), and Aleksandar Redkin (Belgrade).

The following artists worked in Veliki Bečkerek:⁹⁸ Aleksandar Ivanoviča Lažečnikova (Moscow 1872 – Veliki Bečkerek 1944), Afanasij Ivanovič Šeloumov (Kamenc Ukraine 1892

– Starnberg Germany 1983), Andrej Vasiljevič Bicenکو (Kursk 1886 – USA 1985), Kosta Eliot (Odessa 1925 – unknown events after 1950 when he emigrated to Italy). In Bela Crkva⁹⁹ following artists worked: a painter Vladimir Aleksandrov (1926), an art pedagogue Nikola Aleksandrov, Petar Vladimirovič Barišev (Russia 1879 – Bela Crkva 1949), a painter E. Benua, a painter Pavel Bikodorov, a painter-icon painter Lev Butovič, applied artist Vladimir Gaponov (Moscow 1912 - ???), icon painter Ernest Generalov, painter Fedor Geršeljman, painter-icon painter Vladimir Korecki (Warsaw 1984 – Bela Crkva 1967), Georgij Korf worked with scenography, painter Nikolaj Kuznjecov (Herson county 1852 – Sarajevo, around 1930), painter Jevgenija Lukinskaja (Rostov on the River Don late 19th century – Prague 1970), Konstantin Konstantinovič Lukinski (1895 - ???), wood carver Petar Nikolajevič Mezencov (Russia 1880 – Bela Crkva 1964), Jevgeniji Prudkov, painter Vladimir Savčenko (Russia around 1910. – Bela Crkva 1976), wood carver Petar Sevastjanovič, painter Nikolaj Titov, photographer Aleksandar Ševčenko and others.

Vsevolod Guljevič graduated from the Crimean cadet corpus in Strniš near Ptuj in 1922; afterwards, he enrolled the Nikolajevsk military academy in Bela Crkva. He worked in Belgrade. He did historical paintings (*Horseman, 15th century*) and portraits (*Portrait of King Petar I in 1912, 1940*) and he illustrated books. He developed a specific style of army-patriot painting.¹⁰⁰

The painter and art pedagogue Aleksandar Ivanoviča Lažečnikova worked in Veliki Bečkerek between 1920 and 1944. He mainly painted landscapes and still lifes, rarely portraits and icons. He supported the idea of bringing art closer to the people. He was esthetically and politically against radical Modernism and Avant-garde Cubism-futuristic tendencies. His artwork developed in a recognizably modern academic manner between Romanticism and Realism and the anticipation of Impressionism. He first showed his work in Veliki Bečkerek with Varkonji, Ženar, Šnajder, Cvejanov, Berenij and others in 1921.¹⁰¹

Afanasij Ivanovič Šeloumov¹⁰² was born in Ukraine. He finished art school in Odessa in 1912. He studied at the art academy in St. Petersburg between 1912 and 1914. He went to Turkey with the White Guard army in 1920, and reached Yugoslavia in 1921. He probably briefly lived in Novi Sad. He worked as a painter in metal workshops in Bečkerek, but also as an official town painter. He lived in Veliki Bečkerek until 1944, when he withdrew to Germany with the German troops.

96 See catalogues: *Dela ruskih slikara u našem gradu*, National Museum in Zrenjanin and The Society of Russian-Serbian friendship, Zrenjanin, 1991; *Ruski slikari u Zrenjaninu*, Russian House in Belgrade, Belgrade, 1996; and *Ruski umetnici emigranti u Vojnom muzeju*, Military Museum, Belgrade, 1996.

97 Catalogue: *Velika izložba ruske umetnosti*, Belgrade, March 1930.

98 *Ruska umetnost u srednjem Banatu*, National Museum, Zrenjanin, 1995; and Boris L. Pavlov *Ruska Kolonija u Velikom Bečkereku (Petrovgradu - Zrenjaninu)*, National Museum, Zrenjanin, 1994.

99 Ozren M. Radosavljevič, *Ruski umetnici u Beloj Crkvi*, Library Belocrkvske sveske V, Bela Crkva, 1994.-

100 *Ruski umetnici emigranti u Vojnom muzeju*, Military Museum, Belgrade, 1996, pp. 30-49.

101 "Képkiallatás Becskereken", *Torontal*, Veliki Bečkerek, November 19th 1921, pp. 2

102 Catalogue: *Afanasij Scheloumoff*, Galerie Schumacher, Munich, 1962.

He actively pursued painting in Germany until his death in 1983. His painting was directed towards Academic Realism, portrait painting, historical themes and romantic scenes from Russian life. As an illustrator he did numerous drawings of soldiers from Russian and European history.

Kosta Eliot was born in 1925, to an English father and a Russian mother. He came to Veliki Bečkerek from Belgrade in 1945.¹⁰³ He worked as a scenographer in the National Theatre in Zrenjanin in 1946-1947. He worked in agitprop and as a drawing teacher in the grammar school in Zrenjanin. He moved to Belgrade in 1949. He made the theatrical scenery for Bernard Shaw's *Mrs. Warren's Profession* in the Belgrade drama theatre. He immigrated to Italy in 1950, during the period when Russian immigrants were leaving socialist Yugoslavia because of the political tensions surrounding INFORM Bureau. After that, every trace of him is lost. Several works remain: the social-realist aquarelle *A Participant of the Battle of the Sutjeska River*, and an oil painting *Landscape* (1945).

German case – *missing art* (Serbian edition, p.70)

The position of the “German” cultural identity proved to be a hybrid construction of four different potential cultural models:

- (i) The *optimum projection* of the great German identity as a constitutive potential of the integrator, or, perhaps, of the conqueror of the entire European culture;
- (ii) The imperial Austro-German identity as a field of sovereignty and domination, which is in competitive and conflict opposition with Hungarian nationalism and potential or actual imperialism;
- (iii) Local “German” cultural communities in Vojvodina, primarily in Banat (*the Banat Germans, Donauschwaben, Volksdeutsche*);¹⁰⁴ and
- (iv) The specific hybrid identity of Hungarianized Germans. Militant German social, political and cultural identity

was exhibited, certainly, during World War II, when there was a massive identification of German inhabitants with the Nazi policies of the Third Reich. Immediately after World War II, after the end of the national fight for liberation and the colonization of Serbs and Montenegrins, there was a deportation of Germans from Banat, and thus, the weakening and disappearance¹⁰⁵ of “German identity” in Vojvodina in the second half of the 20th century.

What every researcher/historian, or simply the curious art enthusiast, notices is that there is hardly any mention of German art produced in Vojvodina in histories and retrospective reviews, save for the German artists who were integrated by Hungarian culture: Ferenc Eisenhut¹⁰⁶ (1857–1903), Henrik Emil Aczél¹⁰⁷ (1876–1946), Péter Schneider, Antal Streitmann, Adalbert Béla Müller¹⁰⁸ (Bačka Topola, 1896. – Salzburg, 1976), and others.

Ferenc Eisenhut was schooled in Budapest. His paintings were in a historic and oriental style. His orientalism painting brought him a significant international fame. He exhibited in Budapest, Munich, Paris, Berlin, Madrid, etc. He was famous as an oriental painter, which meant study visits to the Orient (Caucasus, Tunisia, Algiers). He had great success with his painting *Healing with the Kuran* (1883). This piece was bought and exhibited in the Royal Palace in Buda. His painting *Death of Dulbaba* made him the first painter to receive the Grand Hungarian national gold medal in Budapest. Ferenc Eisenhut painted the monumental *Battle at Senta* (oil on canvas 700x400cm) for the *Millennium Exhibition*, commissioned by the Bačka-Bodroš County. The painting was commissioned in 1896 and was exhibited in a specially set up exhibition area in Sombor in 1898. The painting is constructed in a monumental historic panoramic genre. Eisenhut, along with Lajos Markó, Ferenc Zich and Ágost Meisl conducted a large scale “panorama” showing a procession of dignitaries from the towns and counties that followed St. Stephen's crown to the Royal Palace in Buda. The panorama was on display during August 1898. Eisenhut painted those scenes in a number of occasions in small-scale oil sketches.

The question that imposes itself is if there was an autonomous German art in the 20th century in Vojvodina. According to secondary sources, a list of German artists in Vojvodina in-

103 V. Zadler, *Ruski slikari u našem gradu*, National Museum, Zrenjanin, 1991.

104 The migration of the Danube Germans refers to a wide range of migration of individuals and families from the German speaking area to territories that the Austrian Empire took away from the Ottoman Empire during the 17th, 18th, and 19th centuries. German migrants settled the territories of Banat, including the Arad territory, south of the Tisa River and east of the Danube. In Srem, they settled between the Sava River and the Danube. In the area between the Danube and the Carpathian mountains there were more than 1.5 million Germans in 1918. See <http://www.genealogienetz.de/reg/ESE/dschwaben.html#gender> and http://www.dvvtimme.org.yu/donauschwaben_yu.htm. The term Volksdeutsche means German people, that is, German people living outside Germany. The notoriety of the name “Volksdeutsche” was developed by the Nazis, who spread their politics via German people in the East-European countries. After World War II, the idea of “collective guilt” was applied to Volksdeutsche, and consequently, Germans emigrated and the established demographic balance was destroyed. See Vladimir Geiger, *Folksdojčeri – pod teretom kolektivne krivnje*, Grafika d.o.o., Osijek, 2002; Zoran Žičetić, “Nemci u Vojvodini: njihovo naseljavanje, njihovo poreklo i trajne vrednosti u njihovoj zaostavštini”, *Književne novine*, year 46, number 882, Belgrade, 1994, pp. 12; and Herbert Prokle et al. (eds.), *Genocid nad nemačkom manjinom u Jugoslaviji*, Belgrade, Society for Serbian-German cooperation and Donauschwäbische Kulturstiftung, Munich, 2004.

105 As one of the cultural marks and strongholds of Germans in Vojvodina, the magazine *Fenster* is still being published, Sremski Karlovci, 2005-2006.

106 Olga Kovačev Ninkov, *Život i delo Franca Ajzenhuta (1857-1903)*, City Museum, Subotica, 2007.

107 Beke László, Bernáth Mária, *Magyar Művészet 1890–1919. A posztimpresszionizmus és szimbolizmus kismesterei – I*, Akadémia Kiadó, Budapest, 1981, pp. 417.

108 Olga Kovačev Ninkov, “Slikari velikih tema i formata 6: Ajzenhut, bački umetnik”, *Dnevnik – Subotičke*, number 36, Subotica, March 9th 2007: <http://www.subotice.net/arhiva/broj%2036/strane/feljtton.htm>.

cludes: K. Rozel, R. Hemig, I. Kraus¹⁰⁹ and Sebastian Leicht¹¹⁰ (Bački Brestovac, 1908–2003), Josef Elter¹¹¹ (1926–1997) and Robert Hammerstiel¹¹² (Vršac, 1933). Leicht began high artwork in Vojvodina, continued it in Germany, whereas Elter worked in Germany, and Hammerstiel in Austria.

Sebastian Leicht began his sculpting, painting and graphics artwork during the 1930s. His painting and sculpting is dedicated, mostly, to the representation of everyday life of the German community. One of his retrospectively written essays “Švapsko-nemački Kulturbund” deals with German cultural associations and the creation of “Švapsko-nemački Kulturbund” in 1920 in Vojvodina.¹¹³ Leicht published a book¹¹⁴ of drawings/graphics with the scenes of life of the Danube Germans, with especially characteristic drawings of the banishment of Germans from Banat. The drawings are done in a realist-expressive manner of the late social art, specific of the painting of “new objectivity”, for instance social drawing by Kathe Kollwitz or Georg Grosz. Two photographs of Leicht’s missing or destroyed sculpture: *Sower* (Bački Petrovac, 1936), erected to commemorate one hundred and fifty years of the arrival of the Danube Germans, and the monument in marble erected to commemorate the settler families in Filipovo (present-day Bački Gračac, 1938) were published in *Fenster* magazine.¹¹⁵ The style of both sculptures is realistic. The latter monument was destroyed during the colonization and built into the foundations of a business building in Bački Gračac.

Jewish culture and artists throughout 20th century:
missing art¹¹⁶ (Serbian edition, p.76)

The settling of Jews in Hungary and Vojvodina is connected with the period after the victory of Eugen Savojski over the

Turks at Senta in 1697. The settling of Jews in Subotica¹¹⁷ began in the 1770s. Jewish communities existed in the majority of towns in Vojvodina.¹¹⁸ Vojvodina’s Jews spoke Hungarian, German and Yidish. Religious service was in Hebrew. Jews lived within their own municipalities or communities. They participated in different forms of public life in Hungary and Vojvodina – from education, newspaper publishing, trade to politics.¹¹⁹ After World War I *The Alliance of Jewish Municipalities* was formed and it remained active until 1992. Jewish culture was created as a special European phenomenon of the constitution of modern societies and nations on the Balkan Peninsula and in Central Europe. It was characterized by a complex structuring with regards to its removal from public life, integration/assimilation into the majority nations or radical responses of Jewish nationalism via Zionism.¹²⁰ According to the 1991 census, 206 ethnic Jews lived in Novi Sad. In the past, the Jewish population in Vojvodina was much larger, with around 19,000 Jews before World War II. The greatest number of Jewish citizens was murdered during the Nazi and Fascist occupation in World War II. Jews were under constant pressure of the state and administrative agencies in Austro-Hungary. It was only in 1895 that the Jewish (Israelite) religion became equal with all acknowledged religions in the Austro-Hungarian monarchy. A Jewish citizen was accused in Tisaeslar of a “ritual killing” in 1882–1883. There was a pamphlet that was printed in four languages (Serbian, Hungarian, German, Slovak) at that time in Novi Sad, with anti-Semitic contents, and in daily newspapers, for instance in the Serbian radical party’s *Zastava*, there were anti-Semitic articles. During the fall of Austro-Hungary, because of pillaging and violence, many Jews abandoned the country and settled in towns. Jews were seen as equals in the new Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes and the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, except during the early days when the new government was being built. Jewish citizens were integrated in the business and public life of the Kingdom. There were several anti-Semitic outbursts in Croatian (*Neven*, Subotica), Hungarian (*Délbácska*) and Serbian (*Zastava* and *Jedinstvo*) newspapers. Jews who did not have papers and citizenship after the assassination on King Aleksandar in Marseille on 9th October 1934 were issued orders to abandon the country. The official standpoint of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia on Jews changed in 1938, when their rights in the

109 According to Miloš Arsić, “Slikarstvo u Vojvodini 1900–1944”, footnote 2, from: *Slikarstvo u Vojvodini 1900–1944*, Contemporary Visual Arts Gallery, Novi Sad, 1991, pp. 29.

110 Painter and sculptor Sebastian Leicht was pointed out by Stjepan A. Seder, editor of *Fenster* magazine from Sremski Karlovci. Based on his instructions, Đura Popović was reached, who has a number of Leicht’s works (graphics, paintings).

111 *Josef Elter*, 2006.

112 “Robert Hammerstiel: Images by a Contemporary Witness, Leopold Museum”, Vienna, 2007; see also: Nadežda Radović, “Govoreći o drugima najviše kažemo o sebi – Omaž Vrščanina Roberta Hammerstila u bečkom Kunsterhausu”, *Danas*, 8–9. September 2007; and Zoran Žiletić, “Nepoželjni jer su Nemci / Slikarstvo, istorija umetnosti i etničko čistunstvo”, *Danas*, September 20th 2007; and Sava Stepanov (ed.), *Robert Hammerstiel*, The Museum of Vojvodina, Novi Sad, 2005.

113 Sebastian Leicht, “Švapsko-nemački Kulturbund”, according to a manuscript without designated sources and names of translators.

114 Sebastian Leicht, *Der Weg der Donauschwaben – Dreihundert Jahre Kolonistenschicksal*, Verlag Passavia Passau, 1983.

115 Photographs of Leicht’s sculptures were published in *Fenster* magazine, number 6, Sremski Karlovci, December 2006, pp. 11 and 15

116 *Židovi na tlu Jugoslavije*, Museum area, Zagreb, 1988; Pavle Šosberger, *Jevreji u Vojvodini: kratak pregled istorije vojvođanskih Jevreja*, Prometej, Novi Sad, 1998.

117 Dušan Jelić, “Kratak pregled istorije subotičkih Jevreja i njihovog doprinosa razvoju grada”, in: *Zbornik 5 – Studije, arhivska i memoarska građa o istoriji subotičkih Jevreja*, Jewish historical museum, Belgrade, 1987, pp. 1–192.

118 See, for instance: Milenko Beljanski, “Somborski Jevreji (1735–1970)”; and Eugen Verber, in: *Zbornik 4 – Studije, arhivska i memoarska građa o Jevrejima Jugoslavije*, Jewish historical museum, Belgrade, 1979, pp. 1–54 and 57–62.

119 Dragoljub Čolić, “Učešće Jevreja u razvoju privrede Banata” and “Jevreji u grafičkoj industriji Zrenjanina”, in: *Zbornik 4 – Studije, arhivska i memoarska građa o Jevrejima Jugoslavije*, Jewish historical museum, Belgrade, 1979, pp. 111–191 and 193–198.

120 Dr. Cvi Rotmiller, “Antisemitizam, asimilacija i cionizam”, *Matica srpska Literary Magazine*, book 314, issue 2, Novi Sad, 1927, pp. 189–193.

trade of wholesale food products were restricted, the number of students who were allowed to enter high schools and universities was also restricted (*Numerus clausus*), and Jewish reserve officers were removed from a combat schedule and placed in working units. During the occupation, German laws ("Second Jewish law from 1939") were enforced, which restricted their rights of work, employment, trade and schooling, and work units and work camps were established. Hungarian occupation forces conducted a raid in Šajkaška Street in Novi Sad, in Stari Bečej and in Srbobran between 4th and 29th of January 1942. At that time 1193 Jews and around 2000 Serbs were murdered. The Hungarian government, after German troops entered Hungary on 19th March 1944, made a decision according to which Jews had to wear a yellow star, and all Jewish assets were to be seized. By order of the Hungarian ministry for internal affairs from 7th April 1944, Jewish citizens were to be deported, which started taking place on 26th April 1944. Jews from Srem were killed in concentration camps in the Independent State of Croatia; Jews from Banat were taken to Belgrade and killed by the Nazi German authorities in Belgrade. These laws were abolished with the liberation of Vojvodina in October 1944.¹²¹

Technically speaking, Jewish art was connected with religious customs and can be seen in the architecture of the synagogues¹²² and Jewish cemeteries.¹²³ The project for the fifth synagogue in Novi Sad, the first one in the 20th century, was made by Lipot Baumhorn (1860-1932), an architect from Budapest. The construction began in 1906 and was completed in 1909. Baumhorn was an architect from Budapest who studied under Ödön Lechner (1845-1914), the founder of the Hungarian national *art nouve* in architecture. The synagogue in Subotica¹²⁴ was erected in 1902 in a Secessionist style, following the project of Marcell Komor (1868-1944) and Dezső Jakab (1864-1932). Miksa Róth (1865-1944) did the stained glass windows. There were 72 Jewish cemeteries in Vojvodina, the only active cemetery today is the one in Pančevo.

There is a large number of Jewish artists who worked in the context of the Hungarian and Serbian art from Vojvodina during the 20th century. According to a list by Pavle Šosberger¹²⁵

and Miriam Reiner¹²⁶ the following Jewish artists either worked in Vojvodina, or came from it: painter Henrik Acél, painter Đorđe Bošan (1818–1894), painter Đula Brener (1859), painter Kálmán Déri (1859–1940), painter Fischer Marcel, textile designer and painter Sándor Gedeon (1886), sculptor Nándor Glíd (1924–1997), painter Klára Geréb (1901–1944), engraver Károly Kálmán (1800–1870), sculptor and painter Mihály Kara-Krón (1887–1970), painter and physician Dr. Dezső Löwenberg, painter László Fülöp, Elek, Laub, (1869–1937), painter Lajos Lenkei, painter Eugen Lipković Lipi (1872–1948), painter and sculptor Ede Telcs (1872–1948), painter Artúr Schiffer (1872–1948), sculptor Boriska Spitzer-Sinkó (1872–1948), graphic designer István Zádor (1882–1963), designer and painter Imre Reiner, painter Piri Jarden-Levinger (Kisač, 1915; lives in Israel), painter Eva Fischer, painter László Szilasi (Subotica, 1925; lives in Israel), painter Dan Rajzinger (Kanjiza, 1934; lives in Israel), Ichak Tarkay (Subotica 1935; lives in Israel), Tamara Mirković (Novi Sad, 1972; lives in Israel), sculptor Olga Ungar (Novi Sad, 1975; lives in Israel), painter Gabrijela Hajzler (Novi Sad, 1978), and Cecilija Hajzler.

Klára Geréb studied painting and graphic art in Vienna and Paris. She lived in Subotica from 1927. She produced paintings, graphics and illustrations. She mainly did academic landscapes. She was murdered in Auschwitz in 1944.

Mihály Kara-Krón was born in Bžezani. He studied in Budapest. He lived in Novi Sad between 1929 and 1938. He made figures and reliefs for building decorations, busts and public monuments. A sculpture above the entrance to the building *Kora hleba* in Novi Sad was produced by him. He made graphics in the late Secessionist style (*Lithography I – IV*). He moved to Israel before the beginning of World War II.

Sándor Gedeon was born in the Czech Republic. He moved to Veliki Bečkerek in 1905, where he worked as an art teacher for a while. Between 1925 and 1934 he lived in the USA, where he worked in a silk printing workshop. Upon his return to Veliki Bečkerek he founded a workshop for printing silk, where he worked from 1934 until 1938. He worked with painter K. Pfeiffer on the design for silk printing. During World War II he disappeared.

Modernist sign – the case of painter and designer Imre Reiner (Serbian edition, p.80)

Imre Reiner¹²⁷ (1900-1987) was born in Vršac. He lived in Timișoara, Zaladni, and later in Frankfurt, Stuttgart, Paris,

121 Pavle Šosberger, "Položaj jevrejske zajednice u Vojvodini kroz vekove", from: *Jevreji u Vojvodini: kratak pregled istorije vojvodanskih Jevreja*, Prometej, Novi Sad, 1998, pp. 25–26.

122 Dragoljub Čolić, "Sinagoga u Zrenjaninu", from: *Zbornik 4 – Studije, arhivska i memoarska građa o Jevrejima Jugoslavije*, Jewish historical museum, Belgrade, 1979, pp. 199–213; and Živomir Simović, "Na razmeđu vekova – spomenik visokog domašaja stila secesije – Povodom osamdesetogodišnjice podizanja sinagoge u Subotici", *Zbornik 5 – Studije, arhivska i memoarska građa o istoriji subotičkih Jevreja*, Jewish Historical Museum, Belgrade, 1987, pp. 227–230.

123 See, for instance: Mirko Vajcenfeld, "Jevrejsko groblje u Subotici", iz: *Zbornik 5 – Studije, arhivska i memoarska građa o istoriji subotičkih Jevreja*, Jewish Historical Museum, Belgrade, 1987, pp. 209–212.

124 Bela Duranci, "Subotička sinagoga", from: *Arhitektura secesije u Vojvodini*, Grafo-prodakt, Subotica, 2005, pp. 42–45.

125 Pavle Šosberger, "Slikari i vajari", from: *Jevreji u Vojvodini: kratak pregled istorije vojvodanskih Jevreja*, Prometej, Novi Sad, 1998, pp. 80–81.

126 Mirjam Rajner, "Likovni umetnici i njihova dela U voljenoj zemlji – antologija useljenika iz bivše Jugoslavije u Izraelu", <http://www.makabijada.com/antologija-likovno.htm>.

127 A detailed study on Imre Reiner was written by Nikola Račić from Vršac.

London, New York, and Chicago, only to settle down in the Swiss town of Ruvigliana near Lugano, where he stayed until his death. He came from a Jewish culture of Banat. He was a painter, a graphic designer, a sculptor, a writer of the esthetical, theoretical and pedagogic essays on typography and xylography. He learned engraving and sculpting in the family circle. For a while he stayed in the Transylvanian town of Zalatne, where he studied sculpture under Professor István Ferenci until 1918. He enrolled into the National Art Academy in Budapest, but soon, in 1920, transferred to the study of painting and graphics in Kunstgewerbeschule in Frankfurt. He started studying at the Applied Arts Academy in Stuttgart from 1921. He studied with Professor Ernest Schneidler (1882-1956), a graphics design, typography and book design specialist. Reiner worked as a painter, typographer and graphic artist during the 1920s. He was close to the late expressionist expression and iconography of new objectivity – for instance, graphics the piece *Hunger*. Publishing house *Juniperus Presse* from Stuttgart published his first illustrations of literary texts.¹²⁸ His first exhibition was held in *Schaller* gallery in Stuttgart in 1921. Some of his artwork was introduced by the painter Oscar Schlemmer (1888-1941) to Paul Klee (1879-1940). The meeting between Klee and Reiner took place on 7th July 1923 in Weimar. Reiner published a transcript of that conversation many decades later.¹²⁹ Reiner was also influenced by a lecture of Indian scholar and writer Rabindranath Tagore (1861-1941) in Paris, in 1930. Reiner lived in the USA from 1923 until 1925. During the following two years he continued with his art study at the Academy in Stuttgart. For a while, he worked as a designer in the *Mercedes* car company. He designed his first alphabet, called “Meridian”, in 1929, and the Geber Company purchased the royalties. For political reasons, he moved to Paris in 1930. It is there that he designed the “Corvinus” alphabet for the Bauersche Giesserei Company from Frankfurt. The “Corvinus” alphabet received international acknowledgement and fame, and was realized in six different modes between 1932 and 1935. He made the first version of the “Symphonia” alphabet in 1932. He presented the “Gothic” type of letters in 1933. He exhibited paintings in French galleries Zak (1930), A.L.P. (1931) and De l’Art Contemporain (1933). He settled down with his wife Hedwig Bauer in the town of Ruvilianne near Lugano. In Ruvigliana, he continued to paint and to explore new possibilities in graphic art, literary works illustrations and book design. His letter types were censored in Nazi Germany. He worked in London between 1937 and 1939. He collaborated with the Monotype Corporation Limited from

London. This company bought his “Matura” alphabet in 1939. Two more, successfully designed and accepted alphabets followed between 1937 and 1938: “Floride” – for Deberny&Peignot from Paris (1939) and “Figaro” – for Monotype Corporation Limited from London (1940). Almost all influential graphic and publishing houses in Europe during the 1950s wanted to have in their program at least one of Reiner’s alphabets. During that period he designed several alphabets: “Reiner script”, “Reiner black”, “Mustang”, “Bazaar”, “London script”, “Mercurius”, “Pepita” and “Contact”.¹³⁰ In Paris, he worked for UNESCO’s department of culture, where he was an editor of the *International Art Review*, for which he also handled graphic design since 1950. He had numerous exhibitions: Antwerp (Royal de Beaux-Arts museum, 1948), Philadelphia (Print-Club, 1949), Paris (A. Loewy gallery, 1950), Hamburg (Dr. A. Hauswedell gallery, 1952), Dortmund (Ostwall museum, 1953), Sao Paulo (Museum de Arte, 1954), Chicago (Apprentice-House, 1956), San Francisco, Milan, etc. Because of health problems, Imre Reiner stopped traveling and creating art in 1982. He passed away in Lugano on 21st August 1987.

Reiner’s graphics and painting work¹³¹ underwent a long period of evolution – from expressionist Figuration (series *Persone stanche*, 1921) to the abstract lyrical Abstraction based on the research of pictorial potential of a visual sign (*Le Jardin*, 1931; *Remember*, 1940; *Iris*, 1947; *Cesrev*, 1958-1961; *Ohne Titel – die Rosskastanie*, 1956; *Aus Kreta*, 1960; *Ohne Titel*, 1964). After World War II he established a developed and sophisticated lyrical-semiotic expression close to the international Abstraction Lyrique.

Abstraction Lyrique, L’Art Informel and Existential Figuration – Eva Fischer (Serbian edition, p.84)

Painter Eva Fischer¹³² (1920) was born in Daruvar, Croatia. She was born into a rabbi’s family. Her father Dr. Leopold Fischer was an expert interpreter of *Talmud*. She lived in Yugoslavia until 1941, with short visits to Hungary, Czechoslovakia and Romania. She grew up in Vršac between 1931 and 1936, where she went to high school. She studied Art Academy in Lyons just before World War II. She was in Belgrade in November 1941 when she escaped to Spaleto, Italy, via Albania. She was interned in Valengrand from 1941 to 1943. She was hiding in Bologna in 1944 and 1945. Most of her family disappeared in

128 Maksim Gorki, *Die Geschichte eines Verbrechens*, Juniperus Presse, Stuttgart, Julius Hofmann Verlag, 1922; Byblical texts: *Isaacs Segen über Jakob und Esau*, Juniper Presse, Stuttgart, 1921; Homer, *Ilias. Vierundzwanzigster Gesang*, Juniperus Presse, Stuttgart, Julius Hofmann Verlag, 1923.

129 Mogens Greve-Olsen, *Imre Reiner – Samtale i Weimar, Sommeren 1923*, Roskilde, Kopenhagen 1976.

130 Mogens Greve-Olsen, *Imre Reiner – Skriftkunstner, Typografiker, Forfatter, Maler og Grafiker*, 1975.

131 *Imre Reiner*, Museo D’Arte, Mendrisio, 1986; Franco Zambelloni, *Il Pittore Travestito – Undici disegni di Imre Reiner*, Giampiero Casagrande editore, Lugano, 1994; Imre Reiner, *Werke von 1926–1979*, Eberhart Auktionen, Zollikon, 1997.

132 Mirjana Mareš, “Eva Fišer”, from the *Eva Fischer* catalogue, National Museum, Vršac, 1970; Nikola Račić, “Eva Fišer, slikarka”, a manuscript.

concentration camps during World War II. She has been living in Rome since 1946. She started exhibiting her work in 1947. She worked within the art group “Via Margutta”. She was close to painters Mario Mafai (1902-1965) and Renato Guttuso (1911-1987), and to Giorgio de Chirico (1888-1967), Marc Chagall, Luchino Visconti (1906-1976). She worked for a while in the studio of Juan Mordò in Madrid. She worked with the London *Lefevre Gallery*; she made stained glass¹³³ for the Jewish Museum in Rome, and participated in numerous exhibitions in the USA. She exhibited her work in the Cultural Center in Belgrade and the National Museum in Vršac in 1970. The Italian movie composer Ennio Morricone (1928) composed music after her paintings, *A Eva Fischer, Pittore* (1989).

The painting work of Eva Fischer is realized within the range starting from existential Figuration (*Taled*, 1947; *Men-zogna e memoria no. 1*, 1952) across Abstraction Lyrique and L'Art Informel¹³⁴ (*Mura no.6*, 1956) to Existential Figuration or the memory art¹³⁵ with references to the postmodern Eclecticism (... *ombre infinite di scarpe*, 1990; *Introspezione*, 1996 and *Alberto che lege nella sua stanza*, 1997). Her painting work is to a great extent representable as a modernist derivation of the Jewish religious and national identity (*Benedizione, bozzetto*, probably 1981). On the other hand, the paintings are guided by the memory of the ordeal of the Jewish people in World War II.¹³⁶ The paintings suggest the sublimeness and the secret of the sacrifice, that is, the psychological trauma of the survivor. The relationship of Figuration and Abstraction is resolved by a dramatic use of action-movement, which underlines existential crises, the darkness of the incomprehensible evil, traumatic memories and a sort of a wonderful mixture of suffering and delight.

Memorial sculpture – the case of Nándor Glíd (p.86)

Nándor Glíd¹³⁷ was born into a Jewish family in Subotica. He studied type founding and sculpting in Subotica and Budapest. During World War II he lost almost all members of his family in Nazi camps. Nándor Glíd joined the national fight for liberation in 1944. He started going to the Applied Arts School in Belgrade in October 1945. During his schooling he won the first prize for the portrait *Student* in a national level contest in

1948. He graduated from the Applied Arts Academy in 1951. He went on a two-month study visit to Paris in 1953. He was a teacher and a professor at the Faculty for Applied Arts in Belgrade from 1974.

During the early stage of his work he made sculptural portraits and figures (*Little Girl's Portrait*, 1953). He worked in found materials, making assembly memorial sculptures. He created ornamental objects for the decoration of the Revolutionary Museum in Sarajevo and Novi Sad from old and trophy weapons. He produced a memorial dedicated to the Yugoslavs who perished in Mauthausen concentration camp in Austria: *Mauthausen I* (a sketch), 1957; *Mauthausen II* (in bronze), 1958; *Mauthausen III* (in bronze), 1960. He made the memorial for the victims of the Dachau¹³⁸ concentration camp (1959-1968). A memorial dedicated to the memory of the concentration camp victims, similar to the one in Dachau, was placed in the memorial complex *Yad Vashem*¹³⁹ in Jerusalem in 1997. Models and variants of the Mauthausen memorial were done in a specific vitality of a dynamic and expressive sculptural¹⁴⁰ line, characteristic of the Abstraction Lyrique and existentialist sculptures of Alberto Giacometti (1901-1966). The heroic-tragic monumentality is not in focus as much as the evocativeness of the memories and associations in connection with the horrors of individual and collective suffering, and the memory of the frailty of the close human body/life. In these works what is shown is the specific high-modernist sculpture universality of the individual and experienced plight of the Jewish people. Glid's sculpture exhibits in Dachau and Jerusalem are introduced in the ambient articulation of the horizontal memorial plastics.

He erected a great number of public and memorial sculptures all across Yugoslavia, as well as the monumental sculptures to commemorate the victims of Nazism (Trebinje, 1953; *Table for One*, Kragujevac, 1980; *Phoenix* – memorial to the Jews of Split, at the Jewish cemetery, 1973). His significant memorials in Vojvodina are: *The Ballad of the Hanged* (Lazar Nešić Square, Subotica 1967) and *Freedom (Fire Bird)* (Majšanski Road, Subotica, 1980). After his death, a sculpture *Menorah in flame 2* was placed in Thessaloniki, as a memorial for the Thessaly victims of the holocaust. Besides sculpture (*Crystal night*, 1988), he also did drawings and graphics (series of monotypes *Holocaust*, 1985-1986) with the suffering of the Jewish people as the subject matter. His style in sculptures was guided by the existentially motivated and vitally set expression

133 *Le Vetrate Di Eva Fischer – Nel Tempio Israelitico di Roma*, Comunità Isrealitica di Roma, Roma, 1981.

134 Eva Fischer & Ennio Morricone, *Imagini e Suoni*, Superfici, Roma, 1992.

135 Jacopo Recupero, *Eva Fischer – 39 engravings and 21 lithographs*, CIDAC, Rome, 1978; Diego Collovini, “Il labirinto della memoria”, from: *Eva Fischer*, Linead d'ombra Libri, Conegliano, 1999, pp. 21–23.

136 *Eva Fischer – Labirinti della Memoria – opere dal 1946 al 1989*, Istituto Italiano di Cultura Tel Aviv and Yad Vashem – Art Museum – Jerusalem, 1987.

137 Ana Baranji (ed.), *Nandor Glid*, City Museum, Subotica, 1990.

138 Kathrin Hoffmann-Curtius, Susan Nurmi-Schomers, “Memorials for the Dachau Concentration Camp”, *Oxford Art Journal*, Vol. 21, No. 2, 1998, pp. 23–44.

139 *Yad Vashem* is a memorial complex (museum, memorials, research and educational centers) dedicated to the persecution of the Jewish people in the Nazi era. It was opened in Har HaZikaron (Mount of Memory) in Jerusalem in 1953.

140 Stojan Čelić, “Nandor Glid”, *Umetnost*, No. 18–19, Belgrade, 1969, pp. 78–83.

with rhythmic compositions that showed the darkness of the human and national tragedy of the Jewish people in World War II. Characteristically, his works arise from the context of the Yugoslav socialist Realism (participation at the competition for the memorial to Marx and Engels, 1955; *The Bust of Josip Broz*, 1970) and socialist high Modernism, but were realized, more closely, by the memorial relation to the suffering of the Jews in the era of Nazism. This duality significantly determines his work – it is prone to dual identification, as a Yugoslav socialist and as Jewish memorial work.

Croatian society, culture, art and Vojvodina during the 20th century (Serbian edition, p.88)

Croatian cultural politics, in all its generic processes, from Croatian autonomies in Austro-Hungary, over the establishment of the *Croatian Duchy* in the Kingdom of Yugoslavia and the Independent State of Croatia (ISC) during World War II, to the Socialist Republic of Croatia and the independent Republic of Croatia, was, during the 20th century, socially, culturally and politically oriented towards Vojvodina and the Croatian national community in Vojvodina. Baranja was an area of “conflicts” between the Serbian and the Croatian hegemony policies, from Austro-Hungary, over the Baranja Republic and then the militant and war politics of ISC, to post-social wars and interventions in the 1990s.

At the turn of the 20th century, there were painters that stood out of the Bunjevac or the Bunjevac-Croatian culture who were striving towards the modern European expression, namely: Stipan Kopilović (1877-1924) and Jelena Čović (1879-1961). For instance, Jelena Čović¹⁴¹ was born into a clerk family in Subotica. She began her education in 1900 with the academic realist painter Gusztáv Brandl Kőszegi (1862-1908) in Šopron. City officials awarded her with a scholarship after her first solo exhibition in the “Pešta” hotel lobby in Subotica in 1902. She continues her education in Royal Women’s Art School in Budapest in 1902, with Lajos Deák Ébner (1870-1911) and László Hegedűs (1870-1911). She then moved to Anton Ažbe’s school (1862-1905) in Munich in 1903. The press from Subotica followed her artwork. She held an art class on Lake Palić during the summer of 1904. That is when she faced painting in nature. During her stay in Nagybanya she learned the *language* of Impressionism, probably around 1906. That is when *The Woman on the Beach* (1904), her characteristic impressionist work, was created. In Subotica, she opened a course in painting and applied arts. Upon the invitation of Gabriella Vermes, a

wealthy woman from Subotica, she left for Kőszeg, near Šopron in 1907, where she lived until 1914. She taught at the women’s college, held private lessons and traveled with Vermes, visiting European museums (Berlin, Paris). During the restoration of the Franciscan monastery in Subotica, she gave the altar pilla *Heart of Jesus* to the St. Michael’s church. She taught art at the Male civic school, female crafts school and the crafts and trade school.

At the level of art, one can speak of the influences from Zagreb, as a cultural and educational center (*Art and Trade College*, and later *The Royal Academy of Art and Trade*), on the art practices in Vojvodina during the first half of the 20th century. Numerous artists from Vojvodina were educated and worked in Zagreb, for instance Sava Šumanović, Ivan Tabković, Milan Butozan, Franja Radočaj, Milenko Gjurić, Ivan Jakobčić, etc. A number of painters (Stevan Čalić, Milan Konjović) were educated in Prague at the Art Academy with Vlaho Bukovac.¹⁴² What could be especially emphasized are the relations between Serbian, Vojvodina and Croatian culture through Avant-garde experiments and actions of a Dadaist Dragan Aleksić, held in towns in Slavonia (Osijek, Vinkovci) and Vojvodina (Novi Sad, Subotica). Aleksić’s concept of a “Yugo-Dada” was focused towards advertising and spreading Dada activities in the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes. A special *phenomenon* was the cooperation of the zenithist Ljubomir Micić with Hungarian activists gathered around Lajos Kassák (1887-1967) in Budapest and Vienna, and with the Dadaists of Subotica. The relationship of the Micić Zenithism with the Hungarian Kassák activism was significant because of the important and obsessive concepts for the development of zenithism. Furthermore, artists (Mihailo Petrov), and writers (Miloš Crnjanski, Boško Tokin), who were born in, or were in some other way connected with Vojvodina, worked in Micić’s magazine *Zenith*, at the time of its Zagreb editions.

Milenko Gjurić¹⁴³ (Zemun, 1894 – Zagreb, 1945) was a graphic artist, painter and professor. He studied at the Royal National Trade School in Zagreb from 1906 until 1910. He went to the Art School in Zagreb between 1912 and 1916, which was transformed into the *Temporary Art and Trade Art College* (1907). He was in the class of professor Mentio Clement Crnčić. He also studied at the Academy in Prague between 1916 and 1918. He made graphics (copper engraving and wood carving), easel and wall painting. He started the *Grafička umet-*

141 Olga Kovačev Ninkov, “Slikarstvo Jelene Čović (1879–1951)”, *Klasije naših ravni*, No. 3–4, Subotica, 2002.

142 *Jugoslovenski umetnici – Praški đaci 1900–1939*, Museum of Modern Art, Belgrade, 1987.

143 A.C. de Schlemmer, “Profil d’artisti”, *Umjetnost*, almanah za likovnu umjetnost, Zagreb, November 1925, pp. 5; “Đurić Milenko”, *Enciklopedija likovnih umjetnosti*, Vol. 2, Lexicography bureau FPRY, Zagreb, 1962, pp. 165; and “Gjurić (Đurić) Milenko D”, *Likovna enciklopedija Jugoslavije*, Vol. 1, YLC Miroslav Krleža, Zagreb, 1984, pp. 452; and Miodrag B. Protić (ed.), *Jugoslovenska grafika 1900–1950*, Museum of Modern Art, Belgrade, 1978, pp. 29, 51, 245–247.

nost magazine. It was the first magazine about agraphic art in Croatia.¹⁴⁴ Under the name of *Grafička umetnost*, it published three catalogs of graphics of domestic and Czech artists during 1919, 1920 and 1921. *Grafička umetnost* magazine changed its name into *Art*. Gjurić was advocating for the traditional and the modern graphics, with regards to the technique and the media. He published a study *Yugoslav copper engravers from the 16th century until the present-day*. In his early graphic works from 1917, on which he experimented with the phenomenon of the “clear and slight visibility”¹⁴⁵ (*Prague Railway Station* from 1917, or *The Bell Foundry* from 1922), he was close to the graphic solutions of Milan Uzelac and Vilko Gecan. When subject matter is concerned, he was close to the expressive and social art, although his political and ethical positions come from Christianity. He did a series of graphics: *The Bible* (1922), *Old Zagreb* (1924), *Labor* (1937), etc. The graphics series *Labor* is considered his most important graphics project. The representation of human labor and social professions and human labor, that is, social relations (*Manifestations*, wood carving, 1937) was achieved in the context of social right-wing and Christian art of the 1920s and 1930s.¹⁴⁶ He was advocating for the traditional technical and esthetic producing values in graphic art, and only worked in wood carving and copper engraving. He dedicated his work to religious painting – from painting icons and iconostasis to easel and wall painting. He was also involved in restoration. He published a book *Slikarske tehnike u crkvenoj umetnosti*¹⁴⁷ (1936). He participated in religious art exhibitions (Rome, 1930, 1934). His religious paintings were in the rational and traditional style of the “new-byzantine” painting. He had exhibitions in Sremska Mitrovica (1917), Zagreb (1921), Belgrade (1922), Zemun, Subotica, Senta (1933), Osijek (1923, 1937), Rome (1924, 1938). He was an active and renowned painter and graphic artist in the Independent State of Croatia.¹⁴⁸

Sava Šumanović (Vinkovci, 1896 – Sremska Mitrovica, 1942)¹⁴⁹, as a student of the real high school in Zemun, took painting lessons with Professor Isidor Jung¹⁵⁰. He started going to the *Faculty for Art and Trade* in Zagreb in 1914. The

time when Šumanović went to this institution coincided with World War I (from 1914 to 1918). During his first year of university he studied in the class of Professor Oton Iveković. He lived with his uncle at the corner of Zrinjevac and Praška Street. He became friends with his fellow students: Đura Tiljak, Marijana Trepšea, Tomislav Sabljak, Milan Uzelac, Juhn, Milan Steiner, Antonija Košćević and others.¹⁵¹ Milan Steiner explained to him the directions of the contemporary German art and painting – he pointed him in the direction of the *Der Sturm* magazine, and Vasily Kandinsky's book *Über das Geistige in der Kunst*¹⁵² (1914). After the first year of study, he was assigned to the class of Professor Clement Crnčić. During that time he mainly did landscapes. He exhibited his work in 1918 and 1919 at the *Christmas Exhibition* at “Urlich” in Zagreb, then at the 6th *Exhibition of the Spring Salon* and the exhibition of the Yugoslav art in Paris (*Exposition des Artistes Yougoslavie*, Petit Palais de la Ville de Paris). The artist, critic, and translator Antun Branko Šimić became friends with Šumanović over the shared fascination of the new and modern. Sava Šumanović traveled from Zagreb to Paris in September 1920. He came back to Zagreb and stayed there between 1922 and 1925, only to travel to Paris again in the autumn of 1925. Sava Šumanović was arrested on 28th August 1942 in his family home in Šid. The arrest was conducted by the police forces of the ISC. He was executed along with other 150 hostages in Sremska Mitrovica on August 29th or 30th 1942. He was buried in one of the mass graves.

A number of artists who were born in Croatian communities in Vojvodina or lived during a period of time in Vojvodina developed a greater part of their art practices in Zagreb or within Croatian culture: Kamilo Tompa (Sombor 1903 – Zagreb 1989), Milan Butozan (Pančevo, 1930), Tomislav Gotovac¹⁵³ (Sombor, 1937), Vladimir Mattioni,¹⁵⁴ (1943), Andreja Kulunčić¹⁵⁵ (Subotica, 1968). Dimitrije Mića Bašičević¹⁵⁶ – Mangelos (Šid, 1921 – Zagreb, 1987),¹⁵⁷ who came from a Serbian community in Vojvodina, worked – as a critic, art historian, director of the Museum of Naive Art, a member of the *Gorgona* group,¹⁵⁷ manager of the Studio of the Gallery of Contemporary Art, an artist – in Zagreb, most of his life. Ankica Oprešnik (Vitez, 1919 – Novi Sad, 2005) was a graphic artist and a painter who was educated in Belgrade during the 1940s. She lived with her husband, Vojvodina painter Milan

144 Milenko D. Gjućić, “O grafičkoj umjetnosti”, *Grafička revija*, Zagreb, June 1937, pp. 43–44; Frano Dulibić, “Prvi hrvatski časopis posvećen grafici – Milenko D. Gjurić i grafička umjetnost (1920–1921)”, *Grafika*, No. 3.2, Zagreb, 2004.

145 Mirela Ramljak Purgar, “Aspekti grafičkog izraza Milenka Gjurića u kontekstu njegovog vremena”, from: *Radovi Instituta za povijest umjetnosti*, Institute for the history of art, Zagreb, 2006, pp. 197.

146 “Retrospektivna izložba profesora Milenka D. Đurića akademskog slikara i grafičara”, *Vojvođanski grafičar*, No. 15, Novi Sad, 1941, pp. 4–5.

147 *Slikarske tehnike u crkvenoj umetnosti* – Painting techniques in religious art.

148 Arturo Lancellotti, “Gjurić Milenko – Hrvatski slikar i urezivač”, *Rivista Italo Croata*, Fiuma, 1943, pp. 97–99.

149 Dimitrije Bašičević, *Sava Šumanović – život i umetnost* (first edition: 1960), Vojina Bašičevića publishing, Novi Sad, 1997.

150 Isidor (Iso) Jung was born in Valpovo. Date of birth is unknown. He taught drawing in a high school in Zemun. He had exhibitions in Zemun (1910, 1921), Vinkovci (1920), Osijek (1910, 1920, 1924, 1926, 1927, 1929, 1950). He lived and worked in Osijek.

151 Milan Steiner 1894–1918, Art pavillion, Zagreb, 1987.

152 *Über das Geistige in der Kunst* – On the spiritual in art

153 Aleksandar Batista Ilić, D. Nenadić (eds.), *Tomislav Gotovac*, Croatian Film Association and the Museum of Contemporary Art, Zagreb, 2003.

154 *Verbumprogramkatalog*, Contemporary Visual Arts Gallery, Novi Sad, 1995.

155 Andreja Kulunčić, *Mjesto pod suncem*, Gallery Nova, Zagreb, 2006.

156 Branka Stipančić (ed.), *Dimitrije Bašičević Mangelos*, Museum of Contemporary Art, Zagreb, 1990.

157 Nena Dimitrijević (ed.), *Gorgona*, Gallery of the City of Zagreb, Zagreb, 1977.

Kerc in Novi Sad. Bogomil Kalavaris (Perlez, 1924) is one of the most important painters of the Vojvodina landscape. He has been living and working in Istra since 1982. Following this, Croatian and Bunjevac artists who lived and worked in Vojvodina were presented at the exhibition *Croatian Artists in Vojvodina*: Stipan Kopilović, Jelena Čović, Ivan Balažević, Stipan Šabić, Katarina Tonković–Marijanski, Ivica Kovačić, Vera Đanke, Josip Skenderović Aga, Šime Peić, Cecilija Milanković, Rudolf Brkić, Jasmina Vidaković–Jovančić, Laura Peić, Spartaka Dulić, Robert Tilly, Dragan Rumenčić, Ivan Jandrić, Irena Tođeraš and Stevan Andrašić, and the artists working in straw Jozefina Skenderović, Marija Dulić, Ana Milodanović and others.¹⁵⁸

The case of Ivan Tabaković (Serbian edition, p.93)

Ivan Tabaković¹⁵⁹ (1898–1977) was born in Arad. He studied painting at the Art Academy in Budapest in 1917 and the Royal Academy of Art and Trade in Zagreb (1919–1924) under the Professors Maximilian Vanka and Ljuba Babić. He also studied at the Academy in Munich with Becher Gundal and at Hans Hofmann's private school, during 1922 and 1923. After a short stay in Paris in 1925, he returned to Zagreb where he ran an art school with Oton Postružnik. Together they organized the *Grotesque* exhibition (1926).¹⁶⁰ He returned to Novi Sad in 1930, where he stayed until 1938, with brief visits to Paris in 1934 and 1935. He started working as a teacher in the *Applied Art School* in 1938.

He was one of the founders of the *Zemlja* group¹⁶¹ in Zagreb in 1929. The intention to create an engaged artistic group appeared simultaneously with several artists – in Zagreb with Ivan Tabaković and Oton Postružnik, and with Krsta Hegedušić and Leo Junek in Paris. Antun Augustinčić, Krsto Hegedušić, Drago Ibler, Omer Mujadžić, Kamilo Ružička and Ivan Tabaković participated in the first session of the preparatory committee.¹⁶² The influence of the Weimer *new objectivity* as a critique and an engaged painting practice could be recognized in the work of the *Zemlja* group during the 1930s. With regards to the subject matter, what took place was the

establishing of the critical social and class, and with regards to the manner of presentation, of the post-Expressionist painting, with specific relation towards the naïve (folklore) painting. According to the manifesto written by Drago Ibler in 1929, the goal of the *Zemlja* group was to create an independent painting expression. The goal was to be achieved by fighting the fashions from abroad, by raising the general painting level in the culture and by fighting art itself and the modernist decadence.¹⁶³ The painting of the *Zemlja* group is a political painting that by means of a figurative form emphasizes and rhetorically decomposes critical attitudes of authors. Characteristic of the movement are the following works: *Justitia* (1936) by Krsto Hegedušić, *A Drunken Carriage* (1935) by Marijana Detonija and *Genius* (1929) by Ivan Tabaković. *Zemlja* group had several exhibitions (Zagreb, 1929; Paris and Zagreb, 1931). At the third exhibition, works of peasant-painters were in focus, after which Hegedušić founded the *Hlebina School* in 1931.

Tabaković's *Genius* stands quite separately in his opus, but in the general practice of the painting productions that co-participated in the Post-Avant-garde *re-establishment of order*.

In that sense, the frame of the post-cubist and expressionist (form or color) directions and tendencies is especially incompatible and practically unusable. The mental origin of *Genius* can be, in part, found in the period between 1926 and 1930, when Tabaković worked as a freelance illustrator at the Anatomy Institute of the Faculty of Medicine in Zagreb. The economic and political, and most certainly the art situation of the time, as well as the awareness that the material crisis unavoidably causes the spiritual crisis, the awareness of a man as a social, as well as a natural, biological being, all had their thematic outcome, first in the series of drawings from 1926–27, with the indicative title *Satirical anatomy of the human stupidity and misery* and then in the drawing exhibition *Grotesques*, which he organized together with Oton Postružnik in Zagreb. All of that, with the implicit conditionality of the creation of any artwork, determined by the artist's "motivation: tactic, artistic, ideological and psychological" (M. Porebski), and by the wider historical context of cultural, social and political circumstances, somehow reinforces the claim that this work is self-created and self-important. Also, all given factors represent a strong conceptual array from which *Genius* logically arose.¹⁶⁴

The painting *Genius* is at the same time a non-apologetic grotesque of the present world and a project of a critical attitude in painting and through painting as a manner of producing politically important function. On the other hand, *Genius* could be seen as a form of resistance of an eccentricity and fantasti-

158 The exhibition took place in the Klovićevi dvori Gallery in Zagreb, 1998. See: Andrija Anišić, "Aktualno – tjedan Hrvata iz Vojvodine u Zagrebu", *Zvonik* godina V No. 7 (45), Subotica, August 1998, <http://www.zvonik.org.yu/451/ZV07.html>.

159 Dragana Vranić (ed.), *Ivan Tabaković – Legat Rastislave Tabaković*, Museum of Modern Art, Belgrade, 1985; Lidija Merenik, *Ivan Tabaković*, Matica srpska Gallery, Novi Sad, 2004.

160 Ivanka Reberski, "Grotesque – prolog Zemlje (1926)", from: *Oton Postružnik*, Institute for the History of Art, Zagreb, 1987, pp. 23–28.

161 Josip Depolo, "Zemlja 1929–1935", from: Miodrag B. Protić (ed.), *1929–1950: Nadrealizam Postnadrealizam Socijalna umetnost Umetnost NOR-a Socijalistički realizam*, Museum of Modern Art, Belgrade, 1969, pp. 36–50.

162 Ivan Tabaković, "Prilozi za rešavanje naše ideologije" (25. februar 1929), from: Lidija Merenik, *Ivan Tabaković 1898–1977*, Matica srpska Gallery, Novi Sad, 2004, pp. 71–74.

163 Drago Ibler, "Program Udruženja umjetnika Zemlja" (22. V 1929), in: Josip Depolo, "Zemlja 1929–1935", from: Miodrag B. Protić (ed.), *1929–1950: Nadrealizam Postnadrealizam Socijalna umetnost Umetnost NOR-a Socijalistički realizam*, Museum of Modern Art, Belgrade, 1969, pp. 38.

164 Suzana Vuksanović Soleša, "Fenomen pomeranja granica stvarnosti i umetnosti do granica saznanja i tajni (Ivan Tabaković: *Genius*)", from: Dragomir Ugren (ed.), *Centralnoevropski aspekti vojvodanskih avangardi 1920–2000. ... Granični fenomeni, fenomeni granica*, Museum of Contemporary Painting, Novi Sad, 2002, pp. 26–29.

cally oriented artist to the transparent political pragmatism of showing “reality” in the productions of the *Zemlja* group.

Tabaković took part in an important Zagreb-based publication *Hrvatska grafika danas 1936*¹⁶⁵ (*Croatian graphic art today 1936*), which was published under the “Ars” edition, with Zdenko Vojnović as the editor-in-chief. The publication *Hrvatska grafika danas 1936* appeared in the context of Croatian Modernism (Ljubo Babić) in the range of expressionists (Vilko Gecan, Sergej Glumac), and the members of the *Zemlja* group (Oton Postružnik, Marija Detoni) to the peasant-painters (Krsto Hegedušić). Ivan Tabaković published two works *Still life* and *Paris*¹⁶⁶ as the only artist from Croatia. His works are the characteristic intimate drawings created after collaboration with the *Zemlja* group. The following identification line about Tabaković’s works stands in the biographical section: “He applied planted trees of the Parisian school to Vojvodina motifs.”¹⁶⁷

Serbian society, culture and art in Vojvodina (p.95)

When one talks about Serbian¹⁶⁸ art in Vojvodina – what becomes noticeable is the complex process of reception of the national Austro-German and Hungarian modernity that enabled a turn from church art, as a national-identity art in the 18th and the early 19th century, towards civic art¹⁶⁹ (genre scenes, and portraits, historically-allegoric and religious painting). Serbian art, as a “national social practice”¹⁷⁰ in Vojvodina, underwent a series of characteristic stages. One of the first important projections of Serbian art in Vojvodina, in the context of art history, was conducted through the work of Veljko Petrović and Milan Kašanin *Serbian art in Vojvodina from the age of the despot to unification*.¹⁷¹ This book projected a traditional concept of the continuity in the development of the Serbian art within Austro-Hungary and Hungary. Serbian art in Vojvodina began with the producing of national, religious and class representations with art within a culture in the age of the Austrian and Austro-Hungarian empire during the

18th, 19th and the first decades of the 20th century.¹⁷² The names of the first painters that started to stand out include Todor Ilić Češljarić, Georg Tenecki, Jakov Orfelin, Arsa Teodorović, Pavle Đurković, Georgije Bakalović, Dimitrije Avramović, Konstantin Danil, Konstantin Arsenović, Ljubomir Aleksandrović, Katarina Ivanović, Nikola Aleksić, Jovan Popović, Pavle Simić, Đura Jakšić, Adam Stefanović, Novak Radonić, Stevan Todorović, Đorđe Krstić, Uroš Predić and others. One of the leading institutions for the projection of the idea of “Serbian art in Vojvodina” was certainly Matica srpska (established in 1826), and the Matica srpska Gallery (established in 1847). The Matica srpska Museum was founded in 1847. In the period between 1847 and 1933 collections of the museum were formed. The museum and gallery were open for the public between 1933 and 1947. Temporary director of the museum was Franja Malin, and the members who participated in the creation of the museum’s statute were: Aleksandar Moč, Sava Stojković, Nikola Milutinović, Franja Malin and Gliša Mirković.¹⁷³ The gallery was being developed as a separate department of Matica srpska from 1947 until 1958, when it began functioning independently.

Showing Serbian national identity in painting and sculpture is a problem on its own. Visual representation of the civic and national political public, that is, of marked identity as a “European political identity” was done as early as in the graphics of Pavle Simić and Jozef A. Bauer’s *Serbian National Assembly in Sremski Karlovci on May 1st 1948* (1863). The national and civic approach to democratic gatherings is confronted with the concept of national “assembliness”, which is the idea of being gathered into an organic democratic whole of the “assembly”. Besides this seemingly documentary scene, what is also characteristic is a neo-classical model of Academic Realism/Romanticism seen in the paintings of Paja Jovanović, for instance *Proclamation of Dušan’s Law – The Coronation of Emperor Dušan* (around 1900). Anastas Bocarić, with the painting *Prince Marko and the Fairy – From darkness into light* (1910-13), developed a grotesque allegorical character of a *people’s hero* by anticipating popular and populist genre of presenting national mythology and national mythological characters in “graphic media”. On the other hand, Đorđe Jovanović¹⁷⁴, with his monumental patriotic and allegorical neo-classical sculptures, marked the model of representing Serbian national identity as a European one (*Grand Serbia*, 1901). Nation is shown as a personified figure of a victorious woman, having all of the attributes of glory,

165 *Hrvatska grafika danas 1936*, Ars, Zagreb, 1936.

166 Ivan Tabaković, “*Still life*” and “*Paris*”, from: *Hrvatska grafika danas 1936*, Ars, Zagreb, 1936, illustration XXXIV and pp. 21.

167 “Biografske notice”, from: *Hrvatska grafika danas 1936*, Ars, Zagreb, 1936, pp. 22.

168 Miodrag B. Protić, *Srpsko slikarstvo XX veka*, I, II, Nolit, Belgrade, 1970; Lazar Trifunović, *Srpsko slikarstvo 1900–1950*, Nolit, Belgrade, 1973; and the monograph *Matica srpska Gallery*, Matica srpska, Novi Sad, 2001.

169 Nenad Makuljević, *Umetnost i nacionalna ideja u XIX veku: sistem evropske i srpske vizuelne kulture u službi nacije, Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva*, Belgrade, 2006.

170 Dr. M. Petrović, “*Za nacionalni karakter Vojvodine*”, *Letopis Matice srpske* Vol. 314, No. 2, Novi Sad, 1927, pp. 161-163.

171 Veljko Petrović, Milan Kašanin, *Srpska umetnost u Vojvodini od doba despota do ujedinjenja*, Matica srpska, Novi Sad, 1927.

172 For instance: Aleksa Ivić, *Istorija Srba u Vojvodini od najstarijih vremena do osnivanja potisko-pomoriške granice (1703)*, Matica Srpska, Novi Sad, 1929.

173 Leposava Šelmić, “*Galerija Matice srpske*”, *Matica srpska Gallery*, Matica srpska, Novi Sad, 2001, 007, 082–083.

174 Miodrag Jovanović, *Đoka Jovanović 1861–1953*, Matica srpska Gallery, Novi Sad, 2006.

sublimity, dignity and power.¹⁷⁵ Given examples underline a wide symbolic field of visual productions of identification, and certainly, of dominant proposals for the derivation of a collective subject of Serbian Vojvodina, “Serbian self”, as a dominant subject in the multicultural society of Vojvodina.

What was, therefore, established was a derivation of class structuring of the Serbian¹⁷⁶ bourgeoisie identity by means of art practices between World Wars. Along with that, what also took place was a derivation of a macro-political project of “integrative Yugoslav quality”¹⁷⁷ as an artistic and architectural project during the constitution of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, and the Kingdom of Yugoslavia in the 1920s. Following this, an emancipatory modernist model of internationalization of Vojvodina art was established, above all, the model of high modernist emancipation of Serbian and Hungarian Modernism through Budapest, Vienna, Munich, Zagreb and Belgrade, during the 1920s and 1930s. Within the domination of modernist paradigms, there were several excess appearances that signified stepping out of the frame, or breaking up the continuity of the national culture, first and foremost in the Avant-garde practices of the 1920s, through connections and interactions with the Serbian (Belgrade), Croatian (Slavonia and Zagreb), and with the Hungarian (Budapest and Vienna) Avant-garde. There was a derivation of the international, and more specifically, pro-Yugoslav model of the critical social Realism of the 1930s and early 1940s, as well as a derivation of the projection apologetic socialist Realism from the late 1930s until the middle of the 1950s. After the break up with USSR in 1948, there was a derivation of a multi-cultural concept of Vojvodinian culture, with different national cultures being comparable and equal to each other, and with a certain dominance of the Serbian national identity, pulling Vojvodinian art “scenes” towards the Belgrade scene. Artists from Vojvodina started directing themselves towards Belgrade and the Belgrade articulation of modernity during the 1950s and 1960s. This process of redirection was threefold: firstly, through the leading role of the Belgrade Academy, and later, the Faculty of Art in an artistic modernist education¹⁷⁸, secondly, by establishing a strong and influential Serbian and Yugoslav exhibition scene in Belgrade, and thirdly, through the dominant role of the Belgrade institutions in international communication. The influence of Belgrade critics and art historians, namely

Miodrag B. Protić and Lazar Trifunović, was crucial in the derivation of the interpretative models of the Vojvodina socialist Modernism. With the establishment of the paradoxical and conflict situation, after 1989, there was a noticeable withdrawal of the Hungarian artists from the Vojvodinian art scene, and later on, the dominance of the “Serbian” paraimperial concept in traditional (painting, sculpture, architecture) art media and the establishment of the *new art practices* within the dynamics of globalism and global-local, or in other words, anti-global activisms.

This proposed schematics points to the dynamics within national art practices according to the models of Yugoslavity, internationality and globalism in 20th century art. A number of artists born in Vojvodina worked professionally in Belgrade. For instance, Uroš Predić (Orlovat, 1857-1953) was educated in Vienna. He worked in a number of towns in Vojvodina, lived in Novi Sad and Stari Bečej, and settled permanently in Belgrade in 1909. In his work, besides Paja Jovanović, he established the strongest relationship between the Austro-German late Romanticism, Exoticism and national Realism with modern Serbian art from Vojvodina. Predić’s educated and enlightened painting, almost in a Schiller-like manner, was devoted to the aesthetic education and upbringing (*Older brother teaches younger brother to stand on his head in the corner*, 1905).

Next, Zora Petrović (Dobrica in Banat, 1894 – Belgrade, 1962) became, during the 20th century, one of the most important painters of the Vojvodinian and Serbian Modernism. Her education in Budapest (1915-1918) and an early stay in Nagybanya (1918) redirected her work towards Modernism and expressive tendencies after Impressionism. Mihajlo S. Petrov (Belgrade, 1902-1983) lived in Novi Sad between 1926 and 1929. Several artists from Vojvodina collaborated in a Belgrade modernist group *Oblik*¹⁷⁹ (1926-1939): painter and graphic artist Árpád G. Balázs (member since 1931), architect Dragiša Brašovan (member since 1934), architect Nikola Dobrović (member since 1932), painter Petar Dobrović (member since 1926), Mladen Josić (exhibited during the first exhibition of the group in 1927), painter Milan Konjović (member since 1927), Zora Petrović (she was a member since 1927), Stanka Radonić-Lučev (member since 1930), Ivan Radović (member since 1927), Svetislav Strala (participated in all the exhibitions of the group), Milenko Šerban (participated in exhibitions IV to XVI), and Sava Šumanović (one of the founders of the group, did not exhibit in all exhibitions of the group). Group *Oblik* had a specific modernist function of creating a “moderate” or “high” modernist creative integrative platform in the area of the first Yugoslavia.

175 Compare: Uroš Predić, “Vajarski radovi akademika Đorđa Jovanovića”, Belgrade, 1933, pp. 6; and Nenad Makuljević, “Alegoričnost”, *Umetnost i nacionalna ideja u XIX veku: sistem evropske i srpske vizuelne kulture u službi nacije*, Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva, Belgrade, 2006, pp. 215.

176 *Vojvođani o Vojvodini – Povodom desetogodišnjice oslobođenja i ujedinjenja*, Association of the Vojvodinians, Novi Sad, 1928.

177 Aleksandar Ignjatović, *Jugoslovenstvo u arhitekturi 1904–1941*, Građevinska knjiga, Belgrade, 2007.

178 *50 godina Fakulteta likovnih umetnosti u Beogradu 1937–1987*, ULUS – “Cvijeta Zuzorić” Art Pavillion, Belgrade, 1987.

179 Vladimir Rozić, *Umetnička grupa Oblik (1926–1939)*, Office for joining Serbia and Montenegro to the EU, Belgrade, 2005.

Next, a number of leading artists of the “socialist Modernism” came from Vojvodina, although they realized a greater part of their work as artists or pedagogues in Belgrade: Lazar Vozarević (Sremska Mitrovica, 1925 – Belgrade, 1968), Dragoslav Stojanović SIP (Petrovaradin, 1920 – Belgrade, 1976), Živojin Turinski (Zrenjanin, 1935 – Belgrade, 2001), Milorad Bata Mihailović (Pančevo, 1923 – lives in Paris), Matija Vuković (Platičevo near Rume, 1925 – Belgrade, 1985), Zoran Petrović (Sakule, 1921 – Belgrade, 1996) and others. In that way, the integration of the art from Vojvodina in to the corpus of the socialist Modernism and the arriving moderate post-Modernisms was conducted.

Genre painting: from modernity towards
Modernism and beyond (Serbian edition, p.102)

The complex process of the evolution of the modern towards the modernist painting can be followed in the slow evolution of the realist into the modernist portrait from the middle of the 19th century until the 1920s. Some characteristic examples of realist and romantic portraits are available, for instance from Tan's portrait (*Sava Tekelija*, 1861) and Popović's portraits (*Pavle Trifunac*, 1898 and *Jovan Đorđević*, 1900) to the self-portrait of Novak Radonić (*Self-portrait with a hat*, 1855), and Krizman's portrait *Franja Malin* (1907), late-romantic self-portrait of Voja Trifunović (1913), expressionist portraits of Danica Jovanović (*Gypsy Woman*, 1914) or Ivan Radović (*Self-portrait*, from 1919 and 1920) and Milan Konjović (*Professor Dida*, 1934), to the modernist post-fauvist portraits of Petar Dobrović (*Girl Margarita I*, 1928), Šuput's intimate self-portraits (*Self-portrait*, 1939), and neo-classical self-portraits of Vasa Pomorišac (*Self-portrait with a palette*, 1932) and, then, the explicit socialist Realism of Boško Petrović (*Marshal Tito's Portrait*, 1944) and the socialist-realist Realism of Sava Ipić (*Self-portrait*, 1954) or socialist-realistic-modernist separated portrait of Dušan Milovanović (*Portrait*, 1957) or the new figurative movement of Ferenc Maurits (*Shooting Ground*, 1971; *Electric Requiem*, 1973) or the urban post pop-rock portraits (Miodrag Miljković, Ljubiša Bogosavljević, István Szajkó, Tibor Bada, Milan Blanuša) from the 1980s, to the anti-portraits of Marshal Broz Tito in the concept for the film *A Poem about a Film* (1971).

This brief and highly approximated history of the portrait points to the significant changes in the comprehension of art itself from the middle of the 19th century to the second half of the 20th century. The modern view of the portrait, present with the painters who worked in Vojvodina, mainly with the Serbian painters, from the second half of the 19th century, was led by a political demand for the establishment of the national-

bourgeoisie module of representing the identity and the role of social and cultural subjects. In other words, “the portrait” was a means of identifying the differences of the Serbian upper class and its representatives, taken from the Austro-German and Hungarian culture. The academic trade and the realistic approach promised the possibility of adequate political and social representation. The modern national and bourgeoisie portrait is first and foremost a portrait of a man, rarely of a woman from the same class, which shows that the concept of a portrait was essentially connected with the social structuring and the derivation of the class, national and gender power. Certainly, portrait work of Paja Jovanović represents a paradigmatic sample of academic and realistic painting from the end of the 19th and the middle of the 20th century. The return to Realism in portrait painting took place two times: with the portraits within the bourgeoisie Realism, the return to order and the Neoclassicism (Šumanović, Dobrović, Šuput, Pomorišac) in the late 1920s and the early 1930s, and with the establishment of the socialist Realism (Petrović, Ipić) immediately after World War II.

The appearance of the artists' late-romantic self-portrait led in the direction of “taking away” the representative role of the aristocratic and civic self-portrait and emphasizing the self-portrait as a painting genre and, later, as a “pictorial field” of plastic expression and exploration. In this concept of the self-portrait, the sub-genre of the “artists' self-portrait” also marks a different *idea* of the importance of the painter. The painter's self-portrait is not so much there to show his or her class, national, or even professional-guild identity, as it is to underline and promise the exquisiteness of the painter or the artist as an autonomous creator within modernist culture. This can be clearly seen in the self-portraits of Voja Trifunović, Ivan Radović, Sava Šumanović and Vasa Pomorišac. Early expressionist portraits and self-portraits (Danica Jovanović, Radović, Konjović) were described as questioning and provoking the expressiveness of the pictorial material in the gap between the representation (the iconic order) and expression (the index order). This scheme can also be found with the painters after World War II, who, within the Abstraction Lyrique, post-L'Art Informel and new Figuration, transformed the human body/face as the material media of expression and separation of the iconic (Ferenc Maurits, Dušan Milovanović). The portrait genre was renewed (Miodrag Miljković, Ljubiša Bogosavljević, István Sajko, Tibor Bada, Milan Blanuša) during the age of the eclectic post-Modernism of the 1980s. What should be kept in mind is that the “genre renewal” does not mean the return of the academic or non-expressive portrait but, namely, the painting reaction to the media mass and popular culture of the 80s. Formally, this means the establishment of the referential relations between the painting image and the media images (photography, film, video).

A sub-genre of the portrait/self-portrait can be found in paintings with the portrait or self-portrait of artists in the nude. This sub-genre is seen as the explicitness of the “autonomy” of art, that is, as the emphasis of the artist’s creative space as an exceptional space of freedom, sexuality, pleasure in watching (artist-man is the one who watches) and being watched (a nude woman is the one who is there to be watched). On the other hand, “nude portraits” represent the determination of the male painting canon, according to which the categories of the “active man” (creator) and the “passive woman” (the object of pleasure) are prominent. The following artists worked according to this scheme: Paja Jovanović (*Artist and Model*, around 1905) and Sava Šumanović (*Breakfast in Grass*, 1927; *Model in the studio*, 1939; and the drawing *Painter with Model*, 1940). The nude genre was not common in the art of Vojvodina, however it did signify rather the fulfillment of the autonomy than the representation of the erotic, pornographic or perverse pleasure: Peter Kalman, *Female semi-nude in studio* (undated), Janoš Ajh *Female semi-nude* (undated), Ödön Sárosi *Female nude* (undated), Stevan Drakulić, *A male nude study* (around 1910), Alekandar Sekulić,¹⁸⁰ *Reclining female semi-nude* and *Male semi-nude* (undated), József Pechán, *Standing nude* (1911) and *Bathing women* (1912–13), Petar Dobrović, *Male nude study* (1913) and *Male nude* (1922), Sava Šumanović, *Two nudes* (1922) and *Women on a lake shore* (1923), Petar Dobrović, *Venus* (1920), Mladen Josić, *Female nude* (1926?), Ivan Radović, *Three Graces* (1923) and *A nude in the interior* (1933?), Milan Konjović, *Female nude* (1926) and *Model in the studio* (1932), etc. All nudes show the “easiness” of the modernist recreation of the genre in stylistic patterns or the manners of Academic Realism, Secession, Expressionism, Cubism and neo-Classicism.

Two painters led the concept of a nude to the obsessive presentation of the longing for the body of the other, that is, to the presentation of the overtaking view. One of them is Paja Jovanović, who painted numerous nude-portraits and nude-allegories of his wife Muni Jovanović around 1920.¹⁸¹ Figures in the *Nude on a red robe* (1918–20; 115 x 211cm) and the *Nude next to the armchair (Muni)* (1920; 110 x 208cm) are enigmatically eroticized. These works are focused on watching and representing a specific close person, who, in painting representation, becomes almost an ideal object of erotic/sexual desire. Her quite classically and academically painted figure is centered as an “object” of the painter’s desire, which dissolves the borders of privacy. Dissolving the borders of privacy is important to Paja Jovanović the painter, since he is a painter of great historical, oriental-Balkan, great national or allegorically-

symbolic public, universally directed scenes, genre scenes or historical events. He is a public-view painter. On the contrary, the paintings from the studio or his wife’s boudoir open up *the other scene* of the artist’s fantasy and derivation of voyeurism and civic exhibitionism. To expose her body, which he as a man owns, to another’s view and to enjoy in the looks which will be directed at her body by others. Voyeuristic and exhibitionistic aspects of these paintings are also emphasized by their relatively large format. The other painter is Sava Šumanović, with his series of late paintings entitled *Female bathers from Šid*¹⁸² (1935–38). Even though Šumanović worked in the nude genre throughout his career, the *Female bathers from Šid* series is exquisite. Paintings are in large format, some reaching up to 192 and 254cm. Paintings are composed of several figures: five or seven. Figures are painted in such a manner that the lines of the figure that are dividing it from the window in which the figures are placed is emphasized. The figures are placed so that they do not blend into the background, but that the background looks, often, like a screen behind the figures, or, perhaps, that the figures are painted separately, placed and arranged on the surface of the canvas. Figures are nude, with pieces of clothing covering the genitals, and, at times, with sandals that appear to be from the fashion of the time. Figures are typical, with highly artificial faces devoid of psychological meaning, so that the paintings appear very artificial. Šumanović made these paintings during the long period of his solitary life in his parents’ house in Šid. They seem to evoke his memories of Paris, or, perhaps, they seem to evoke and react to the pictures/photographs from the fashion magazines he was receiving at the time. These paintings are not neo-classical pieces, although they are composed in a strict and rational manner. They are, probably, closer to the painter’s obsessions with the “modern” but absent female body, although, if we are to accept the thesis about Šumanović’s homoeroticism,¹⁸³ it could be assumed that they are also identification images of women in which he phantasmatically inscribed himself: the other impossible woman. Jovanović painted a woman owned by a man in a civic, patriarchal sense, whereas Šumanović painted an impossible woman/women, a phantasmatic construct in the void of the painter’s canvas or the Šid existential space.

Finally – the problem of the landscape genre, and the “country landscape” sub-genre or the “scenes from the country life” could also be analyzed. Landscape genre, as opposed to the portrait genre, is modified from the autonomous painting genre into a “sign” or “text” of the Vojvodina regional identity derivation. Early landscapes were made, for instance, in Na-

180 Vukica Popović, Jasna Jovanov, Jelena Knežević (eds.), *Alekandar Sekulović (1877–1942)*, Matica srpska Gallery, Novi Sad, 1990.

181 Snežana Lazić, “Akt u delu Paje Jovanovića”, iz kataloga *Akt u delu Paje Jovanovića*, First Yugoslav young painters’s biennale – National museum, Vršac, 1994.

182 Ješa Denegri, “Pozni Šumanović: Šidjanke”, from: Ješa Denegri, Vojin Bašičević, Dragomir Ugren (eds.), *Šidjanke*, Vojin Bašičević edition, Novi Sad, 1998, pp. 1–2.

183 See notes in an art historian Živko Brković’s book, *Sava Šumanović – Epistolarni portret – pisma, dokumenti, bolest*, Književno-izdavačka zadruga Centar, Belgrade, 1998.

gybanya, as a step out of the academic and romantic political, religious, national or allegorical painting and into the autonomous genre of questioning the expressivity of the viewed scene – landscape. With modernist painters, such as Šumanović, Dobrović, Radović, Tabaković or Konjević, a landscape was set up as a pictorial field of painting self-reflection in questioning painting and perceptive conditions of representation, expression or visibility. Here, landscape genre has a similar evolution to the still-life genre: the drama of the modernization is represented with the separation of the iconic characteristic of a scene or a composition of an object. However, the line of Modernism that was separated and established from the *landscapism* of Nagybanya, with numerous returns from more radical Modernisms to more moderate versions, provided a context for the recognizable para-genre of the *Vojvodina landscape*. The phrase “Vojvodina landscape” does not have a national or a state identity, but a regional one, and also, occasionally, a “provincial” identification, which is an ethnic sense multi-cultural and signifies the “atmosphere”: of the plains, peace, farmer’s relation with nature, of the country which is out there, of the Pannonian etc... The genre itself was modified from the Barbizon Realism (Laslo Kezdi Kovač, *Windmills in*, 1892; *A Forest in Ečka*, around 1895; or *A Street in Dolja*, 1898), Impressionism (Eden Šaroši, *A Landscape*, 1916; and Jelena Čović, *A Woman on a Bank*, 1904, or *In the Park*, 1907), Secession (Bela Farkaš, *Sremska Kamenica*, 1934) post-Fauvism (Milenko Šerban,¹⁸⁴ *Spring on Mount Fruška Gora*, around 1934; Sava Šumanović, *An alley in Šid*, 1935; Ivan Tabaković, *Novi Sad Landscape*, 1934), Expressionism (Milan Konjović, *Sombor – A View of the Wheat Fields*, 1938), Cubism (Ivan Radović, *Houses*, 1922; Sava Šumanović, *Viaduct*, 1921), moderate Modernism (István Nagy, *Willow Trees*, around 1930, Stojan Trumić, *Wheat in*, 1938) and socialist Modernism (József Ács, *Senta Landscape*, 1953; Bogomil Karlavaris, *Canal in Autumn*, 1946; Milan Kečić, *A Road in Krčedin*, 1954; Stevan Maksimović, *Sremski Karlovci*, 1949; Boško Petrović, *A Country Street with a Row of Trees*, 1954; Milan Konjović, *Scorched Vojvodina*, 1957; Ankica Oprešnik, *Autumn in a Village*, 1959; Milan Kečić, *Dudik in Nikinci*, 1961; Bogomil Karlavaris, *A Crossroad near Indija*, 1964; Živojin Miškov, *Blue Plum Orchard*, 1967). This historical transformation of the landscape genre indicates three important aspects:

1. The direction towards the derivation of the autonomous painting landscape genre, similar to autonomous genres like still-life, nude, and even the modernist portrait;
2. The direction towards the emancipation away from the demands of the social and socialist Realism, towards the search

for the “imminent” subject matter – visibility – within the art of Vojvodina;

3. The direction towards the derivation of a local presentation of the “regional” and towards the functionalization of the local landscape image as the identification “super-national” matrix for a given region.

Internationalism and Modernism between World Wars:
towards the great Modernism (Serbian edition, p.113)

The relative term of “international art”, throughout the 19th century, can only approximately mark different influences of a single, dominant, national culture on other marginal cultures; it can mainly determine influences of imperial and imperialist cultures on small or underdeveloped cultures within Europe and outside it.

The imperial model of internationalization implies the integration of small and underdeveloped cultures into the dominant “discourse” of art culture is politically, economically, arbitrary, culturally and artistically “superior” or, more accurately, in terms of power “superior” and “hegemonic”. Looking at the case of Vojvodina art in the 19th and the early 20th century, it is noticeable that Vojvodina art is in the same symmetrical, hierarchical relationship towards Hungarian culture and its art dominances, just like the Hungarian art is, towards the hegemonic Austrian/Viennese art *scene*, and the Viennese art *scene* towards the German cultural horizon and art paradigms, primarily of the Munich art schools and the leading artists of Romanticism, Secession, post-Impressionism and Expressionism. The imperial model implies the realization of political dominance and supremacy, which established horizons of interpreting and understanding art in contemporariness. Also, as the 19th century drew near its end, the ostensible change of symmetrical relations started becoming asymmetrical and dispersive in the synchronic influences of Budapest, Vienna and Munich, and of Dresden, Berlin and Prague. This meant that the imperial model turned into manifold “competitive” models of different centers of power within the German political range of influence, and, somewhat later, within the domain of influence of the developed Slavic cultures (Czech Republic, Poland).

The imperial model signifies a political, social and cultural influence or the *cultural imperialism*. *Cultural imperialism* is, in a modernist sense, the power of an “exceptional” society to produce, offer and impose its cultural, and, in a more narrow sense, its art productions to a very wide, often intercultural, geographical area. This kind of an influence was by the end of the 1920s and 1930s achieved by the French culture and its imperialistic country, the German culture and its democratic and crisis country in the period of the Weimar Germany, and

184 See: Mihailo S. Petrov, “Izložba Hegedušić - Šerban”, *Letopis Matice srpske* Vol. 315 No. 3, Novi Sad, March, 1928, pp. 458-459; Irina Subotić, *Milenko Šerban (1907–1979)*, Matica srpska Gallery, Novi Sad, 1997.

the Russian, and later on, the Soviet culture and its revolutionary totalitarian country. French¹⁸⁵ culture offered the model of “international art” at the internal and external level. At the internal level, it represents the creation of an imperial culture that integrates different minority discourses into a single “grand” and “general” model of French modern art. At the external level, it means overcoming a simple national model, and advocating for the *universal modernist concept* of art, which becomes a kind of a great “Pan-style”, seen in the example of the Parisian school from Impressionism to L’Art Informel and Abstraction Lyrique.

Universal modernist concept in its moderate and radical models as an internationalism is seen in areas of Vojvodina art from the late Impressionism of Nagybanja at the turn of the 20th century, through the high, and more often moderate, Modernism of Šumanović, Dobrović, Radović and Konjović in the 1920s and 1930s, or though the socialist Modernism of Konjović, Stevan Maksimović, József Ács or Ankica Oprešnik in the 1950s and 1960s, to the Neo-Avant-garde appearances (Textualism: Vujica Rešin Tucić, Vojislav Despotov, Judita Šalgo, KÔD group) between the 1960s and 1970s, which marked the turn towards the international Avant-gardes, and with conceptual art, towards the internationalism of the Anglo-Saxon art. The universal modernist model was established with Vojvodinian, Serbian, Croatian, Hungarian “young” artists directing themselves towards important internationally oriented art schools in Budapest,¹⁸⁶ Munich,¹⁸⁷ Prague,¹⁸⁸ and Paris¹⁸⁹.

185 *Paris – Berlin / Rapports et Contrastes France-Allemagne 1900–1933*, Centre Georges Pompidou, Paris, 1978; *Paris – Moskva 1900–1930*, Centre Georges Pompidou, Paris, 1978; *Paris – Paris 1937–1957*, Centre Georges Pompidou, Paris, 1981; Francis Frascina, *Pollock and After – The Critical Debate*, Harper & Row, London, 1985.

186 On the education in Budapest see: Miloš Arsić, “Slikarstvo u Vojvodini 1900–1944”, footnote 15, from: *Slikarstvo u Vojvodini 1900–1944*, Contemporary Visual Arts Gallery, Novi Sad, 1991, pp. 29.

187 The following artists were studying at the Königlische Akademie der Bildenden Künste (Art Academy) in Munich: Stevan Aleksić (since 1896), Stevan Drakulić (since 1905), Mališa Glišić (since 1908), Kosta Jorgović (since 1903), Péter Kálmán (since 1906), Jovan Kešanski (od 1900), Stipan Kopilović (od 1902), Arnold Klein Korányi (since 1910), Đorđe Krstić (since 1873), Angela Mačković (probably since 1901), József Máli (since 1893), Milivoj Mauković (since 1877), Stevan Milosavljević (since 1906), Nikola Mihajlović (since 1908), Emanuel-Maša Maunović (???), István Nagy (since 1897), Sándor Oláh (probably since 1908), József Pechán (since 1889), Vasa Pomorišac (since 1913), Milan Popović (???), Aleksandar Sekulić (since 1900), Ivan Tabaković (since 1922), Pal Vago, Jene Velder (since 1874). The following artists were studying in Simon Hollósy’s private school: József Máli (since 1893), József Pechán (since 1904), Sándor Oláh (since around 1908), Emil Ženar (since 1910). The following artists were studying at Anton Ažbe’s private school: Jelena Čović (since 1903), Stevan Drakulić (1904–1905), Stevan Aleksić. Ödön Sárosi was studying in Valter Tor’s school (since 1913). Danica Jovanović was studying at the Female Academy in Munich (since 1909). Jovanka Marković-Strajnić was studying at Professor Hajek’s summer school in Dachau in Munich. See: *Minhenska škola i srpska slikarstvo*, Matica srpska Gallery, Novi Sad, 1985; and Miloš Arsić, “Slikarstvo u Vojvodini 1900–1944”, footnote 9, from: *Slikarstvo u Vojvodini 1900–1944*, Contemporary Visual Arts Gallery, Novi Sad, 1991, pp. 29.

188 Árpád G. Balázs (since 1920), Stevan Čalić (since 1919), Milan Konjović (since 1917) and others were studying in Prague at the Art Academy (*Akademia výtvarných umění*)

189 The following artists were studying in Paris: at the Julian Academy – Aladár Edvi Illés (since 1893), István Nagy (probably since 1900); at the Colarossi art school – Milenko Šerban (since 1926); in Andre Lhoté’s private school – Milenko Šerban (1927, 1929), Sava Šumanović (since 1921). Andre Lhoté (1885–1962) was a French painter, sculptor, pedagogue and art writer, close to Cubism and Section d’Or group. He opened his first private school in 1922.

The ideal of a modernist international artist – derived from the French context of great modernity – was achieved, in different paradigmatic ways, by: Sava Šumanović, Petar Dobrović, Ivan Radović, Milan Konjović, Árpád G. Balázs, and Zora Petrović. This is a concept of the derivation of great modern European art, which is established through autonomous and authentic art practices.¹⁹⁰ The myth of the great painter is real.

The case of Sava Šumanović: a great ecstatic Modernism
(Serbian edition, p.114)

After the Zagreb influences connected with German modern art, Sava Šumanović entered the “discourse” of French modernist painting of late Cubism (*Sculptor in studio*, 1921 or *Viaduct*, 1921) and post-Cubism (*Woman by the window*, 1924, or the series of paintings *Women from Šid*, 1935–38), creating a poetic horizon of the heroic and, later on, the obsessive expression that surpasses the individual human drama of a mental illness, loneliness, provincial isolation and, finally, of war. Šumanović’s painting opus, in a clear way, marked the journey of a provincial artist opening himself up to the dominant appearances of modernist urban art in the Parisian period (*Still-life with a clock*, 1921), and, following that, it signified the painstaking, long wanderings of an artist without a clear goal, caught in the phantasms of the local struggle for survival and the fight with an illness. Šumanović in a frank way spoke of his human and artistic drama¹⁹¹ in *Moj predgovor* (*My preface*), in the catalogue for his solo exhibition in Belgrade, 1939.

Šumanović’s painting work was essentially established and developed in the domain of experiencing authentic autonomy of art creation, such as the one established in the *Parisian school*, during the first decades of the 20th century. Based on the dominance of Cubism, he returns to idealism of the French modernist painting, and to the search for the expressive exclusiveness of a masterpiece in the Parisian school style (*A Drunken Boat*, 1927). He, then, moves from the neo-classical (*The Shepherd Girl* or *At the Well*, 1921; *Female Nude with a Mirror*, 1923) to the modernist (*Red Rug I*, 1929 or *The Road to Bužilava*, 1929), within the painter’s formal, color and thematic obsessions with *painting itself*. At the height of his neo-classical interest, he decides for the rational and controlled derivation of the composition within the “absolute” painting autonomy:

We want a painting which would be unique, logical and harmonious. As much as it is humanly possible and within our power,

190 Ješa Denegri, “Primeri istorijskog modernizma”, from: Dragomir Ugren (ed.), *Centralnoevropski aspekti vojvodanskih avangardi 1920–2000. ... Granični fenomeni, fenomen granica*, Museum of Contemporary Visual Arts, Novi Sad, 2002, pp. 16–18.

191 Sava Šumanović, “Moj predgovor”, from: *Katalog izložbe Sava Šumanovića*, Novi univerzitet, Belgrade, 1939, pp. 21. Živko Brkić analyzes in great detail the cultural and poetic phenomenology of Šumanović’s illness in: *Sava Šumanović – epistolarni portret – pisma, dokumenti, bolest*, KIZ Center, Belgrade, 1988.

we will try to reach those goals, although it is hard to reach any result at all in a country where painting is substituted with a plain anecdote: in which a painting is immediately good if it shows a revolution with red, white, black banners, or a woman in a tavern, a woman outside a tavern, a decadent man, etc., and where a painting style is found to be *Michelangelo-like* in a Munich-Vienna Secessionist way: one needs to employ a considerable amount of effort if they want to remain a pure painter.¹⁹²

Later on, the illness and the province led him to great successes and failures: from Srem landscapes (*A Drying Building near Šid*, 1933) to the *Women from Šid* series (1935-38). Šumanović's work exhibits a fatal and dramatic gap of a great artist of Modernism between the dominant international style of Modernism he found in Paris and the struggle for local survival and creation in Šid at the border between Croatian and Serbian society, culture and, finally, art, a gap between painting rationality and painting entropy in a mental illness.

The case of Petar Dobrović: great canonic Modernism

(Serbian edition, p.116)

Petar Dobrović¹⁹³ (Pečuj, 1890 – Belgrade, 1942) took over and lived a *role* of an important “modernist master” who in every new or traditional technique or thematic demand exhibits an authentic ability to pictorially *place works in the world*. Dobrović conducted proto-cubist drawings with male and female nudes during his stay in Paris 1912-1913. These are proto-cubist geometrical transformations of a human figure, close to procedures performed by Hungarian pro-Avant-garde artists close to Lajoš Kašak, such as Lajos Tihanyi, Róbert Berény, József Nemes Lampérth and Károly Kernstok.¹⁹⁴ By the end of World War I, in the context of a crisis of Hungarian culture, the extremely expressionist, politically toned works *Self-portrait as a Worker* (1913), *Bohemians* or *A Portrait of an Actor* (1917) and *The Execution in Šabac* (1919) were made. After the fall of the Baranja Republic, during the creation of the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, he entered the arena of political-art struggle, where he confronted Meštrović's Secessionist concept of “racial style” and the growing concept of “integrative Yugoslavity” in the name of autonomous modernity:

I am giving a serious warning to our artists, that the goal of art is nature, and that form is the sculpture's language, and color is the painter's. Not anecdotes, not history, but nature. Variations,

space, light, color, form, fitting objects one into the other, that is the goal of the art of painting, not Jug Bogdan.¹⁹⁵

His “painting modernity” is at the behavioral level close to a strong subject, that is, to Picasso and Matisse enjoying themselves and being as one with the painting as the horizon of modern human existence. At the formal level, painting is realized around the ideals of the Parisian school, the post-Fauvist expression. Dobrović, perhaps most clearly, described this dimension of the “modern master” in his autobiographical lines:

My life is simple. It went by in painting. When they disturbed me in my work during the World War, I led the rebel troops against the monarchy; true, I was arrested, sentenced to death, but it was not me who perished, it was the monarchy. In the summer of 1921, I had the honor of being the President of the Republic and of half a million people, and still Hungarian troops banished me. I was an art school professor in Belgrade; I banished myself from there after a few years. So, today, I am painting and I will that, by the time I die, I will have painted entire Yugoslavia along with all of its people. That is all I can say about my life. Today I am 47, I have a wife and a son and I spend my days quite satisfied.

My group exhibitions: Budapest, 1917; Paris, 1919; Belgrade, 1920, 1921, 1924, 1930, 1933, 1934, 1936; Prague, 1924, 1932; Paris, Salon de l'Escalier, 1927; Zagreb, 1921, 1926, 1929, 1934; The Hague, Rotterdam and Amsterdam, 1931;...

By the way, I have had numerous exhibitions, all over Europe; my paintings are scattered all over the place.

I paint and I draw, using every technique. I do not make caricatures, or illustrations. I paint everything, both landscapes, and people, nudes and compositions.¹⁹⁶

This is a life of an artist devoted to painting, revealing himself through painting in his authenticity, importance and dominant role in culture. Devotion to painting is, actually, an action directed towards the discovery and overcoming “painting itself” in all its uniqueness and authenticity, making it different from other arts. On the other hand, his standpoint on painting as an art of color *is referred to nature and arises from nature*.¹⁹⁷

Miroslav Krleža wrote one of the most important discussions on Dobrović's work as a painter.¹⁹⁸ This discussion was written after his exhibition organized to mark the *Spring Salon*¹⁹⁹ in Zagreb, 1920. Dobrović showed 36 paintings at

192 Sava Šumanović, “Slikar o slikarstvu”, *Književnik*, No. 1, Zagreb, 1924, pp. 20–24.

193 Žana Gvozdenović (ed.), *Galerija Petra Dobrovića*, Museum of Modern Art, Belgrade, 1989; and Simona Čupić, Jovana Barić-Jeremić, Maja Landratoške, *Petar Dobrović (1890–1942)*, Prosveta, Belgrade, 2003.

194 According to Đerđ Varkonji: “Petar Dobrović u mađarskoj likovnoj umetnosti”, in: Ješa Denegri, “Primeri istorijskog modernizma”, from: Dragomir Ugren (ed.), *Centralno-evropski aspekti vojvodanskih avangardi 1920–2000... Granični fenomeni, fenomeni granica*, Museum of Contemporary Visual Arts, Novi Sad, 2002, pp. 16.

195 Petar Dobrović, “Povodom izložbe jugoslovenskih umetnika u Parizu 1919. g.”, *Dan*, Year I, No. 3, Novi Sad – Belgrade, 1919, pp. 41–44.

196 Petar Dobrović, “Autobiografski zapis” (1937), in the *Petar Dobrović Gallery catalogue*, Museum of Modern Art, Belgrade, 1989, pp. 3.

197 Petar Dobrović, “Povodom izložbe jugoslovenskih umetnika u Parizu 1919. g.”, *Dan*, Year I, No. 3, Novi Sad – Belgrade, 1919, pp. 41–44.

198 Miroslav Krleža, “Marginalije uz slike Petra Dobrovića”, *Savremenik* Vol. 4, Zagreb, 1921, pp. 193–202.

199 *IX izložba proljetnog salona*, Art Pavilion, Zagreb, 1920. See: Ivanka Reberski, “Umjetnička orijentacija prema novoj realnosti”, from: *Realizmi dvadesetih godina – magično, klasično objektivno u Hrvatskom slikarstvu*, Institute for the History of Art, Zagreb, 1997, pp. 31–32.

the exhibition and developed the concept of high modernist expression. Krleža interpreted his opus of the time by indicating Dobrović's central-European position, and his monumental and rational painting procedure in shaping a new constructive modern age plasticity and objectivity.

The case of Ivan Radović: a significant breakthrough in the situations of great Modernism (Serbian edition, p.119)

Ivan Radović (Vršac, 1894 – Belgrade, 1973) lived in Budapest and was educated there; he participated in the work of the Nagybanya colony (1918), visited Prague, Vienna, Munich and Paris in 1921. He lived in Sombor, and then in Belgrade, for the remainder of his life. He was a part of the Yugoslav tennis team in the Davis Cup. In the early period of his painting work, he went through the characteristic stages of modernist painting, from Impressionism and Expressionism to Cubism. He is one of the painters from Vojvodina who had a series of experiences with the atmosphere of the Hungarian activist Avant-garde in Budapest, between 1915 and 1919, and with the influences of the German painting group *Der Blaue Reiter* (*The Blue Rider*), and finally, with the late Parisian Cubism, Orphism and post-cubist neo-Classicism of the early 1920s. His early painting work and development of the painting work are under the influence of the Hungarian Expressionism and Activism: from *Compositions* (1919), over *City* (1921) to *Self-portrait* (from 1922, 1925). On the other hand – a truly radical excess took place with the cubist and proto-abstract works based on the reduction of illusionism of the third dimension onto the pictorial static or dynamic, collage composition of lines and surfaces: *Compositions* from 1921, 1923, 1924. Two works especially stand out: *Abstract landscape* from 1921 and the analytical-synthetic collage *Abstract composition II – collage* from 1924. According to Ješa Denegri:

During these stages, the duration of which, and especially the influences on the artist's shaping, is difficult to determine, what is created is one of the most radical comprehensions of plastic language during the short, but very exciting period of cubist reception and the first assimilations of experiences of Abstraction in Serbian art until the mid 1920s. As was the case with other Budapest students, rather than the lessons taught in school, a greater influence on Radović's forming was the cultural and artistic climate of the Hungarian capital: numerous exhibitions of the contemporary European art, from the domestic art there were *Osmorica* group, Kassák's *Activists* and their magazines *A Tett* and *Ma*. There was also the peer friendship with Dobrović and Konjović, at the time when they shared similar interests. Radović is the only one in this group who comes close to the Kandinsky-like Abstraction, that is, to the abstract landscape of Franz Martz, hence the presumption that he was familiar with the atmosphere set forth by the *Blue Rider Almanac*. Radović is the maker of a lin-

guistically and conceptually pure cubist collage, which indicates that he was aware of the ideas of the analytical stage of this movement, regardless of the significant temporal retardation. All of this indicates that Radović had highly developed receptive skills, along with the ability to reformulate adopted experiences on his own. He was aware that it is the recent artistic ideas, and not knowledge of technique that are important for an artist's spiritual and intellectual shaping. Curiosity, open-mindedness, nomadic wandering through the diversity of expressive languages and subject matters, which will be the feature of Radović's entire opus, all found their first realizations in the turmoil of his early years as an artist, during the first half of the 1920s.²⁰⁰

After radical experimental works on the *nature of a painting* with the direction towards Abstraction, Radović went back to neo-Classicism (*Three Graces* or *Three light nudes*, 1923) and he blended into an endless "ahistorical" field of Intimism: *The Fisherman* (1922), *The Peasant* (1928) or *A Village in Vojvodina* (1939). What is characteristic of Radović is the absence of a development as a painter, and the presence of a dispersive and eclectic practice of "trying himself out" through different forms of expression: Cubism, proto-Abstraction, Expressionism, Intimism. He developed Intimism and, later on, moderate Modernism through sub-genre variations: of the movement, the nudes, the interior and the scenes from Vojvodina. In a way, he created a paradigmatic image of the Vojvodinian *genre painting* as a specific provincial Intimism, from the late 1920s to the late years of his life after World War II.

The case of Milan Konjović: horizons and contexts of great Modernism (Serbian edition, p.121)

Milan Konjović (Sombor, 1898–1993) developed, in a very determined and sophisticated manner, a contradictory blend of a provincial and world-class modern artist. His work was directed towards the establishment of correspondence of the local uniqueness, often at the provincial image of that subject matter, and towards the universality and the high Aestheticism of the modernist "expressive" statement. This contradiction of Konjović's reception and cover of expressionist and fauvist painting Modernism is so apparent that it can be seen even in the early critical reviews of his work, for instance in Kašanin's review *Milan Konjović*:

Just like in his customs, Konjović's artistic work is Western European in concept. He is a citizen and a liberal, he paints liberally and in a civic manner, for citizens and liberals, mainly landscapes, flowers and interiors. He has a native blood in himself, he knows what a home is, what is his room, a beloved face, a landscape he remembers from his childhood, flowers he sent or

200 Ješa Denegri, "Primeri istorijskog modernizma", from: Dragomir Ugren (ed.), *Centralnoevropski aspekti vojvodanskih avangardi 1920–2000. ... Granični fenomeni, fenomeni granica*, Museum of Contemporary Art, Novi Sad, 2002, pp. 17.

was sent to someone. He paints individually, what he loves, as is for himself and in himself, without any tendency or a programme, solely for his own happiness and for those he aims to share happiness with, and in the process he moves outside his own persona and its belonging to one nation or one area, and paints like a European citizen for a citizens' Europe. (...)

Milan Konjović's culture is French, Parisian, but he does not surrender to it, he uses it: his personality is autochthonic, grown out of itself, preserved, strong enough and proud to lower itself by imitating any other artist. Perhaps he would paint differently had he not lived and did not live in Paris, but in that case, his painting vision would remain personal, regardless: out of all the artists who went through Paris, French influence is least visible on Konjović – he has his own visual fantasy and his own structure.²⁰¹

Three paintings of still life represent his radical works, close to Cubism: *Cubist still-life*, *Grey still-life* and *Still-life*, all from 1922. Konjović himself talked about a clash with Cubism and the search for a different, more expressive painting expression. Denegri interprets his interest for Cubism in the following lines:

The way and the manner of the creation of these paintings is quite extraordinary: Konjović was enticed to create them upon receiving a monograph on Picasso by Maurice Raynal in Vienna in 1922, the paintings being done upon his return to Sombor in August, the same year. However, these paintings are much more than merely a consequence of a chance anecdote. It could be assumed that these paintings owe their creation to Konjović's cultural horizon and artistic experience of his education in Prague (where he started studying at the Academy in 1919, and between November 1920 and February 1921, took private lessons with Jan Zrzaví). It should be kept in mind that Prague is, after Paris, a leading European center of Cubism, or in more precise terms, Prague is the first center of a specific central-European Cubism-Expressionism, as one of the equal versions of different comprehensions of Cubism, hence different Cubisms, with Bohumil Kubišta, Antonín Procházka, Vincenc Beneš, Emil Filla, Josef Čapek, Václav Špála as its the leading representatives. With his Prague education, trips to Munich, Berlin, Dresden, Vienna, and then with a longer stay in Paris, with a strong cultural basis and self-awareness of his own roots, Konjović formed himself based on the central-European educational influences directly or indirectly adopted from modern Parisian painting experiences.²⁰²

Also, neo-classical nudes, like *Female nude* from 1926, represent exceptions to his work. The establishment of a characteristic post-fauvist and expressionist statement, mainly in landscapes, is realized in paintings such as *Vineyards in France* (1929), but also in nudes, such as *A Model in a Studio* (1932) or *Professor Dida* (1934). Horizon of the *Parisian school* and its establishment as a canonic measure for moderate, and in

rare occasions, high modernities became also the horizon of Konjović's painting opus.

The case of Árpád G. Balázs: critical and problem borders of high Modernism (Serbian edition, p.124)

Árpád G. Balázs²⁰³ (Felsőőrkés, 1887. – Szeged, 1981) went to the Teacher's School in Banya and Kiskunfélegyháza. He studied at Országos Magyar Királyi Képzőművészeti Főiskola (National Royal Hungarian Faculty for the Art of Painting) during 1913 and 1914. He transferred to *Akademia výtvarných umení* (Art Academy) in Prague in 1920. He went through a Symbolic, Secessionist and Expressionist art climate and through training in the arts of painting and graphics. He spent time in Nagybánya on several occasions, between 1913 and 1942. He collaborated with an ex-Dadaist Zoltán Csuka on book and catalogue designs.²⁰⁴ He lived in Romania between 1942 and 1947, then in Szeged until 1957, when he returned to Yugoslavia. During World War II, he actively exhibited in the war and totalitarian Hungarian society. He also produced graphics and illustrations. He was in touch with Lajos Kassák in 1918, and he was also familiar with the works of a Hungarian magazine *Ma*, Yugoslav magazine *Zenit*, and he knew the German practice of *new objectivity*, Czech Avant-garde group *Devětsil* and Croatian socially oriented painters' group *Zemlja*. He worked in Belgrade from 1927. Pavle Bihalji marked his work a *beginning of new Realism*.²⁰⁵ He was a member of the *Oblik* group since 1930. An eclectic and contradictory clash of rhetorically overstated expressionist statement took place in Balázs's work (*Pieta*, 1923), with critical social themes, but also with religious symbolism and, occasionally, allegory. Balázs's painting and graphics work is, therefore, a true example of central-European Expressionist evolution in the search for the visibility of sublime and pathetic invisible existence. Significant late and social-critical work represents a catalog of lithographies – song illustrations – for *Endre-Ady Album* (*Sea Burial*, *Near the Graveyard*, *On the Shore of Dark Waters*, *Horses of Death*, *A Crazy Deadly Night*, *Eternal Procession of Death*, *At the Moment of Death*, *Tired we cheer each other*) from 1929 and 1930. Parallels to this catalog of graphics can be found in the paintings *Pieta* (1923) or *A Worker's Family* (1928), and in the aquarelles *Death on Railway Tracks* and *I am going out*. Prob-

201 Milan Kašanin, "Milan Konjović", *Srpski književni glasnik*, XXXVII, Belgrade, 1932, pp. ???.

202 Ješa Denegri, "Primeri istorijskog modernizma", from: Dragomir Ugren (ed.), *Centralnoevropski aspekti vojvodanskih avangardi 1920–2000. ... Granični fenomeni, fenomeni granica*, Museum of Contemporary Art, Novi Sad, 2002, pp. 17–18.

203 Bela Duranci (ed.), *Arpad Balaž – slike, grafike, crteži 1920–1970*, Matica srpska Gallery, Novi Sad, 1970; and Anna Baranyi (ed.), *Balázs G. Árpád (1887–1981)*, City Museum, Subotica, 1987.

204 Arpad Balaž, Zoltan Čuka, *Vojvodanska galerija / Vajdasági galéria*, Minerva, Subotica, 1927; and Zoltán Csuka (ed.), *Kéve: vajdasági költők antológiája*, Kepes Vasárnap, Novi Sad, 1928.

205 Pavle Bihalji, "Povodom slikarske izložbe A. G. Balaža", *Nova literatura*, Year II, No. 1, Belgrade, 1930, pp. 29.

bly one of the important images of expressing contradictions of urban modern bourgeoisie society is Balázs's painting *Belgrade Allegory* (1937), in which he shows, with precise iconography (the relationship of church towers and the construction site), a typical bourgeoisie idea of the synthesis of the new and old: the modern and the traditional.

Whereas the modern art at the turn of the 20th century was, under the influence of central-European painting nationalisms, an instrument of performance and even of the establishment of the Serbian national identity in the "Diaspora", the Modernism of the 1920s and 1930s was performed within a complex national state, as a gesture within the determined class horizon that needed an identification in the autonomy of the international modernist art. The art of the high Aestheticism assumes a position in the center of the struggle of a higher middle class for the political hegemony in a modernist society.²⁰⁶ Art, as a social and cultural institution, is described as a specific, ostensibly autonomous area of class identification, and instrument of a political struggle for power and organization of social relations. Such art is given as one of the social and constitutional mechanisms within the derivation of *ideology*, which means, as a mechanism of the ostensible self-visualization of reality for a specific society in history and its leading classes. Authors such as Šumanović, Dobrović, Radović or Konjović are painters who *transpose* the modernist internationalism – hegemony – of the French art into an authentic human drama (Šumanović), a role of a great master (Dobrović) and an author who offers a universal reference point to the regional "discourse" (early Konjović), and into a painter who brings the universal "discourse" of Modernism to local themes and modes of presentation (late Konjović). Unlike them, Árpád G. Balázs remains an example of an extremely specific painting individuality within the framework of central-European evolutions of Symbolism, Secession and Expressionism towards the new objectivity and socialist Realism. Only after World War II will he enter the framework of Intimism, and consequently, moderate Modernism.

The case of Zora Petrović: obsessions and gender representations in great Modernism (Serbian edition, p.128)

The painter Zora Petrović²⁰⁷ developed, between the 1930s and the early 1960s, an expressionist figurative painting. She devoted herself to the genre of female nude with emphasized focus on the presentation of the sole female and exotic (the other, gypsy)

eroticism. She was born in 1894 in Banat. She grew up in a Vojvodina bourgeoisie, merchant family. She graduated from the *Serbian Female College* and the *National Civic Female School* in Pančevo in 1909. After a three-year conflict with her parents, she started studying at the *Art and Trade School* in Belgrade in 1912. She studied under Đorđe Jovanović, a sculptor, and painters Marko Murat and Milan Milovanović. She studied painting at Országos Magyar Királyi Képzőművészeti Főiskola (National Royal Hungarian Faculty for the Art of Painting) between 1915 and 1919. During her fourth year of study, she went back to Belgrade and transferred to the *Arts and Crafts School* with Professor Ljuba Ivanović, for her final year. She taught art education in the *Second Female Grammar School "Queen Marija"* in Belgrade between 1921 and 1944. She spent time in Paris during 1925 and 1926. She lived alone. She was a member of SANU (Serbian Academy for Art and Science). She died after brain tumor surgery on 25th May 1962.

Some of the paintings of Zora Petrović are examples of a formal-expressive modernist evolution of the female nude (*Standing Nude of a Gypsy Woman*, 1936, or *A model in a studio*, 1954), whereas some of the paintings represent undeniable ecstatic presentations of self-erotic or erotic visualization of a "sexual urge" (*Desire*, 1933) or presentations of "sole femininity" (*Pregnant woman*, 1938; *Holiday*, 1954), that is, ecstatic compositions of the relations of women's bodies (*Two floating nudes*, 1958; *A game*, 1958; *Two women during a game*, 1959) or confrontations with *female eroticism in an enclosed world of women* (*Gypsy woman in yellow stockings*, 1935; *Gypsy women*, 1936, or *A ripe plum*, 1957). Zora Petrović comes from a patriarchal national bourgeoisie and, later on, puritan real-socialist culture. It is as if her paintings, paradoxically, express a pictorial affectation of a man's look given to an exotic and available/close Romany body of a model. A thesis could be deduced from this painting, and from some other paintings, that the derivation of gender never goes on its own, that it is connected with the policies of representing other identities. For instance, early nude *Gypsy woman in yellow stockings* is clearly emphasized as homoerotic, that is, lesbian, coded sign of an exotic and eroticized body meant for the viewing pleasure, and the potential promising touch. As if it is expected that the painter herself approaches the desired body. For instance, the iconographic solution of the eroticized figure in this painting can be compared with the composition of the homoerotic sculptural figure of *David* by Donatello (around 1425-1430). They have in common the seductive and *lively* position of the enticing naked body, with minimum details of clothing (boots, hats, stockings) that emphasize eroticisms. Or, the three figures in the painting *Gypsy women* suggest the atmosphere of the meeting with the *other* who is *there* and who is *postponed* (*différance*), that, it is possible to "have it with a look" although it can never

206 Terry Eagleton, *The Ideology of the Aesthetic*, Blackwell, Oxford, 1990, pp. 3

207 Dragoslav Đorđević, *Zora Petrović*, Prosveta, Belgrade, undated; Olivera Janković (ed.), *Zora Petrović – Umetnost kao život*, SANU, Belgrade, 1995.

be experienced and sexually owned as a body. This painting is also an explicit presentation of structuring the ethnic-gender-class phantasm and relations in the Serbian society. Because, Romany women belong to the position which is occupied in the French or German or English painting by the body of a black woman, a woman from Algiers/Morocco, in other words, the racial other. The other, exotic body, is the body towards which desire is directed. As opposed to these earlier paintings, nudes from the 1950s have a modernist form, which from the iconic sign of representing specific and particularly that female body, moves on to the universal index sign emphasizing annulled individuality which is the instrument of its own universality – self-identification through the universal woman. A figure of a nude Gypsy woman *Miss* (1957) is painted in a convulsion: distorted form of the old deformed but still desired female body, which is both impossible and attractive. It is as if the *atmosphere/aura* of the *abject*, which is characteristic of a prepared woman's role in a masculine society, is being anticipated. It is true – a woman is the one who can desire – but every one of her longings is turned into a “convulsion of pain and defeat”. It is possible to draw a comparison between the deformed figure of a woman in the painting of Zora Petrović, which is broken down by its own, always and in every moment, impossible desire, and the *anxious women* (Virginia Woolf, Lora Brown, Clarissa Vaughan) in Steven Daldry's film *The Hours* (2002). Heroes of this film are three very different women: Virginia Woolf (played by Nicole Kidman) is a famous writer who ends her life in depression and suicide, Lora Brown is an unhappy homemaker, who runs away from her failed, petty bourgeoisie marriage, and Clarissa Vaughan, who is a successful editor in a publishing house, living in a lesbian marriage. All three characters are tragic figures of *anxious women*. In the case of the dramatic, deconstructionist painting of Zora Petrović, the observer is faced with yet another censored spot within the Serbian modernist culture – with sexuality and the emotion of a desire, suffering and sublimity of an old woman.²⁰⁸

Return to order: fascination with the concept and the ideology of *order* (Serbian edition, p.131)

The international character of the *return to order* (*rappel à l'ordre*), which is seen during the 1920s and 1930s as the “crisis of Modernism” and, consequently, the return to order, is also present within the given modernist framework. *The return to order* is, strictly speaking, a name for retro or neo-classical appearances and individual art practices in French culture

and art shortly after World War I, and also a name for the appearances of *new objectivity* (*Neue Sachlichkeit*) in German painting and new Classicisms in Italian painting after World War I. It draws attention to the social situation of strengthened French bourgeoisie nationalism and to the potential art re-establishment of traditional cultural-artistic and historical identities. After the expressionist and cubist painting “revolution”, at the beginning of the 20th century Cubism started spreading towards purism and moderate Cubism of the Lhote²⁰⁹ type. In this way, neoclassical concept, procedures, form and composition solutions joined to the cubist experiment. The return to the tradition of a good, beautiful painting led from the purists, across Lhote to Cézanne, the early Renoir and Poussin, as stable traditional role models of creating a painting and the art of painting (scene compositions, figurative compositions, rational approach to the creation of a work). *The return to order* is an attempt of the renewal of traditional painting issues (subject matter, form, composition models, color, rationalization of presentation and expression) by reshaping means of modernist art innovation (Cubism, Futurism, Expressionism, Fauvism, mass culture). *The return to order* indicated an interest of Avant-garde artists for critical-narrative potentials of painting and a turn towards painting as a weapon of social fight in Weimar Germany.²¹⁰ The long history of the resistance to anti-painting Avant-garde in Italy was connected with the development of the “neoclassical” and “metaphysical” (*Pittura metafisica*, *Realismo Magico*, *Neoquattrocentismo*) idealisms within the experience of modernity, but also within the right-wing/fascist structure of the Italian society, culture and art during the 1920s and 1930s.²¹¹ For that reason, the return to order is a *neo* appearance, and not a reconstruction, return or a *great renewal* of the painting tradition. Jean Cocteau in his essay *The Rooster and the Harlequin* and his book *Rappel à l'ordre* spoke of a beautiful and authentic art (music, theater, painting, film) and, in doing so, went back to the pre-Avant-garde concept of art for the enjoyment and art for the senses. The influence of the return to order is also visible in the Yugoslav (Croatian, Slovenian, Serbian and Vojvodinian) culture of the 1920s.

In Vojvodina, the following artists created in a post-cubist or post-expressionist procedure: Sava Šumanović, Ivan Radović, Milan Konjović, Mladen Josić, Vasa Pomorišac, Árpád G. Balázs, Miloš Babić, Ivan Tabaković and others.

Sava Šumanović published program essays “*Slikar o slikarstvu*”²¹² (“*A painter on painting*”) and “*Zašto volim*

208 Miško Šuvaković, “Iskliznuća unutar ženskog slikarstva: Alis Nil i Zora Petrović”, from: *Studije slučaja – Diskurzivna analiza izvođenja identiteta u umetničkim praksama*, Mali Nemo, Pančevo, 2006, pp. 95–100.

209 André Lhote, *O pejzažu*, Mladost, Zagreb, 1956.

210 S. Michalski, “New Objectivity – Painting, Graphic Art and Photography”, in: *Weimar Germany 1919–1933*, Taschen, Köln, 2003.

211 Elizabeth Cowling, Jennifer Mundy, *On Classic Ground: Picasso, Léger, de Chirico and the New Classicism 1910–1930*, Tate Gallery, London, 1990; Germano Celant, *Italian Art 1900–1945*, Rizzoli, New York, 1989.

212 Sava Šumanović, “*Slikar o slikarstvu*”, *Književnik*, No. 1, Zagreb, 1924, pp. 20–24.

Poussinovo slikarstvo"²¹³ ("Why I love Poussin's painting"), and the texts of the Croatian promoter of new appearances in art are also influential. Antun Branko Šimić also published articles in "Konstruktivno slikarstvo"²¹⁴ ("Constructive painting") in 1921, and "Slikarstvo i geometrija"²¹⁵ ("Painting and geometry") in 1926. A. B. Šimić theoretically determined the framework of the neoclassical constructive post-cubist painting as the rejection of modernist ideas of progress and improving development of abstract forms by turning to the constants, to the positive and constructive values of tradition and traditional presentation. Šumanović made his first painting works in a manner close to the French puritist post-cubist Neoclassicism (*Two nudes* from 1922, *A Sailor on a Pier* from 1921-22, or *Three Women on a Lake Shore* from 1923), as did Ivan Radović (*Three graces*, 1923) and Milan Konjović (*Female nude*, 1926) and Mladen Josić (*Female nude*, 1923) and others.

The painting work of Vasa Pomorišac²¹⁶ (Modoš [Jaša Tomić], 1893 – Belgrade, 1961) is an example of a neoclassical anti- or postmodernist neoclassical painting. He studied painting with Stevan Alkesić in 1911. He made paintings and icons for the churches in Progar, Grad (Romania) and Srpski Sv. Petar (Romania) in 1911. He started studying at the Academy of painting in 1913. He was drafted by the Austro-Hungarian authorities and sent to the Russian front, where he soon surrendered. He took part in the fighting on the Russian side, when he was injured in 1916. He started studying painting at the Academy of Art and Trade in Zagreb with Professors Ljuba Babić and Ferdo Kovačević in 1919. He soon transferred to the Arts and Crafts School in Belgrade. He lived in London from 1920, where he worked on his paintings *St. John*, *Virgin Mary's cries*, *Card players* and others, during 1923. He was specialized in glass painting at the London Central School of Arts and Crafts. He lived in Belgrade between 1925 and 1935. He had a solo exhibition, with M. Golubović and M. Petrović in Novi Sad in 1926. He also exhibited his work at *Exposition des Arts Décoratifs* in Paris in 1925. He is one of the founders of the *Zograf* group (around 1927 – 1939) in Belgrade. *Zograf* group was a right-wing, national group, of which the members fought against the influence of international art and advocated for the preservation of the national art and its Byzantine influences.²¹⁷ During that period, he painted *St. Antony's Temptations*, *Leda and the Swan*, *Self-portrait*. During the first period of occupa-

tion, he earned money by painting commissioned portraits. He became a professor at the Art Academy in Belgrade in 1942. He exhibited at great Serbian art exhibitions in the Art Pavilion in Belgrade in 1942 and 1944. By the decision of the Banat Military Command Center he worked in the Zrenjanin museum from 23rd January 1945 until 1950, when he was elected an Associate Professor at the Applied Arts Faculty. He worked on the preservation of cultural goods in Zrenjanin in 1945. He made ten stained glass windows with the national fight for liberation as the subject matter, for the City Hall building in 1947. He also made stained glass windows in the "Metropol" Hotel in Belgrade in 1958.

Petar Dobrović had a twofold comprehension of the *ideas* of "Neoclassicism": literally as passing through the traditional Western modules of representation (*Venus*, 1920?) or quite conditionally, in a modernist manner, as a development of an individual modernized bourgeoisie²¹⁸ Realism (*The portrait of a girl Marcela*, 1927). Árpád G. Balázs (*Pieta* from 1923, and *A worker's family* from 1928) developed an expressionist Christian-Catholic and socially oriented painting expression of a strong rhetorical pictorial and graphic dramaturgy. He engaged an expressionistic statement in a religious and political subject matter.

The return to order, as an international "set of appearances" marked the stabilization of the canon of modern painting, and, consequently, enabled the development of the 19th century bourgeoisie Realism (for instance Henrik Emil Aczél *Portrait of two boys*, 1905) into its high-modernist or explicitly-modernist forms (Dobrović, *Doge's Court in Dubrovnik* from 1934-35; Tabaković; Konjović, *Sombor – A View of the Wheat Fields*, 1938; Šumanović, *A Bathing Woman*, 1929 or *A Concert in a Field*, 1925; Milenko Šerban *Four friends*, 1938-39), into its moderately modernist and intimacy appearances (Ivan Radović *Noon* from 1939, Milan Konjović *A model in a Studio* from 1932, Milenko Šerban *A Boy* from 1931, Ivan Tabaković *Tools* from 1924 or *A Blue Tavern* from 1937, Aleksandar Kumrić, Radovan Potočnjak, Ivana Potočnjak *Portrait of Dr. Mihovil Tomandol* from 1940, Franja Radočaj, Lukács Gyelmis, István Nagy, Árpád G. Balázs *Novi Sad* from 1937, Bogdan Šuput *The Park in Kamenica* from 1939 or *A Self-portrait* from 1939, Milan Butozan *Still-life* from 1934, Milivoj Nikolajević; Svetislav Vuković /1901-1980/ *Grandfather and grandson*, 1926 etc.), into an unexpected bourgeoisie exotics (Mihály Kara-Krón, *Lithography I-IV* from 1928). Bourgeoisie Realism was reshaped into a modernist-formal pictorial expression with which pictorial or visual autonomous qualities of a work were emphasized. A realist reference for a painting or graphics, in

213 Sava Šumanović, "Zašto volim Poussinovo slikarstvo", *Književnik*, No. 2, Zagreb, 1924, pp. 57–59.

214 Antun Branko Šimić, "Konstruktivno slikarstvo I", *Savremenik*, Vol. XVI, No. 3, Zagreb, 1921, pp. 184–185.

215 Antun Branko Šimić, "Slikarstvo i geometrija", *Književnik*, No. 2, Zagreb, 1926, pp. 65–66.

216 Ljiljana Stojanović (ed.), *Vasa Pomorišac. 1893–1961. / Retrospektivna izložba 1907–1961*, Museum of Modern Art, Belgrade, 1986.

217 Belgrade Archives, Memoarska građa – O društvu likovnih umetnika Zograf, K-XIV/8.

218 Jelena Stojanović (ed.), *Građanski realizam Petra Dobrovića*, Museum of Modern Art, Belgrade, 2005.

other words, served merely as an external cause for the painting reflection or an experience of the seen, the imagined or the presumed. In this text, I realized the bourgeoisie Realism as:

- A high or explicit modernist expression in which the mastery or the autonomous painting experimental character of a modernist artist is taken to the apparent sensual appearance of a beautiful, expressive or sublime image;

- Moderate Modernism will include all works that strived after the modernist expression as a stable and canonic model for the reproduction of the current bourgeoisie reality and its aesthetics;

- Intimism²¹⁹, as a version of moderate Modernism, will include all works which ideologically focused on a small theme or a detail from everyday life, bearing in mind that we are dealing with an explicit attitude of the “middle class” that identifies itself with reference to a small, secure, problem-free and stable reality.

Bourgeoisie and social Realism are, in fact, two functional – but opposing – lines within Modernism between world wars. Social Realism was, accordingly, derived as a critical practice in which artistic and aesthetic demands on the painter or a graphic artist were subordinate to the political-left-wing and critical discourse. The following artists worked within the framework of social art: Ivan Tabaković (*Genius* from 1929), Árpád G. Balázs (*A lunch of the proletariate family* or *Digging* from 1934), Bogdan Šuput (*Loading out*, 1934), Arnold Klein Korányi (*At the foundry*); András Hangya²²⁰ (*Lumberjacks* from 1936, or his undated early works *Newspaper seller* and *Lumberjacks*), Ivan Jakobčić (*A premonition* from 1938 and *War* from 1939), etc.

The case of Miloš Babić – late Futurism or new science fiction (Serbian edition, p.137)

Miloš Babić²²¹ (New Szeged, 1904 – Belgrade 1964) went to the Applied Arts School in New Szeged (1918-1921), and later to the “Futer” studio and to a figurative drawing course at the Kolarac national university, held by Petar Dobrović, between 1923 and 1930.

Miloš Babić developed a “post-futuristic” and “fictional-machinist” painting procedure into a geometric, illusionist and three-dimensional representation of movement/dynamics, machine/airplane (*Air-land maneuver* and *Pilots* around 1930) and the city (*Metropolis*, 1930?). Babić’s painting was created as a confrontation to the demand of presenting the unrepresentable, of making the dynamics of modernity (movement, flight, transformation, turn) visible. He used the “iconography” of

abstract painting to express the very “thing” that occurs under the surface of modern life – down there in the depths of the fast movement of a machine or a metropolis.

Babić’s religious-political allegorical-pictorial paintings (*Anti-Christ at work* and *Endless labour*, around 1930) respond to the European urban mysticism and the comprehension of the manifold character of a modern and mechanized human existence of the day. These paintings are unique cases of such presentable character of dynamics and movement in the Yugoslav painting of the time. It is possible to draw a reference to the late German Expressionism in their fascinations with the city dynamics and to the Italian Futurism (Fortunato Depero, 1892-1960; Enrico Prampolini, 1894-1956; Alfredo Ambrosi, 1910-1945) from the fascist age in their fascinations with the absorbing height and speed of the aircraft. This type of abstraction is not an “expression” of the aspiration for the autonomy of the bourgeoisie painting or the revelation of the essential expression of great modernist masters, but an expression of living in the ecstatic crisis of modernity. We are dealing with the atmosphere of society in which the breakdown of liberalism, expansion of Bolshevism, and the imperial aggression of fascism and Nazism will be confronted; Babić’s work, in other words, seems to anticipate with visual means the “new world order” (*l’ordre nouveau*). It is interesting that his painting greatly corresponds to the critical-political esoterism of a Serbian mystical teacher Dimitrije Martinović (1887-1953) and to his magazine *The New Atlantis – For Western Renaissance & World Socialism*²²² published in Britain. We are not dealing with social, political and art connections between Babić and Martinović, which are probably non-existent, but with an uncertain general – public – atmosphere of a dramatic crisis of modernity and confrontations with it, through radical and imminent means of a modernist, and hence abstract dynamic symbolization of the visible and the invisible.

The case of Borislav Bogdanovich: fascinations with modernity – a new world (Serbian edition, p.138)

Borislav Bogdanovich (Ruma, 1889 – Scottsdale, USA, 1970) studied painting in Zagreb, piano in Prague, and improved his technique in Paris. In Zagreb, he studied painting with Ljuba Babić and Tomislav Krizman. He was involved in painting and the graphic arts. He was influenced by post-Impressionism (*A Girl with a Basket*, 1936), Bonnard’s Intimism (*Tonka and Mrs. Bogdanović in the garden*, 1937) and, certainly, by moderate Expressionism (*Self-portrait of a Nineteen year old*,

219 Gorana Jančić (ed.), *Slikarstvo srpskog intimističkog kruga*, Memorial Collection of Pavle Beljanski, Novi Sad, 2002.

220 Hangya András, Forum, Novi Sad, 1984.

221 Ana Baranji, *Miloš Babić*, City Museum, Subotica, 1984.

222 For instance: Dimitrije Mitrinović (ed.), *The New Atlantis – For Western Renaissance & World Socialism*, vol. 1, no. 2, London, 1934.

1919). He had solo exhibitions in Zagreb in 1937 and 1938, and participated in group exhibitions from 1933. He collaborated with members of the *Dvanaestorica* group during 1937-38. The group was active in Belgrade, and several Belgrade and Zagreb painters and sculptors also took part: Stojan Aralica, Borislav Bogdanovich, Marko Čelebonović, Nikola Gvozdenović, Kosta Hakman, Hinko Juhn, Milan Konjović, Franko Kršinić, Peđa Milosavljević, Milo Milunović, Zora Petrović, Risto Stijović, Frane Šimunović and Ivan Tabaković.²²³

With his wife Herma Robinson, who was an Austrian Jew, he left Yugoslavia in 1939. They left Europe fleeing from Nazism. They settled in the bohemian upper west side in New York City. Their children were born there: Peter (1939) and Anna. Peter became a film and TV director, and Anna a producer and a popular music lyrics writer. One of Borislav Bogdanovich's obsessions was the American film, which had an influence on his son's interests and choice of career.²²⁴

Borislav Bogdanovich's painting had highly modernist intimate characteristics: still-lives, portraits and interiors. His first public appearance in the USA was at a group exhibition "Role of color in modern art" in the Nierendorg Gallery in 1940. There, he exhibited with European modernists, like Emil Nolde, Wassily Kandinsky, Franz Marc, Joan Miró and Paul Klee. Afterwards, he had numerous exhibitions. He went through a neoclassical stage (*Peter Pierrot*, 1943). His painting became more unpolished during the 1940s and 1950s, with emphasized lines, more discernible form and clearer and purer colors (*A Gas Lamp with a Japanese Shade*, 1951; *Masks with Sphinx*, 1958). He had exhibitions in the Whitney Museum, the Chicago Art Institute and the Corcoran Biennale in Washington. He spent a period of his life in Arizona, where he painted desert landscapes and large-scale murals about the American Wild West mythology, for instance, *Bison Hunt* (1970). Fascinations with the "native" America led him away from the modernist Intimism towards the regional monumental American painting. After his death, numerous retrospective exhibitions have been organized in Europe: Museum of National Art in Belgrade²²⁵, Gallerie Bernheim-Jeune in Paris, Burdeke Gallery in Zurich, etc.

Fascinations with death – three *unrelated* cases:
Mangelos, Šuput and Aleksić (Serbian edition, p.140)

Mangelos (Dimitrije Mića Bašičević) was a Zagreb artist from Šid. Bašičević, and under the pseudonym Mangelos, created

art from the late 1940s until his death.²²⁶ His rare artistic public appearances took place at the *Permanent Art* exhibition (Gallery 212, Belgrade 1968) and at the solo exhibition *Picasso phenomenon – Mangelos Commentary*; what followed were a few exhibitions in which he joined the post-conceptual atmosphere: *Manifestos* at the Toša Dabac Gallery in Zagreb (1978), *Shid – Theory* (Podroom, Zagreb, 1979), *Energy* (Dubrava Gallery, Zagreb, 1979), *Retrospective* (Prostor proširenih medija, Zagreb, 1981), *Mangelos* (Sebastijan Gallery, Belgrade, 1986), *Mangelos* (Izložbeni salon Doma JNA, Zagreb, 1986). However, his real international career began after his death, with numerous international exhibitions, organized by art historian Branka Stipančić.²²⁷ One of the basic problems of interpreting Mangelos's artwork is the identification of philosophical, theoretical and artistic notions during the 1940s and 1950s. That is the period of individual artistic life and work, outside public spaces and institutions. It is possible to talk about Mangelos the artist as an *outcast* and a *stranger*, and not as a marginal or an alternative artist. Mangelos's *outcast* position is described by his recluseness, mysteriousness, and mysterious datings, re-datings and presentations of his own work and self-interpretations of those works. For instance, he was a member of the *Gorgona* group, although he never had a public appearance with the group or from it. This means he was an outcast in the micro-culture to which he most strongly belonged, and which was composed of him with his other associates. Furthermore, the duality of Mangelos and Mića Bašičević, an art historian and an artist, or more drastically, a curator and an artist, draws attention to thorough separation, falling out, completeness. What is more, Mangelos is a Serb in a Croatian culture, always on a covert lookout. Although Mića Bašičević was one of the extraordinary experts and theoreticians of the *new medium* (photography, film, kinetic art),²²⁸ Mangelos's production revolved around an unusual quasi-medium, which is neither painting, nor writing, nor object art. His work could be described by a series of negative attributes: not-poetry-not-prose-not-painting-not-text. This series of negative attributes has its outcome in early Avant-garde rebellions (for instance, Van Bor wrote "Neither poetry, nor prose, but a new form of expression", 1932), but it also has a dimension that pre-War Avant-gardes could not reach, and that is the existentialist nihilism that leads to a *hollow being* – existentially interpreted

223 Milan Kašanin, "Izložba Dvanaestorice", *Umetnički pregled*, Belgrade, 1937, pp. 2.

224 <http://www.imdb.com/name/nm0000953/>; and http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Peter_Bogdanovich.

225 Katalog: Lj. Stojanović, F. Soretić, *Borislav Bogdanović*, Museum of Modern Art, Belgrade, 1975.

226 Biljana Tomić (ed.), *Mangelos*, Galerija Sebastijan, Beograd, 1986; Branka Stipančić (ed.), *Dimitrije Bašičević Mangelos*, Galleries of the City of Zagreb, Zagreb, 1990; Ješa Denegri, Vojin Bašičević (eds.), *Mangelos – drugi o njemu*, Vojin Bašičević edition, Novi Sad, 1997.

227 Branka Stipančić organized an exhibition *Mangelos nos. 1 to 9½*, Museum de Arte Contemporânea de Serralves, Porto, 2003; Neue Galerie am Landesmuseum Joanneum, Graz, 2003; Fundació Antoni Tapies, Barcelona, 2004; Kunsthalle Fridericianum, Kassel, 2004.

228 Dimitrije Bašičević Mangelos, *Fotografija i umetnost*, Vojin Bašičević edition, Novi Sad, 1996.

nothingness. Crazy writing,²²⁹ from *tabula rasa* to the *manifest*, negating writing with painting and painting with writing, which is said in the term *tabula rasa* (empty board) itself, is a movement towards nothingness (*hollow being*, zero degree of letter and image), which will later, in a more strict and formal sense, be interpreted as a “tautology” in the fluxus, conceptual art and primary painting. Also, each of Mangelos’s works introduces us to the game of combinatorics of different activity and occupation in life: manual character of the practical realization of work, theoretical discourse character introduced into the work inscription, subversiveness of the levels of meaning of contextuality of the discursive fragments of a painting, ironic reversal of axiological meaning and, an unexpectedly, but necessary, contemplative focus on a certain fine and untouchable matter that affectively encompasses each of Mangelos’s art pieces. Mangelos’s manual character is a picture of the history of writing (*écriture*) told by means of painting procedures in the age of *machinist media*. Manual work is a tool of contemplative focus in the midst of technological alienation:

The world is not only changing, it has changed.
We are in a different century
Of the second civilization. A military one.
The civilization of manual work is over
And with it, all social phenomena
Based on manual labour.²³⁰

The paradox of alienation of the machinist age and the manual contemplative work is the central problem of Mangelos’s work. It is precisely these behavioral, intellectual, artistic and critical-theoretical games with the “Other”, the “double” and the “hollow” that Mangelos played, but also the games that are still being performed by his work in the curatorial system of constructing identities of 20th century art²³¹, which build language maps on language, maps that offer different hypothesis on the “subject” called Mangelos. Mangelos the artist predicted the year of his “death” – or more accurately, the length of his life. Prediction as an effect of alienated existential game with the sense of settling accounts. It was an obscure cynical mathematical result. But Mangelos calculated that critical year with great precision. As if one could have faith in the mathematical result in the context of an art practice of a Neo-Avant-garde experimental research of the ability to represent *life itself*

and *death itself*. He laid down the numbers that divide life into classes in an art project called *Šid manifesto*:

In quotations we often find “two” Marxes, three “Van Goghs”, “several” Picassos etc. The purpose of this is to indicate significant differences between the early and the late stages of authors. Attitudes of early stages are significantly different from the attitudes of the late ones. To the point of opposition. As if they were products of different people. The explanation of this phenomenon is simple. We are dealing with completely different subjects in the same person in legal terms. Material assumption of differentiation is a complete change of cells in an organism. Cells are being substituted every seven years. If the information on physiology I got in school in Šid – is reliable, than there should be nine and a half Mangeloses.

mangelos no. 1 ... 1921–1928
mangelos no. 2 ... 1928–1935
mangelos no. 3 ... 1935–1942
mangelos no. 4 ... 1942–1949
mangelos no. 5 ... 1949–1956
mangelos no. 6 ... 1956–1963
mangelos no. 7 ... 1963–1970
mangelos no. 8 ... 1970–1977
mangelos no. 9 ... 1977–1984
mangelos no. 9 1/2 1984–1987 (if the calculation is correct)
1933, – šid – 1987, les champs du dornier goulag²³²

Shown death is not death. It was a game with numbers and multiplicity of subjects. But death is not . . . a toy. Death has no body. “The smoothness of body” is not a feature of death. Death has no features. Death has no surface, no inner depth, no pharynx or ingestion. As a young man, Mangelos witnessed war and its brutal drama. The war drama, to him, was a horror of emptiness, which he addressed in his essays “a triumph of instincts” and “a triumph of war”. His pictures painted on student’s writing boardlets, called *Tabula rasa*, were being created from the late 1940s, until his death, not as a symbol of death, but instead of death. The phenomenology of death in art was one of his obsessions.

Bogdan Šuput²³³, a painter, was born in Sisak in 1914, where he lived until 1923, when his family moved to Novi Sad. He studied painting at the Royal Art School in Belgrade, at the teacher’s department (1932–38). He painted art graphics and paintings. His art graphics were close to the social art. He was a member of OMPOK (youth cultural-economic movement).²³⁴ He worked on improving his technique in Paris – Bernheim Jeune Gallery, from 13th to 24th March 1939. He was a member of the *Desetorica* group founded in 1940; members included Jurica Ribar, Nikola Graovac, Milivoj Nikolajević, Ljubica Sokić, B. Grujić, D. Vlajić, Aleksa Čelebonović, Danica Antić and

229 Nenad Dimitrijević, *We Manifestists and the School of Podroom*, in: Nenad Dimitrijević, *Manifesteri i škola Podrooma* (1978/1979), from: Dimitrije Mića Bašičević *Mangelos – Drugi o njemu*, Vojin Bašičević edition, Novi Sad, 1997, pp. 17–21.

230 Mangelos, “manifest manifestah”, from: Branka Stipančić (ed.), *Dimitrije Bašičević Mangelos*, Galleries of the City of Zagreb, Zagreb, 1990, pp. 53.

231 We are referring to the discovery of Mangelos’s work after his death and to the actions of involving his opus in the international art flows. Critics Nena Dimitrijević, Biljana Tomić i Branka Stipančić made the initial promotion of Mangelos’s work. Branka Stipančić made an exceptional critical, theoretical and historiographic attempt to create the mythical figure of Mangelos as an artist who names and conceptualizes the age of late modernity. Today his works are a part of numerous museum collections, from MOMA in New York, to Centre Pompidou in Paris.

232 *Mangelos no. 9 – no art šid-theory* (sito-štampano), Podroom, Zagreb, November 1978.

233 Vera Jovanović, *Slikar Bogdan Šuput 1914–1942*, Memorial collection of Pavle Beljanski, Novi Sad, 1984.

234 Živan Milisavac, *OMPOK, Omladinsko kulturno-privredni pokret 1936–1938*, Novi Sad, 1959.

Stojan Trumić among others. He lived in Novi Sad until 1940, when he was drafted by the army. Soon after the beginning of the war, he was captured and sent to a camp. He returned to Novi Sad in late 1941. He was killed by the Hungarian occupation forces during the Novi Sad raid in January 1942. Šuput's artwork was in connection with the influences of the intimist Modernism of the Parisian school. His melancholy motivated *A girls' semi-nude* (1937), the accurate postimpressionist *St. Michel I Boulevard* (1938), the intimately toned *P. M. Interior* (1938) or the completely conceptless *A jar and a mortar* (1940) were works of moderate Modernism, which, within the language of modern painting, were in a search for the importance of painting *itself*. One of the rare "exceptions" was the painting *Construction of an international road* (1938), close to graphics pieces: *Construction of the Belgrade bridge* (1933), *Unloading at the Belgrade docks* (1934), *Maintenance of an electric post* (1934), etc. But a conceptually different work, which does not coincide with Šuput's rational painting Intimism or his graphic pragmatic-liberal social engagement, is the painting *Skulls* (oil on canvas, 64.1 x 94.2cm, 1939). The painting was created as a development of a still-life composition with seven skulls:

I paint every day. Seemingly, it is enough. Now I cannot complain about the mess . . . Since you've left, I managed to paint a very good painting with 7 thousand year old skulls, which are already decomposing and some of them half "gone off" from clay. I painted it in Matica, so I wouldn't have to take it home. They were found during the leveling of the airport. A richness of grey and ochre tones. Slightly less than *Notre Dame*.²³⁵

It was not unusual to paint and draw skulls in the academic training for making still-lives. Also, there has always been a great modernist "intrigue" concerning Cézanne's still-lives with skulls (*Still-life with a skull*, 1895-1900; or the *Pyramid skull*, 1901): are those merely an exercise in form or uncertain addresses to death!? There are three bizarre motifs connected with Šuput's painting:

1. A chance passing by the construction site at the airport where the skulls from an old graveyard were found;

2. An almost non-chalant composition of the everyday objects (a jug, a glass, a printed page etc.) with the deliberately, and unnaturally placed skulls; and

3. The feeling of the closeness of war, which had already entered the European scene in 1939. In two years time, Šuput himself became a victim of that war, which was, as it turned out, imminently approaching. The painting was carefully prepared ("A sketch of *Skulls*", 1939), and the painting itself is compositionally and in the sense color, with its intimate bizarreness, given as a premonition of the universal destruction. This is one of the rare intimate pieces that goes out of its "little

world" and tells a story of a universal event of the big world, all the while emphasizing and developing a formalist model of presentation in a given Modernism.

Stevan Aleksić²³⁶ (Arad, 1876 – Modoš, 1923) came from a painters' family. He studied painting at a private school and then at the Academy (1896) with Nikolaso Gyzis in Munich. He returned to Arad in 1900, and later on settled in Modoš. He painted icons, portraits (*Self-portrait*, 1906), historical compositions and genre scenes (*Merry people of Banat*, 1905). The painting that made his painting thematic-genre work more serious and which represents a late symbolic and early proto-expressive "challenge" is *At a tavern table* (oil on canvas, 91 x 100cm, around 1906). This work was created at that contradictory and dramatic clash of international patterns of creation, developed from symbolic, Secessionist and proto-expressionist Munich and the ruling planerism that was continued with French or secondary Impressionisms. Landscape and portrait painting was, under the influence of Nagypanya, looking for greater autonomy, which was visible in an almost carefree presentation of the light in a landscape or on the face of the painted model. Neutral and intimate modes of creation of landscapes and portraits were signs of modernity, which was being achieved with great difficulty. Aleksić's group portrait with "death" was, on the contrary, an expression of painting gesture that offers, to the "innocence of Modernism", "dirty hands" of strong expressions, provincial bohemia, but also an expression of cynical distance from the "intimate idyll" towards the horror of drunkenness, madness, fear and death. What is present is the fear of death that is cynically-sublimely offered to the spectator through the "spectacle" of a festivity.

The painter made numerous paintings with tavern/bohemian/art life subject matters (*The artist and the muse*, 1900; *A self-portrait*, 1900-1901; *Marry people of Banat*, 1905; *Self-portrait with a fez*, 1910; *A self-portrait*, 1912; *Self-portrait with a cat*, 1913) and on the topic of death (*Dušan Aleksić at his death bed*, 1900; *Marija Aleksić at her death bed*, 1907; *The grim reaper*, 1916), and on the topic of inter-painting relationship of death and an artist (*Self-portrait in a tavern*, 1904; *At a tavern table*, 1906; *An innkeeper in Szeged*, 1917; *Self-portrait from a tavern*, around 1917; *A self-portrait*, 1918; *A self-portrait*, 1922). Aleksić's obsessive treatment of the topic of the encounter with death is a part of that "para-genre" of post-symbolism and proto-Expressionism developed in the North of Europe, which can be seen in Edvard Munch's (1863-1944) *Self-portrait with an arm of a skeleton* (1895), Cézanne's *Portrait of a boy with a skull* (1896-98) or *Self-portrait with a skeleton* (1896), and with Lovis Corinth (1858-1925). However, a direct source²³⁷

236 Jasna Jovanov (ed.), *Stevan Aleksić*, Matica srpska Gallery, Novi Sad, 1989.

237 Jovan Sekulić, *Minhenska škola i srpsko slikarstvo*, The Republic Bureau for the protection of the cultural monuments, Belgrade, 2002, pictures 35a. and 35b.

235 From a letter Bogdan Šuput wrote to his brother Žarko on November 21st 1939.

is the painting of a Swiss painter Arnold Böcklin (1827-1901) *Self-portrait with death and a violin* (1872), and numerous late-romantic postcards showing a dramatic relationship between a portrait and a skeleton as a symbol of death. All three works (text-manifest and the paintings), no matter how different they are – share the effort to show “death”. But this is not easily shown, nor are love and life. It is only the consequences of death, life and love that can be shown. Death is “nothing” and how can “nothing” be set free from the figurative character of presentation. Figurativeness seems unavoidable by (inscribing) death into a letter or a painting. However, a distance from figurativeness can be reached through cynicism towards death (Aleksić), through triviality of the horror/fear of death (Šuput) or by doubling to the point of parody the difference between the subject and the living individual (Mangelos).

Sculpture, politics and identities (Serbian edition, p.147)

The sculpture of Hungarian and Serbian artists of a small and, occasionally, monumental format during the period before World War II was created in the sign of national modernity and, later on, moderate Modernism.²³⁸ During the first half of the 20th century, sculpture in Vojvodina was subject to the political and religious demands, when it comes to the monumental memorial sculpture in Austro-Hungary, Hungary, the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes and the Kingdom of Yugoslavia. When it comes to “small plastics”, it was conditioned with national and social interests of the rising bourgeoisie classes. A small number of sculptures were leading towards the autonomy of the art of sculpture²³⁹, as it was, quite noticeably, taking place in painting and the graphic art.

Monumental sculptures – of the political and religious type – from the period of Austro-Hungary were mainly placed in Sombor, Subotica and Veliki Bečkerek, and in Novi Sad and Zemun. Most of the public Austro-Hungarian and Hungarian monuments were destroyed after the fall of Austro-Hungary. Most of the public monuments of the Kingdom of SCS and the Kingdom of Yugoslavia were destroyed during World War II by the Hungarian and German occupation forces, or, shortly afterwards, during the communist revolution. Monumental and public sculpture from the end of the 19th century until the end of World War II had clear features of a “network symbolic

instrument” of articulation of the public and political, rather than of the cultural and artistic public space and opinion.²⁴⁰

In the territory of Sombor, it is possible to mention the monument *Calvary* in Bezdan, with a stone cross on the graveyard in Gornja Varoš, the monuments at the Holy Trinity Square²⁴¹ and St. George Square²⁴², as well as the monuments to Ferenc Rákóczi II (1676-1735) and to József Schweidel (1796-1849) from 1907. A sculptor from Pest, Gyula Jankovits, (1865–1932) created the monument to Ferenc Rákóczi in 1912. The monument was placed on a pedestal 5.88m high, in front of the building of the today’s City Museum. The monument was removed between the World Wars. The monument to József Schweidel was financed by the donations from the citizens of Sombor, and was unveiled in 1905. It was created by Lajos György Mátrai (1850–1906), a sculptor from Budapest. It was removed from the entrance to Sombor Park, in front of the former municipality building just before World War II. A memorial monument to King Aleksandar Karađorđević I by Antun Augustinčić was placed at St. George Square in 1940. It was removed in 1941, only to be dismembered and sold to the Kragujevac foundry in 1954.

Monuments by Karl Salzer, B. Jablonski and Kovač, *Holy Trinity* (1815, Bajmok – 1878, 1893), can be found in Subotica. A monument by Petar Palavinči (1887-1958) *Emperor Jovan Nenad II*²⁴³ dates from 1927. The monument was destroyed when the Hungarian troops entered Subotica in 1941. It was reconstructed by Sava Halugin, a sculptor, in 1991. The *Emperor Jovan Nenad* monument was one of the symbolic signs of the importance or the historical presence of the Serbian people and the Serbian, that is, Yugoslav political interests in the territory of the Pannonian plain. It is interesting that the symbol of Nenad’s monument is also inscribed in the graphic works of “Savez Sokola” in the “Yugoslav Subotica”. The motif of the *Emperor Jovan Nenad* monument on Sava S. Rajković’s postcard is shown as an emphasized neo-classical symbol of this sports and militant right-wing organization.

The Croatian sculptor Ivo Rendić created the bust of Emperor Franz Joseph I in the town park in Zemun. The town

238 Miloš Arsić, “Razvoj skulpture u Vojvodini (1895–1980)”, from: Ljiljana Ivanović (ed.), *Razvoj skulpture u Vojvodini 1895–1980*, Contemporary Visual Arts Gallery, Novi Sad, 1984, pp. 5–7.

239 One of the rare analytical studies of modern sculpture is an essay by Kosta Strajnić “Evropsko vajarstvo XIX i XX veka – Klasicisti, romantičari, realisti”, *Matica srpska Literary Magazine*, Vol. 317 No. 2, Novi Sad, August 1928, pp. 209-233.

240 Penelope Curtis, “The Public Place of Sculpture” and “The Tradition of the Monument”, from: *Sculpture 1900–1945 – After Rodin*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1999, pp. 5–34 and 37–70.

241 The square was named after the monument to the Holy Trinity, placed in 1774, to show gratitude for the end of a plague epidemic. The monument was a classic baroque sculpture of an elegant, graceful, highly erected column on top of which there was a statue of the Holy Trinity. The monument was removed in 1947, and was damaged during the removal.

242 A memorial monument to King Aleksandar Karađorđević by Antun Augustinčić was standing at St. George Square. Soon upon its reveal, when the Hungarian occupation forces arrived, it was removed in 1941. The monument was a part of a unity with a Christian Orthodox cross from 1795, which is today standing in the garden of the St. George church.

243 Emperor Jovan Nenad II (died in 1527) is a mysterious figure from Serbian history, who started a rebellion against the Hungarian kingdom, declared himself an emperor, and thus, the ruler of the Serbian empire on the territory of the present-day Bačka.

management committee for cultivation and park maintenance commissioned the monument. The first public sculpture was placed in the town park, during the festivity commemorating the Emperor's birthday on 27th July 1901. The bust of Emperor Ferdinand Joseph I from white marble was placed on top of the pediment, with the town coat of arms. A garden was planted behind the monument that closed the passage to Vuk's Street. The monument was destroyed during the brief breach of the Serbian army in Zemun in 1914. The bust disappeared, and the pediment was sold in 1950.²⁴⁴

The Zagreb sculptor Rudolf Valdec created the horse-riding monument to *King Petar I the Liberator* in Zrenjanin in 1926. The monument was destroyed in 1941.

A parade horse-riding statue to *King Petar I* by Petar Palavanči was placed in Pančevo in 1932. It was destroyed by the Germans during the occupation.

Ivan Meštrović (1893-1962) made a monument to a Serbian politician Svetozar Miletić (1826-1901) in Novi Sad. The monument was erected under the initiative of Matica srpska. It was completed on 1st October 1939. It was 5m in height and was placed on a 2m high pedestal. The monument was removed from the square in front of the City Hall during the Hungarian occupation of Novi Sad in World War II. It was placed in the former military barracks, near Almaško graveyard. It was returned to the central square in the autumn of 1944. It was placed on a lower pedestal. The sculptor Pavle Radovanović engraved basic information onto the monument several years later.

The following artists also created monuments and public sculptures: Toma Rosandić (1878-1958), Robert Frangeš-Mihanović (1872-1940), Paško Vučetić (1871-1925), Milan Nedeljković (1896-1947), Mihály Kara-Krón. Sculptors Milan Nedeljković, Stevan Bodnarov (1905-1993) and Vojislav Šikoparija-Ratimirović (1892-1966) mostly worked in Belgrade. Karlo Baranji²⁴⁵ created in a very late Secessionist sculptural style (*Head of Christ*, 1932; or *Icarus*, 1936), possibly under influence from Ivan Meštrović. Zlata Markov Baranji (1906-1986) worked with ceramics.

The first Serbian sculptures in Vojvodina were done by classicists Dimitrije Petrović (Baja, 1799-1852) and Đorđe Jovanović²⁴⁶ (Novi Sad, 1861 – Belgrade, 1953). Jovanović created public monuments in Novi Sad, Ruma, Sremski Karlovci and Belgrade (*War victims*, 1918; *Vuk Stefanović Karadžić*, 1937), and the academic and symbolical sculptures of smaller

dimensions (*Sorrow*, 1907). Hungarian sculptors Ferenc Međeši, Ede Telcs, Béla Radnai – Rausch (1873-1923) and Istók János were creating until World War I. They mainly made small plastics and civic sculptures. Several sculpting exhibitions were organized: Novi Sad 1902, Veliki Bečkerek 1903, Vršac 1907.

Socialist Realism as a socialist Internationalism "Workers of all countries, Unite!" (Serbian edition, p.155)

Putting forth the definition that modern/postmodern societies and cultures of late capitalism, from Western Europe and USA to Australia and Japan, are identified as the societies and culture of the *first world*, and former colonized cultures of Africa, Asia and South America are cultures of the *third world*, then the societies (countries, cultures) that were identified as societies of the real socialism²⁴⁷ could be referred to as the *second world*.²⁴⁸ The idea of the "second world" is an open and heterogeneous concept, which, from one culture to another (from country to country), has completely different actual and fictional realizations. It is possible to talk about different versions of the real socialism of the revolutionary governments at the end of World War I (German communist revolution, Hungarian revolution of Béla Kun, the Baranya Republic), from state socialism of the Soviet type determined by the hard concept of soc-realist culture, through the Chinese mass revolutionary socialism determined by the concept of a "cultural revolution", to the Yugoslav self-governing socialism determined by hybrid social, political and cultural potentials between the political East and West.

After the dramatic war years with tragic occupations, persecutions, raids and deportations, with the genocide over the Jewish people, performed by the Nazi and pro-Nazi regimes of the ISC, Hungary and Germany, Vojvodina underwent a brutal and vengeful communist revolution that led to the liquidation of the bourgeoisie urban and rural social class, and to the genocide and persecution of the Danube Germans. After the establishment of the revolutionary government and after the revolutionary party dictatorship²⁴⁹ immediately after World War II and during the 1950s, there was a metamorphosis of the revolutionary party government into a party-bureaucratic and technocratic social organization under the patronage of the liberalized and bureaucratized elite in all real-socialist societies.

244 Branko Najhold, "Urbani razvoj", from *Hronika zemuna 1871-1918*, Trag, Zemun, 1994, pp. 96.

245 Bogomil Karlavariš, "Karlo Baranji", *Umetnost*, No. 39, Belgrade, 1974, pp. 76; Bela Duranci, "Na prekretnici vekova: Karlo Baranji", from: *Moj izbor*, Visual Cultures Center "Zlatno oko", Novi Sad, 2004, pp. 4-17.

246 Miodrag Jovanovic, *Đoka Jovanović 1861-1953*, Matica srpska Gallery, Novi Sad, 2006.

247 It is, of course, possible to talk about different versions of the real socialism, from the state socialism of the Soviet type, through the Chinese mass revolutionary socialism determined by the concept of a "cultural revolution", to the Yugoslav self-governing socialism between the political East and West.

248 Aleš Erjavec, "Drugi svet", from: *Kpodobi*, Zveza kulturnih organizacij Slovenije, Ljubljana, 1996, pp. 121-124.

249 This process was significantly longer in USSR, and could be followed back to 1917.

Roughly speaking, regardless of the individual differences, late socialism from USSR to Yugoslavia is determined by a faster or slower weakening of the state and party centralism and control of culture and art. Techno-bureaucratic institutions of the late real-socialism were considerably liberalized and redirected, explicitly or implicitly, towards the reform of real-socialist countries in the direction of the socialistically adapted Western liberalism or national democracies²⁵⁰ during the 1980s. After the fall of the Berlin wall and of the Warsaw block, there was an establishment of the so-called post-socialist or transitional period in Eastern and Central Europe. The exception is, of course, SFRY (Socialist Federative Republic of Yugoslavia), in which the transitional period began with the breakdown of the federative state and numerous cruel civil and intervention wars, and with the change in the structure of society. All these processes could be observed in terms of “entropy” with regards to the offered paradigms and ideals or goals of the real socialism, but also with regards to the integrity of the economic-political system.

The roads of transformations of the bourgeoisie art modernist pluralism between World Wars brutally ended during World War II in Vojvodina, when either propaganda art of the conflicting parties (Nazi German art, Nazi Hungarian art, Nazi ISC art, socialist Realism of the fight for national liberation movement) or occasional private-intimate productions done out of the public eye (for instance, works of Sava Šumanović in Šid until 1942, when he was executed, and the work of Milan Konjović in Sombor or of Aleksandar Lakić, who during 1942 and 1943 made several highly expressionist figurative and erotically motivated paintings) were the only forms of art created. According to the chronology of Miloš Arsić in the catalog *Slikarstvo u Vojvodini 1900-1944 (Visual Arts in Vojvodina 1900-1944)*²⁵¹, it is clear that the exhibiting activity was mainly connected with the Hungarian national community between 1941 and 1944.²⁵²

With the end of war and establishment of the new socialist country, the processes of the renewal of *art life* were performed on two levels: at the level of engaging artists towards the direction of the socialist Realism and establishing new art institutions – from exhibitions to gallery and museum work. Socialist Realism, or soc-Realism, could be seen as a normative art doctrine and style formation based on the representation

of the optimum projection (project, vision, utopia) of the new Yugoslav socialist society.²⁵³ Socialist Realism was created during the 1930s in USSR, and became a dominant art in the countries of the social Realism immediately after World War II. Characteristics of social Realism are the totalitarian and revolutionary reactions to the autonomies of Modernism, so it is often seen as a constant postmodern anti-Modernism, since it develops a critique and liquidation of Avant-garde and modern art; and that it, in a formal-artistic sense, returns to the forms of the mimetic representation. As a model of revolutionary art, socialist Realism is anticipated in the socially engaged art of the 19th century, from Courbet’s painting Realism and Zola’s critical Naturalism to Russian literary aesthetics in the service of a society – Ogarjova, Dobroljubova and Pisareva. It was initiated by the writings of Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels, V. I. Lenin and Leon Trotsky on literature and revolution, and was confirmed as a state art by the speech of Andrei Ivanovich Zdanov at the Kharkov conference in 1934. Aesthetics of the socialist Realism were developed by Lukács Görgy and Todor Pavlov, above others. Socialist Realism is a result of a long process of selection of art means and traditions, based on the state and political needs. As a dominant art in the countries of real socialism, it is based on:

1. Pseudo-classicist, romantic and academic figurative iconography of the 19th century, which is shaped into the typical socialist iconography;
2. The ideas of Realism as an art of synthesis and monumental (heroic) representation of the new society;
3. The dialectic method of truthful and historically specific representation of reality (reflection theory) in its revolutionary development;
4. The actualization of the pedagogue function of art in a society, by showing the appropriate to a wide audience.

According to Karel Teige, theoreticians of socialist Realism define and postulate Realism as an accurate representation and interpretation of interesting, primarily socially important and typical realities, as a means of giving values and politically purposeful content. Those important contents must be presented in a form that is easy to understand and subordinate to content, so that they would be able to transfer to the audience the thoughts of the artist and his or her emotional engagement, with the technique that is a testament to the artist’s skill. Realistic painting must be eloquent and faithful to nature and reality, with its content and the subject matter, and with the mimetically and illusionary set form. Socialist Realism was supposed to reach the high level of inner compatibility between the critical Realism and revolutionary Romanticism (Maxim

250 Aleš Erjavec, “Kulturna dominanta ter kulturna identiteta Drugega sveta”, in: “Drugi svet”, from: *K podobi, Zveza kulturnih organizacij Slovenije*, Ljubljana, 1996, pp. 124–134.

251 Miloš Arsić, “Pregled samostalnih izložbi sa bibliografijom (izbor)” and “Pregled grupnih izložbi sa bibliografijom (izbor)”, from: *Slikarstvo u Vojvodini 1900–1944*, Contemporary Visual Arts Gallery, Novi Sad, 1991, pp. 185–198 and 199–211.

252 Avoiding the discussion about the art during World War II is quite understandable in the period of the socialist Yugoslavia – see, for instance, footnote 7 in Miloš Arsić “1. Zatečena situacija”, in: “Period 1944–1950”, from the catalogue *Likovna umetnost u Vojvodini 1944–1954*, Contemporary Visual Arts Gallery, Novi Sad, 1980, pp. 12 i 34.

253 *Umjetnost i revolucija: revolucionarno kiparstvo*, Spektar, Zagreb, 1977; and *Umjetnost i revolucija: revolucionarno slikarstvo*, Spektar, Zagreb, 1977.

Gorky), and be proletariat in content and national in form (Stalin), and consequently achieve a subjective reflection of objective reality (Pavlov)²⁵⁴ and turn artists into engineers of human souls (Stalin). The notion of an artist as an engineer of human souls was shaped in the left-wing Avant-gardes. Tretjakov wrote that art is a process of production and consumption of emotionally engaged works, and that an art creator must become a psycho-engineer and a psycho-constructor. Art is not just a mirror that reflects historical class struggle, but is also the weapon of that struggle, which at the same time means, the “instrument” of intervention in the derivation of the given social reality.

Specific features of the socialist Realism in Vojvodina²⁵⁵ are obvious: socialist Realism²⁵⁶ appeared with the victory of the political forces that were in charge of the national fight for liberation and which established a new communist regime. The victory of the communist regime was not only a “revolution”, but also a complex effect of the national fight for liberation movement, that is, of the clash with high and middle national classes and layers of society, and particularly of the enforcement of a repressive politics towards the German and Hungarian national minorities because of their active involvement with the occupation regimes in the territory of Vojvodina. During that period, a settlement of the “colonists”, mostly Serbs from Croatia, Bosnia and Montenegro, took place, which altered the ethnic structure of Vojvodina, as compared with the pre-War period. It was only after the strengthening of the communist government that the establishment of the politics of national equality was enforced. The introduction of the socialist Realism had quite certain starting grounds in the social art of the pre-War period. With the establishment of socialist Realism as a dominant “style”, there was an aesthetic, artistic and political turning away from the bourgeoisie Modernism. A termination of the Avant-garde practices and radical-modernist tendencies in Vojvodinian culture started taking place in the late 1920s, with the establishment of the dominant *discourse of art* of the moderate and high-modernist tendencies of the bourgeoisie Realism and Modernism, so that socialist Realism was not created out of the clash with Avant-garde experiments and artists’ excesses, but out of the critical clash with the highly aestheticized, formal and hermetic *style* of the moderate and high Modernism, which was prone to certain versions of Realism.

On the other hand, there was an integration of formal and modernist solution into painting practices of socialist Realism,

which led to the *softer* version of the socialist Realism. Paradoxically, there was a clash between the *soft* socialist Realism, modified modernist *style* patterns and the introduction of the regional “people’s” (Serbian, Hungarian, Slovak etc) expressions in painting. In other words, the syntheses of the “new” revolutionary theme with modernist form and folklore expressions were visible during the first exhibitions of Vojvodina art during 1945 and 1946.²⁵⁷ An explicit concept of socialist Realism was achieved at the exhibition of the Art Club of the Fighters-Painters of the 3rd Yugoslav Army, held at the Cultural Center in Novi Sad, in January 1945. Nine artists participated in the exhibition, three of them from Vojvodina: Milan Kečić, Jovan Vitomirov, Z. Petrović. The first post-War exhibition – *Exhibition of the artists from Vojvodina* – took place at the City Museum in Petrovgrad (Zrenjanin) showing works from artists, most of whom were born in Vojvodina, but were mainly associated with Belgrade through their work. First awards went to Milan Konjović, for his *Celebration of the October Revolution in Sombor* (1945) and to Ivan Radović – *Germans passed through here* (1945). The next important exhibition of Pavle Beljanski’s collection, entitled *Contemporary Yugoslav Painting*, took place in Sombor, in October 1945. This exhibition was seen as a diversion, since it showed works of the pre-War Modernism, and the participating authors, Milan Konjović, Veljko Petrović, a writer and Jovan Hercog, were subjected to criticism.

Critics and theoreticians of the socialist Realism with revolutionary beliefs were advocating an obvious revolutionary turn from modernist Formalism towards the art in the service of people and the working class. Influential essays of Jovan Popović, Sreten Marić²⁵⁸ and Oto Bihalji-Merin²⁵⁹ started appearing in the Belgrade press and newspapers. Roughly speaking, they thought that the formalist aesthetic of Modernism should be surpassed with the establishment of a new instrumental and didactic art, with which the realistic and, at the same time, revolutionary and socialism oriented art was projected. Revolutionary engaged painting themes, which they were advocating for, were the themes of the national fight against the Nazi occupation and the themes of the revolutionary reconstruction and rebuilding of the country. Both thematic positions are expressed as international demands for participation in the global Soviet revolution, but also in the general human didactic move towards the new socialist man and society:

254 Teodor Pavlov, *TEORIJA ODRAZA – osnovna pitanja dijalektičko-materijalističke teorije saznanja*, Kultura, Belgrade, 1947.

255 Miloš Arsić (ed.), *Likovna umetnost u Vojvodini 1944–1954*, Contemporary Visual Arts Gallery, Novi Sad, 1980.

256 Dragoslav Đorđević, “Socijalistički realizam, 1945–1950”, from: Miodrag B. Protić (ed.), 1929–1950: *Nadrealizam Postnadrealizam Socijalna umetnost Umetnost NOR-a Socijalistički realizam*, Museum of Modern Art, Belgrade, 1969, pp. 68–81.

257 See: Boško Petrović, “Katalog somborske Galerije moderne jugoslovenske slikarske umetnosti”, *Letopis Matice srpske*, Novi Sad, January-February 1946, pp. 169–171.

258 Sreten Marić, “Povodom jedne izložbe bez datuma”, *Politika*, 6–7–8. I, Belgrade, 1945.

259 Oto Bihalji Merin, “Izložba likovnih umetnika Srbije”, *Borba*, Belgrade, July 22nd 1945.

... true human face, tragic and heroic, glorious in this period of fight for the humanity and human life, still has not been given an expression on a painter's canvas.²⁶⁰

Here, it is important to notice that the idea of "international art" was changed in two ways. On one side, the center of international influences was no longer the modern Vienna, and the modernist Munich, Prague, Budapest or Paris, but the revolutionary and communist USSR. On the other hand, the "international" no longer meant the artistic, intellectual or existential participation in modern world art, but the enforcement of the political platform, party line, Soviet realistic *style* as a general human political-revolutionary practice. Socialist Realism paradoxically kept aspects of Modernism – art which is fighting for the project of progress and transformation of the current, but also some of the anti-modernist features: rejection of painting formalism and Aestheticism, that is, the autonomy of art, in the name of the revolutionary role of art in the *new society*.

In the period between 1945 and 1953, a "visual arts life" was established, with the beginning of amateur work in clubs, the opening of various cultural centers, art classes, with the organization of exhibitions of contemporary Vojvodina art, the organization of group and solo exhibitions, etc. After the end of cooperation with USSR in 1948, the first self-criticisms or revisions of canonical suppositions of the socialist Realism – for instance "Proglas saveza likovnih umetnika Jugoslavije" ("The proclamation of the union of visual artists of Yugoslavia").²⁶¹ In the introductory article "Idejnost daje krila talentima" ("Ideas give wings to the talented") of the first issue of *Umetnost* magazine, Jovan Popović provided the new program course of the cultural and art politics in Yugoslavia:

The socialist idea is one of the most important elements to be developed in our art, visual, as well as other. In the transformed social reality, which transforms people and is transformed by the people, art, too, must be transformed together with social reality, with the conscience of the people who build socialism and with their image, which is a part of the country's image. It must do this, so that it would affect, on its part, people's transformation, so that it would not just superficially and mechanically register, but interpret and educate as well, so that it would discover the new and imply, summon.

That is why the socialist idea cannot be just some mechanical declaration. It must permeate the content and the form of a work, it must be inseparable with artists' most intimate feelings and thoughts. Artists cannot give true art works if, in hidden corners of their individuality, they jealously nurture intimate disagreements with the sense and perspective of our society and age. Their most intimate has to be in accordance with the ideas and practices

of our new society. That is why the work on ideological awareness is crucial.

In our cultural revolution, which developed at a considerable rate, during the very construction of the material foundations of the new socialist culture, artists already have every condition provided by a country of working people, a country in which all assets from the production are in the hands of the working people, where the entire cultural legacy belongs to the working people, as well as the heritage of the socialist culture, in which people themselves are the creating subjects. Artists have a new audience, which expects to see in their works what is in life felt as grand and beautiful, and is grateful if those works make life more meaningful and beautiful. State and mass organizations commission from artists paintings and sculptures, ornaments for big public buildings and monuments for towns and squares.²⁶²

Certain inversions of the socialist Realism (idea, didactics, transformation of reality, closeness of life, role of a socialist country) and certain revisionist remarks on artists' creative talent, the function of art that is not only didactic-notional but focused towards the "beautiful" and "decorative" were established in this text. Harder versions of the socialist Realism can be identified in the works of Boško Petrović (*Portrait of Marshal Tito*, 1944), Milan Konjović (*Portrait of Tito*, 1944), Stojan Trumić (*Partisan from Banat*, 1945), Mileta Vitorović (graphics map *Sutjeska I and II*, 1945, 1954), Milan Kečić (*Motif from Batina*, 1945), Đorđe Teodorović (*At sunrise*, 1946–47 or *The construction of Marshal Tito Bridge in Novi Sad*, 1946), Sándor Otáh (*Rukovetačica*, 1948), Andraš Hand (*Forming of the navy brigade*, 1949), and Milivoj Nikolajević²⁶³ (*24 drawings of villages*, 1950). Concepts of the genre of "country life", typical of the moderate Modernism in Vojvodina, and socialist Realism were ideologically developed in Nikolajević's catalog of drawings. It is written in the accompanying lines:

Subject matter of countryside in twenty-four drawings in this catalog is not and could not have been given in the versatile, rich, and, actually, endless content provided by our countryside, especially in the present socialist transformation. This is just the beginning.

All portraits, individual figures and landscapes were done directly in country work communes, on communal estates and in the villages of Vojvodina. Figure compositions are entirely observed in the field, and later developed, based on the drawings of individual figures and entire groups done directly at the source.

Most of the drawings were made in country work communes *Crvena zvezda* and *Pobeda* in Bačko Dobro Polje and in the *Novo doba* commune in Irig, and the final two in communes *Marko Orešković* in Nakovo and *Crvena zvezda* in Bački Jarak.²⁶⁴

260 Jovan Popović, "Izložba vojvođanskih likovnih umetnika", *Borba*, Belgrade, September 20th 1945.

261 The proclamation was published in the catalogue of the first exhibition of the Union of visual artists of FPRY, Ljubljana, 1949.

262 Jovan Popović, "Idejnost daje krila talentima", *Umetnost*, No. 1, Zagreb, 1949, pp. 7–8.

263 Milivoj Nikolajević, *24 crteža sela*, Matica srpska, Novi Sad, 1950.

264 Note from: Milivoj Nikolajević, *24 crteža sela*, Matica srpska, Novi Sad, 1950.

“The Hard”²⁶⁵ version of socialist Realism is taken to mean the works of the strict Academic Realism. Numerous Yugoslav painters (Marijan Detoni, Ismet Mujezinović, Edo Murtić, Vanja Raduš, Oton Postružnik, Krsto Hegeđušić, and even Đorđe Andrejević Kun), who had high positions in the party system, allowed themselves to bend the rules of Academic Realism within the soc-realistic themes even in the 1940s.

Đorđe Teodorović²⁶⁶ (1907-1986) was one of the representatives of the “hard” version of socialist Realism in painting in Vojvodina.²⁶⁷ He finished art school, with an academic course, in Belgrade in 1933. Some of his professors were Nikola Bešević, Ljuba Ivanović and Milan Milovanović. The impressionist painter Milan Milovanović had the greatest influence on his painting development. Teodorović is one of the founders of the socially oriented art group *Život* (1934), which included members like Đorđe Andrejević Kun, Mirko Kujačić, Dragan Beraković, Radoica Živanović – Noe, and Vladeta Piperski. The group was under the influence of the Yugoslav Communist party. It acted entirely within the concepts of proletariat art, that is, the social Realism. During that period, Teodorović painted paintings with social subject matters, mainly from the life workers-farmers: *Evening walk* (1935) and *Resting* (1939). After the war, he was one of the most prominent representatives of socialist Realism. He created a series of large, monumental paintings with subject matters from the national fight for liberation (several versions of the painting *Sutjeska* from 1949, 1949, 1953, 1968; *At sunrise* from 1946-47; *Seventh day* from 1966). During the same period he painted large-scale compositions with historical-patriotic subject matter, for instance *First Serbian Uprising 1803* (1960). Teodorović went back to painting intimist themes (nudes, portraits, landscapes) after his visit to Paris in 1950.

He worked in the Agitprop of the Provincial Committee for Vojvodina in Novi Sad. He was a professor at the Visual Arts Academy in Belgrade from 1948 until he retired in 1968.

At first sight, compromising the paintings of Milan Konjović *Liberation of Sombor* (1944) and *Fight at a farm* (1945) creates a far-reaching synthesis, which will promise possible evolutionary revisions of socialist Realism towards socialist Modernism of the 1950s and 60s. Konjović finished these paintings with temperamental strokes, in a composition and content that is utterly modernist, almost abstract. The relationship of the “partisan subject matter” or the “new idea” and the modernist form and strength of expression was something

that was yet to be developed in the 1950s, through socialist Aestheticism and moderate Modernisms within the socialist Modernism.

Modification models of socialist Realism (Serbian edition, p.162)

In order to understand the art of the 1950s, it is necessary to indicate fundamental changes within the socialist Realism and, more precisely, the interpretations of tension between the East (*Warsaw pact*) and the West (*NATO pact*). I will use models.

Model one: binary feature of the 1950s. This is a model, which in its notions confronts the art and culture of the western capitalist Modernism and the eastern real-socialist anti-Modernism. Western Modernism is seen as an expression of the actualization of the autonomy of art that developed in the industrial capitalist society of the middle of the 20th century. Bourgeoisie Modernism of the 19th century and the period before World War I is the Modernism of a growing culture of specialized competence and conquest, for instance, in art autonomy (in the formal sense, with regards to the tradition of mimesis and in the social sense, with regards to the institutions of politics, religion, and public opinion).²⁶⁸ Contrary to this, Modernism of the developed capitalism²⁶⁹ in the 1950s is a ruling hegemony and a dominant culture of its age that integrates:

- (a) High formalist Aestheticism;
- (b) Developments of the industrial use of high art in mass culture; and
- (c) Individual position of a subject (artist) in a society.

On the contrary, socialist Realism in the political East – although the very term of the political East is not consistent at all – is based on criticism and rejection of ideals of art autonomy in the name of social revolutionary victories. Before the victory of the October revolution, socialist Realism was a critical socialist Realism, which showed, with artistic means, the tension of the class conflict in a bourgeoisie society. After the victory of the Bolshevik revolution in 1918, critical socialist Realism in the USSR was transformed into an apologetic art of the interests and functions of the leaders, that is, of the party, class struggle. In the eastern European countries, in the late 1940s and early 1950s, socialist Realism mainly stands for an externally enforced model of presentation of the optimum projection of the social and revolutionary context. Social-

265 Umjetnost i revolucija – Revolucionarno slikarstvo, Spektar, Zagreb, 1977.

266 Đorđe Teodorović, “Autobiografija”, a manuscript.

267 Miodrag B. Protić (ed.), *Jugoslovenska umetnost XX veka: Nadrealizam, postnadrealizam, socijalna umetnost, umetnost NOR-a, socijalistički realizam*, Museum of Modern Art, Belgrade, 1969; Miloš Arsić (ed.), *Likovna umetnost u Vojvodini 1944—1954*, Contemporary Visual Arts Gallery, Novi Sad, 1980.

268 Francis Frascina, Nigel Blake, Briony Fer, Tamara Garb, Charles Harrison, *Modernity and Modernism. French Painting in the Nineteenth Century*, Yale University Press, New Haven, London, 1993.

269 Paul Wood, Francis Frascina, Jonathan Harris, Charles Harrison, *Modernism in Dispute. Art since the Forties*, Yale University Press, New Haven, London, 1993.

ist Realism no longer had the critical function, whereas the apologetic one was developed into the rhetorical – ornamental or trivially didactic effects of the promise or projection of a specific modern “age”.

If we are to remain a moment on the matter of function, it could be said that the West projected the *function of art to be without function*, whereas the East projected the *function of art to be in the service of the revolution*, meaning permanent progress. However, the function of functionlessness and the function of utilitarianism are the effects of a speech of ideology, which seems to hide the actual state of affairs. It can be noticed that the western autonomous (as functionless) Modernism is represented and interpreted as modernized Modernism or real Modernism, and the eastern engaged (as functional or utilitarian) Modernism as a kind of anti-Modernism. On the other hand, historical examples assure us that the functionlessness of the western Modernism had its political utilitarian purpose of building a special brand of social relations (liberal society) and its international hegemony, and that the overstated activism, optimism and utilitarian character of the socialist Realism was often, in the 1950s and 1960s, mere rhetoric statement (a decoration, didactics) about the state of affairs nobody believed in any more, although...

Model two: hegemonic picture of Western Modernism in the 1950s and 1960s. In this model, the Western high Modernism is shown as a dominant and the only representation of Modernism as opposed to all other possible versions and side Modernisms (Modernism of the popular culture, Neo-Avant-garde Modernism, Modernism within the real socialism, moderate Modernism, regional Modernism). High Modernism is envisaged, represented and realized as the history of evolutions or self-progress of the art-aesthetic formalism and institutions of culture which are observing that self-progress. High Modernism is based on the ideology that represents art with non-ideological and non-conceptual terms and expressions. What is being indicated is the development of aesthetic formalism, abstract art and of the accomplishment of the essence of visual autonomy of an artwork. Artwork is freed from the mimetic identity of representation, and the artist is an exceptional individual who, through their own human drama (of suffering or enjoyment) transcends their existence in the work that *is*, and with that *is*, it confirms the validity of the artist's existential action or act.²⁷⁰

Model three: asymmetric models within Western Modernism of the 50s. We start from the idea that Western Modernism is a dominant hegemonic culture, but that it is not a unitary, all-encompassing paradigm, but that the dominant concept of Modernism is based on the dialectic relationship of high and

critical, experimental and emancipating Modernisms. High Modernism is, in that respect, seen as a Modernism, developed and aesthetically perfected by the individual creative act of an artist, who, in existential terms, tempts the very nature of his medium. High modernist work is esoteric: it is based on exceptional values outside the frames of everyday existence and ideology, that is, on the original, the sublime and the unspoken. It is in that spirit that certain works of abstract Expressionism, Abstraction Lyrique, L'Art Informel are created, although, American authors, by all means, represent paradigmatic examples, and their actions, at the turn of the 1960s, will be *canonized* by Clement Greenberg²⁷¹ as a pictorial-axiological-metaphysical horizon of Modernism. These works were not created at the clear plane of formalism but on a certain inconsistent juncture:

(a) existential beliefs about the individual (paradoxical union of the French existentialism atmosphere of the 40s and the 50s and the American pragmatic individualism);

(b) of the concept of a symbol or an archetype as a direct trace or expression of a human act;

(c) of the formalist realization and development of a work; Formalism here is not something that is connected with mathematical Formalism or literary- theoretical Formalism of the Russian Avant-garde, but with the Kant-like and neo-Kant-like ideals of the interest-free and autonomous experience of an art work, which are connected with the autonomy of the manual action in a pictorial field; and

(d) of beliefs about universality of the Modernist experience and appreciation of an artwork and of art.

As opposed to all these positions, there are principles that cannot be identified with esoteric high Modernism and its autonomy. Those are *esoteric* approaches that see art as a field of the social, rather than only the pictorial, and the act of creation as a way of questioning and criticizing given environment (world of art) and not as a way of putting in motion unconscious powers in human existence.²⁷² The a priori rule of taste is being confronted with the ideas of the concept and conceptualization of the process and context of creation, exhibiting and reception of art. The artist is the one who, in their medium, works with the conceptualization of conventions or customs from a given micro-world or macro-world of art and culture. This *other line* (of history, co-relation of scenes) is not homogenous as the first one and is often realized in any of the four different models:

(i) Individual approaches of painters who are, with regards to their status, close to high modernists, but who do not adopt their universal aesthetics, but critically provoke the status

270 Charles Harrison, *Modernism*, Tate Gallery Publishing, London, 1997.

271 Clement Greenberg, "Modernist Painting", *Art and Literature*, no. 4, 1965, pp. 193–201.

272 Charles Harrison, "Modernism in two voices", from: *Essays on Art&Language*, Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1991, pp. 2–21.

of the work (the painting), the subject of art (painter – artist – human being) and of the world of art as a function of art and culture institutions – these authors, in the American environment, certainly include Ad Reinhardt, Frank Stella, Jasper Johns, Robert Rauschenberg, and in the European environment, partly Georges Mathieu, Lucio Fontana and, certainly, Piero Manzoni and Yves Klein;

(ii) Individual or collective approaches that reconstruct (regenerate) the tradition of the historical construction-ist (geometrical painting, neo-constructivism, kinetics) and Dada (neo-Dada, flux, happening, lettrism) Avant-gardes in the late 40s and 50s – these are Avant-gardes that Peter Bürger, justifiably or not, critically identifies as the *second hand Avant-gardes*;

(iii) Individual or collective approaches that establish an existential, artistic and theoretical criticism of the dominance of high Modernism in the West and socialist Realism and Aestheticism in the East, in other words, Avant-garde experiments, innovations, excesses, subversions are not a re-make of the Avant-gardes prior to World War II, but a response of the new generations of artists to the canonizations, anomalies and crises of the 50s (examples are the artists after L'Art Informel, flux, happening – main figures of which are Cage, Klein, Manzoni, group N, group T, group Zero); and

(iv) Different and incomparable approaches identifying with the criticism of Modernism in the range from the left-wing strategies of the social Realism to the right-wing procedures of post-SurRealism, fiction painting, fiction Realism and the renewal of national and regional styles.

This heterogeneous un-whole model broke up the unity of the presentation and pointed out that the body of Modernism is more like a *bulb*, as described by Deleuze and Guattari, than like smooth billiards balls, as it was believed and dreamed by the fathers of Modernism.

Model four: renewals of Modernism in real socialist countries. In Eastern European countries, and let us say that the second Yugoslavia²⁷³ is an atypical example, there are several fundamental paradoxical processes in the positioning of the relations of the socialist (communist) Realism and the Western (capitalist) Modernism that can be pointed out.

Socialist Realism was after World War II identified as:

(a) The extension of the critical social Realism between world wars, in fact, as a victorious tendency with regards to the ruling, roughly speaking, moderate bourgeoisie Modernism, elitist west-oriented Modernism, avant-gardes and special national tendencies in art in every Yugoslav culture;

(b) An imported phenomenon, certainly from USSR, that, upon the victory of the socialist revolution, gains a political-utilitarian and normative-regulatory function in the new society;

(c) A rhetorical utilitarian context, which, at the level of discourse, must be sustained bureaucratically, in order to be declared in the name of Realism (revolution, class struggle and working people's identity), but which can be, at the level of specific painting formation, be gradually modified, by introducing new formal solutions of the historical or current Modernism; and

(d) The context, which is gradually modified, after the abandonment of relationship with USSR and with the development of the socialist self-governing, into modernist art (practices of socialist Aestheticism and, later on, socialist Modernism, are being established in Vojvodina and Serbia).

Socialist Realism was, in the specific historical space of the second Yugoslavia, seen as a dynamic open phenomenon that changed its figures (ways of expression and shaping), and guarded and sustained regulatory functions in culture. This indicates that one ideology can have at its disposal different spheres of ideas, that is, ways of announcing its identity and its social, political, cultural and even artistic demands.

Modern art in Serbia and Vojvodina was, during the 50s, being created out of several, incomparable sources:

1. With the rejection of socialist Realism in the current art oriented towards high-Modernism, seen as an expression of the exuberant and progressive development of the socialist society, and visible in the works of the representatives of the socialist Realism, who started moving towards aesthetic Modernism in the late 40s and during the 50s;

2. With gradual transformation of socialist Realism into moderate modernist art that relies upon the tradition of the modernist Intimism between world wars, on one side, and on the other side, upon the current moderate (neither-abstract-nor-figurative, and apolitical) tendencies of the second hand Modernism, first of all of the Paris school – this tendency is identified as socialist Aestheticism;

3. Socialist Aestheticism was created in the moment when the post-revolutionary period was established in a socialist revolutionary society, and when revolutionaries were replaced by the bureaucrats and technocrats at important, but not at leading, positions, which means that socialist Aestheticism is an expression of the interests and taste of the new governing class, which is not there simply to change the world, but also to enjoy in it;

4. As opposed to the evolutions of socialist Realism into socialist Aestheticism, radical tendencies that provoked the conventions of the canonic Realism and the actually governing socialist Aestheticism started to appear, in other words,

²⁷³ Miodrag B. Protić (ed.), *Jugoslovensko slikarstvo šeste decenije*, Museum of Modern Art, Belgrade, 1980.

these were the tendencies that strived for the transformation of painting itself, for instance, the events concerning Abstraction Lyrique, L'Art Informel in the 50s and the early 60s, but also the tendencies that established the Neo-Avant-garde status as a shield from the functions of socialist Realism and the rising socialist Aestheticism in the 60s;

5. However, radical tendencies certainly also include the import of new, modern, current and fashionable appearances from the international art – with this actual or ostensible (and actual and ostensible) openness, new art in the second Yugoslavia is formed with a certain awareness (sphere of an idea) of being part of international art; and

6. There was also the appearance of tendencies, which are seen as the criticism of any Modernism by returning to the pre-modern sources in traditional European painting, primitive painting, individual post-surrealist fiction or national tradition.

This is why it is important to emphasize the transition from socialist Realism to socialist Aestheticism and from socialist Aestheticism to socialist Modernism. Socialist Aestheticism is a modernist reaction to socialist Realism in Yugoslav art after 1950. A reaction to socialist Realism as a dogmatic program model of representation and expression in real socialism is seen in the development of the aesthetic, non-program, ideologically neutral and artistically autonomous expression and representation. Socialist Realism, in the revolutionary and post-revolutionary period, was a part of the wider Eastern-European realist movement as an optimum projection of the revolutionary present and an accomplishment of the future ideal communist society. After 1948, with the termination of the political relations with the USSR, socialist Realism lost its international support. During the 50s, with the appearance of post-revolutionary bureaucratic and technocratic social classes and with the liberalization of society, the relationship towards art also changed. Art was no longer expected to represent possible and optimum realities, but also to accomplish partially or completely autonomous aesthetic functions. Since Yugoslavia was, during that period, in a political sense between the East and the West, it opened up towards contemporary Western art, or more precisely, towards its moderate and aesthetic versions. Socialist Realism evolved, during the late 50s and during the 60s, into a moderate Modernism that became an art tendency for almost three decades. This art was an art of the *middle way* between Abstraction and Figuration, modernity and tradition, regionalism and internationalism, folklore and the urban. On one hand, it made dominant flows of international Modernism closer, and on the other, it was an expression of the resistance to the radical versions of Modernism, from Abstraction to Neo-Avant-gardes. The climate of canonizing “moderate” modernity was a part of the project of separation and

emancipation of the *Yugoslav way to socialism* from the Soviet model. The concept itself was enticed from within, by former Avant-garde artists and modernists who were part of the Serbian new communist intellectual elite: Oto Bihalji-Merin,²⁷⁴ Oskar Davičo, Marko Ristić and others. Moderate Modernism was established as a general and universal aesthetic-artistic atmosphere.²⁷⁵

From socialist Aestheticism to socialist Modernism (p.169)

The term “socialist Aestheticism” was introduced by the literary critic and aesthete Sveta Lukić in 1963, to describe the development of literature and art in Yugoslavia.²⁷⁶ According to Lukić, socialist Aestheticism was created after 1955, as a reaction to socialist Realism:

Aestheticism dulls the edges, rounds up things, smothers a more specific, further divergence. Theoretically empty, definitely loose, in practice, it forms more neutral works.²⁷⁷

A positive side of Aestheticism, on the other hand, is the criticism of extra-artistic criteria for grading art. Painter and art historian Miodrag B. Protić marked the Aestheticism in art as a positive return to modern autonomy and important painting issues:

Because of his focus on the very nature of art, Sveta Lukić conditionally called this period the socialist Aestheticism, not giving it an otherwise negative meaning – which may be true in literature (because of its alleged avoidance of neuralgic causes) but not in painting, because there can and, due to their different natures, have to exist the same functional differences between painting and literature, as there are between literature and poetry, which Sartre emphasized in his famous essay. When it comes to painting, we are dealing, more or less, with the return to its minute ontological, structural and semantic content and reality. (...) Such “Aestheticism” meant, in fact, activism (...), the increase of freedom and self-awareness as an anthropological necessity, often a new draft of the man’s world as well, offered by a post-revolutionary generation. (...) Hence, “Aestheticism” of the sixth decade is revolutionary, because it placed in the center the unity of an idea and of matter, of hand and spirit, a paradigmatic relationship of the subject and the object ... because it viewed creation as an anthropological,

274 Oto Bihalji-Merin, *Savremena nemačka umetnost*, Belgrade, Nolit, 1955; Oto Bihalji Merin, *Prodori moderne umetnosti, Utopija i nove stvarnosti*, Nolit, Belgrade, 1962; Oto Bihalji Merin, *Graditelji moderne misli*, Prosveta, Belgrade, 1965.

275 An indicative discussion on the matter: Dušan Bošković *Estetika u okruženju – Sporovi o marksističkoj estetici i književnoj kritici u srpsko-hrvatskoj periodici od 1944. do 1972. godine*, Institute for philosophy and social theory and IP Filip Višnjić, Belgrade, 2003.

276 Sveta Lukić, “Socijalistički estetizam”, from: *Umetnost na mostu*, Belgrade, Ideje, 1975, pp. 225–243.

277 Sveta Lukić, “Socijalistički estetizam. Jedna nova pojava”, *Politika*, April 28th Belgrade, 1963.

significant feature of the human kind, the socialist's assumption that released and developed it.²⁷⁸

According to art historian Lazar Trifunović²⁷⁹, socialist Aestheticism is a sign of transformation of revolutionary into civic art from 1950 to 1960. Aestheticism guided by the laws of form and pictorial problems of a painting was modern enough to enable opening up to the world, but traditional enough (reshaped aesthetics of Intimism of the fourth decade) to satisfy "citizens' taste" developed from the social conformity, and inert enough to fit itself into the myth of a happy and unified community. In other words, Aestheticism had everything necessary to blend with the projection of a partly liberalized socialist society. The art historian Ješa Denegri used this contradictory controversy on the specific appearance of socialist Aestheticism to derive an issue of re-creation and re-appearance of Modernism in the conditions of real self-governing socialism during the second half of the 50s in Serbia. In "Inside or Outside *Socialist Modernism?* Radical Views on the Yugoslav Art Scene, 1950-1970", he carefully and approximately introduced two terms – "Yugoslav art scene" and "socialist Modernism".

The term "Yugoslav art scene" means the geographical area and the political environment in which both polycentric and decentralized common art life of the *second Yugoslavia* (1945-1991) was taking place. Polycentric and decentralized, because it consisted of several cultural areas and their capitals, former republics of the previous country, which were now made independent state subjects. Unified and common, because the unification of that life was linked with numerous personal and institutional connections between various characters on the Yugoslav art scene of that time. The term "Yugoslav art scene", according to Denegri, did not necessarily lead to the abandonment of particularity and individuality of national cultural environments nor did it demand that they are annulled in the name of some unitary concept of "Yugoslav art", but because of the fact that it was placed within the borders of one and the same country, this art scene was interwoven with continuous and everyday links, exchanges, contacts, of the artists' themselves and of the art life organizers, managers of galleries and museums, art critics and associates in the cultural columns of the mass media, in other words, of the most important factors of the country's "art world" or "the system of art".

Denegri placed the other term – "socialist Modernism" – as a condition of modern art in socialist conditions:

It is without doubt that the political circumstances, in which the history of the "second Yugoslavia" and its unique political status, humorously dubbed "a see-saw on the fence between East and West", took place, and had a considerable part in the establishment and representation of the specific "art

system" that functioned outside the framework of rigid ideological pressures, which existed in the real-socialist countries, but also in the demands of the art market, which can be found in the countries of liberal capitalism. During the first post-war years, being a country with a political order closely connected with the Soviet Union and its followers, Yugoslavia adopted, in culture and art, a normative doctrine of socialist Realism, which, besides the fact that it owes its establishment to external reasons, owned its own roots in the native tradition of a socially engaged art between world wars. An event that was crucial in the weakening and ultimate rejection of the socialist Realism ideology took place in 1948, when Yugoslavia terminated its ally connections with the communist countries and the Soviet Union as their leader, even though the communist order remained in power, and, consequently, socialist Realism kept its governing position in culture and art. The convention of the Yugoslav Writers' Association, held in Ljubljana in 1952 and the famous essay by Miroslav Krleža, read at the convention, are considered to be the point of the definite end of the dominance of socialist Realism, although numerous events in certain art areas prepared for that end gradually, enabling and facilitating, to a considerable extent this final blow given to the ruling doctrine of the time. Today, the generally adopted opinion is that the relatively short period of domination of socialist Realism (approximately between 1945 and 1950) represents the historical hiatus that the art of Yugoslav cultural spaces in the 20th century divides into two great "normal" periods, into the first and the second part of the 20th century, and hence, the age of post-war Modernism in Yugoslavia as a whole and, separately, in each of its composing units began after 1950, and lasted during the following several decades, creating an exceptionally interesting, highly complex, rich, diluted, diverse and unquestionably high quality sum of numerous art appearances, happenings and processes.²⁸⁰

It is certain that neither new cultural nor new art processes would have been set in motion, had there not been a general change in political direction, nor would there have been a fast, only a few years long, process of change in the art scene and, accordingly, general art climate. But that change was not, after all, conducted solely because of political reasons and interests, according to Denegri, but because of the art production itself, which quickly filled the space of the scene with different content and expressive *languages* that had a crucial role in the process:

And this art production is, in its spirit, a change of the poetics, trends, concepts and ideology of the global post-war Modernism of the 50s and the 60s, about which it can be claimed that, because

278 Miodrag B. Protić, "Jugoslovensko slikarstvo šeste decenije – Nove pojave", from: *Jugoslovensko slikarstvo šeste decenije*, Museum of Modern Art, Belgrade, 1980, pp. 14.

279 Lazar Trifunović, in: *Enformel u Beogradu, "Cvijeta Zuzorić" Art Pavilion*, Belgrade, 1982, pp. 11–12.

280 Ješa Denegri, "Inside or Outside *Socialist Modernism?* Radical Views on the Yugoslav Art Scene, 1950–1970", from: Miško Šuvaković, Dubravka Đurić (eds.), *Impossible Histories – Historical Avant-gardes, Neo-Avant-gardes, and Post-avant-gardes in Yugoslavia, 1918–1991*, The MIT Press, Cambridge MA, 2003, pp. 172.

of the specific characteristics of the Yugoslav social, political and cultural conditions of that time, it represents a version of “socialist Modernism”, which appeared as such, actually, only in that Yugoslavia and it, therefore, represents a unique formation, created at the intersection of the features of the Eastern and the Western cultural and art model. Gradually, one model (the west one) became more dominant, which is the consequence of establishing connections tight enough, but it was never fully integrated into the Yugoslav art scene and its specific formations of “socialist Modernism” within the corpus of the post-war Western Modernism, or, in more accurate terms, within the corpus of the post-war West-European Modernisms.

In the establishment of the artistic system of “socialist Modernism”, logistical support of the cultural-political institutions, which intervened in the touring exhibitions of international art in Yugoslavia after 1950, and during the return exhibitions of Yugoslav selections at the international art scene, played a major role. The chronology of such events marks the following most important dates and events: 1952, the exhibition of the *Contemporary French Art*, with numerous major names, in Belgrade, Zagreb, Ljubljana and Skopje; *A Selection of Dutch Painting, De Stijl*, in Belgrade, Zagreb and Skopje, with all of the members of *De Stijl*; a solo exhibition of Henry Moore in Belgrade, Zagreb and Ljubljana in 1955, with Herbert Read’s preface; exhibition of *Contemporary German Graphics and Drawings* in the same cities, with Will Grohmann’s preface; exhibition of *Contemporary Italian Art*, again in Belgrade, Zagreb, Ljubljana and Skopje, in the range from Carro and Severini to Afro and Ved; and as the crowning event, exhibition of American lithography in color in several cities, and the famous exhibition *Contemporary US Art* from the collection of the Modern Art Museum in New York, with a whole great generation of abstract expressionist, among other participants, only in Belgrade in 1956. Considering with what kind of developed political strategy numerous highly prestigious and high quality presentations of modern American art were organized in Western European countries, then it appears that Yugoslavia was also included in that framework, as an American sphere of interest, both in the political and cultural sense, with quite specific goals and effects. There is no need to emphasize that all these events (and many others, less spectacular) from the program of international cultural exchange had deep and superficial influences on the expressive directions of Yugoslav artists, which, along with other reasons, contributed in great deal to the re-orientation of the general profile of contemporary Yugoslav art, from the abandoned socialist Realism to those significantly altered foundations of the accepted phenomenon of “socialist Modernism”. Essentially the same, although reciprocal effects were caused by the return visits of Yugoslav artist abroad, especially those at the Venice Biennale, where Yugoslavia had been participating in its own pavilion since 1950, furthermore, the selections with which, regardless of the local criteria according to which they were chosen, Yugoslavia, nevertheless, tried to, as appropriately as possible, fit in the standards of international art discourse of the post-war decades. This is, essentially also true for the exhibitions of Yugoslav artists at the biennales in Sao Paulo and Tokyo, at the Mediterranean countries biennale in Alexandria, where Yugoslav artists were often benevolently given numerous recognitions, as

it is true for other tours of the Yugoslav art in numerous western European countries, among which the Exhibition in Paris in 1961 was especially prominent, for it led a famous French art critic, Michel Ragon, to give the following symptomatic remark, as a praise to that art: “In Yugoslavia, the living art is at the same time the official art.” At home, the Salon, during the 50s, and shortly afterwards the Youth Biennale, organized by the Modern Gallery in Rijeka and, after 1961, the Triennale of the Contemporary Yugoslav Art in Belgrade functioned as periodical manifestations of the unification of Yugoslav art scene, whereas, since 1955, there was a regular, highly ambitious international exhibition being held in Ljubljana, under the name Graphics Biennale, becoming in time, because of its equal reception of the artists from the East and the West, but also of the artists from the so-called third world countries, a true emblem of cultural policies and art system of the Yugoslav “socialist Modernism”. All of this, with a lot of other factors, led to the gradual construction and strengthening of a complex and specific art system of the second Yugoslavia, a system almost entirely organizationally based, materially dependent and ideologically supervised by the institutions of the political power, but – which should be admitted – flexible enough to make most of the active artists feel free, participate voluntarily as much as they can and to the best of their abilities, thus with complete conviction in the making of a culture of their own environment higher and more contemporary, during the first post-war years and decades, filled with optimistic exuberance of the renewal of the entire, and hence artistic, life.²⁸¹

This complex political, social, cultural and artistic process led towards a new kind of art production, different from socialist Realism, bourgeoisie Realism and moderate or high Modernism between World Wars. We are dealing with changes that were at the same time a rediscovery and a development of art autonomy in the conditions of a centralized government and its cultural policy. Socialist Modernism – as a very general term – included different phenomena, from versions of socialist Realism, socialist Aestheticism, modern Academism, Intimism, high pro-western Modernism (Abstraction Lyrique, L’Art Informel, action painting), to moderately modernist practices that developed from syntheses of western Modernisms and national or revolutionary symbolizations of identities within socialist Yugoslavia.

A turning away from socialist Realism meant for the 1950s’, 1960s’ and 1970s’ art in Vojvodina an abandonment of the “central-European” connections made during the first half of the 20th century, and a focus on direct influences from Belgrade and the domination of a hegemonic and homogenizing Serbian art as such. A break from the “central-European capitals” such as Budapest and Prague was determined with the isolation of Hungary and Czechoslovakia within the Warsaw Pact.

281 Ješa Denegri, “Inside or Outside Socialist Modernism? Radical Views on the Yugoslav Art Scene, 1950–1970”, from: Miško Šuvaković, Dubravka Đurić (eds.), *Impossible Histories – Historical Avant-gardes, Neo-Avant-gardes, and Post-avant-gardes in Yugoslavia, 1918–1991*, The MIT Press, Cambridge MA, 2003, pp. 173–175.

An orientation towards Belgrade was essentially guided by the political-economic dominance of Belgrade as a capital of FPRY/SFRY, but as well by the migration of artists from former Yugoslavia, including Vojvodina, to the strong political-economic and, hence, artistic centers, such as Belgrade. On the other hand, Belgrade also became a kind of a “transit” or a “connection” point with western art, mainly because of the numerous influential international exhibitions that were arriving to the city. That is why the picture of “new Modernism” in Vojvodina appeared as a “picture” of a transformation process of socialist Realism into socialist Aestheticism and socialist Modernism in Belgrade. The guiding influences of Vojvodina artists, who worked in Belgrade, were also seen as important (Đorđe Bošan, Bogomil Karlavariš, Milan Kečić, Zora Petrović, Zoran Petrović, Branko Protić, Ivan Radović, Dragoslav Stojanović – SIP, Ivan Tabaković, Živojin Turinski, Lazar Vozarević and others). With the development of the Belgrade Academy of Visual Art towards Modernism, its dominance in the Serbian, Vojvodina and Yugoslav space was also established. New exhibiting institutions were formed, most importantly, the Museum of Modern Art, founded in 1964. The Museum of Modern Art started and determined the project of socialist Modernism:

Roads from art to life are, therefore, complex, but unavoidable if what we want is for socialism to be not only an economic and political category, but also a category of humanism and culture – a true socialism.²⁸²

Certain anticipations of socialist Aestheticism in Vojvodina were sensed in Konjović’s modernist expressive soc-realist works, as well as in the Intimism oriented paintings of Karel Napravnik (1909–1957) – *Nude in repose* (1946); Stojan Trumić (1912–1983) – *Piper from Vojlovica* (1949); Milan Kečić (1910–1998) – *Quinces* (1950), Milan Kerc (1914–1980) – *JNA Street in Novi Sad* (1951); Nikola Graovac (1907–2000) – *Window* (1953); József Ács (Bačka Topola, 1914. – Novi Sad, 1990) – *On the bank of the Danube* (1954); Stevan Maksimović (1910–2002) – *Cross-road* (1954); Boško Petrović (1922–1982) – *Village blacksmith shop* (1954); Imre Sáfrány (1928–1980) – *Three graces* (1954); and Mileta Vitorović (1920–1991) – *Still-life with a jug* (1954).

Lazar Vozarević started at the Applied Arts School in Belgrade in 1941, and the Visual Arts Academy in 1943, which he graduated from in 1948. He was a member of art groups *Jedanaestorica* and *Decembarska*. He started teaching at the Visual Arts Academy in Belgrade in 1960. Besides paintings, he created book illustrations and mosaics. He developed a specific *manner* of the new modern painting: he discovered the power of indexed pictorial surface, the evocative relationship between

color and drawing, and his simplified expressively presented human figures led to the sign of humanity itself, and not of a specific person or face. His works *Kozara dance* (1952), *Pietá* (1956) or *Satyr and a girl* (1958) express the irrelevance of a chosen subject matter: from the themes of the revolutionary fight for national liberation, through Christian or themes from the Classical period. Each subject matter is open to pictorial reshaping and expressing general/universal humanity. His procedure is significantly connected with the Modernism poetry of Pablo Picasso and his humanist promise of a new art for a modern man.

The work of Ankica Oprešnik represents an extraordinary example of painting revolutions within Modernism. She had solo exhibitions from 1951 (Novi Sad). A retrospective exhibition was organized in 1969.²⁸³ She crossed a long road of painting development from associative Figuration (*Women and a Cat* or *Eternal hunt*, 1954), to moderate Abstraction Lyrique (*Requiem for an autumn*, 1963; *Death of Red Plants*, 1969; *Unhanded medals*, 1968; *Oprešnik – Spring Paths*, 1970). In graphic art, she crossed a similar road of development, from Abstraction Lyrique (*Little Girls*, 1954, *White Woman*, 1960). By establishing a pictorial and visual autonomy, an individual stroke, a universal symbolization and by making criteria for the choice of a reference “theme” relative, she developed an open poetic platform within socialist Aestheticism and, later on, socialist and late Modernism (*Game is Over* and *Unfinished Building* from 1998).

This principle of constructing a painting can be also be found with Milan Konjović (*Bag-pipes* or *Scorched Vojvodina*, 1957), Stevan Maksimović (*Winter meditation*, 1958), Ankica Oprešnik (*Autumn in a Village*, 1959), Pál Petrik (*Paper masks*, 1959), Tivadar Wanyek (1910–1981; *Family* 19??), Boško Petrović (*Cathedral V*, 1960), or the series of paintings *Bunk bed*, 1958, and 1969–1975). What is seen as a model of painting philosophy and work was an encompassing form that did not lose the iconic reference points and, in that way, established a referential relationship with the local climate, intimate spaces, but also with folklore characterizations. This folkloric feature, so visible in Vozarević’s work, is also, in a certain way, a part of the public political discourse, because with the abandonment of the revolutionary pro-Soviet universalism “Workers of all countries, Unite!” there was a creation of local representation of *folklore* as a universal “type” (or *archetype*), which takes place with the synthesis of modernist socialism and national identity in the direction of establishing socialist nations and nationalities. These poetic attitudes and creative procedures could be found in modern poetry (Vasko Popa, 1922–1991) and contemporary art music (Ljubica Marić, 1901–2003. In paint-

282 Miodrag B. Protić, “Od umetnosti do života”, *Umetnost*, No. 1, Belgrade, 1965, pp. 5–10.

283 Ankica Oprešnik Catalogue, Contemporary Visual Arts Gallery, Novi Sad, 1969.

ing, graphic art and sculpture, a blend of folklore, Modernism and socialist optimism was reached by the synthesis of modern expressiveness and folklore references. The application of Aestheticism of socialist Modernism developed in painting and graphic art in graphic design, that is, mainly in political,²⁸⁴ sports and commercial posters, is highly indicative. Dragoslav Stojanović Sip²⁸⁵ established a developed Modernism poetics in the design of political (*All to elections*, 1958 or *50 years of October*, 1967) and sports posters. An example of formation in the socialist optimism spirit can be found in the poster of Bogdanka Poznanović, Cveta Davičo and Kolja Davičo *May 1st '68* from 1968.²⁸⁶

Naïve art and socialist Modernism: from authentic art to the market (Serbian edition, p.178)

The idea of encouraging naïve art fit well with the concept of the socialist Modernism,²⁸⁷ for it was an art that originated from the people and addressed the people, and was an alternative to the alienated urban professional Modernism or exclusive radical Modernisms and Neo-Avant-gardes. On the other hand, modernist critics and aesthetes thought highly of the naïve or authentic art, as a direct original creativity, which led through the academic canons of knowledge about art to the “authentic” expression. Naïve art had a role, furthermore, in emphasizing art creativity of the minority ethnics groups and their cultures on the platforms of the socialist construction of a multi-cultural society. Naïve art and its integrations into high art had a goal of creating a recognizable socialist culture for the socialist people. One of the utopian procedures that socialism made was, also, the process of making art more “amateur”, that is, of establishing art creation as a general human creative principle: every working man can become an artist and every artist, with his sincerity and candidness, should be a general human creator – a creative being. It should not be forgotten that many Yugoslav modernist critics, such as Oto Bihalji Merin, Dimitrije Bašičević, Radoslav Putar or Boris Keleman, were advocating for an “equal” role of naïve art in modern society, culture and art.²⁸⁸ After World War II, numerous naïve paint-

ers and sculptors became prominent: Emerik Feješ (Osijek, 1904 – Novi Sad, 1969), Ilija Bosilj (Šid, 1895 – 1972), Pál Homonai (Irig, 1922), and the art *school* of naïve art in Kovačica, and, further on, *Uzdin school of naïve art* which is connected with the Romanian culture in Vojvodina. The representatives of the *Uzdin school* are Anujka Maran, Marija Balan, Florika Puja, Ana Onču, Steluca Caran, Ofelia Spariosu, Sofija Bosika, Stela Đura, Viorel Bosika, Adam Mezin and others.

Pál Homonai²⁸⁹ was born in 1922 into a farmer’s family in Irig. He finished elementary school and craft school, and became skilled in the craft of carpentry. He lived in Novi Sad from 1938, where he went to the Crafts College. He worked as a carpenter until the mid 1960s, when he turned to painting. He has been living and working in Kecskemét in Hungary since 1992. Homonai is a country landscape and scene painter, that is, a genre scene painter. His painting is not realistic but fairytale-like and idyllic, with emphasized styles and representations of the experienced world in pictorial signs (*Wedding*, 1971; *My home*, 1972; *In nature*, 1972).

Approaches to painting among farmers and craftsmen in Kovačica started in the late 1930s.²⁹⁰ Martin Paluška and Jan Sokol began their joint work on painting; later, they were joined by a public communal servant Vladimir Boboš. Martin Paluška and Jan Sokol participated, for the first time, in an exhibition of amateurs of visual arts of Vojvodina in Novi Sad and in Subotica, in 1950. After the experience with Vladimir Boboš as the chairman, they founded, within the cultural-educational society Pokrok (Progress), a visual arts-painting section. Martin Janoš and Jan Knjayovic immediately joined the section. Twelve painters from Kovačica exhibited their paintings together for the first time in 1952, during the commemoration of 150 years since the settlement of Kovačica. Since then, exhibitions have been held annually. On 15th May 1955, the Gallery of the National Painters in the Communal Hall was opened, as the first country gallery in Yugoslavia. The Society of Kovačica Painters had 30 members at that time. The gallery functioned within the Culture Hall from 1955, and it received its own space as a Naïve Art Gallery in 1989. Painters from Kovačica affected the appearance of naïve painters in the surroundings towns and villages, among the first in Uzdin and Padina. The most prominent painters from Kovačica are: Martin Paluška, Jan Sokol, Mihal Bireš, Vladimir Boboš, Martin Jonaš, Jan Knjazovic, Pavel Hrka, Jan Strakušek, Jan Venjarski, Alžbeta Čížikova, Katarina Karlečikova, Zuzana Halupova,

284 Dr. Drago Njegovan, *Politički plakat u Vojvodini (1848–2003)*, Novi Sad, Vojvodina Museum, 2004.

285 Marijana Petrović Raić, *Dragoslav Stojanović Sip (1920–1976) – Skica za portret*, Belgrade, Museum of Applied Arts, 2003.

286 Jevta Jevtović (ed.), *Beogradski politički plakat 1944–1974*, Belgrade, Museum of Applied Arts, 1974, illustration No. 79.

287 Nina Pradon (ed.), *Jugoslovenska kolekcija naivne umetnosti – Bogosav Živković, Ferenc Kalmar, Emerik Feješ, Milan Stanisavljević, Ilija Bosilj, Sava Sekulić*, Jagodina, Museum of naïve art, 2001.

288 Oto Bihalji Merin, *Das naive Bild der Welt*, Köln, Dumont-Schauberg, 1959, or: *Umetnost naivnih u Jugoslaviji*, Belgrade, Jugoslavija, 1963; and Boris Keleman, *Naivno slikarstvo Jugoslavije*, Zagreb, 1969; *Catalogue Naivni '70*, Zagreb, Applied Arts Gallery, 1970.

289 Oto Bihalji Merin, *Homonai*, Belgrade, 1969. and Munich, 1988.

290 According to an anecdote: the machinist locksmith Martin Paluška and farmer Jan Sokol, while playing chess on a Sunday afternoon, entrusted each other with a secret that they love to paint. It happened in 1939. Since then, they would occasionally paint together.

Katarina Kožikova, Ondrej Venjarski, Jan Garaj, Mihal Povo-
lni, Jan Bačur, Eva and Husarik.²⁹¹

In the Bunjevac society, the cultural-art society “Matija Gubec” was active in Tavankut, near Subotica, with its members – naïve female farmer and worker painters: Marija Ivković-Ivandečić (Đurđin, 1919), Kata Rogić (Šurđin, 1919), Ana Milodanović (Žednik, 1926), Teza Milodanović (Žednik, 1936), and Đula Milodanović-Kujundžić (Žednik, 1938). They attracted public attention with an exhibition in cultural-art society “Matija Gubec” in 1962.²⁹²

Naïve art, with its complex role of an *instrument* of socialist cultural policy and utopian modernist project of the return to ideal sources of human – people’s – creation, came a long way from authentic general human art, through a *socialist sample* of the integration of folklore into art, to a commercial export of exotic art production and cultural artefact. Oto Bihalji Merin quite explicitly and in a contradictory way determined the attitude towards naïve art:

We love naïve art, even though nowadays we look at it with more criticism than we did several decades ago, when it first saw the light of day; we love it, because its authentic and clearly determined expressive strength gives us back the conclusion of an archaic landscape and lost visual art, and because its existence strengthens our belief that quiet growth of its benevolent blades of grass and imaginative flowers can be preserved in a climate of optic machines and cybernetic contraptions.

Today, naïve art can be seen as a trace of archaeologies of socialist Modernism in growing arts of nationalist and religious constructions of local identities, and totalizing global commercialization.

“Bosilj affair” and a “philosophical wonder” in Šid (p.181)

Ilija Bašičević or Ilija Bosilj²⁹³ is a farmer from Šid. He finished four grades of elementary school. He spent his childhood and adolescence as a shepherd. Over his life, he was a farmer and a cattle breeder. During World War II, he spent time in Vienna with his sons Dimitrije and Vojin. There, he became ill with tuberculosis. For medical reasons, he ceased hard manual labour. He was an enthusiastic reader of the Bible and numerous mythological texts. He started painting in 1957, at the age of 62. He made drawings, paintings and painted objects. He developed a

very unusual “style” or “manner” of almost non-illusionist and symbolic painting. He created paintings with motifs from the Bible – Old Testament scenes with Moses, Noah and Elijah, scenes of the Apocalypse. He also worked on symbolically and allegorically presented themes from Serbian medieval epics, legends and myths. In the series *Iliad*, named after the painter, he worked on topics from everyday life. He painted fantastic and flying creatures. He started exhibiting at group exhibitions in 1962, and at solo exhibitions in 1963. He had exhibitions in Germany, the Netherlands, France, Slovakia, Italy, Japan, etc. A legacy of his paintings was donated to the town of Šid, under the name *Ilijanum*. The initiative to place a exhibit of the collection was made in 1970.

The art historian, curator and artist Dimitrije Bašičević Mangelos is Ilija Bašičević’s eldest son. Dimitrije Bašičević began his involvement with naïve art as a critic and art historian in 1952. He wrote about Generalić, peasant painters and writers in Croatia, about Virijus, Emerik Feješ, Ivan Rabuzin and others.²⁹⁴ He was an associate in the Peasant Art Gallery from 1954. He was a co-founder of the Primitive Art Gallery in Zagreb in 1957. He was in charge of the Primitive Art Gallery between 1962 and 1965. He worked as a museum consultant until 1982, when he retired. Simultaneously with his activities as an art historian, curator and critic, Dimitrije Bašičević worked, secretly and publicly, as an artist in Zagreb’s Neo-Avant-garde scene.

The end of his involvement in naïve art took place during a public conflict and debate about the work of Ilija Bosilj, also known as the “Bosilj affair”, which reached its climax during 1964 and 1965, but lasted until 1971. The debate and the conflict took place within the scope of the criticism of Dr. Dimitrije Bašičević, director of the Primitive Art Gallery in Zagreb, for promoting the paintings of his father Ilija Bosilj Bašičević, to the problem of authenticity of Bosilj’s paintings. There were certain doubts that Ilija Bosilj perhaps had not painted his works on his own, that there was a possibility that the works had been painted by Dimitrije Bašičević, or that perhaps the other son, physician Dr. Vojin Bašičević, head of the TBC ward of the Children’s Clinic in Novi Sad, had painted them, and in some cases, there was even a version that an underage patient of Dr. Vojin Bašičević may have been the possible author of the

291 Milivoje Mihailović, *Seljaci slikari iz Kovačice*, Kovačica, Culture Hall in Kovačica, 1962; Vladimir Valenčik, *Svet kovačičke naivne umetnosti*, Kultura, Bački Petrovac, 2003.

292 Bela Duranci, “Pletene vlati agrarnog zlata”, from: *Vojvodina – bogatstvo razlika*, Kl society PCESA, Novi Sad, 2002, pp. 30–33.

293 Vladimir Crnković, Slobodan S. Sanader (eds.), *Ilija Bašičević Bosilj 1895–1972 – Slike*, Contemporary Visual Arts Gallery, Novi Sad, 1989; *Ilija Bosilj*, Museum of Naive Art, 1994; Ješa Denegri, Darinka Rackov, Vojin Bašičević (eds.), *Ilija Bosilj – Ironija ironije – nepoznate slike*, Museum of Vojvodina, 2004; Nebojša Milenković (ed.), *Svet po Iliji*, Ivan Bašičević edition, Novi Sad, 2006.

294 Dimitrije Bašičević, “Impresije iz Galerije seljaka slikara” (1952), “Majstor škole u Hlebinama. Ivan Generalić” (1953), “Seljačka umjetnička galerija” (1953), “Mirko Virius” (1954) and “Seljačka slikarska škola u Hlebinama i seljački slikarski pokret (1954)”, from: Vladimir Crnković (ed.), *Mića Bašičević, Studije i eseji / Kritike i zapisi 1952–1954*, Zagreb, Society of Art Historians of Croatia, 1995, pp. 39–45, 72–78, 123–125, 209–212, 220–222. Also: Dimitrije Bašičević: “Miris zemlje – Uz izložbu Petra Smajića” (1956), “Naši primitivci. Povodom Petra Smajića” (1956), “Emerik Feješ” (1956), “Slikarstvo naivnih” (1957), “Ivan Večenaj” (1959), “Ivan Rabuzin” (1960), “O Generaliću, kao o travi, o Viriusu, o Škurjeniju, kao o pticama” (1960), “Ivan Generalić” (1962), “Umjetnost naivnih” (1962), “Naivni 63” (1963), from: Vladimir Crnković (ed.), *Mića Bašičević, Studije i eseji / Kritike i zapisi 1955–1963*, Society of Art Historians of Croatia, Zagreb, 1995, pp. 23–24, 24–31, 32–34, 65–69, 73, 74, 75, 88–98, 99–101, 102–103, 106.

works. In less serious accusations, influences of the sons on the old peasant painter were indicated. Most of the problematic statements or comments were about structuring the roles on the Croatian art scene, as an expression of a political, national and economic power.²⁹⁵ Powerful or important figures or structures of the artistic and political life of Croatia and Yugoslavia could be seen behind the conflict: the Educational-Cultural Council and the Committee for the City Gallery, Council of the City of Zagreb Gallery,²⁹⁶ the director of the City of Zagreb Gallery Božo Bek,²⁹⁷ art critic Dubravko Horvatić,²⁹⁸ art historian Branimir Donat,²⁹⁹ visual arts critic Radoslav Putar,³⁰⁰ painter and academic Krsto Hegedušić,³⁰¹ art historian Grgo Gamulin,³⁰² curator Mirjana Gvozdenović,³⁰³ painter and writer Miro Glavurčić,³⁰⁴ literature historian Josip Depolo,³⁰⁵ Dr. Dimitrije Bašičević,³⁰⁶ and others. The debate was being developed in Zagreb and Belgrade daily newspapers, *Vjesnik*, *Telegram*, *Polet*, *Studentski list*, *Večernje novosti*, *Svet*, *Politika*, *Politika ekspres*, *Vidici*, etc. The spectacular character of the conflict was also marked by a public act of painting, which Ilija Bosilj performed to demonstrate his ability and skill. Ilija Bašičević was summoned by an Official Memo³⁰⁷ of the Committee for the City Gallery to appear in front of an expert commission, whose task was to determine the “authenticity” of his creative act. The commission was composed of

visual arts critic Marko Meštrović, the director of the Museum of Arts and Crafts Zdenko Munk, visual arts critic Radoslav Putar and architecture engineer Vjenceslav Richter. The process of assessment took place in Dr. Dimitrije Bašičević’s apartment on 18th February 1965. The commission issued a statement entitled “Joint conclusion on the result of the investigation of Ilija Bosilj’s process of painting”. The document states the following:

At the invitation of the committee for the City Gallery of the Educational-Cultural Council of the Parliament of the City of Zagreb, we attended on February 18th this year, in the apartment of Dr. Dimitrije Bašičević in Zagreb, 3/I Freudeureich Street, the actual action of painting, performed by Ilija Bašičević – Bosilj.

The parties that signed the document generally oppose such manner of the verification of authenticity in the area of painting, but they did respond to the invitation with the desire to finally settle accounts with the entire situation concerning the City Gallery, by using this ultimate method.

Even though, the signed parties, at the request of the Committee chairman, dictated their individual statements for the record kept during the investigation, the same felt necessary to once more state their official opinion and formulate their findings in the following manner: during the investigation, in the interval of about two hours, Ilija Bašičević – Bosilj, based on his drawing/sketch, painted a part of a larger composition of figures. Besides direct experiences during...³⁰⁸ of the previously known and now exhibited works of Ilija Bosilj, we had yet another opportunity to undoubtedly confirm the fact that Ilija Bašičević Bosilj is, in fact, the author of the works publically presented under his name. During the investigation, Ilija Bašičević also made, upon his own request, a drawing with figures, which also contributes to the evidence that his authorship of the works in question is real and undeniable.³⁰⁹

Following the “verdict”³¹⁰, Ilija Bosilj filed charges against everyone who had accused him.³¹¹

This turbulent debate had a complex *background* in the struggles for the control and the struggles for the potential plurality of art practices during the process of establishment of the cultural-artistic system of “socialist Modernism” after the prevalence of the totalitarian party control of art and culture in socialist Realism. The conflict was ostensibly focused on the aesthetic-artistic issues of:

- 1) First of all, the authenticity of Bosilj’s painting work, and, also
- 2) The role of family connections between the protagonists in this case, that is, the role of favouring Bosilj’s work by his

295 Cross-reference: Vladimir Crnković, “Mića Bašičević – Studije, eseji, kritike i zapisi o likovnoj umjetnosti (1952–1963)”, from: Vladimir Crnković (ed.), *Mića Bašičević, Studije i eseji / Kritike i zapisi 1952–1954*, Society of Art Historians of Croatia, Zagreb, 1995, pp. 130–131 i 133–134; and Vojin Bašičević, “Moj otac Ilija i brat Dimitrije” and “Bibliografija”, from: Dimitrije Bašičević Mangelos, *Moj otac Ilija – nacrt za antimonografiju*, Vojin Bašičević edition, Novi Sad, 1995, pp. 8–9 and 283.

296 V. Maleković, “Povodom različitih napisa...”, *Vjesnik*, Zagreb, December 30th 1964.

297 “Božo Bek: S predstavnicima određenih shvaćanja i stavova u stalnom sam sukobu”, *Vjesnik*, Zagreb, March 1971.

298 Dubravko Horvatić, “S onu stranu Aheronta”, *Telegram*, Zagreb, April 2nd 1965.

299 Branimir Donat, “Narodno i naivno stvaralaštvo”, *Telegram*, Zagreb, March 26th 1965, pp. 10.

300 Radoslav Putar, “Što se događa oko Gradske galerije?”, *Polet*, Zagreb, February 1965, pp. 4; Radoslav Putar, “Autentično slikarstvo – Izložba slika Ilije Bosilja u Izložbenom salonu Studentskog centra”, *Studentski list*, No. 6, Zagreb, March 2nd 1965, pp. 11.

301 “Razgovor ove nedelje: Krsto Hegedušić – Šta je sa našim naivnim slikarima?”, *Politika*, Belgrade, February 8th 1963; “Krsto Hegedušić piše *Ekspresu*”, *Ekspres Politika*, Belgrade, September 16th 1963; B. Đorđević, “Krsto Hegedušić, majstor slikar, jedan od najvećih stručnjaka za naivno slikarstvo: Sumnjam, da je Bosilj autor!...”, *Večernje novosti*, Belgrade, March 27th 1971; Gordana Brajović, “Iza kulisa rimske izložbe samoukih slikara Srbije – Ko je, u stvari, naivan?”, *Večernje novosti*, Belgrade, April 13th 1971.

302 Grgo Gamulin, “S onu stranu Aheronta”, *Telegram*, Zagreb, March 26th 1963, pp. 2.

303 Mirjana Gvozdenović, “O Iliji Bosilju i oko njega”, *Telegram*, Zagreb, February 26th 1965, pp. 8; Mirjana Gvozdenović, “Prisilna demonstracija umjetnosti”, *Studentski list*, Zagreb, March 2nd 1965; Mirjana Gvozdenović, “Okolo galerije u Hlebinama”, *Bjelovarski*, April 22nd 1965; Mirjana Gvozdenović, “Razgovori o naivcima”, *Telegram*, Zagreb, April 30th 1965.

304 Miro Glavurčić, “Svinje i Bosilje”, *Vidici*, Year XIII, No. 90, Belgrade, January 1965, pp. 20.

305 Josip Depolo, “Simptom jednog stanja – Nije u pitanju slikarstvo I. Bosilja već metode koje su primenjene u njegovom oglašavanju”, *Politika*, Belgrade, March 21st 1965.

306 A statement by Dr. Dimitrije Bašičević in S. Saračević’s article “Odmotava se klupko u slučaju Bosilj”, *Vjesnik u srijedu*, Zagreb, New Year 1965.

307 This was the Memo No. 06-511/1-65, signed by the president of the Educational-Cultural Committee, Josip Šentija.

308 An illegible word

309 This is a signed document – with signatures of Meštrović, Munk, Putar and Richter – dated February 20th 1965.

310 T., “Zaključen slučaj Bosilj”, *Vjesnik*, Zagreb, June 29th 1965.

311 B. Miroslavljević, “Epilog slučaja Bosilj uskoro pred porotom – Tužba naivnog slikara”, *Večernje novosti*, Belgrade, October 19th 1965.

son Dr. Dimitrije Bašičević, the director of the Primitive Art Gallery in Zagreb.

The elements of personal conflict between painter-academic Krsto Hegedušić and Dimitrije Bašičević were also present. The conflict began while Dimitrije Bašičević was working at the Archive of the Visual Arts Institute JAZU, when the academic Krsto Hegedušić was Bašičević's superior.³¹² But, in fact, the conflict was mainly focused on settling the "scores" in the economic and cultural-political market of naïve art, and, most importantly, on the positions of critics, curators and art theoreticians who were in connection with the City of Zagreb Gallery. Hegedušić defended and represented the model of "naïve art" conceived in the work of the socially oriented group *Zemlja* during the world wars, and the practice of the *Hlebine School*, which succeeded it. Dimitrije Bašičević advocated for the ideas of the modernist representation of authenticity and hermeneutical search for the authentic. On one side, there was the question of the identity of authentic "naïve art" in socialist society, and on the other side, the question of the exhibiting programme of the City of Zagreb Gallery and its policy, which, at the time, fought in a radically plural and modernist way. We are talking about the time when the City of Zagreb Gallery with the Contemporary Art Gallery under its wing was developing a new concept of the museum of contemporary art, that is, when it identified itself with the international Neo-Avant-garde and neo-constructivist movement of the "new tendency".³¹³ The "new tendency" movement did not only mark the abandonment of the socialist Realism, but of the "socialist Modernism" as a moderate version of the acceptable and bureaucratically set up Modernism, as well. That is why this was not only a local conflict in Zagreb or in Croatia, but a Yugoslav-level conflict of opposing the bureaucratized socialist Modernism with the new Neo-Avant-garde art practices. Numerous influential names from the cultural life of Zagreb and Belgrade were being mentioned, names that were directly or indirectly connected with the affair. In that situation the "Ilija Bosilj affair" was a convenient superficial cause of a complex clash between different centers of power in the new modernist self-governing culture. Dimitrije Bašičević, with his specific critical and activist style of mystifications and provocations, added to this tense situation another dimension in the field of art – the dimension of manipulative interpretation.

When Dimitrije Bašičević resigned from his job as a manager of the Gallery, he exited the public and debating discourse. He was put in the position of the manager of the Benko Horvat collection, and then of the Center for Film, Photography and Television, with the City of Zagreb Galleries. That is when his "secret" work of the marginal artist – the *outsider* and philosopher Mangelos – began. In time, Mangelos became one of the most important artists in the Croatian art scene at the turn of the 21st century, and his work became highly valuable and respected in international scenes, with purchases from museums like the Bobur in Paris and MOMA in New York.³¹⁴

The manuscript of the book *Moj otac Ilija – Nacrt za jednu antimonografiju* (*My father Ilija – A Draft for an Anti-Monograph*) was written in 1976 and 1977. There is no critical, historic, aesthetic-theoretical or literary equivalent to this book in Croatian, Vojvodinian or Serbian art of the 20th century. With its title alone, the text of the "anti-monograph", says that it was created in a specific spiritual climate of the Gorgona and post-Gorgona,³¹⁵ more precisely of the Zagreb Neo-Avant-garde tradition of anti-art (anti-film Pansini,³¹⁶ anti-novel Kristl,³¹⁷ anti-painting Knifer³¹⁸). The topic of the text is the "son's" opinion of the "father" in the universality of opinions on the possibility of opinions of art and artists. This is an "anti-monograph" because the text does not represent the monograph of an artist's life, but it exposes the potentials of opinions on the conditions of authentic modern art. The discourse of the text itself is established at the dramatic junction of the Heidegger-type (Martin Heidegger) metaphysics, modern anthropology, structural analysis of culture and Neo-Avant-garde textual-intertextual experiment. The manuscript was written in an open form that resembles free verse. Text is grouped into sub-chapters "Pevanje i mišljenje" ("Singing and thoughts"), "Naivno o naivnom" ("Naively about naïve"), "Modeli smrti ili modeli ništavila" ("Models of death and models of nothingness"), "Kada sam bio zvonar" ("When I was a bell ringer"), "Istorija teorije" ("History of theory"), "Ključevi" ("Keys"), "Nejasni sukobi u istoriji" ("Unclear conflicts in history"), "Ili-jada ili Gordijski čvor simbolike" ("Iliad or the Gordian knot of symbolism"), "Progres i evolucija" ("Progress and evolution"), "Tripot nonkonformist" ("Thrice a non-conformist"), "Istina i stvaranje tajne" ("Truth and the creation of a secret"), "Ključevi metafore" ("Keys of a metaphor"), "Metafizika pseće

312 See: Dimitrije Bašičević, "Glavnom i odgovornom uredniku *Večernjih novosti* drugu Mirku Stamenkoviću...", a manuscript of the letter dated April 10th 1971. Also, look at the statement by Dr. Dimitrije Bašičević given in the Court of Zagreb – No. Kr 70/66 – a manuscript, and a letter by Dimitrije Bašičević addressed to Vojin Bašičević, concerning the legal charges from March 26th 1965.

313 Ješa Denegri, *Umjetnost konstruktivnog pristupa. Exat 51 Nove Tendencije*, Zagreb, Horetzky, 2000; Marijan Susovski (ed.), *Konstruktivizam i kinetička umjetnost: Exat 51 Nove tendencije*, Museum of Contemporary Art, Zagreb, 1995.

314 See, for instance, the catalogue of the exhibition: Deborah Wye, Wendy Weitman (eds.), *Eye on Europe – Prints, books & multiples – 1960 to now*, The Museum of Modern Art, New York, 2006, pp. 88.

315 On the issue of post-Gorgon see: Branka Stipančić (ed.), *Josip Vaništa – Vrijeme Gorgone i Postgorgone*, Zagreb, Kratis, 2007.

316 Mihovil Pansini (ed.), *Knjiga Geffa 63*, Zagreb, Geff, 1963.

317 Miško Šuvaković, "Drama označitelja / ka teoriji apsurdna u savremenoj umetnosti: Kristl i Paripović", *Quorum*, No. 1, Zagreb, 1991.

318 Julije Knifer, "Zapisi", *Život umjetnosti*, No. 35, Zagreb, 1983.

duše i duševni život jednog divljaka“ (“Metaphysics of a dog’s soul and a social life of a savage”), ”Ironija ironije“ (“Irony of irony”).³¹⁹ This “anti-monograph” showed a complex structural relationship of a creator of the history and the world. And so, a large metaphysical act was performed through quotation-collage simulacrum, paraphrases, ironic references and identifications. In other words, in the field of naïve or art outside the great system of Western “artistic” art, what was created was a complex and sophisticated philosophical-theoretical work on the “two-faced” identity of the world and history as a constituent of the very character of art as such in the heart of an authentic creator. Bašičević’s step into manipulation with the philosophical-theoretical discussions on his father’s work would prove right everyone who doubted the authenticity of Bosilj’s painting work, but. . . But, that one crucial “but” concerning Mangelos’s work indicates that there is no art practice outside manipulation, which preprepares the world for the appearance of art, as the only art in the world. That is why, the myth and the work regarding Ilija Bosilj and Mangelos, regardless of the fact who created those works and with what means, is one of the most exciting and dramatic procedures in the art of the socialist Modernism of the 1950s, 60s and the 70s. It is about the modernist search for the very nature of art and painting as such. On the other side, this anti-monograph and the affair that preceded it show that the ideas of “authenticity” and “originality” of the painters of naïve art, and the naïve as an art paradigm, were in fact political, cultural and theoretical art constructs in the execution of socialist Modernism, socialism with a human face and of the creation of an authentic rural identity of a socialist nation. When Ilija Bosilj, alone or with someone else’s help, rose above the “primary” and the “simple” character of the naïve, he became an object of an *affair*.

Outsider art in Vojvodina: from Péter Kukac Nagyapáti to Bada Dada (Serbian edition, p.188)

Newer – culture oriented theoretical interpretations³²⁰ of art led towards the selection and identification of marginal or outsider art practices, that is, towards the location and interpretation of the marginal otherness with regards to the great art practices and discourses of Modernism. A clear distinction can be made, between “naïve”, “amateur” or “private” art practice as the “authentic”, “exotic”, “patriarchal-conservative” or “commercial” as opposed to the *outsider*, not fitting in and provocative, sometimes subversive art practices. The notion of

outsider contains a critical and visionary potential, which is outside or above modern art and official cultural dominations, that is, civic or academic canonizations of artistically, aesthetically and culturally valuable. Today, it is possible to *derive* a history of *outsider* productions and their subsequent integrations into high art.

Stipan Kopilović³²¹ was, when it comes to elementary education, a barber who studied painting in Pest, Munich, Florence and Rome, and spent time in Paris. He studied painting and drawing with the graphic artist Gustav Moreli in Pest. In Munich, he studied with Peter Halm at the Royal Bavarian Academy in 1902-1903. In 1904 he stayed in Bajmok. There he taught a summer school and earned a living by modeling and drawing. Travelling through Europe, he earned his living by working as a barber. In 1907, he went back to Subotica. He spent time in Budapest. He returned to Paris probably around 1908. By that time, he had already declared himself an impressionist painter: *Loading a boat* (around 1907), *A Boat on the Seine* (1908) or *Autumn* (1908). His Hungarian name was István Kopilovity, and he signed his paintings with a single “K”. It was only until 1922 that he signed his painting, created in Ziča Park in Bačka Topola, with his full name for the first time. He participated in World War I as an Austro-Hungarian soldier. Near the end of the war, as a wounded man, he met his future wife Terezija, a nurse in an army hospital. He participated in the Hungarian socialist revolution. He worked as a public servant in Bačka Topola. He actively agitated for the establishment of an art colony in Bačka Topola in 1922. He is one of the founders of the Society of Visual Artists of Vojvodina, in 1923. In literature, Kopilović is represented as an artist recluse, who worked in an isolated provincial Vojvodina society during the first decades of the 20th century. His preserved opus consists of 23 easel paintings and wall paintings in a Catholic church in Bajmok (1907-1908).

Péter Kukac Nagyapáti³²² (Bačka Topola, 1908-1944) is one of the forerunners of naïve painting and anticipators of “country genre painting” in Vojvodina. He was born as the ninth child in a country family. There is little information about his education, other than the fact that he finished the first grade of a state civic school in 1922-1923. There is also an unsigned newspaper article about a talented artist from Topola, published in *Hirlap* in 1923.³²³ Péter Bicskei, a drawing teacher from Topola, supported the idea of Péter Kukac Nagyapáti being educated in art and wanted to help realize it. There is controversial information that Péter Kukac Nagyapáti probably studied painting with Sándor Oláh or Árpád G. Balázs, and

319 Dimitrije Bašičević Mangelos, *Moj otac Ilija – nacrt za antimonografiju*, Vojin Bašičević edition, Novi Sad, 1995, pp. 39–113.

320 Džon Fisk, *Popularna kultura*, Clio, Belgrade, 2001; and Colin Rhodes, *Outsider Art: Spontaneous Alternatives*, Thames and Hudson, London, 2000.

321 Bela Duranci (ed.), *Slikar Stipan Kopilović 1877–1924*, NIO Subotičke novine, 1991

322 Juhász Erzsébet, Bordás Győző and Csemik Attila, *Nagyapáti Kukac Péter – 1908–1944*, Forum, Novi Sad, 1985.

323 Article from *Hirlap*, Year 3, No. 160, July 15th 1923.

that he went to Italy³²⁴ to study art, or that he never actually went to Italy, but spent the trip money on alcohol, etc. He spent the remainder of his life wandering about the farms around Bačka Topola where he painted the owners for money, food, alcohol or a bed for the night. All those stories about Péter Kukac Nagypáti evolved into local myths.³²⁵ Péter signed his paintings with initials N.P. Péter Nagypáti's paintings are created in a highly rational realist manner, which was closer, regarding its subject matter, to naïve art, than to formal precise compositional and figurative solutions of representation. His Realism is close to and has analogies with the Realisms of his contemporaries, gathered around the Croatian group *Zemlja* and the naïve Hlebine School, that is, to the regional Realism of American provincial artists of the 20s and 30s. With regards to genre, Péter's paintings could be classified into landscapes and exteriors, that is paintings of farms (*Farm*, 1930) and village streets (*Bakoš' tavern in Gunaroš*, 1935), group (*Family of Roža Pajzer and Janoš Tot Išasegi*) and individual (*Woman cutting bread*, undated) portraits and combined genre scenes (*In tavern*, undated, or *Self-portrait with a Gypsy*, undated), and there are also a few remaining wall paintings. A repeated motif of an airplane flying across the sky (*Livestock farm* or *Watermill*, undated) appears in a number of paintings. The motif of a plane in the sky is one of the obsessive subject matters of Péter's painting: repeated and minutely developed. A plane in the sky was a common motif of popular culture of the late 1920s and 1930s – see, for instance, postcards of Subotica or Lake Palić, where planes were drawn into the pictures. It is assumed that he painted portraits after the photographs. A developed iconography of representing class relations in exteriors, genre scenes and portraits is another feature of his painting, which brings him close to the ideals of bourgeoisie Realism, achieving them in a rural layered society.

Emerik Feješ was born into a Hungarian family in Osijek in 1904. His family moved to Novi Sad in 1909. He trained in the button and comb making craft with his father. He worked and lived between the world wars as a button and comb maker, a trade assistant and a lathe operator in different towns throughout the Kingdom of SCS and Yugoslavia (Belgrade, Rijeka, Zagreb, Celje, Maribor, Osijek). During World War II he lived in Pest and Nagyvárád. He returned to Novi Sad in 1945, where he stayed until he died in 1969. He started painting in 1949 after retiring as an invalid. He exhibited his works in 1955. During the early period, he painted nudes, portraits, still lifes and genre scenes, and from 1954 onwards, he exclusively painted architectural scenes. In genre sense, Feješ became a painter

of towns. He was one of the rare urban painters obsessed with modernity and cultural layeriness of the representation of a town. He painted simple, modernistically purified composition of frontal representations of architectonics, as well as the a-logical perspectives.³²⁶ Architectonics is presented in a highly geometricized manner, with emphasized horizontal and vertical lines and clear colors. Most of his works were created based on samples of black and white postcards of cities (*Parliament in Pest*, 1955; *St. Mark, Venice*, 1956; *Milan*, 1958; *Brussels, City Hall*, 1959; *A motif from Munich*, 1958; *Notre Dame, Paris*, 1962; *Big Ben, Houses of Parliament*, 1962; *Vienna, Stephansdom*, 1967; *Subotica*, 1960). He used the techniques of Gouache and tempera, and in the late period he switched to oil paint, and chose plastic wood for the painting surface. His paintings have facial angles, they are elementary structured and inorganic (no people, animals or plants). Alienation and self-referentialness make his work highly modernist.

Bíró Miklós³²⁷ (1948–1974) was another one of the unusual, eccentric and marginal figures of the Subotica scene. His paintings, for instance *Untitled* (1970), were made from specific acts of an urban loner, who responds to the current and existential anxieties of art. They are neo-figurative compositions, in which expressive gesture and caricature representations are put closer to one another.

As opposed to strong individual self-referring creators who acted, at least initially, outside the system of art, a new model of an *outsider* appears out of conceptual art, as an alternative artist who intentionally works on his art position outside of or as opposed to the official culture. *Outsider art* is, therefore, an art of marginal lives as well, of not fitting into the norms of urban society, art of communes, alternative productions within suburbia (graffiti) and political, religious, gender and music micro-cultures of young people above others. The focus is also on the design³²⁸ of fanzines, posters, record covers, graffiti, T-shirts etc. Some artists deliberately used to choose the position of an *outsider*, stepping out of the high art, as was the case with the members of KÓD group with the concept of the “invisible art”³²⁹ during the 70s. The concept stood for the abandonment of the art system and of work in everyday life and with everyday life and everyday human relations. For instance, *Nepostojeći bend* (*Non-existing band*) that Slobodan Tišma, Svetlana Bijelić, Čeda Drča and Mirko Radojičić created by drinking Coca-Cola

326 Mića Bašičević (ed.), *Feješ, Peasants' Art* Gallery, Zagreb, 1956; Matko Meštrović, *Emerik Feješ*, Gallery of Dom sindikata, Beograd, 1969; *Emerik Feješ*, Museum of Contemporary Visual Arts, Novi Sad, 1997; Vladimir Crnković, “Emerik Feješ”, from: *Strani majstori iz kolekcije Hrvatskog muzeja naivne umjetnosti*, Croatian Museum of Naive Art, Zagreb, 2006, pp. 46–48.

327 Bíró Miklós (1948–1975), Forum, Novi Sad / Újvidék, 1984.

328 Sava Savić, Igor Todorović, *Novosadska punk verzija – Prilog istoriji novosadske punk-hardcore scene: 1978–2005*, SKC, Novi Sad, 2006.

329 Miško Šuvaković, “6. Nevidljiva umetnost”, in: “Grupa KÓD”, from: *Retrospektiva: Grupa KÓD, (3 i 3 KÓD)*, Contemporary Visual Arts Gallery, Novi Sad, 1995, pp. 22–24 i 32

324 Imre Šafranj, “Na tragu Nađapati-Kukaca” (1957), from: *Odlazak*, Forum, Novi Sad, 1972, pp. 112.

325 Bela Duranci, “Tri dečaka siromaha”, from: *Vojvodina – bogatstvo razlika*, Cultural-historical society PČESA, Novi Sad, 2002, pp. 77–89.

in Liman. Art (poetic, theatrical, visual) productions of Božidar Mandić and the members of the *Porodica bistrih potoka*³³⁰ (*Family of close streams*) founded on Mount Rudnik in Serbia in 1977 also belong to the mentality of deliberate *outsidedness*. Božidar Mandić was born in 1952 in Novi Sad. He worked as a writer and a theatrical worker. He is the founder of the *Porodica bistrih potoka* commune. He began his art work as one of the participants in the Novi Sad conceptual art, collaborating with KÔD group. He was advocating for intimate and non-exhibiting acts. He started, afterwards, to show interest in cultural or life practices during the 70s, in the context of researching new forms of life. He was under the influence of the Slovenian commune *Družina u Šempasu* (*Society in Šempas*, 1971).

Certain artists in the period of conceptual art, like for instance Branko Andrić (1942–2005), or in the age of post-modernity – for instance Bada Dada or Dr. Marijaš³³¹ – from *outsider* positions outside art and cultural system crossed into the domain of alternative art practices by subverting the power of high art, and by linking high and popular culture. The work of Branko Andrić³³² covered an area between Neo-Avant-garde experiments,³³³ post-pop,³³⁴ popular music (rock, jazz), and film and multimedia proto-post-modern productions, though in intimist drawings and collages as well.³³⁵ He worked in Vienna from 1974. He described his presence on the *other* scene in the following manner:

In Vienna, I have the status of a free artist, and I've been living like that for the past 23 years, since 1974. I'm not a member of any association, I've left them all, didn't pay the membership fee. I'm working my way through on my own. It's nothing much, I have a pretty good image from before, and people want to buy my works when they see them. I usually don't carry around a portfolio or a CV, I only carry a catalog with my works, I show it around, and people who have never heard of me before – buy because they like it. Or they set up an exhibition for me. From those encounters, I ended up with several exhibitions in the most important city galleries in Vienna, and they have a kind of a state owned fund, for example in the form of galleries belonging either to an association or to the city. I have no contact with private gallery owners, except that I occasionally go to an exhibition, drink a glass of wine, eat a piece of finger food, if there's any . . . and that's about it. We manage. Anđelija [Andra's wife] started showing off her works too. Sometimes we even work, if a job comes along. Even manual labor. For example, last year I worked on a project of the Japanese

sculptor Kavamata. For ten days I hammered nails for a large sculpture, Kavamata was making an enormous object downtown. I got the job by meeting a painter, Leonard, he is from Columbia, or Bolivia, Chile, or something like that, and he told me that he was doing something in Vienneneustatt. So I told him to call me if he heard of something similar. He called straightaway at 5 the next morning. I was on the train for Vienneneustatt at 6 a.m. sharp. There I hammered 10cm nails, for ten days. We became friends and we talked, and I didn't even tell him that I was also an artist and that I made sculptures from wood. Afterwards, a friend of mine, a painter, brought me a buyer, and said: it's good that Kavamata didn't see this, because if they ever made a project from your drawings, that would be something.³³⁶

His work has remained a movable alternative between popular culture and an accelerated enterprise of a large cultural industry. We are dealing with eccentric urban mythologies and productions of culture indexations in pop culture, the alternative, privacy and systems of high art.

We are also dealing with nomadic artists who were working and intervening between cultures. Tibor Bada (Bada Dada, 1963–2006) was born in Novi Sad. He finished a high school in graphic design in Novi Sad. He went to a journalism school in Belgrade. He was involved in comics making, in painting, poetry, urban activism, performance and rock music. He worked in Csaba Varga's cartoon studio in Budapest. He participated in group exhibitions from 1977, and had solo exhibitions since 1981. Bada Dada was an artist who did not make compromises, and who acted at the cross-section of individual and public pop-urban mythologies. His poetry, performance, comics-cartoon or painting opus was a part of the derivation of urban folklore of Novi Sad, Belgrade and Budapest in the 1990s. He was toying with the critique of consumer society, cultural icons and tactics of kitsch representation and expression. Dr. Máriás (1967) has been on the public stage since 1986. He has developed a style of marginal and urban visual and performance expression. Bada Dada and Dr. Máriás established a poetic-metaphorical-symbolic expression of reaction and improvisation in absurd situations in the life of a "small man". The role of an *outsider* was set up as a critical model of intervention in a contemporary technocratized world. They performed with a music performance group *Naučnici* (*Tudósok, Scientists, Scholars*) and published music tapes/CDs.

330 Božidar Mandić, *Porodica bistrih potoka*, Dnevnik, Novi Sad, 1989.

331 Catalogue: *Dr. Marijaš + Bada Dada*, Dom omladine, Beograd, 1995; or Szombathy Bálint, *dr. Máriás Képzőművészete*, A38 Kulturális Kht. – Magyar Műhely Kiadó, Budapest, 2007.

332 Nevena Simin spoke with Branko Andrić, in: [artmagazin.co.yu: http://www.artmagazin.co.yu/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=85&Itemid=36](http://artmagazin.co.yu/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=85&Itemid=36).

333 Branko Andrić, "Program umiranja", *Polja*, No. 122, Novi Sad, 1968, pp. 13; Branko Andrić, "Uvod u osnove mini-hepeninga", *Polja*, No. 129–130, Novi Sad, 1969, pp. 5.

334 Branko Andrić, "Ja sam mamin mali seksualac", Author's edition, Novi Sad, 1972; Branko Andrić, *Stranputice seksualne revolucije*, Cultural Community of Novi Sad, Novi Sad, 1986.

335 ?

Age of socialist Modernism (Serbian edition, p.198)

A poetics of modern painting, made open and eclectic in this way, enabled the creation of a dominant "style" that was to mark the socialist age from the middle of the 1950s to the

336 http://www.artmagazin.co.yu/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=85&Itemid=36&limit=1&limitstart=2

1970s – examples being the works of Zoran Petrović *Composition* (1958) and Aleksandar Lakić (1922 – 1988) *War III* (1960).

Stevan Maksimović³³⁷ graduated in painting from the Visual Arts Academy in Belgrade in 1950. He was one of the founders of art colonies in Vojvodina. Over a long number of years, he developed a moderate highly stylistic and associative abstract composition, for instance *Winter mediation* in 1958. In the late 1970s, he went back to a complex and eclectic nationally and mythically oriented expressive Figuration.

Imre Šafranji³³⁸ acted as a painter, a critic, an illustrator and a writer. He worked as a journalist. A large part of his artistic legacy was destroyed in a fire, in the City Hall in Subotica in November 1970. He created paintings with specific modernist-expressive styles of plant and animal motifs: *Thistle* or *Peacock* (1956). His styled associative and emotionally toned Expressionism was certainly a part of the atmosphere of socialist Aestheticism. The artist made an unexpected step out of the frames of his opus with a series of collages in 1970. Those collages were simple structures of found and then quoted paper objects such as train tickets, flyers, wrappers, etc. It is characteristic that these collages do not have an associative but a highly literal character, which makes them an excess in his painting opus.

Socialist Modernism, during the 60s and the 70s, was being developed and, more often, modified with regards to the paradigms of Abstraction and paradigms of Figuration.

A sharp and radicalized line of abstract painting was formed around the appearance and reception of international L'Art Informel in the works of certain artists (Branko Protić, József Ács, Patrik Pal, Bogdanka Poznanović). Lyrical versions and developments around Informel or through it could be found with Živojini Turinski, Pavle Blesić, Isidor Vrsajkov, Zoran Petrović, Milivoj Nikolajević (*Green rhythm in space*, 1968), and all the way up to the authors who faced the uncertainty of geometrical Abstraction and its pop-versions: Mileta Vitorović (*Sign Č*, 1968), Miodrag Nedeljović (*Aggressive form I*, 1968), Dragoslav Stojanović – Sip (*Rhythm variations*, 1966), Mira Brtko (*K-27*, 1967), etc.

In the domain of sculpture, the development of abstract sculpture forms can be observed from the late 1950s with the transition from figurative sculpting to vitalistic and associative abstract forms: Jovan Soldatović (1920; *Family*, 1954), Mira Jurišić (1928; *Flow*, 1963), Matija Vuković (1925–1985; *Bison*, 1965), Oto Logo (1931; *In the core*, 1966), Zoran Petrović (*Beetles before Battle*, 1966. or *Musical instrument with ten*

tubes, 1970), Aleksandar Zarin (1923; *Figure of the Dying*, 1957, and *Over lost time*, from the series *Hands*, 1968).

A determining constant of the socialist Modernism was connected with the preservation and presentation of a figurative expression. The focus is on the procedure of abstracting in the *tradition* of socialist Aestheticism, but, during the 60s, it was often linked with religious or folklore symbols: Stevan Maksimović (*Offering*, 1971–1971); with the establishment of the fantastic illusionist work of the Belgrade group *Mediala*: Milorad Mihajlović (*Painting*, 1971); and with the interest in *new Figuration*: Petar Ćurčić (*Imperial manouvers*, 1971), Ferenc Maurić (*Shooting grounds*, 1971), Vladimir Tomić (*Cork*, 1975) and others.

During the 60s and the early 70s, socialist Modernism was established, in Vojvodinian art, as a dominant public discourse of art creation. It was supported by the state institution commissions, by the creation of a collection in the Contemporary Visual Arts Gallery, and through the presentation in the media. The horizon of moderate expression and non-interest Aestheticism was dominant, both in visual arts and in music, literature and theatre, until the appearance of post-Modernism.

L'Art Informel or the borders of a painting: an unspecified moment of re-examination of painting (Serbian edition, p.202)

L'Art Informel is one of the characteristic *critical points* of Modernism in painting in Serbia and Vojvodina in the 1950s. The importance of the appearance of Informel in Belgrade is connected with painting practices, as well as with the engaged promotional, critically-theoretical and historical graphic activities of Lazar Trifunović.³³⁹ Informel was recognized and experienced as a “modern naturalism” or the practice of inscribing new materials into the pictorial area of a picture.³⁴⁰ The act of inscription of the non-painting into the field of painting was recognized and interpreted as a radical gesture of modernist Abstraction.³⁴¹ Informel was seen and critically interpreted as a conflict authentic and innovative phenomenon in the confrontation with the socialist Realism, socialist Aestheticism and anti-Modernism of the group *Medijala*. The role of Josip Broz Tito's speech from 1963, where he expressed, among

337 Miloš Arsić (ed.), *Stevan Maksimović*, Contemporary Visual Arts Gallery, Novi Sad, 1987.

338 Tolnai Ottó, *Sáfrány Imre*, Novi Sad, 1978; Imre Šafranji, *Na tragu* (putopisi, eseji, kritike), Osvit, Subotica, 1971.

339 Lazar Trifunović (ed.), *Enformel: mladi slikari Beograda*, Cultural Center, Belgrade, 1962; Lazar Trifunović (ed.), *Enformel u Beogradu*, “Cvijeta Zuzorić” Art Pavilion in Belgrade, January–February 1982; and Ješa Denegri, “Lazar Trifunović kao kritičar i istoričar beogradskog enformela”, from: *Zbornik Narodnog muzeja – istorija umetnosti*, XV-2, National Museum, Belgrade, 1994, pp. 249–261.

340 Lazar Trifunović, “Moderni naturalizam” (1960), *Studije, ogledi, kritike*, 4, Museum of Modern Art, Belgrade, 1990, pp. 151–152.

341 Lazar Trifunović, “Apstraktno slikarstvo i mogućnosti njegove ocene”, *NIN*, Belgrade, November 20th 1960.

other things, negative attitudes about abstract art, should not be forgotten, either.

The appearance of Informel in Vojvodina took place, unlike in Belgrade, on the margins of socialist Aestheticism with numerous experiments on the status and potentials of *deconstructing* autonomy and pictorial-mimetic-expressive determinedness of painting surface. One of the important initial pro-Informel events was the exhibition of the painter Branko Protić at Tribina mladih (Young People's Tribunal) in Novi Sad in 1959. Branko Protić (Bačka Palanka 1931 – Belgrade, 1990) worked mostly in Belgrade, and realized a sophisticated practice of literal investigation of the reduced pictorial surface and “pure” material organization on the surface, for instance *Composition* (1956). Afterwards, exhibitions *Gioconda Is Not Who She Used To Be* (Young People's Tribunal, 1962) and *Twenty Seven Contemporary Painters* (Likovna jesen Gallery in Sombor, 1962) took place, where L'Art Informel Abstraction Lyrique was interpreted in a polemic or representative way. In the exhibition in Sombor, József Ács represented artists from Vojvodina.

Ješa Denegri, in the historical³⁴² reviews of the Vojvodinian L'Art Informel, indicates the authentic individualist and isolative nature of the investigation of the border of Informel:

The representatives of Informel and matter painting, who worked during their entire career in Vojvodina's art scene, unlike the Belgrade representatives of the same movement, did not keep tight working relation between themselves: József Ács and Bogdanka Poznanović, even though they both lived in Novi Sad, belonged to various generations; Pál Petrik worked alone in Subotica. Isolated, without the support of the critics for this new tendency, they did not have enough time to establish a common phenomenon of L'Art Informel in the Vojvodinian scene, even though they were both individually aware of the language and spiritual features of their own painting career. There is data about Ács and Poznanović, indicating that they visited the Biennale of the “Triumph of Informel” in Venice in 1958 and there became familiar with certain presented European events. Bogdanka Poznanović is a highly intellectual and very informed artist, with frequent peer contacts in other Yugoslav art centers, and through her acquaintanceship with Marko Ristić, she undoubtedly became familiar with the principles of surrealist automatism as an experience that had a significant influence on the genesis of the painting of gesture and matter.

According to Denegri, a special quality of Vojvodinian Informel paintings is their pictorial non-referentiality, reduction of surface and an obvious non-associativeness. The painter and critic József Ács realized in a small number of paintings

(*Exact movement*, 1961) an act of expressive, materially positioned painting that could be characterized as works of radical Informel. The painter and scenographer Pál Petrik (Subotica, 1916-1996) drew attention to the processes of investigation and development within the material pictorial field of a painting (*Experiment I*, 1961). The painter Bogdanka Poznanović (Begeč, 1930) with her series of Informel paintings *Pittura 6* (1962) or *Composition V* (1963) crossed the path from the painter as a “producer of paintings” to the experimental artist, who started moving, in the late 60s and during the 70s, across painting towards process and conceptual art.

The case of Ana Bešlić: autonomous modernist vital form of sculpture (Serbian edition, p.206)

Ana Bešlić³⁴³ (Bajmok, 1912) created an extremely radical modernist opus of sculptures. She graduated from the Visual Arts Academy in Belgrade in 1947. She completed a post-graduate program under Professor Toma Roksandić in 1949. She works and works in Belgrade. She has had solo exhibitions since 1954, when she had an exhibition with Đorđe Bošan in Subotica.

Her opus began with the creation of a post-figurative vitalist sculpture, probably after Henry Moore's archetypical autonomous sculptures. It should not be forgotten that two great and influential exhibitions of Moore's sculptures took place in Yugoslavia in 1955³⁴⁴ and 1960.³⁴⁵ These exhibitions marked the establishment of a new sculpting paradigm of “organic” and “vitalist” Abstraction, which became a model for the development of the socialist Modernism from Olga Jančić and Olga Jevrić to Dušan Džamonja and Vojin Bakić. Ana Bešlić met Moore during his stay in Belgrade, as an example, see the picture from her atelier during Moore's visit. The sculpting work of Ana Bešlić started losing its instrumental-representational relationship with the socialist Realism as early as the first years of the 50s, and was redirected towards the investigation of primary shapes and perceptive/receptive conditions of a sculpture (*Sitting figure*, 1953, and *Torso*, 1954). Some of her works were realized as public sculptures (*Wings*, Lake Palić, 1957; *A Torch of memory*, Bajmok, 1971), and in the process they lost the references of a socialist sculpture, exposing themselves as models of universalist symbolic representation of *life's vitality*³⁴⁶, which can only indirectly be linked with the

342 Ješa Denegri, “Enformel i slikarstvo materije”, from: Dragomir Ugren (ed.), *Centralnoevropski aspekti vojvodanskih avangardi 1920–2000. ... Granični fenomeni, fenomeni granica*, Museum of Contemporary Visual Arts, Novi Sad, 2002, pp. 52–53; Ješa Denegri, “Enformel u Vojvodini”, from: Ješa Denegri, *Šezdesete: teme srpske umetnosti*, Svetovi, Novi Sad, 1995, pp. 48–54; and Ješa Denegri, “Enformel u Vojvodini”, from: “Koincidencije i paralele: pojave enformela u Španiji i Srbiji”, *Newsletter of the Department of History at the Faculty of Philosophy*, Belgrade, 2006, pp. 30–31.

343 Katarina Ambrozić, *Ana Bešlić*, City Museum, Subotica, 1983.

344 Henry Moore – *Skulpture i crtež*, Committee for International Cultural Connections of FPRY, Belgrade, 1955.

345 Henry Moore – *Skulpture, fotografije in barvne reprodukcije*, Umetnostna galerija v Mariboru and Committee for International Cultural Connections in Belgrade, 1960.

346 Herbert Rid, “Višesmislenost moderne skulpture”, *Umetnost*, No. 22, Belgrade, 1970.

ideas of optimism in real socialism – for instance *Composition 1* (1957) and *Composition 2* (1958). At one moment, she found “her form” in the roundness of post-L’Art Informel (from *Roots*, 1963 or *Sculpture VII*, 1963, to *Open form I*, 1966, and *Open form X*, 1968b or *Sculpture in two colors 2A*, 1970). Since the middle of the 1960s, her work has been directed towards the exploration of potentialities of a form and its perceptive, optic and plastic variations and transformations.

The sculpture work of Ana Bešlić is at the same time one of the radical extensions of modernist phenomenology and reduction of complex sculptural forms, and also, from the point of view of feminist history of art, an associative form leading us to the comprehension of the “woman’s” experience of a sculptural body as a gender body. Her explicitly gender, almost genital, associativeness as a subtext of a universal modernist abstract-vital expression was an important determinant of her emancipation as a sculptor, and of an extraordinary struggle to surpass formalism, that is, to open a new form and relativize the essential relationship of the “inner-outer” in the sculpture. By surpassing formalism, a “plastic sense” was reached that enabled a new understanding of sculpture as a gender and psycho-analytically determinable spatial event or text. Her purified organic form could be compared to the ideas of eroticism of the “eccentric Abstraction” which the critic Lucy Lippard found in the works of Louise Bourgeois or Eva Hesse.³⁴⁷ This is the sculpture that reaches a *spectacularization* of gender inscription.

Monumental sculpture – from socialist Realism to socialist Modernism (Serbian edition, p.209)

An almost straight-line evolution of monumental figurative soc-realist monuments in honor of the revolution and the fight for national liberty to the abstract vitalist and modernist constructions and architectural installations represents an exquisite phenomenon of Vojvodinian, Serbian and Yugoslav art, this time observed and interpreted in the area of Vojvodina.³⁴⁸ Authors of these works came from different centers of the second Yugoslavia. In the territory of Vojvodina, there were around 1500 monuments and memorial sculptures to the war for national liberty, according to the census from 1977. A transformation of monument construction from socialist figurative Realism to vitalist socialist Modernism in the case of politically demanded, standardized and commissioned “monu-

ments” is an excellent index of conceptual changes that were taking place in Yugoslav society, culture and art from the time of the revolutionary socialism to the self-governing socialism as the “socialism with a human face”. First monuments, created under the influence of the Soviet socialist Realism, were made on the principles of monumental post-constructionist Figuration. This means that the rational and symbolic relations were established between architectural bearing structures of monuments or the buildings on a designed area for a monument and the sculptural realizations and exhibits of individual statues or groups of statues. The followings works are created in that manner: Antun Augustinčić (1900–1979) and an architect Drago Galić (1907–????) – *Monument to the fighters of the Red Army* (1947) above the village of Batina on the right bank of the Danube; also, the work of Sreten Stojanović (1898–1960) *Monument to the perished fighters* (1951) on Irig road; or Toma Rosandić’s *Monument to the victims of fascism* (1952) in Subotica. A work that stands out of the monumental exhibit is a statue of a woman and a boy by Ana Bešlić – *Monument to the perished fighters and the victims of Fascist terror* (1955) in Subotica (Aleksandrovo).

During the early 60s, monuments based on the architectural or sculptural arrangement of spatial complexes started to appear, during which there was a change of the realist figure with an abstract figure or, later on, with an abstract vital form: Bogdan Bogdanović (1922) – *Memorial cemetery* (1960) in Sremska Mitrovica; Aleksandar Zarin³⁴⁹ – *Monument to the fallen fighters of the War for National Liberty* (1961) in Kikinda or *Monument to the Resistance* (1961) in Ada; Rudolf Matutinović (1927) – *Monument to the fighters of the partisan division in Kikinda* (1966) in Kikinda; Nándor Gléd – *Ballad of the Hanged* (1967) in Subotica; Živojin Karapešić (1938), Cveta Davidč and Miša David (1942) – *Monument to the revolution* (1975) in Ruma; Dragan Radenović (1951) – *Monument on the place of formation of Partisan division of Kikinda* (1981) in Kikinda; Nebojša Delja (1934) – *Execution grounds near Pančevo* (1981) near Pančevo; Milorad Berbakov (1936) – *Memorial complex and the museum of the battle of Batina* (1981) on the left bank of the Danube near Bezdan; Čedomir Radović (1937) and Sava Halugin (1946) – *Memorial cemetery of the fallen fighters of the War for National Liberty* (1984) in Novi Sad.

Transformations of monumental construction from socialist Realism towards vitalist socialist Modernism display two important processes:

(i) A higher degree of bureaucratization and technocracy in which the monument to the war for national liberty no longer has direct narrative didactic but memory and evocative-

347 Lucy R. Lippard, “Eros Presumptive”, from: Battcock, G. (ed.), *Minimal Art – A Critical Anthology*, E. P. Dutton & Co., INC., New York, 1968, pp. 209–221

348 Bela Duranci (ed.), “Spomenici revolucije u Vojvodini”, Likovna jesen Salon, Sombor, undated; and Jovan Maček, *Spomenici revolucije Vojvodine*, Provincial Bureau for the Protection of the Culture Monuments of Vojvodina, Novi Sad, 1987.

349 Slavko Konculov (ed.), *Aleksandar Zarin – Skulpture 1950–1974*, Contemporary Gallery UK “Ečka”, Zrenjanin, 1974.

symbolic-emotional functions of reminding and designating distant past; and

(ii) A growing demand for the autonomy of the principles of shape which are no longer utilitarian and functional but aesthetically indexed, and thus sculptures develop into architectural monuments or spatial micro-macro-complexes.

Still, works from the period between the 60s and the 80s are monumental works that represent a society that no longer sees monumentality in bureaucratic and technocratic developments as an expression of revolutionary or party strictness and power, but as an expression of economic potential to erect striking “monuments” for the future. This kind of work was, for the sculptors, architects and engineers of horticulture, an area of financially stimulated and, in the sense of shape, freer, that is, more autonomous creative work. Obvious contrasts between vital *Moore form* and the instrumental patriotic, revolutionary or party function open up critical places of the socialist Modernism, and perhaps any Modernism. These contradictions even today mark these monumental works. A characteristic example of Moore’s, and further on, of high-modernist influence that was leading to the “autonomous” or the sculpture “itself” can be found with Branko Ružić (1919–1927) in his work *Composition* (Lake Palić, 1963) or Jovan Soldatović – *Family* (monument to the victims of 1942 raid, created in 1970) or in the works of Ferenc Kalmar, Karl de Negrij and Bela Duranci³⁵⁰ – *Turbulent plane* (Tavankut, 1971) or László Szilágyi – *Ring* (Lake Palić), Nándor Glid – *Freedom* (1980), Sava Halugin – *Sprouting* (1982), etc.

One of the most eccentric projects of memorial sculpture is an unfinished architectural and sculpting work by the sculptor Jovan Soldatović,³⁵¹ the architect Mirko Krstonošić and the agricultural engineer Milan Sapundžić, *Memorial monument to the Srem front* (1987–1988). This memorial monument was erected on the one hundred and eighth kilometer of the Belgrade-Zagreb highway near the Bosut River. The unfinished space of the *memorial center* consists of the “gathering site” with the relief of the Srem front³⁵² and the presentation of the military operations, then the wall with the names of those who died, and finally the museum built in the ground with a lookout.³⁵³ The sculpture complex dedicated to the Srem front was created at the climax of the eclectic post-Modernism, and

in itself contains a highly eclectic and contradictory union of a memorial park, soc-realist sculpture, horizontal ambient plastics, ambient art, fantastic-grotesque art of post-Modernism and engaged Figuration, for instance in the style of the Zagreb *Bijafra* (1970–1978). Special features of this complex are the sculpture installations in the interiors of the monument complex. This memorial architectural and sculpture complex was erected at the end of the period of real socialism, 1987 – two years before the fall of the Berlin wall – and with its poetic and aesthetic Eclecticism it displays an entropy of symbols, meanings and values of an unfinished social and political system, destroyed with contradictions.

Borders of modernity – or the case of Mira Brtko (p.214)

Mira Brtko³⁵⁴ was born in Novi Banovci. She got a degree in directing from the Theater and Film Academy in Belgrade in 1953 and from the Visual Arts Academy (*Accademia di Belle Arte*) in Rome in 1963. She directed the theater play *Glass Menagerie* in Subotica in 1953. She studied in Prague, working with the director Otokar Vavr. She was making short films for Zagreb-Film until 1959. She worked as a screenwriter in films *La Steppa* (1963) and *Soloist* (1963) and as an assistant to director Pietro Germi on the film *Un maladetto imbroglio* (1959) in Italy. She was assistant director on the film *Sutjeska* (1970–71).

She started painting more intensely during her stay in Rome, where she had a solo exhibition in 1964, and where she participated in several group exhibitions, among which *Forme presenti* in 1965 is the most important. She appeared on the Vojvodinian and Serbian art scene at the exhibitions in Contemporary Visual Arts Gallery in Novi Sad and in the Salon of the Modern Art Museum in 1971. She collaborated with the art group *Illumination*, formed in 1967 by a Japanese artist Nobuja Abe (1913–1971), which had members like Milena Čubraković (1924–2004), the American artist Marcia Hafif and two Italian artists – Paolo Patelli and Aldo Schmid. The group did not have a declarative program, but all of its members were connected by a common conception of art as a completely non-referential Abstraction, with organic and meditative, rather than with highly geometrical and constructive features. In Brtko’s early paintings, which have Italian names, thus meaning they were either created or were included in the artistic life of those surroundings, according to Ješa Denegri, there is a gradual separation from the legacy of L’Art Informel, of which the final traces can be seen in slight relief layers of matter, with the painting eventually becoming an arranged and completely

350 It is interesting that Bela Duranci, a famous art historian, appears as a co-author in this sculpting work.

351 Ljiljana Ivanović (ed.), *Jovan Soldatović – skulptura: 1942–1984*, Contemporary Visual Arts Gallery, Novi Sad, 1985; Bela Duranci, “Vajar Jovan Soldatović (1920–2005)”, *Rukoveti*, No. 1–3, Subotica, 2006, pp. 70–83.

352 The Srem front was formed in World War II, between 21st October 1944 and 13th April 1945. It was formed during the withdrawal of the German army from the Balkans. 250,000 soldiers participated in the fighting. Troops of the Third Reich, the Independent State of Croatia, Yugoslav National Army, Red Army, Bulgarian Army and the “Italy” brigade took part in the battles. During the fighting on the Srem front around 14,000 ally soldiers lost their lives.

353 Bogdan Ibajter, “Tišinom kroz Aleju časti”, *Politika*, April 18th 1988, pp. 7.

354 *Catalogue: Mira Brtko*, Contemporary Visual Arts Gallery, Novi Sad, 1971; and Gordana Sarčević (ed.), *Mira Brtko – Usmerena imaginacija*, Contemporary Visual Arts Gallery, Novi Sad, 1994.

two-dimensional plastic organism, most often done in white, moving to the minimalization of form, and the minimalization in a more radical stage, which she, however, does not reach, because such extreme comprehension of a painting obviously did not suit her formation and nature.³⁵⁵ In the spirit of ideas preached by Abe, which was essentially accepted by her younger associates, a painting, although devoid of any object reference and reduced to simple and concise visual effects, is not an aesthetic product, but is created and should work as a sign of spiritual “enlightenment” in the tradition of Asian life philosophies.³⁵⁶ After the group *Illumination* ceased to exist and during the continuation of an individual painting and sculpting work alongside other interests, Brtka joined a type of symbiosis of the principles of organic and geometric Abstraction of highly intense color palette, of which the colored zones are separated with hard edges, building a type of a painting (painting from the series *River “A”*, 1970, or *AL 11*, 1970) in the spirit of the basic plastic postulates of the painting culture of the late Modernism.

Mira Brtka realized a number of series of sculptures at the turn of the 21st century: *From without – from within* (1999), *Readymade* (2000) or *Red sculpture* (2005–2007). Most of these sculptures³⁵⁷ were created by “adopting”, “rearranging” and “renaming” readymade metal semi-products or prefabricated elements. The concept of *readymade* was not set up explicitly in a Duchamp-like manner, but in such a way where the idea of readymade is integrated in the practices of “new sculpture” of the 80s and the 90s. These works have a simple object configuration and enter the procedures of conceptual sculpture creations. These works could, in other words, be marked as the effects of derivation and physical perception/observation in sculptural performances. The sculptor in the *Red sculpture*³⁵⁸ series adopts, rearranges and renames metal semi-products (processed, welded pieces of metal) and places them on a pediment, the result of which is the “appearance” of the model of monumental sculpture. These “cynical sculptures” are offered as a kind of an undetermined and arbitrary “removed trace” of monumental sculptures from the age of socialist Modernism. Their character of the trace of socialism is emphasized with the use of a red metal frame around the pediment and the sculpture. The paradox of these works is that they suggest a cynical

relationship with the falsity of the socialist Modernism but also, on the other hand, a melancholic, almost gentle relationship with the artifacts of the work and of the symbol of past utopian societies.

Avant-garde – from excess to the international experimental “platforms” (Serbian edition, p.217)

Avant-garde is a super-style notion that indicates radical, excess, critical, projective, experimental and interdisciplinary artistic strategies of the twentieth century. The relationship between Modernism and Avant-garde has changed during the twentieth century. There are three characteristic models of relationship between Avant-garde and Modernism:

1. Early Avant-gardes (from the middle of the nineteenth century to the beginning of the Second World War);
2. Neo-Avant-gardes (from the end of the Second World War to 1968);
3. Post-avant-gardes (which emerged after 1968).

Early Avant-gardes or historical Avant-gardes are predecessors to the modernistic art and culture. By means of radical excesses and experiments, they initiate the project of a new art, society and culture, which is accepted through manufacturing and media power of Modernism and transformed into mass culture and art of the high Modernism. The notion of early Avant-gardes corresponds to Burger’s concept of “historical Avant-gardes”.³⁵⁹

Neo-Avant-garde³⁶⁰ emerged when the modernistic culture established the dominating values and models of expression during the Cold War epoch.³⁶¹ It arose as a criticism of the modernistic dominance in culture and its models of autonomy and specialization of special arts, apolitical quality, abstract formalism, aesthetic formalism and clear differentiation between high modernistic elite art and mass modernistic popular art and culture. While the early Avant-garde was developing projective power of an ideal Utopia, neo-Avant-garde was establishing the models of critical work and, on the other side, the possibility of an actual Utopia.

Post-Avant-garde is a name for a variety of mutually different movements from the end of the sixties, in which the historical heritage of Modernism and Avant-gardes is being reassessed in a theoretical and practically-critical manner. The characteristics of Post-Avant-garde are:

355 Ješa Denegri, “Postenformel reduktivna apstrakcija”, from: Dragomir Ugren (ed.), *Centralnoevropski aspekti vojvođanskih avangardi 1920–2000. ... Granični fenomeni, fenomeni granica*, Contemporary Visual Arts Museum, Novi Sad, 2002, pp. 76–81.

356 Nobuja Abe represented the teachings of utter nothingness of thought before God. Nothingness is connected with reductionism and non-referentiality in painting of his followers. See: Plinio Corrêa de Oliveira, “Catholic Universality and Pagan Internationalism”, http://www.tfp.org/TFPForum/PCO/catholic_universality.htm

357 Suzana Vuksanović (ed.), *Nova skulptura u Vojvodini 1980–2000*, Museum of Contemporary Art of Vojvodina, Novi Sad, 2006.

358 Sava Stepanov (ed.), *Mira Brtka: Crvena skulptura*, Center for Visual Culture “Zlatno oko”, Novi Sad, 2007.

359 Peter Birger, *Teorija avangarde (The Theory of the Avant-garde)*, Narodna knjiga, Belgrade, 1998

360 Mikloš Sabolči, *Avangarda & Neoavangarda (The Avant-garde and the Neo-Avant-garde)*, Narodna knjiga, Belgrade, 1997

361 David Cate, *The Dancer Defects – The Struggle for Cultural Supremacy during the Cold War*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2003

1. The non-existence of Utopian views (criticism of Utopian in Avant-gardes and neo-Avant-gardes);
2. Theoretically elaborated ideological and linguistically-semiological analysis of the nature of art and culture;
3. Applying Avant-garde and neo-Avant-garde radical, excess and experimental procedures to the new media models of expression.

Post-avant-garde is manifested through various tendencies:

1. Theoretical criticism of Modernism (conceptual art, semio-art);
2. Simulation of Avant-garde and neo-Avant-garde strategies in post-modernistic media culture of extravaganza (neo-conceptualism, simulationism);
3. Simultaneous simulation of Avant-garde strategies and anti-Avant-garde models of expression in totalitarian societies (retro-Avant-garde, art of perestroika);
4. Developing of conceptual and media procedures by which new ecstatic Utopias of post-modernistic societies and their technological-hypermedia culture are projected (Modernism after Postmodernism, technological art).

Vojvodinian Avant-gardes emerge as a part of Yugoslav and Hungarian Avant-garde. It involves a variety of excess, experimental, intermediary and interdisciplinary artistic phenomena in the interstice of literature and visual arts (Serbia, Croatia, Slovenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Vojvodina) between the years 1918 and 1935. During the 20s and early 30s, specific Avant-garde cultures, such as Serbian, Vojvodinian, Croatian and Slovenian Avant-garde formed in the Yugoslav cultural space. However, they were not mutually isolated, but defined by intertextual and intersubjective exchanges and influences. A flow of ideas, polemical situations and actions that made an open, instable, inconsistent and concisely-expanding world of *Avant-garde* was created in Yugoslavia, which was in complicated relations with Hungarian, German, Czech, French and Dutch Avant-garde.

The artistic and cultural situation in the Slavic south before the First World War was complicated:

1. The Kingdom of Serbia is a country in which a nationally-bourgeois moderately-modernistic culture and the values of a bourgeois society are being established, under the influence of French culture;
2. Vojvodina, Slovenia, Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina were a part of Austria-Hungary – their cultural milieu is determined by a wakening of national cultures and searching for the national identities on one side, and megacultural frame of Central European Modernism on the other side (cosmopolitanism and eclecticism which develops under the influences of Vienna, Budapest, Munich, Berlin and Prague).

It is a period of forming and realization of political and cultural idea of Yugoslavianism as a project of the future union

of Yugoslav peoples. For example, the great *mainstream* was a concept and anticipation of *integrated Yugoslavianism*, which was presented as a sculpture by Ivan Meštrović with a model for the Vidovdan Temple (1912-1913). Because of that, Avant-gardes were a reaction to a secessionist and symbolic discourse of *mainstream* through the acceleration of the transformation of postimpressionism into expressionism and cubism, and Dada. Between 1910 and 1918 several Avant-garde phenomena appear, anticipating at the time contemporary modernistic and Avant-garde ideas, though they never shaped into Avant-garde movements. With the beginning of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, and, a while later the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, the cultural areas of, above all, Ljubljana, Zagreb and Belgrade are formed, and their solid mutual relations are established. Beyond this “capital” axis, through the activist work of the Avant-gardes (Dragan Aleksić, Branko Ve Poljanski [1898 - 1947], Ljubomir Micić [1895–1971]) and political refugees from Hungary, the Avant-garde events take place in Slavonia (Osijek, Vinkovci) and Vojvodina (Subotica, Novi Sad). In these kinds of conditions Avant-garde movements with clear platform statements appear, becoming excessively detached from the main modernistic current. From the ideological point of view, Yugoslav Avant-gardes are left Avant-gardes, which means:

1. That they were party-politically or indirectly manifestly connected to Marxism and communist party;
2. That they were critically subversive in relation to values, meanings and models of expression of modern urban bourgeois society and its culture; and
3. That they are antiauthoritarian, anarchical and excessive in their specific and Avant-garde characteristics (the ideals of freedom, difference, distinction).

The first real Avant-garde magazine is *Svetokret - List za ekspediciju na Sjeverni pol čovjekovog duha* (*Svetokret - The magazine for an expedition to the North Pole of a human spirit*), published by Virgil Poljanski (Branko Micić, Branko Ve Poljanski) in Ljubljana in 1921. The magazine was entirely his work and was explicitly of cosmopolitan and Yugoslav character (it was published by a Serb from Croatia, intervening pro-Dadaistically with Slovene culture).

Zenithism is an international art movement that emerged in Zagreb (Croatia, the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes) in 1921. The poet Ljubomir Micić starts the international magazine *Zenit* (*Zenith*), manifestly forming a new Avant-garde movement “zenithism”³⁶², which was active for six years (1921 – 1926). Zenithism is an eclectic, excess and experimental international Avant-garde movement that emerged in the social

362 Irina Subotić (ed.), *Zenit i avangarda 20-ih godina*, Narodni muzej i Institut za književnost i umetnost (National Museum and Institute for Literature and Art), Belgrade, 1983.

and cultural climate after the First World War³⁶³, i.e. in the conditions created by deterioration of the Austro-Hungarian Empire and the constituting of the multinational Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, i.e. the Kingdom of Yugoslavia.³⁶⁴ The zenithistic movement is defined by attitudes and manifest rhetoric that was important for early Avant-garde movements such as expressionism, futurism, vorticism, primitivism and cubofuturism immediately before the First World War. These qualities are aesthetic and technical formalism, i.e. the aspiration towards a new topology of text and picture. Further, the emphasizing of individualism with a marked dominating male self-confidence (*machismo*), the tendency towards national-imperial syntheses, which move from the project of Yugoslavianism, the Balkan man (the Balkan barbarogenous, the Balkanization of Europe)³⁶⁵, the new man of bolshevism, fantasy of the pan-Slovene quality towards the nationalistic realpolitical Serbianism. Zenithism is defined by an attempt to establish an authentic Avant-garde art movement on the edges of the territories of Middle Europe, Central Europe and the Balkans: a movement from the Balkans and a movement for the Balkanic transformation of European civilisation. Many artists and chance fellow-travellers cooperated in the publishing of the magazine *Zenit*. The movement and the magazine were the work of Ljubomir Micić and his wife Anuška (Nina-Naj) Micić, and occasional activities and participation of Micić's younger brother Branko Ve Poljanski. *Zenit* was initiated in the post-secessionist and protoexpressionistic atmosphere of Croatian art in Zagreb immediately after the First World War. The notions of expressionism, Dada, futurism, constructivism and abstraction infused the zenithistic activities that unfolded in complicated and contradictory-conflicted political relations between Croatian and Serbian cultures at the beginning of the 1920s. It involved a dramatic situation of facing the national – Serbian, Croatian and Slovenian – ideologies with the establishing and failure of performing the supernational "South-Slav" or "Yugoslav" identity. Ljubomir Micić was a Serb who acted in the Croatian social, cultural and artistic environment. *Zenit* also emerged in the conflicting qualities and contradictions of ethnically-national and culturally-social confrontations of the local Balkanic cultures with the international artistic atmo-

spheres and innovations after the First World War.³⁶⁶

The zenithistic movement was active in Zagreb from 1921 to 1923, and in Belgrade from 1924 to 1926. The people who contributed to the magazine were Zagreb Avant-gardes Marian Mikac³⁶⁷, Andra Jutronic, Jo Klek³⁶⁸, Vilko Gecan³⁶⁹, Vinko Foretić, Vjera Biller, Dragan Aleksić³⁷⁰, Belgrade Avant-gardes Mihailo Petrov, Boško Tokin, Rastko Petrović, Stanislav Vinaver and others. On an international and cosmopolitan level zenithism was defined by the cooperation with the French poet Ivan Goll (1891 – 1950) and Aleksander Archipenko, Robert Delaunay, Ilija Erenburg, Vasilije Kadinski, El Lissitzky, Louis Lozowick, Theo van Doesburg, Hannes Meyer, László Moholy-Nagy and others.

Dragan Aleksić (1901–1958) started his Dadaistic artistic work as a student in Prague by organizing a number of Dadaistic evening events during 1921 and 1922. Together with Branko Poljanski he set a string of Dadaistic events with the display of visual poems and poetry reading in the Yugoslav Hall on Štefanska Street in the center of Prague.³⁷¹ At that point, a program text was created and written on a 25 meter-long piece of rolled paper. Aleksić was under the influence of German Dadaistic activism. Among others, he was in contact with Melchior Vischer (i.e. Emil Walter Kurt Fischer, 1895 – 1975), and he was given a chance to participate in the Dadaistic atmosphere of Prague, which was initiated by Raoul Hausmann (1886 – 1971) and Richard Huelsenbeck (1892 – 1974) during their guest engagements there (Hausmann and Huelsenbeck held a morning performance in 1920, and Hausmann and Kurt Schwitters in 1921). Through Branko Poljanski he cooperated with Ljubomir Micić and the *Zenit* magazine in Zagreb during 1921. He published a proclaiming article named "Dadaism" in the third issue of *Zenit* (Zagreb, April 1921). He wrote a grotesque novel "*The Outburst of Mr. Hristos*" (Serbian: Provala gospodina Hristosa), which was supposed to be published in the *Zenit* edition, but due to a conflict with Micić the publishing did not happen. He published two Dadaistic international magazines *Dada Tank* and *Dada Jazz* in Zagreb in 1922, and Ve Poljanski published an anti-Dadaistic magazine *Dada Jok*

363 See: Paul Peppis, "Introduction: Nations, empires, and the historical avant-garde", from: *Literature, Politics, And The English Avant-Garde – Nation and Empire, 1910–1918*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000, pp. 1–19

364 Miško Šuvaković, "Impossible Histories", from: Miško Šuvaković, Dubravka Đurić (eds.), *Impossible Histories – Historical Avant-gardes, Neo-Avant-Gardes, and Post-avant-gardes in Yugoslavia, 1918–1991*, The MIT Press, Cambridge MA, 2003, pp. 2–35.

365 Ljubomir Micić, Ivan Goll, Boško Tokin, *Manifest zenitizma*, Biblioteka Zenit, No. 1, Zagreb, 1921; or Ljubomir Micić, "Paraliza Evrope – Politička novela", from: Ljubomir Micić, *Zenitizam*, Oktobar, Niš, 1991, pp. 32–33.

366 Ljubomir Micić, "Papiga i monopol 'hrvatska kultura'", *Zenit*, No. 24, Zagreb, 1923, pp. 1–2; Anthony D. Smith, "Nationalism and Modernism"; and Esther Levinger, "Ljubomir Micić and the Zenitist Utopia", from: Timothy O. Benson (ed.), *Central European Avant-Gardes: Exchange and Transformation, 1910–1930*, LACMA, Los Angeles, 2002, pp. 68–80 and 260–278

367 Branimir Donat, "Marian Mikac, zaboravljeni tvorac Morisa Švarca", *Vjesnik Danica*, Saturday, 11th September, 1993, pp. 20–21

368 Vera Horvat-Pintarić (ed.), *Josip Seissel*, Gallery Nova, Zagreb, 1978; V. Bužančić, *Josip Seissel*, Art Gallery "Branko Dešković", Bol, 1988; Marijan Susovski (ed.), *Josip Seissel. Nadrealističko razdoblje – slike, crteži, akvareli, tempere, pasteli, crtači blokovi od 1920. do 1987*, Museum of Contemporary Art, Zagreb, 1997

369 J. Ladović, *Vilko Gecan*, Art Studio Azinović d.o.o, Zagreb, 1997

370 Gojko Tešić (ed.), *Dragan Aleksić – Dada Tank*, Nolit, Belgrade, 1978

371 Jindřich Toman, "Now You See It, Now You Don't: Dada in Czechoslovakia, with Notes On High and Low", from: Stephen C. Foster (ed.), *The Eastern Dada Orbit: Russia, Georgia, Ukraine, Central Europe and Japan*, G. K. Hall & Co., New York, 1998, pp. 14–15.

(Zagreb 1922). The polemical zenithistic work and actions of Branko Ve Poljanski was in the public discourse of cultural and artistic controversy in the Vojvodinian culture of the twentieth century, i.e. in the confrontation of the new and the old ones.³⁷² The significant artist of European Dada collaborated in publishing *Dada Tank* and *Dada Jazz*: Tristan Tzara, Kurt Schwitters, Richard Huelsenbeck. Aleksić introduces the notion of *Yugo-dada*, pointing at the Yugoslav character of his concept of Dadaism. The cities of Dadaistic events (morning performances) during 1922 were Osijek, Vinkovci, Novi Sad and Subotica. Dadaistic events whose leading protagonist was Dragan Aleksić himself took place in Osijek and Vinkovci³⁷³, while at the performances in Novi Sad and Subotica³⁷⁴ poli-Avant-garde eclectic confrontation of the effects of Dadaism, activism and zenithism happened. In Novi Sad, a lecture was held that was dedicated to the presentation of expressionistic activist art in 1922.³⁷⁵ A battle for the “Avant-garde hegemonies” was fought between Kašak, Micić and Aleksić’s positioning on the artistic scene of Southeast Europe. Dadaistic events or morning performances were eclectic combinations of exhibition and cabaret. The basic idea was to treat poetic lyrics as a score from which a theatrical or a stage event would be performed. To that kind of stage and theatricality the role model was the cabaret “spectacle”, and for the Dadaistic manner of grotesque, parody and the carnevalisation, the paradigmatic role model was certainly the Zurich Cabaret Walter from 1916. Micić was preparing himself to perform at the Subotica morning performance, and he announced it in his program paper “Kategorički imperativ zenitističke pesničke škole” (The Categorical Imperative of the Zenithistic School of Poetry)³⁷⁶. According to the available data, Micić probably withdrew from performing and distanced himself from Subotica Dadaists.³⁷⁷

Serbian, or more precisely, Belgrade Avant-garde of the twenties is defined by opposed currents:

1. The activity of zenithists, the brothers Micić and a Dadaist, Dragan Aleksić from 1923 – this tendency can be determined as Belgrade Avant-garde of Serbs from Croatia; and
2. Serbian (Belgrade) Avant-garde, which emerged from questioning the modernistic tendencies, whose course leads from the magazine *Putevi* (Roads, 1922 – 1924), through the

almanac *Crno na belo* (Black on White, 1924), *Hipnos* (Hypnos, 1922 – 1923), *Svedočanstva* (Testimonies, 1924 – 1925), *50 u Evropi* (50 in Europe, 1928) to the Belgrade surrealist movement (*Nemoguće* [Impossible], 1930; *Nadrealizam danas i ovde* [Surrealism today and here], 1931 – 1932; surrealist publications, etc.).

One of the leading Serbian Avant-garde graphic artists and painters was Mihailo S. Petrov. In a short period of his life, he was connected to the Avant-garde tendencies. Petrov studied at art school in Belgrade from 1919 to 1921. In 1921 he stayed in Vienna. There he became familiar with the theory of the new or “absolute” painting of Vasilije Kandinski. He translated Kadinski’s piece “Slikarstvo kao čista umetnost” (Painting as a pure art, Misao, Belgrade, 1922). He was a contributor to the magazines *Zenit* (Zagreb, 1921 – 1922), *Dada Tank* and *Dada Jazz* (1922) and *Út* (Novi Sad, 1922). He published abstract Dadaistic linocuts, which, together with the graphic experiments of Jo Klek, belong to the most significant visual results of the Serbo-Croatian Dada and zenithism. At that time he completed his key watercolor painting *Kompozicija 77* (Composition 77, 1924). He continued his studies at the Krakow academy in 1923. He exhibited at *Prva Zenitova međunarodna izložba nove umetnosti* (The First Zenith International Exhibition of the New Art), which was held in the *Stanković School of Music* in Belgrade in 1924. He was one of the organizers and the participants of the *Sixth Yugoslav Exhibition* in Novi Sad in 1927. He quit the Avant-garde experiments in 1925 and turned to social art. He lived in Novi Sad from 1926 to 1929, where he worked on landscapes, which brought him closer to the concepts of painting of the *New Objectivity*

Vojvodinian historical Avant-gardes emerge in the complicated relations between Serbian, Croatian, Yugoslav, Hungarian and Central European Avant-garde. Avant-gardes were an eclectic and critical art phenomenon, which was, at the same time, based on the rejection of the modernistic tradition (succession, symbolism), and also on the criticism of the mainstream and local Modernisms. While doing so, they basically appeared in the framework of the literary experiment and spreading into the area of visual arts and actionism. Artworks of Avant-garde were the “event” of the Avant-garde behavior and act in the cultural conditions of the bourgeois national society. In contrast to Modernism (Dobrović, Šumanović, Konjović) and the efforts of modernistic artists to create the development of artistic activity, the characteristics of Avant-gardes were permanent excess “capriciousness” and the aspiration towards the end of traditions and the provoking of normal artistic practices.

In the 1920s, a Post-expressionistic, activist and Pro-Dadaistic movement of Hungarian³⁷⁸ artists who concentrated

372 V. S-Z, “Branko Ve Poljanski: Crveni petao, Belgrade, 1927”, *Letopis Matice srpske*, Vol. 314 No. 2, Novi Sad, 1927, pp. 304-305

373 Ivan Flod, “Dada – Povodom dodadaističke matinee održane 20. VIII 1922. u Royal-Kinu”, *Hrvatska obrana*, No. 187, Osijek, 21. VIII 1921, pp. 2-3

374 Vida Golubović (ed.), “Dada u Subotici”, *Književnost*, br. 7-8, Belgrade, 1990, pp. 1383-1423

375 “Aktivistički dadaistički matinee” (*Hirap*, II/258, 11th of November 1922, pp. 3), from: Vida Golubović (ed.), “Dada u Subotici”, *Književnost*, No. 7-8, Belgrade, 1990, pp. 1402

376 Ljubomir Micić, “Kategorički imperativ zenitističke pesničke škole”, from: Vida Golubović (ed.), “Dada u Subotici”, *Književnost*, No. 7-8, Belgrade, 1990, pp. 1404-1407

377 Ljubomir Micić, “Povodon matinee ‘jugoslovenskih aktivista’...”, *Zenit*, No. 18, Zagreb, 1922, pp. 61

378 Imre Bori, *Književnost jugoslovenskih Madara*, Matica srpska, Novi Sad, 1979

around an Avant-garde magazine in Hungarian, *Út*³⁷⁹ (Put, Novi Sad, 1922 – 1925) and the magazine *Hirlap* (*Messenger*³⁸⁰, Subotica, 1922) acted in Vojvodina (Novi Sad and Subotica). The magazine *Út* was close to the Hungarian Activism of Lajoš Kašak, while the Subotica Dadaists, concentrated around the Dada club and the action program of the Dada morning performances, were close to the Dadaism of Sándor Barta (Budapest, 1897 – USSR, 1938). The Subotica Dadaists were in direct collaborating contact with Micić's Zenithism and Aleksić's Dadaism. Other than Hungarian, Serbian authors also published in the magazine *Út*: Dragan Aleksić, Milan Dedinac, Žarko Vasiljević, Stanislav Vinaver, Rade Drainac, Boško Tokin, Stanislav Vinaver, Velislav Spasić, Ljubomir Micić, and others. The represented painters were: Sava Šumanović and Mihailo Petrov.³⁸¹ The Hungarian emigration is formed right after the First World War, when the left oriented intellectuals fled from Budapest and Republic of Baranya at the time of Hortij's political terror. The Avant-garde center of Hungarian activism is formed in Vienna, and part of the emigration finds shelter in the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, above all in Belgrade, Bečkerek, Novi Sad and Subotica.³⁸² Those were: Zoltán Csuka (Plandište, 1901. – Erd, 1984), János Csuka (1902–1962), Flóris Mikes, Péter Lőrinc (pseudonyms: Árpád Láng, Žarko Plamenac), and from other parts of Hungary came: Sándor Haraszti, István Tamás Krausz, Lajos Fekete, János Dettre, as well as painters Petar Dobrović, Jenő Lenkei, Géza Hódi and others. The intellectual and political climate that these authors created was significantly connected to the problem of the double status of the “emigrant minority” and the minority were open to the emancipatory and international project of Modernism, above all to the Avant-garde reception and developments of Kašak's Activism and international Dada. These authors established and retained the “speech platform” of Hungarian language from which they communicated with authors of Croatian and Serbian Modernism and Avant-garde. In this context, the “transcultural” model of communication was anticipated among the minority groups on their own, Hungarian language. The authors that were concentrated around the magazine *Út* were supported by Kašak and his circle in Vienna. The following quotation also tells about Kašak's international cultural politics in Europe and the “region”:

The collaboration between the Viennese circle of *Ma* and Berlin (Der Sturm, especially the theoretician Ernő Kállai), or Bauhaus (László Moholy-Nagy, Marcel Brauer, Farkas Molnár) was intensive. Other than that, *Ma* served – especially in the part of the world where Hungarian was spoken – as a model for other Avant-garde groups and their publications. In the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes (later Yugoslavia), in Novi Sad, a group of young Hungarian Avant-garde writers, concentrated around the magazine *Út* (Road) between 1922 and 1925, tried to, with basic intellectual and financial help of *Ma* from Vienna, to perform precisely the activist practice that *Ma* established in Budapest between 1916 and 1919. This attempt failed. The differences are particularly interesting, since *Út* was basically under the influence of the Dadaists and Zenithists. Also interesting are the less obvious, but not less recognizable connections between *Ma* in Vienna and Avant-garde magazines *Periszkóp* and *Genius*, which were published in Arad (Transylvania, Romania) throughout 1925 and 1926. During his last two years in Vienna, Kašak established extraordinary connections with *Das Junge Schlesien* (*The Young Schleisers*), a group of artists that acted on the German speaking territory. He dedicated the last issue of the magazine *Ma* (15th June 1925) to their work, and the rest of the material was published in the Budapest magazine *Dokumentum* the following year.³⁸³

Unlike the magazine *Út*, the artists from Subotica were close to the Dadaistic approach of Sándor Barta. Barta acted in Kašak's circle in Vienna until 1922, when he started a left oriented magazine *Akaszott Ember* (*The Hanged Man*³⁸⁴, 1922 – 1923), which had an influence on the Subotica Dadaistic stage. The Subotica Activist and Dadaist morning performances were connected to Micić's Zenithistic and Aleksić's Dadaistic performances. For example, the invitation to the *Morning Performance* (*Matine*) in November of 1922 was entitled “The Yugoslav Activists” (Jugoslovenski aktivisti). On the invitation, the following artists could be found: Ljubomir Micić, Endre Arató, Árpád Láng³⁸⁵, Zoltan Čuka, Andor Sugár, Virgil Poljanski, Dragan Aleksić, Mihailo Petrov, Sándor Barta, Lajoš Kašak and others.³⁸⁶

The magazine *Út* and Subotica morning performances were essentially, pro or against, connected to Kašak's Activism, as was the Zenithistic project of Ljubomir Micić. Activism is also the name of the Hungarian Avant-garde Pro-Dadaistic and Constructivist movement formed and led by Lajoš Kašak from 1915. The movement got its name from the literary-political magazine *A Tett*, which was founded by Kašak in 1915. The magazine was of anarchistic, revolutionary and antimilitaristic orientation. It was prohibited in 1916, and after the prohibition,

379 According to the available data, six issues of magazine *Út* have been saved: No. 1, 2 and 3 from 1922, No. 1 from 1923, No. 1 from 1924 and No. 1 from 1925.

380 *Hirlap* (*Messenger*) is a magazine of Yugoslav Hungarians. The magazine was founded in Subotica, in December of 1921. It was banned in 1929.

381 Ferenc Nemet, “Predstavni srpske avangarde u mađarskom časopisu *Út*”, from: Vida Golubović, Siniša Tunjević (eds.), *Srpska avangarda u periodici*, Matica srpska Novi Sad and Institute for Literature and Art, Belgrade, 1996, pp. 387–393.

382 Vida Golubović, “Dada u Subotici”, *Književnost*, No. 7–8, Belgrade, 1990, pp. 1383–1388; and Marija Cindori, “Aktivistička dadaistička matineja u Subotici”, from: Dragomir Ugren (ed.), *Centralnoevropski aspekti vojvođanskih avangardi 1920–2000... Granični fenomeni, fenomen granica*, Muzej savremene likovne umetnosti, Novi Sad, 2002, pp. 32–49.

383 Pál Deréki, “Vienna”, from: Timothy O. Benson (ed.), *Central European Avant-Gardes: Exchange and Transformation, 1910–1930*, LACMA, Los Angeles, 2002, pp. 169–170.

384 *Časopis Akaszott Ember* (*Hanged Man*) was an activist magazine which was published by Sándor Barta in Vienna in 1922 and 1923.

385 Árpád Láng, *Árpád Láng és művészete* (*Árpád Láng's art*), Életjel, Szabadka, 1972, translation: Arpad Lang: *Time and Art* (*Activist writings*), Életjel, Subotica, 1972.

386 Vida Golubović, “Dada u Subotici”, *Književnost*, No. 7–8, Belgrade, 1990, pp. 1383–1388; annexe, pp. 1401.

Lajoš Kašak started the magazine *Ma (Today)*. The magazine *Ma* started under the influence of Expressionism and the German magazine *Der Sturm*, from where it developed towards the specific Activist subtypes of Dadaism and Constructivism. After the fall of the Hungarian Soviet Republic, *Ma* was published in Vienna, where the first foreign issue was published in 1920. A Hungarian emigrant circle of artists was formed in Vienna. New artistically and politically oriented magazines were detached from the magazine *Ma*, *Akasztott Ember (The Hanged Man)*, *Egység (Unity)* and *Ék (Wedge)*. The Hungarian Activism had important features of Central or Middle European Avant-gardes, which means that it was organized as a dynamic and eclectic movement, which separated itself from the mythical atmosphere of Expressionism and developed as a critical and left oriented practice close to the subversive Dada and to the specifically-utopian Constructivism. The very word “Activism” denoted a heterogeneous set of modernistic and progressivistic ideas about speed, active effects in society, transformations of reality, breaking of the tradition and awaking of the spirit of modernity.

Digressions about Avant-gardes and Bauhaus (p.226)

The information about the acting of the Avant-garde school for artists Bauhaus³⁸⁷ (Vajmar, Dessau, Berlin, 1919 – 1933) were famous among Vojvodinian Avant-gardists inside the circle around Zoltán Csuka.³⁸⁸ However, a special “case” of international connecting was a relation between the magazine *Út* and the artists that collaborated in the group *KURI*³⁸⁹ (*Konstruktiv, Utilitär, Rationell, International*) in Bauhaus, with Farkas Molnár (Pečuj, 1897 – Budapest, 1945), Weininger Andor (Kármás, 1899 – New York, 1986), Keler Peter (Kiel 1898 – Weimar 1982), and others. The Manifesto³⁹⁰ of the group *KURI* was originally published in the magazine *Út*, which was the consequence of the collaboration with Zoltán Csuka.³⁹¹ The manifesto of the group *KURI* is one of the rare Constructivist agenda documents first published in Vojvodina and Serbia

throughout the 20s. Zoltán Csuka’s book, *Megyünk: versek*³⁹², published in Novi Sad in 1923, is associated with Farkas Molnár. The author of the poems is Zoltán Csuka, Farkas Molnár did the illustrations, and Zoltán Ember (???? - ????) designed the constructivist – activist covers. The covers of the book of poems of Zoltán Csuka, *Fundamentom*³⁹³, were designed by Farkas Molnár.³⁹⁴ It was an exceptionally precise and obvious example of the new graphic typographical design developed in the European Constructivism.³⁹⁵

Surely, one can also mention certain connections between artists and students of Bauhaus with the Yugoslav and Vojvodinian territory. According to the register of students in Bauhaus, the following students came from the territory of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia or the South-Slav territory: Mas Baranyai (Maria Bárányai), Oti Berger, Aogosto Černigoj (August Černigoj, Trieste 1898. – Sežana 1985), Jaetav Bohutinsky, Selman Selmanagić (Srebrenica 1905 - Berlin 1986) and Ivana Tomljenović (Zagreb 1906 - Zagreb 1988) and Henrik Stefan.

The Constructivist artist László Moholy-Nagy (Bácsborsód, 1895 – Chicago, 1946), according to the memories³⁹⁶ of his brother Jenő Nagy, spent part of his childhood in the village *Mohol*, today in Vojvodina, on the banks of Tisa. This town of several thousand inhabitants was, at the time of László Moholy-Nagy’s childhood, divided into Hungarian and Serbian parts of the town. László Moholy-Nagy started adding the name “Moholy” to his surname in 1919. László Moholy-Nagy had a tumultuous life: he started his career as an artist in Budapest, then worked in Vienna in the circle around Lajoš Kašak and, some time later, in Germany. He was one of the most influential lecturer-artists in Bauhaus (1923 – 1928). He had a significant influence on the development of Constructivism, new typography and graphic design, as well as the new media, above all photography and film. After he had left the Bauhaus, he went to Berlin, then Paris and the Netherlands. He settled in London in 1935. He moved to Chicago in 1937, where he became the principal of the *New Bauhaus*. He founded the *School of Design* (1939), which was transformed into the *Institute of Design* (1944). Behind him he left a great painting, sculptural, photographic and designer work. Next to the Jewish – Soviet architect and painter, El Lissitzky (1890 – 1941), he was one of the

387 Catalogue: *Bauhaus*, Institut für auslandsbeziehungen (Museum of Contemporary Art, Belgrade and Galleries of the City of Zagreb, Zagreb), Stuttgart, 1981; Miško Šuvaković, *Estetika apstraktnog slikarstva. Apstraktna umetnost i teorija umetnika 20-ih godina*, Narodna knjiga, Belgrade, 1998

388 Zoltán Čuka, “Bauhaus”, *Letopis Matice srpske* 102, 315, 2, Novi Sad, February of 1928, pp. 273-274

389 Éva Bajkay, “Weimar”, from: Timothy O. Benson (ed.), *Central European Avant-Gardes: Exchange and Transformation, 1910–1930*, LACMA, Los Angeles, 2002, pp. 208; Molnár Farkas – Festő, grafikus, építész, Kassák Múzeum, Budapest, 1997, pp. 1, 13; Bakos Katalin, “A Könyvművész és reklámgrafikus”, from: Molnár Farkas – Festő, grafikus, építész, Kassák Múzeum, Budapest, 1997, pp. 19–20, 22, 30

390 “KURI Manifestum”, *Út*, Újvidék, December 1922; also, Farkas Molnár, “KURI Manifesto”, from: Timothy O. Benson, Éva Forgács (eds.), *Between Worlds: A Sourcebook of Central European Avant-Gardes, 1910–1930*, LACMA, Los Angeles, 2002, pp. 455–456

391 Csuka Zoltán, Molnár Farkas, *Reklam*, Urania, Novi Sad, 1923; and Zoltán Čuka, Arpad Balaž, Vojvođanska galerija (Vajdasági Galéria), Minerva, Subotica, 1927

392 Csuka Zoltán, *Megyünk*, Reklam, Novi Sad, 1923

393 Csuka Zoltán, *Fundamentom*, Faust, Novi Sad, 1924

394 Jaroslav Andel, *Avant-Garde Page Design 1900-1950*, Delano Greenidge Editions, New York, 2002, pp. 182

395 These books and their “new” Bauhaus design were pointed out to me by Darko Šiminčić.

396 “Reminiscences of Jenő Nagy, brother of László Moholy-Nagy”, from: Krisztina Pas-suth, *Moholy Nagy*, Thames and Hudson, London, 1985, pp. 384 i 433

most important international propagandists of Constructivism and the modern style.³⁹⁷

Otti Berger³⁹⁸ (Zmajevac³⁹⁹, 1898 – Auschwitz, 1944) was born into a Jewish family in Zmajevac in Baranya. She studied at the Academy of Arts in Zagreb from 1921 to 1926. She enrolled in the Bauhaus in Dessau in 1927. She did the preliminary course with László Weisz, and her tuition with Vasilije Kadinski and Paul Kleo. She studied textile design in the Bauhaus weaving mill.⁴⁰⁰ She worked with Günte Stolz and Anni Albers in the textile department of Bauhaus. She exhibited on the *Third Exhibition of the Earth* in Zagreb in 1931, where she exhibited her textile works. Belgrade journalist and former Avant-gardist, Stanislav Vinaver, wrote about his encounter with Otti Berger in Bauhaus:

She is in the textile department. ... She tells me about her journeys, her ecstatic mood even with her hearing impairment, in searching for the tangible meanings through matter, through life perceived more harshly, more tangibly...⁴⁰¹

She worked independently as a textile designer from 1932 to 1937 in Berlin. She moved to London in 1937, with the architect Hilbersheimer. She came back to her hometown in 1938 to attend to her sick mother. She received an invitation to come to New Bauhaus with László Weisz, but she didn't get a visa for the USA. Her whole family was deported to a concentration camp in Hungary, and from there to Auschwitz in 1944, where her trail ran cold.⁴⁰²

Stefán Henrik (Mariakemend 1896 – Budapest 1971) studied in Peć. As a Baranyan he ethnically declared himself as Hungarian, German and Serbian. He belonged to the artistic circle of Peć. He studied graphic in Bauhaus in Vajmar from 1921 to 1922 and in Bauhaus in Dessau in 1925. He worked in Hungary from 1928. One of his works executed in a combined technique (lithography and aquarelle), *Monte Venere* from 1921, was published in the Bauhaus series of graphics "Evropska Grafika" (European Graphic).⁴⁰³

The case of Boško Tokin (Serbian edition, p.232)

Boško Tokin (Čakovo, 1894 – Belgrade, 1953) was an important Avant-garde "activists", critics, writers of manifestos and artists. He worked in a heterogeneous field of radicalizations of Modernism. He wrote literary and film reviews, and worked as a film theoretician⁴⁰⁴, film director, novelist and journalist⁴⁰⁵. Tokin received education in Vršac, Zemun and Temišvar. He was a volunteer in the Serbian military between 1914 and 1917. He studied world literature at Sorbonne in Paris between 1917 and 1920. In France he published film reviews and translations of poetry. He lived in Zagreb between 1921 and 1922. Together with Ljubomir Micić and Ivan Gol he wrote *The Manifesto of Zenithism* (Serbian: *Manifest Zenitizma*).⁴⁰⁶ In the first issues of *Zenit* he published texts, reviews and manifestos.⁴⁰⁷ He performed with the Belgrade literary group *Alfa*, which announced the end of its cooperation with Micić's Zenithism.⁴⁰⁸ He worked with the magazines *Comedia* (Belgrade, 1923 – 1926), and Drainac's magazine *Hipnos* and magazine *Putevi* (1923 – 1926). He worked on collages. Together with the Dadaist, Dragan Aleksić, he directed the film *Kačaci u Topčideru* (*Fugitives in Topčider*, 1924). He founded the magazine *Film* (1925 – 1926) in Zagreb. With the essay *Estetika filma* (*The Aesthetic of Film*, 1928) he set the principles of the open and dynamic modernistic aesthetic of film and art:

The aesthetic of film is not and it cannot be definite, if nothing, then because of the degree on which the seventh art is. There are many things that prevent, as we noticed earlier, the more superior, more spiritual constructions, but the road to crystallization is certain, the road to *aestheticizing of the dynamic*. "Every man is entitled to one dream, but he should act so as to fulfil that dream" – that was the title of an American film. A film has its dream, its ideal – by realizing itself, it contributes to the realizing of the human ideals. That is what all arts pursue.⁴⁰⁹

He developed a journalist career. He published a novel about modern Belgrade life, *Terazije* (1932). He criticised Miloš Crnjanski's right oriented magazine *Ideje* (*Ideas*). He founded the magazine *Film* in Belgrade in 1936. He worked with the magazines *Kolo* (*Circle*) and *Filmske Novosti* (*Film News*) in Belgrade from 1942 to 1947. He was convicted as a journalist for collaboration with German occupiers and sentenced to

397 Laszlo Moholy-Nagy, *Painting Photography Film*, The MIT Press, Cambridge MA, 1973; i Laszlo Moholy Nagy, *Vision in Motion*, Paul Theobald & Company, 1947

398 I was pointed out to the life, education and work of Otti Berger by Darko Šimunčić in numerous fascinating conversations about ex-Yu and Croatian Avant-garde/Avant-gardes. Also see: Jadranka Vinterhalter (ed), *Prodori avangarde u hrvatskoj umjetnosti prve polovice 20. stoljeća*, Museum of Contemporary Art, Zagreb, 2007, pp. 14, 17, 166, 170.

399 According to Željko Košćević, Otti Berger was born in Senta or Bački Monoštor. See Željko Košćević (ed), *Ivana (Koka) Tomljenović / Bauhaus Dessau 1929-1930*, Galleries of the city of Zagreb, Zagreb, 1983, pp. 3.

400 Sigrid Weltge-Wortmann, Sigrid Weltge, *Bauhaus Textiles: Women Artists and the Weaving Workshop*, Thames and Hudson, London, 1998

401 Stanislav Vinaver, "Dom gradnje u Dessau", *Politika* No. 8222, Belgrade, 28th of March 1931, pp. 9

402 Barbara V. Lucadou, "Otti Berger – Stoffe für die Zukunft", from: *Wechsel Wirkungen – Ungarische Avantgarde in der Weimarer Republik*, Jonas Verlag, Marburg, 1986, pp. 301–311

403 Eva Bajkay, "Weimar", from Thimoty O. Benson (ed.), *Central European Avant-Gardes: Exchange and Transformation, 1910–1930*, LACMA, Los Angeles, 2002, pp. 207 i 408

404 Boško Tokin, "Estetika filma" (1928), *Filmske sveske*, No. 3, Belgrade, 1971, pp. 263–267; Boško Tokin, Vladeta Lukić, *Filmski leksikon*, Bratstvo-jedinstvo, Novi Sad, 1953

405 Gojko Tešić (ed.), *Avangardni pisci kao kritičari*, Matica srpska, Novi Sad and Institute for Literature and Art, Belgrade, 1994, pp. 49–124 and 671–687

406 Ljubomir Micić, Boško Tokin, Ivan Goll, *Manifest zenitizma*, Zenitistička biblioteka, Zagreb 1921

407 Boško Tokin, "Evropski pesnik Ivan Goll", *Zenit*, No. 1, Zagreb, 1921, pp. 5–6 i 8; "U atmosferi čudesu", *Zenit*, No. 3, Zagreb, 1921, pp. 2–3; "Ma i mađarski pokret aktivizma", *Zenit*, No. 6, Zagreb, 1921, pp. 12 etc.

408 "Alpha – beogradska literarna zajednica", in: *Kritika – Književno-umetnička revija*, Zagreb, November–December, 1921

409 Boško Tokin, "Estetika filma" (1928), *Filmske sveske*, No. 3, Belgrade, 1971, pp. 267

imprisonment (1947 – 1951, Zabela – Požarevac). He published film reviews in the magazines *Film* and *Republika (Republic)*, he published *Filmski leksikon (The Film Lexicon, 1953)*. With his Avant-garde texts, collages, film studies and directing of a film, Boško Tokin made a significant step into the area of research of the Avant-garde and modernistic art.

The case of the American Avant-garde film director:
Slavko Vorkapić (Serbian edition, p.234)

Slavko Vorkapić was born in the Syrmian village of Dobrinč near Sremska Mitrovica in 1894. He received education in Sremska Mitrovica and Zemun, and continued his studies of painting in the School of Arts in Belgrade. He then continued his studies of art in Budapest with a scholarship from Matica srpska. He studied painting at the Budapest academy until the beginning of the First World War. He moved in the circles of art students and artist in Budapest, among Petar Dobrović, Vladimir Filakovac (1892 – 1972), Đoko Mazalić (1888 – 1975), Sabljak (???), Vilko Šeferov (1896 – 1974) and Ivan Gundrum (1892 – 1967). According to Tokin, before the First World War, Zemun was a busy and dynamic political and artistic center.

During his break he would come home to Zemun where, at the time, there was a whole group of artists. Zemun was a small Darmstadt or Fontainebleau. We could say that there was a Zemun school of artists. Other than Vorkapić, there were: Sambunjak, at the time a student of Franz Stuck in Munich, then Sabljak, Sava Šumanović, Milan Nedeljković, Pera Pap, Bogdanović and the then and present-day mayor, Dr. Pera Marković. Zemun – and this above all refers to the youth – was not only revolutionary, a town of secret decades, whose leader was Nikola Kratić (present-day professor and writer), who spread among us the ideas of Vasa Stajić about “the new Serb”. Besides those revolutionaries, there were also artists in Zemun, some of which were members of a secret society. The people of Zemun could often see how their mayor goes with us – I was also active in painting at the time – to Gardoš, Radecki and other picturesque parts of Zemun, even Kupinovo, to paint landscapes. There in Zemun Vorkapić’s artistic personality began developing, there we became enthusiastic about the new art, seeing in Hodler the strongest representative of the new possibilities. Hodler was our “god”, the one that threw a shadow over Clinger, Roden and all the others that we highly appreciated until then. Holder and Meštrović were the personifications of our tendencies “in spite of the unheroic times”. We expected the grandiose, we thought that “our time was coming, that new and wonderful new forces are awaking”. We expected the Renaissance, or rather, we were convinced that we, Serbo-Croats, as we called ourselves, would have a golden share in the general Renaissance of Europe. We felt that there would be great battles, but, understandably, we could not even suspect that the World War was at our doorstep...⁴¹⁰

410 Boško Tokin, “Putovi Slavka Vorkapića – etape: Zemun, Belgrade, Budimpešta, Kratovo, Pariz, Holivud”, *Letopis Matice srpske* book. 315 volume 3, Novi Sad, 1928, pp. 453-454

The art historian Dimitrije Bašičević wrote about the companionship of Sava Šumanović and Slavko Vorkapić, and Vorkapić’s influence on Šumanović:

It appears that, other than Jung, his friend and classmate Slavko Vorkapić in his own way had an influence on Šumanović. “In that period I learned a lot from my classmate Vorkapić Slavko, who had the fortune to leave the grammar school and enroll in the Belgrade school with Mr. Ljubo Ivanović. From that friend I learned the pencil drawing technique and nice drawing in nature.”⁴¹¹

In late secessionist style Vorkapić drew and painted landscapes and nudes, and studies for fantasy and mystical paintings. From the beginning of the war to the retreat of the Serbian army through Albania, Vorkapić worked as a teacher in Kratovo near Leskovac. There he was in contact with the monk Dionisije Burkić, who had special interests in theosophy and occultism. He was attracted by mysticism and visionary poetics. After the retreat of the Serbian army through Albania he was in France. In France he stayed in a pupils’ colony in Voreppe near Grenoble. He soon went to Paris where he enrolled in the Academy (Ecole Des Beaux Arts) in the class of Fernand Cormon. He visited free art schools at Montparnasse, which were led by members of the *Les Nabis Maurice Denis* at the Ranson Academy, and ateliers of Ker-Xavier Roussel, Pierre Bonnard, of the Cubist André Lhote and others. He associated with Tokin, Dešković and Tin Ujević in Paris. His works were reproduced in the magazine *Art et les Artistes*. He participated in the *Exhibition of Yugoslav Artists (Serbian: Izložba jugoslovenskih umetnika)* in *Petit Palais de la Ville de Paris* from 12th April to 13th May 1919. After the tumultuous Parisian artistic life, certain successes and great disappointments, he travelled to the USA in 1920. His great dream of the new world and a successful career was “America”. Even in 1917 he wrote in his notes:

If the evolution wants me to do something for it, may it transfer me to America and may it give me all the necessary resources.⁴¹²

He arrived in America as a waiter or a deckhand on the transatlantic ship *Ile-de-France*. He spent some time in New York, doing various jobs, from an advertising artist to a portrait painter. In San Francisco he worked in the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes’ consulate. He settles in Los Angeles in 1921. He does various jobs to survive. Among others, he drew a portrait of one of the stars of silent films, Bebe Daniels. After that he worked as a retoucher for a photographer, and as a supporting actor after the acquaintanceship with the film director Rex Ingram. He acted in the films *The Prisoner of Zenda*

411 Dimitrije Bašičević, “Život”, from: *Sava Šumanović – život i umetnost* (the first edition: 1960), edition of Vojin Bašičević, Novi Sad, 1997, pp. 10

412 Vorkapić’s note from 28th of February 1917 – according to Boško Tokin, “Putovi Slavka Vorkapića – etape: Zemun, Belgrade, Budimpešta, Kratovo, Pariz, Holivud”, *Letopis Matice srpske* book 315 volume 3, Novi Sad, 1928, pp. 453

(1922), *Scaramouche* (1923), etc. He lived in Santa Barbara and Hollywood. He painted and wrote essays about film aesthetics for living from 1925. He published his essays in the famous Hollywood film magazine *Film Mercury*. Together with the film director Robert Florey he made a short post-Expressionist satirical film *The Life and Death of 9413 a Hollywood extra*⁴¹³ from 1927 to 1928. In the creating of this film, Krivokapić worked on the shooting, drawings and part of the direction. With the support of the director Josef von Sternberg, Vorkapić started working on technical jobs for the Paramount film company from 1928. With the support of David Selznick, he started working for the RKO Company and became a co-director and an editor in his films *Viva Villa* (1932) and *Dancing Lady* (1933). He co-directed four films with George Cukor. Vorkapić became the head of the editing department in the MGM Company, where he worked until 1939. For some time he tried to work in industrial films in New York. He made his first experimental film, *Fingal's Cave/Modes of the Sea* in 1940 with the Hollywood director and editor John Hoffman. He made his second experimental film, named *Forest Murmors* in 1941. Throughout the Second World War he made political publicity films in New York. He made a documentary, named *New Americans* in 1944, about European artists, intellectuals and scientists that emigrated to the USA during the Second World War, including Albert Einstein, Stokowski, Thomas Mann and others. Vorkapić quit working in the film industry when he was elected a professor at the University of Southern California in Los Angeles in 1948. He taught there until 1952. He taught at various universities in Europe, and he taught at the Belgrade Academy of Arts in 1951. He died of a heart attack in Spain in 1976.

Slavko Vorkapić is considered one of the first American experimental directors and editors. He wrote numerous essays and books about aesthetics and theory of film.⁴¹⁴

Neo-Avant-garde and conceptual art:
The asymmetrical other (Serbian edition, p.237)

Neo-Avant-garde⁴¹⁵ is the name for the excess, experimental and emancipatory artistic practices that emerged:

1. As reconstructions, recycling or revitalisations of specific practices of historical Avant-gardes, especially Dada and Constructivism;

2. As specific, but marginally positioned realizations of great modernistic and Avant-garde technological, emancipatory, political and artistic Utopias; and

3. As the establishment of authentic critical, excessive, experimental and emancipatory artistic practices in the cold-war climate of the dominating High Modernism.

The historical Avant-gardes⁴¹⁶ were, on one hand, the advance guard or the driving paradigm for the establishing of the modernist culture, and, on the other hand, the criticism of the traditionalisation of Modernism inside the bourgeois moderate and stabile modernity, but also the canonized autonomy of art. On the contrary, the Neo-Avant-gardes no longer had the status of the advance guard or the driving paradigm in relation to the Modernism, but they have a character of the corrective, alternative, critical or subversive practice inside the dominating High Modernism of the late and post-industrial society. Because of that, the paradigms of the Neo-Avant-garde cannot be simply identified as the *second hand Avant-garde*,⁴¹⁷ but *must* be interpretatively questioned as the executions of various critical, emancipatory, creative, manufacturing or behavioral possibilities in art and culture of the High hegemonic Modernism. Some Neo-Avant-garde phenomena in their beginning directly reinterpret and recycle the practices of the historical Avant-gardes. Some other Neo-Avant-gardes begin in the very critical actuality of dominations and hegemony of the High Modernism, for example the art after the Informel, the American Neo-Dada, Fluxus, Happening and proto-conceptualisms. However, the thing that makes an artistic practice or in an obvious way identifies some other work as Neo-Avant-garde is the critical relation to then topical High modernistic late or post-industrial culture and its hierarchical models of structure of the cultural autonomous identities, statuses, functions and positions of the artistic practice.

Vojvodinian Neo-Avant-garde groups: Zrenjanin and Novi Sad textualists, groups *Januar* and *Februar*, group Bosch+Bosch, group *KÔD* and group (∃ worked in the range from textual experiment to the processual and conceptual art at the turn of the sixties (1969 - 1970) and the seventies (1971 - 1973).⁴¹⁸

The radical Neo-Avant-garde intervention in the field of critical and political art, or narrower – film, was realized by the film director Želimir Žilnik (1942). He realized socially committed documentary and feature films (*Rani radovi* [The Early Works], 1969) in ex Yugoslavia from the late sixties. Throughout the seventies he worked as a critic of the bureaucratic system of

413 *Avant-Garde – Experimental Cinema of The 1920s and '30s – Films from the Raymond Rohauer Collection*, Kino Video, New York, 2005

414 David Curtis, *Avant-Garde between the wars and the Experimental Cinema*, A delta Book, New York, 1971, pp. 50, 52, 58, 62-63, 77; Marko Babac, *Slavko Vorkapić – umentik, teoretičar i pedagog filma – Vizuelna priroda filma*, Clio, Belgrade, 1994; Slavko Vorkapić, *O pravom filmu*, FDU, Belgrade, 1998.

415 Hal Foster, *What's a Problem for the Neo-Avant-Garde? From The Return of the Real*, The MIT Press, Cambridge Mass., 1996, pp. 1-33

416 Paul Woodcock, *The Challenge of the Avant-Garde*, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1999

417 Piter Birger, *Teorija avangarde*, Narodna knjiga, Belgrade, 1998, pp. 91

418 Miško Šuvaković (ed.), *Scene jezika – Uloga teksta u likovnim umetnostima – Fragmentarne istorije 1929-1990 – Antologija tekstova umetnika*, book 2, ULUS, Belgrade, 1989; Miško Šuvaković (ed.), *Retrospektiva: Grupa KÔD, (∃ i (∃ KÔD*, Contemporary Visual Arts Gallery, Novi Sad, 1995

SFRY.⁴¹⁹ He realized a range of critically oriented documentary and feature films throughout the 1980s and 1990s: *Kenedi se ženi* (*Kennedy is Getting Married*, 2007), *Kenedi se vraća kući* (*Kennedy Goes Back Home*, 2007), *Tvrđava Evropa* (*Fortress Europe*, 2001), *Kud plovi ovaj brod* (*Wanderlust*, 1999), *Dupe od mramora* (*Marble Ass*, 1995), *Tito po drugi put među Srbima* (*Tito's Second Time Among The Serbs*, 1993), *Tako se kalio čelik* (*The Way Steel Was Tempered*, 1988), *Sve zvezde* (*All The Stars*, 1985), *Abschied* (*Farewell*, 1976), *Paradies* (*Paradise, An Imperialistic Tragicomedy*, 1976), *Rani radovi* (*Early Works*, 1969).

The experimental work of the composer and ethnomusicologist Ernő Király⁴²⁰ (1919) stands out among the Vojvodinian modernistic composers of artistic, popular and folk music (Josif Marinković [1851 - 1931], Isidor Bajić [1878 - 1915], Károly Krombholz [1905 - 1981], Sava Vukosavljev [1914-1996], Rudolf Bruči [1917], Nikola Petin [1920], Trandafir Žuržovan [1924], Tibor Hartig [1934], Matija Molcer [1935], Ivan Kovač [1937-1984], Jovan Adamov [1942], Svetozar - Saša Kovačević [1950], Miroslav Štatković [1951], Boris Kovač). Király's Neo-Avant-garde experimental work happened between 1969 and 1978. He worked in the domain of experimental composing and performing vocal and instrumental music. He worked on the widening of the phenomenon and concept of the "sound", and on ideas and potentiality of the open musical work. He explored the limits of traditional folk, artistic and neo-technological instruments. The special field of research was the field of musical graphic (*Tačke i linije* [Dots and Lines, 1972], *Natpis na balonu* [Writing on a Balloon, 1973], *Spiral* [1976], *Actiones* [1977]).

The Vojvodinian literary and artistic scene from the mid 60s came to a radical transformation of poetry and intertextual and polygenre models of writing.⁴²¹ Artists and writers often worked in informal groups in Zrenjanin (Vujica Rešin Tucić⁴²², Vojislav Despotov⁴²³ [1950-2000], Jovica Aćin⁴²⁴ [1946], Dušan Bijelić) and in Novi Sad (Judita Šalgo⁴²⁵ [1941-1996], Katalin Ladik⁴²⁶,

Zoran Mirković, Branko Andrić⁴²⁷, Tibor Várady⁴²⁸ [1939]), and in groups *KÔD* (Slobodan Tišma⁴²⁹, Slavko Bogdanović⁴³⁰, Miroslav Mandić⁴³¹, Janez Kocijančič⁴³²), *Januar, Februar, Bosch+Bosch* (Slavko Matković⁴³³, Bálint Szombathy⁴³⁴, Attila Csernik) and the group *Ξ* (Vladimir Kopić⁴³⁵, Miša Živanović). Also, one cannot ignore the fact that the experiment with writing took place in an extremely multiethnic and multilingual environment. Certain poets and poetesses grew up parallel living in two or more languages. Their texts remained marginal, since they kept their distance from the well-established standards. They could not be put inside the frames of literature, since they were not constituted as lyrics or as prose, nor could they be put in the frames of visual arts. They emerged on the edges and cross sections of literary genres, between literature and art, between theoretical discourse and literature. They would not live up to the expectations of their readers, forcing them to question their safe footholds and knowledge. The radical interventions in the text point to the fact that the author had confidence in the language and the text and that he had little confidence in the belief that there was a coherent subject, and he doubted the possibility of telling a coherent story. By crossing the fixed genre boundaries, the texts show the rigidity of the established genre system. Attitudes like these led towards the exploration of the "new media".

Group *Bosch+Bosch*: or the new *Activisms* (Serbian edition, p.241)

The artistic work of the group *Bosch+Bosch*⁴³⁶ could be described as a nomadic practice of moving over the Avant-garde, Neo-Avant-garde and Post-avant-garde traces and codes. The group was founded by Slavko Matković⁴³⁷ in Subotica in 1969.

419 "Rani radovi" (themat), *Rok*, No. 3, Belgrade, 1969; and Želimir Žilnik, *Iznad crvene prašine*, Film Center Serbia, Belgrade, 2003

420 Ernő Király, *Refleksije*, Forum, Novi Sad, 1998; Ira Prodanov, "Razgovor sa kompozitorom Erneom Kiraljem", *Novi zvuk*, No. 19, Belgrade, pp. ??-??: Milica Doroški, "Stvaralaštvo Ernea Kiraja u kontekstu nove umetničke prakse (prekriveni glasovi kulture: vojvodanska alternativna umetnička scena s kraja sedme i tokom osme decenije XX veka)", graduation thesis, Academy of Arts, University of Novi Sad, 2005

421 Dubravka Đurić, "Vojvodanski tekstualizam", from: Dragomir Ugren (ed.), *Centralnoevropski aspekti vojvodanskih avangardi 1920-2000. ... Granični fenomeni, fenomeni granica*, Museum of Contemporary Visual Art, Novi Sad, 2002, pp. 84-88; and Dubravka Đurić, "Radical Poetic Practices - Concrete and Visual Poetry in the Avant-garde and Neo-avant-garde", from: Miško Šuvaković, Dubravka Đurić (eds.), *Impossible Histories - Historical Avant-gardes, Neo-Avant-Gardes, and Post-avant-gardes in Yugoslavia, 1918-1991*, The MIT Press, Cambridge MA, 2003, pp. 64-95

422 Ostoja Kisić (ed.), *Vujica Rešin Tucić - Struganje mašte*, Dnevnik, Novi Sad, 1991

423 Vojislav Despotov, *Sabrane pesme*, Town National Library "Žarko Zrenjanin", Zrenjanin, 2002

424 Jovica Aćin, "Prolegomena za Strip-Tease", *Polja* No. 140-141, Novi Sad, 1970, pp. 12-13

425 Judita Šalgo, "Rečnik", *Polja*, No. 178, December 1973, pp. 12-13; and Judita Šalgo, *67 minuta naglas*, Matica srpska, Novi Sad, 1980

426 Ladik Katalin, *Mesék a hétfejű varrógépéről*, Forum, Novi Sad, 1978

427 Branko Andrić, "Uvod u osnove mini-hepeninga", *Polja*, No. 129-130, Novi Sad, 1969, pp. 5; Branko Andrić, *Stranputice seksualne revolucije*, KZ Novog Sada, Novi Sad, 1986

428 Várady Tibor, "Ujka HO i Amerika", *Polja* No. 131-132, Novi Sad, 1969, pp. 18; Tibor Várady, "Izvan, unutar", prevod Judita Šalgo, *Polja*, No. 140-141, Novi Sad, May-June 1970, pp. 25-28

429 Slobodan Tišma, *Vrt kao to* (Selected poems), Ruža lutanja, Belgrade, 1997

430 Miško Šuvaković, *Politika tela. Eseji o Slavku Bogdanoviću*, Prometej and K21K, Novi Sad, 1997

431 Miroslav Mandić, *Ja sam ti je on*, Matica srpska, Novi Sad, 1984

432 Janez Kocijančič, *Kameja vanvremenog*, RU "Radivoj Čirpanov", Novi Sad, 1975

433 Slavko Matković, *Fotobiografija*, Matica srpska, Novi Sad, 1985; Slavko Matković, *Knjiga*, City Library, Subotica, 1978

434 Szombathy Bálint, *Poetry - Concrete Visual Poems 1969-1979*, Forum, Novi Sad, 1981

435 Vladimir Kopić, *Aer*, Matica srpska, Novi Sad, 1976

436 Bálint Szombathy, "Značajniji momenti u radu grupe Bosch+Bosch", from: Marijan Susovski (ed.), *Nova umjetnička praksa 1966-1978*, Gallery of Contemporary Art, Zagreb, 1978, pp. 48-50; Bálint Szombathy (ed.), *Bosch+Bosch*, Showroom of the Museum of Contemporary Art, Belgrade, 1980; Ješa Denegri, "Bosch+Bosch", from: Ješa Denegri, *Sedamdesete: Teme srpske umetnosti - Nove Prakse (1970-1980)*, Svetovi, Novi Sad, 1996, pp. 43-55; Nebojša Milenković, "Bosch+Bosch", in: "Umetnost kao istraživanje umetnosti", from: Dragomir Ugren (ed.), *Centralnoevropski aspekti vojvodanskih avangardi 1920-2000. ... Granični fenomeni, fenomeni granica*, Museum of Contemporary Visual Art, Novi Sad, 2002, pp. 90-92

437 Nebojša Milenković (ed.), *Ich bin Künstler Slavko Matković*, MSLU, Novi Sad, 2005

The group enters the *new artistic practices* in 1971. Balint Szombathy⁴³⁸ and László Szalma (1948) were in the group from the foundation; the group is joined by László Kerekes (1954) during 1971, Katalin Ladik and Attila Csernik during 1973, and Ante Vukov (1954) during 1975. The activity of the group takes place in the border territory of Subotica, which is in the border territories of Middle Europe and in the border territories of the Balkans, or, politically, on the borderlines of East Europe. At the same time, it was a far away province and a place of cosmopolitanism that was a characteristic for the remains of the *heterogeneous empires*, such as Austria-Hungary. Subotica was a city where Hungarian, Serbian and Croatian cultures shockingly and incompatibly come across each other in their heterogeneous, scattered and decentralized forms. In the paradoxical relations between the incompatibility and the encounters, the nomadic work of the group *Bosch+Bosch* was emerging. Their nomadism is characterised by progress, not crossing over the distance, decentralized stories, subjectivity, elusive histories. Their work happened in the place of *hot conjunctions* of various Avant-garde traditions and their historical illustrations. Therefore, when their artistic heritage is observed today, it is seen as a map of traces, not a collection of products (language, not the body). Whether in the order of visual, written or behavioral discourse, not a single element can function as a sign without pointing to another element, which, however, is not simply present. That recursive (nomadic) connecting, in the *Bosch* work, made every element constituted, starting from the trace of other elements of the chain or systems inside it. That chain, and then web-like connecting was an artistic (visual, linguistic, behavioral) text, which was created through transformations of other texts (pictures, forms of behavior, expression, coding). There were no innocent texts, only textual promiscuities. It looked as if Matković painted and multiplied the *lexias* of the Avant-garde effects, by breaking them up through the opacity of the Neo-Avant-garde experiments and the Post-avant-garde transfigurations (transposition) of the meaning, sense and values. The work of the group members happened in the domain of special interventions, *land-art*, *poor art*, *mixed-media*, *project-art*, concrete poetry, conceptual art, visual semiology, new comics, *mail-art*, etc. Along with the practical artistic work, several authors developed the theoretical and critical practice (Slavko Matković, Balint Szombathy). In the first period of work, the visual mapping of nature and man's immediate surroundings was performed, and later the attention was more and more turned towards the researching of the subject of art and culture, and, with time, the group was pervaded by the attitude towards the linking and imbu-

ing of art and life, meaning, more and more phenomena from everyday life obtained the artistic character. The group *Bosch+Bosch* gathered completely different, often competitive, individual nomadic and open researches and productions that were pointed to the radical criticism of the moderate socialistic Modernism (for example, Balint Szombathy – *Bauhaus*, 1972). The group did not aim for the creation of a homogenous community, but on the contrary, for the open and provocative confrontations of various topical positions. There are almost no phenomena in the topical art that did not in one way or another problematize, tested or performed in *Bosch+Bosch*. The work of the group can be named the term *new artistic practice* or *semio-art*, rather than conceptual art, since the expressions were pointed towards the hybrid potentialities of artistic creation and exploration. László Kerekes performed interventions in the natural space (*Transformations of space: interventions of the bottom of the Palić lake*, 1971 – 1972). László Szalma performed neo-Dadaistic interventionist projects (*Dada*, 1972). Attila Csernik worked in the domain of the concrete, visual and behavioral poetry (*Telopis*, 1975). Ante Vukov did conceptual works with the ideas and appearance of everyday drawn lines (*Linija*, 1975).

Slavko Matković: the case of the nomad artist and/or the case of artistic nomadism (Serbian edition, p245)

Special attention will be paid to the artistic projects of Slavko Matković (1948 – 1994).⁴³⁹ For example, on the occasion of the series of works *Selotejp tekstovi* (Sellotape Texts, 1989) he self-referentially wrote: "My whole life looks like these *texts*. It comes down to the strings of glued pieces – incomplete pieces of information – a narrowly specialized world and life. These glued pieces are my everyday forgotten telephone numbers, people, faces, data, books and all the other trifles that make everyday life in its fast passing."⁴⁴⁰ Self-consciousness about movement and immobility (about the distant spot of the "real" world where commonplace and sublimated meet, about the case that looks like a necessity, about the awfulness of the province and the irrelevance of the place of creation for the "awoken" spirit) makes his paradoxical life of the matter of art. Matković can be seen as a moving map of art. He belonged to the specific kind (set) of artists, which spread from the Dadaists Schwitters and Kassák to the Fluxus artists Maxine, etc. Those were the people with which the border of the bio-

438 Nebojša Milenković (ed.), *Szombathy Art*, Museum of Contemporary Visual Art, Novi Sad, 2005

439 Miško Šuvaković, "Jezik umetnosti / nomadizam Slavka Matkovića", from: *Asimetrični drugi. Eseji o umetnicima i konceptima*, Prometej, Novi Sad, 1996, pp. 122–129; Nebojša Milenković (ed.), *Slavko Matković: Ich bin Künstler*, Museum of Contemporary Visual Art, Novi Sad, 2005

440 Slavko Matković, *Selotejp tekstovi*, Új Symposium, Forum, Novi Sad, 1989, pp. n. n

graphical, concrete, living and artistically productive lost itself (deleted, crossed out) at one moment. It was as if all Matković's works melted together into an unexpected instable and variable whole, a new code of *the artist as his own work*. Details were lost, the heuristic wanderings were disregarded, and there only remained an existential drama: a look looking at the artist. It was not by accident that it was in the Central European monotony (shapelessness, formlessness) that Wittgenstein's cut of the expressible and inexpressible in *Tractatus*⁴⁴¹, or Freud's accentuating of the *unconscious as a second scene* emerged.

For example, in the works⁴⁴² *Paralelne ideje: Kosuth* (*Parallel Ideas: Kosuth*, 1974) and *Paralelne ideje: Cavellini* (*Parallel Ideas: Cavellini*, 1977) Matković indicates the homologies/non-homologies of *the other*, or sceptically puts in doubt the modernist notion of originality, indicating the power of the Post-avant-garde artist to identify himself with the work of another. The artist is not an extraordinary creator any more, but an expert in the *linguistic games*⁴⁴³, world of art and culture. The artist, just like a chess player, moves the pieces (homologies, relations, differences, identities), thus building temporary phrases and utterances about art and in art. However, his approach points to the basic difference between the scene of art and the Other scene. As the counter-transfer in a psycho-analytical session works (from patient to the analyst), he works from the other scene of art to the great art of the epoch (from Matković to Kosuth).

For Matković, the conceptual art was not only the style in the production of the "idea of idea" or the "idea of art as an idea", but also a formula (strategy) of dealing with the specific existential, ideological, ethical and aesthetical space of the world, art, culture and society. In his paper "Konceptualna umetnost" (Conceptual Art, 1973), written for the exhibition *Tendencije 5* (*Tendencies 5*, 1973), Matković formalized his understanding of the sense, meaning and functions of the conceptual art: "Conceptual art is a way of communicating through ideas as works – as pieces of information – which question the very nature of communication."⁴⁴⁴ Conceptual art is revealed as progress, as moving away from the art, surfacing of the subject of art in relation to art, as a creation of distance (thinking about art). The artist (conceptual artist) becomes *the outer asymmetrical other of art*. As an outer he gives it transcendent meaning.

Historically observed, Matković's work (1969 – 1994) belongs to Post-Avant-garde and early postmodernist processes. His work is Post-Avant-garde because he approaches Avant-garde (Hungarian Avant-garde practice and activism of Lajos Kassák⁴⁴⁵, Belgrade Surrealism, Neo-Avant-garde Neo-Dadaistic and Fluxus *mixed-media* production of Bora Ćosić, Voco-visual of Vladan Radovanović, Hungarian underground, Reism of the Slovenian group *OHO*) as an historical *field* of artistic reflections and transfigurations (transpositioning). For him, the history of Avant-gardes and Neo-Avant-gardes was *material* from which the new post-object experiment of semiotic and semiological pre-structuralizing of the open and instable *nature of art*. The performative character of Matković's works (*Preobraženja* [*Transfigurations*] or *Proboji* [*Breakthroughs*], 1971, or paintings *Ja tako slikam* [*That is how I paint*], 80s) is achieved by the mechanism that does not execute the meanings of an act, process, situation, event or work from referential relations or public or private rules, but from the act of execution itself (art as a meta-performance, existence as meta-performance). The moment, the way and the reason of the execution locates the meaning and sense of the art work. For Matković, Avant-garde and Neo-Avant-garde were also sentimental traces of the unaccomplished romantic call (Ješa Denegri wrote about *the great rejection*⁴⁴⁶). His work belongs to the epoch of the *critical* early Postmodernism because he opposed the exoteric methods of the inter-textual, inter-visual and inter-textually-visual production of the hermeneutic (interpretative) circling between different arts of culture of the twentieth century to the esoteric Modernism of the puristic pure and intuitive forms (expressions, constructions). His work is a synchronic bringing of modernity to the extreme experimental and existential expression and exceeding of the modernity into the post-historical epoch of the *semiological sliding of the sign* – from the sign to the assigner. In the visual-poetic experiments⁴⁴⁷ (*Poetsko trunje* [*Poetic Grains*], *Vizuelna istraživanja* [*Visual Explorations*], *Vizuelna obrada teksta* [*Visual Interpretation of Text*], 1970)⁴⁴⁸, in the interspaces of literature and visual arts, Matković tried different strategies of sliding of the sign, the break where the text becomes syntactic order of signs and where the syntactic order of the signs disintegrates until the assigner. His experiment with comic strips⁴⁴⁹ (*Strip broj 1* [*Comic Strip No. 1*], 1971; *Mi smo mali šašavi potrošači* [*We Are the Silly Little Consumers*], 1974; *Esej o grupi Bosch+Bosch* [*Essay about*

441 Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Tractatus Logico Philosophicus*, Publishing House Veselin Masleša, Sarajevo, 1985

442 In: Marijan Susovski (ed.), *Nova umjetnička praksa 1966–1978*, Gallery of Contemporary Art, Zagreb, 1978, illustrations 207 and 208

443 Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Filozofska istraživanja*, Nolit, Belgrade, 1980

444 Slavko Matković, "Konceptualna umetnost (fragment)" (1973), in: Miško Šuvaković (ed.), *Scene jezika – Uloga teksta u likovnim umetnostima... Fragmentarne istorije 1920–1990 – Antologija tekstova umetnika*, ULUS, Belgrade, 1989, pp. 55–56

445 Compare: Ješa Denegri, "Mađarski aktivizam", *Umetnost*, No. 52–53, Belgrade, 1977, pp. 65–67

446 Ješa Denegri, "Slavko Matković" (1989), from: *Fragmenti – šezdesete–devedesete... umetnici iz Vojvodine*, Prometej, Novi Sad, 1994, pp. 60

447 Slavko Matković, *Knjiga - Vizuelno-poetska istraživanja 1971–1978*, Osvit, Subotica, 1979, pp. n. n

448 Slavko Matković, *Knjiga - Vizuelno-poetska istraživanja 1971–1978*, pp. n. n

449 Slavko Matković, *Knjiga - Vizuelno-poetska istraživanja 1971–1978*, pp. n. n

the Group Bosch+Bosch], 1975) as the *object* of meta-transfigurations and transformations are:

1. Ironical confrontations of high art and popular culture, but also simulations of the underground atmosphere of the consumerist society in the conditions of East European alternative worlds;

2. Introducing the effect of *sliding of the sign* in the narrative structures (sequence) of the plot of a comic strip; his comic strips have a specific feedback with the high literature;

3. Rhetorical creation of new mythology in such a way that the world of art becomes the mythical code (or analogue to the mythical code) of the mass culture.

The case of Katalin Ladik: towards the performance of first person speech (Serbian edition, p.250)

Katalin Ladik (1942) was born in Novi Sad, and today she lives and works in Budapest. As an actress she has worked from 1963. She was a member of the Drama of the Novi Sad Theatre. She worked with the group *Bosch+Bosch* from 1973 to 1978. She started working with performance in 1970. Katalin Ladik worked in the domain of Post-Avant-garde excess and subversive performance during the 70s. In her actions and performances she problematized and provoked sexual, political and cultural identities, norms and horizons of comprehension of the role and function of an artist in the socialistic society. Her work spread in a wide nomadic range, from written, spoken and phonic poetry, through the bodily and behavioral actions, performances and para-theater and experimental music, to the visually-textual explorations.

The early works of Katalin Ladik were related to experimental poetry written in Hungarian, and presented in Hungary and to Yugoslav cultures in the Serbo-Croatian and Slovenian languages.⁴⁵⁰ She moved from the domain of modernistic “expressive” lyricism into the domain of erotic written and spoken poetry in which she located the “subjectivising” position of the female sexual and the female erotic voice inside the field of heterosexual differences. By shaping the appearance of the female voice, on the one hand the notion of the female-fertile/sexual/erotic action identity was projected, and on the other, the border of the autonomic high aesthetical lyricism and folk, everyday oriented poetry⁴⁵¹:

Popiću sada mleko

Sada batine dobiću
Zima je igraću
Piću igraću dojiću
Međ' nogama mi nebo
Sada već umreću
(I shall drink the milk now
Now I will be beaten
It is winter, I shall dance
I shall drink, I shall dance, I shall breast-feed
Sky is between my legs
Now I shall already die)⁴⁵²

The performance of the “poetic text” as an *oral event* or theatricalized bodily event (*happening*) and performance was noticeable. In the performance *Vabljenje* (Tempting, Novi Sad, 1970) she displayed her naked para-ritual body resorting to another. In the performance *Rupa koja vrišti* (The Screaming Hole, Tribina mladih [The Youth Stand], Novi Sad, 1979 and Budapest, 1995) she worked with the symbolically-bodily structuring of the simultaneous “impossibility” and “potentiality” of a woman.

On the artistic scene of Novi Sad in the early 70s, Katalin Ladik participated in several public performances. She worked on Carlo Colnaghi's project together with Éva Újházy, Ana Raković, Slavko Bogdanović, Čeda Drča, Vladimir Kopicla, Mirko Radojčić, Miroslav Mandić and Peđa Vranešević.⁴⁵³ Colnaghi was an associate of the performance group of Michelangelo Pistoletto, *Lo Zoo*, which was performing as a guest in Novi Sad in September of 1970. Colnaghi stayed in Novi Sad after the guest performance of the group and worked as an active participant of the Novi Sad “alternative”. Katalina Ladik also worked on the interventionistic ambiance project that she named *Spuštanje Novog Sada na Dunavu* (The Descending of Novi Sad on the Danube, 1973, 1975). The scenic-musical happening *R-O-M-E-T* was performed by Katalin Ladik and Janez Kocijančič on the Youth Stand in Novi Sad in 1972. One segment of this “happening” was the action by Katalin Ladik, when she performed the works of manicure and cosmetic interventions on Kocijančič's body as an object of aestheticizing. In the work *Change Art* (1975), she worked on the inter-subjective relations (changes, modifications and alterations) of two or more participants.⁴⁵⁴ The performance *Black Shave Poem* (1978) was based on the presentation of the bodily event through which “everyday” acts and gestures of man and women were provoked (wearing clothes, relation between underwear and clothes, shaving, etc.). The work *Poemim 1* (1978)

450 “Katalin Ladik – Portret savremenice” (themat), *ProFemina*, No. 5–6, Belgrade, 1996, pp. 126–147; Dubravka Đurić, “Katalin Ladik”, in: “The Construction of Heterosexual and Lesbian Identities in Katalin Ladik, Radmila Lazić and Aida Bagić's Poetry”, from: Jelisaveta Blagojević, Katerina Kolozova, Svetlana Slapšak (eds.), *Gender and Identity – Theories from and/or on Southeastern Europe*, Athena, Belgrade, 2006, pp. 175–179

451 Judita Šalgo, “Opasne igre razgrađivanja – Beleška uz poeziju Ladik Katalin”, *Polja* No. 128, Novi Sad, 1969, pp. 3

452 Katalin Ladik, “Autobiografija”, from: “Katalin Ladik – Portret savremenice” (themat), *ProFemina*, No. 5–6, Belgrade, 1996, pp. 127

453 Miško Šuvaković, “Parateatar”, in: “Parateatar i akcije”, in: “Grupa KÓD”, from: *Retro-spektiva: Grupa KÓD, (3 i 3 KÓD)*, Museum of Contemporary Visual Art, Novi Sad, 1995, pp. 9

454 Katalin Ladik, “Change Art”, from: *Wow*, No. 5, Novi Sad, 1978, pp. 6

was designed as a poetic body-art in which the artist deforms her face with glass.

In the domain of phonic⁴⁵⁵ explorations, she worked on the development of new themes and techniques of the phonetically-acoustic work: new methods, sound recording, radio, television and synthetisation multiply the possibilities of explorations and experimenting. She worked in the interdisciplinary area of exploration of voice between verbal poetry, poetic concrete art, experimental music and performance. She used effects of shaping sound, rhythmic, mime, tact and the role of pause or silence. She used concrete and visual songs that she wrote herself or took from other authors as scores. Phonic explorations were collected and published on the gramophone record *Phonopoetica*⁴⁵⁶ (1976). The gramophone record *Phonopoetica* was realised as an “open-work” based on the graphical score made of concretistic *patterns* of Balint Szombathy, Gábor Tóth and others. That was followed by an event of oral performing of phonetic events, which were documented in photographic and audio recordings. Katalin Ladik made an appearance in the international festival of phonic poetry in Amsterdam in May of 1977.

The Croatian experimental composer Milko Keleman composed a piece called *Yebell*⁴⁵⁷ based on the subject/bodily poetry of Katalin Ladik and Attila Csernik, which was performed as a part of the artistic program on the *XX Olympic Games* in Munich on the 1st September 1972. The piece was performed by the group *Acezantez*, and Ladik was the leading vocal. In association with the group *Acezantez*, she worked on a project by the Croatian composer Dubravko Detoni, *La Voix du silence*⁴⁵⁸ (1972). In the process of a musical event, she was the extra-musical emergency subject, which had an effect on the projected musical performance via orally-phonetic aleatoric interventions.

Groups *Januar* and *Februar* and the experimental case of Vujica Rešin Tucić (Serbian edition, p.252)

On the Youth Stand, on 21st January 1971, the group *Januar* had a performance from 12 noon to 9 in the evening. It was the day of death of the leader of the Soviet revolution, Vladimir Ilić Lenin. In Dom omladine (House of Youth, cinema and concert hall) in Belgrade, on 9th February 1971, the group *Februar* had a performance. Groups *Januar* and *Februar* have the charac-

ter of the counter-cultural⁴⁵⁹ and alternative movement of experimental artists. Groups *Januar* and *Februar* are informal groupings that build a short term, excess and provocative, in a political, artistic and existential sense, a movement or a wave of the alternative scene that emerges by linking artists from Zrenjanin and Novi Sad. The members of *Januar* and *Februar* are connected by a critical and subversive attitude towards the dominating moderate modernistic and social-bureaucratic culture. The manifestation of the group *Februar* is called “*Zakuska novih umetnosti*” (“*Snack of the New Arts*”) and it was realized as a happening. In the occasion of the performance of the group *Februar*, a manifesto was published, called “*Otvoreno pismo jugoslovenskoj javnosti*” (“*An Open Letter to the Yugoslav Public*”), signed by Branko Andrić, Slavko Bogdanović, Čeda Drča, Janez Kocijančič, Vladimir Kopić, Božidar Mandić, Miroslav Mandić, Mirko Radojčić, Ana Raković, Dušan Sabo, Slobodan Tišma, Vujica Rešin Tucić, Peđa Vranešević and Miša Živanović. The provocative neo-anarchistic performance of the group *Februar* leads to a conflict between the Novi Sad alternative and the socialistic modernistic conception of art, which was represented by party and cultural bureaucratic structures in Novi Sad and Belgrade. The conflict around the group *Februar* took on wider dimensions, causing the Belgrade press to get involved in it (*NIN*, *Večernje novosti*) with a severe bureaucratic criticism of the “new art”; especially harsh were the texts by Sava Dautović and Bogdan Tirnanić. On the other side, the support to the groups *Januar* and *Februar* was given in Belgrade by Jovica Aćin, the representatives of the Zagreb art scene Zvonko Maković, Hrvoje Turković and the representatives of the Slovene youth and alternative structures, above all Jaša Zlobec. After the newspaper attacks on the group *Februar*, the Youth Stand, the magazine *Polja* (*Fields*), *Uj Simpozion* and *Index* found themselves in the center of the conflict. The board of the oral program of the Youth Stand refused to accept Vujica Rešin Tucić as a fellow-worker in February of 1972.⁴⁶⁰ The conflict on the Novi Sad scene was resolved by drastic score-settling with the alternative. The management of the Youth Stand (Judita Šalgo⁴⁶¹ and Darko Hohnjec⁴⁶²), which supported the groups *Januar* and *Februar* was replaced, and Miroslav Mandić and Slavko Bogdanović were sentenced to imprisonment.

One of the leading figures of the groups/movements *Januar* and *Februar* was the poet Vujica Rešin Tucić⁴⁶³ (1941). Tucić started his experimental literary and textual work in Zrenjanin

455 Balint Sombati, “Značajni momenti u radu grupe *Bosch+Bosch*”, from: Marijan Susovski, *Nova umjetnička praksa 1966–1978*, Gallery of Contemporary Art, Zagreb, 1978, pp. 49

456 Katalin Ladik, *Phonopoetica*, SKC, 1977.

457 Milko Keleman, *Labirinti*, MIC Koncertne direkcije, Zagreb, 1991, pp. 164

458 Raul Knežević, Dalibor Davidović (eds.), *Acezantez*, MIC Koncertne direkcije, Zagreb, 1999, pp. 143–145

459 T. Roszak, *Kontrakultura*, Naprijed, Zagreb, 1978

460 Slobodan Milovanović's letter from the 8th of February to the Board of oral program of the Youth Stand in Novi Sad

461 Judita Šalgo was the main editor of the Youth Stand from 1st March, 1967 to 2nd July, 1971, and 10th September, 1972

462 Darko Hohnjec was the headmaster of the Youth Stand from 1st December, 1971 to 30th August, 1973.

463 Ostoja Kisić (ed.), *Vujica Rešin Tucić: Struganje mašte*, Dnevnik, Novi Sad, 1991

as a part of Zrenjanin experimental practice. Zrenjanin textual explorations were connected to *Pamphlets* and the edition *Fulmax* 68. The editors were Tucić and Jovica Aćin in the Writers' Club of Zrenjanin. Tucić published one of the pioneer literary performances, "*Moje menstruacije*" ("*My Menstruations*")⁴⁶⁴, in the Belgrade pro-Fluxus magazine *Rok* (1969), which was published by the novelist Bora Ćosić. It was the relation between the textual, para-narrative and bodily action in the sphere of everyday life and rhetorically emphasized triviality of everyday life. Tucić used the elements of the situational relying on the transpositions of the trivialities of everyday life into the literary text and theatricalized behavior of the artist in the private space. The turn to the "trivial everyday life" is identified as the subversive instruments in relation to the public social discourses inside the socialist Modernism. In his para-essay "*Rešin, nerasvetljeni esej*" ("*Rešin, the unexplained essay*")⁴⁶⁵, Jovica Aćin, for example, conceptualized the very trivialising gesture of the poet that becomes an artist-performer by emphasizing the dialectical and grotesque parody – "We hug and kiss each other. There is his answer. In him, virulence is as shiny as the fighting spirit in Marx, the impression of his resistance is irascible, but on the edge of the insane poetic thought."⁴⁶⁶ Tucić then published the experimental book-object "*Jaje u čeličnoj ljusci*" ("*The Egg in an Steel Eggshell*")⁴⁶⁷. In the spirit and the atmosphere of the East European alternative, Vujica Rešin Tucić planned to overcome the static quality of artistic groups and stood for the open and changeable groups that would work in certain months: January, February, March, etc. His activism stirred the Novi Sad artistic scene. After the disappearance of the groups *Januar* and *Februar*, Tucić devoted himself to literary experiment and visual explorations inside the poetic and narrative sequence. His megaproject was an experimentally-intertextual and intermedial work "*Struganje mašte – vizuelni roman – esej – poema*" ("*Scraping of the Imagination – Visual Novel – Essay – Poem*")⁴⁶⁸, done between 1970 and 1982. It was an elaborated model of intertextual explorations inside the verbal and the visual, or collage and prefabricated meaning. With this work, Tucić confronted the Neo-Avant-garde fragmentation of the narrative of a novel to the Post-modernistic intertextual collage, making and mounting of the potentiality of the meaning inside experimental and popular culture. His work in the domain of visualized collage-prefabricated prose was one step behind the strategies of the existentialistic "anti-novel", and through experimental French

new novel and American meta-prose to the poli-medial work. Boško Ivkov interpreted his destructive and shocking prose "performative" quite precisely:

(Vujica Rešin Tucić lives and writes AGAINST life and writing in general and, particularly, AGAINST his own life and his own writing.

His poetry stands OPPOSITE the dead poetry of the dead birds, dead darlings, dead skies, dead waters, dead grass, dead bitters, dead enthusiastic, dead smiling, dead asleep, dead awaken, dead unborn, dead deceased, the deadest.

It IS NOT for a man with the capital M, for beauty with the capital B, for love with the capital L, for truth with the capital T, for justice with a capital J, for reality with the capital R, for sleep with the capital S, for existence with the capital E, for death with the capital D.

It says NO to aesthetics, ethics, being pathetic and all the other *tics*, those prides of theories of literature, nice behavior, nice clothing, nice speaking.

It PISMS when being courted by various isms.)⁴⁶⁹

It was a strong Neo-Avant-garde gesture of refusal, which took place in the concurrence of the post-Surrealistic speech,⁴⁷⁰ destruction of the normative typography of printing syllable in the spirit of the Neo-Dadaistic *topographic poetry*⁴⁷¹ or reconstituting the lyrical inside the inconsistency and hybridity of the popular culture inside the autonomous socialism.⁴⁷² Tucić offered the poetic and artistic paradigm of the activist hybridity.

The context of the conceptual art in Novi Sad (p.255)

The group *KÔD* and the group (\exists) worked in the domain of processual and conceptual art⁴⁷³ at the turn of the 60s (1969 – 1970) into the 70s (1971 – 1973). The groups *KÔD* and (\exists) constituted the context of work that resulted in the short term work of the group (\exists -*KÔD*) and the longer-lasting atmosphere of individual intellectual, intertextual and intermedial work.⁴⁷⁴

In the dominant appearance, the conceptual art belongs to the evolutions of the visual arts, most frequent frame of its institutional development is the world of visual arts. Synchronous to the general line, a part of the conceptualistic production also involves the areas of literary work, or the interspaces

464 Vujica Rešin Tucić, "Moje menstruacije", *Rok*, No. 2, Belgrade, 1969, pp. 120–128

465 Jovica Aćin, "Rešin, nerasvetljeni esej", *Rok*, No. 2, Belgrade, 1969, pp. 119–120

466 Jovica Aćin, "Rešin, nerasvetljeni esej", *Rok*, No. 2, Belgrade, 1969, pp. 120

467 Vujica Rešin Tucić, *Jaje u čeličnoj ljusci*, Serija AG 70, The Youth Stand, Novi Sad, 1970

468 Vujica Rešin Tucić, *Struganje mašte – vizuelni roman – esej – poema*; see: Ostojka Kisić (ed.), *Vujica Rešin Tucić: Struganje mašte*, Dnevnik, Novi Sad, 1991, pp. 251–393

469 Boško Ivkov, "UJICA je V / EŠIN je R / UCIĆ je T", *Polja*, No. 125–126, Novi Sad, 1969, pp. 20.

470 Vujica Rešin Tucić, "Kupanje belih miševa", *Polja*, No. 121, Novi Sad, 1968, pp. 18

471 Vujica Rešin Tucić, "Reform grotesk", *Polja*, No. 143, Novi Sad, 1970, pp. 28–29

472 Vujica Rešin Tucić, "Izašao je novi Čikl", from: Ostojka Kisić (ed.), *Vujica Rešin Tucić: Struganje mašte*, Dnevnik, Novi Sad, 1991, pp. 78–79

473 Mirko Radojičić (ed.), "Konceptualna umetnost" (temat), *Polja*, No. 156, Novi Sad, 1972

474 Miško Šuvaković (ed.), *Retrospektiva: Grupa KÔD, (∃) (∃KÔD*, Museum of Contemporary Visual Art, Novi Sad, 1995

of literary, philosophical (philosophy, linguistics, semiotics and semiology) and visual work, and the conception of the visual is shown through the topical presence of various media (film, photography, video, book, performance, installation), and not just through painting and its history. The documents and texts of the members of the groups *KÔD* and \exists point to the complicated and heterogeneous production of theoretical objects in the contexts of literary text, artistic text, exhibiting-object-text and textual spoken and behavioral situation.

The surrounding context of work and performance of the groups *KÔD* and \exists can be described by the following characteristic positions and situations:

1. The general climate and atmosphere of the late 60s, which is seen in the alternative formations and actions in culture and politics, or the artistic, cultural, political and existential provocative liberalism, radicalism and actionism (neo-anarchism, the new left, new sensibility, hippy movements, rock culture, communes);

2. The tradition of the Avant-gardes, from the French symbolism (Mallarmé), through Gertrude Stein, Russian Formalism and Dadaism, to the theoretically-literary experiments of authors in the Parisian magazine *Tel Quel*⁴⁷⁵ (1960 – 198?);

3. The interest for the linguistic, semiotic and semiological analysis of the “concept” of art and studying the philosophical writings of Ludwig Wittgenstein⁴⁷⁶ in the Anglo-Saxon conceptual art (*Art & Language*, Joseph Kosuth, Lawrence Weiner, Robert Barry, Victor Burgin)⁴⁷⁷;

4. Contacts, cooperation and intertextual exchange with the Slovenian Reism (literary-theoretical post-phenomenological experiment) and the group OHO (transformations from the literary experiment through processional to the conceptual art)⁴⁷⁸; and

5. The complex of the intermedial experiments in Novi Sad (Novi Sad textualis of Judita Šalgo, performance and poetry of Katalin Ladik, magazine Polja, experimentally-research works of Bogdanka Poznanović and Dejan Poznanović in the domain of the new media [the members of the group *KÔD* participated in the realization of the action of Bogdanka Poznanović, *Akcija, Srce, Predmet {Action, Heart, Object}*, 1970], magazine in

Hungarian *Uj Simpozion*) in Zrenjanin (Zrenjanin excess concrete art and experimental textualism of Vujica Rešin Tucić, Jovica Aćin, Vojislav Despotov, Dušan Bjelić), in Subotica (the occurrence of the concrete art and conceptualist group *Bosch+Bosch*), in Belgrade (Gallery 212⁴⁷⁹, festivals BITEF and FEST, Bora Ćosić’s magazine *Rok*)⁴⁸⁰.

In strong cultural frames, such as Anglo-Saxon, German or French culture, artistic work is directly determined by the powerful logistical theories of culture, for example, pragmatism, empiricism and interest in language are emphasized in the Anglo-Saxon world. American and British conceptual arts emerged at the end of the 60s as a reaction to the dominant cultural models of high Greenbergian painting of Modernism. German, Italian or French conceptualism emerged from the syntheses of the phenomenological demonstration (Germany), new left oriented and guerrilla sensibility (Italy) and structuralism (France) with the international language of the processional art (Fluxus, Antiform, Arte Povera).⁴⁸¹ In Yugoslavia, the situation was significantly different. In Yugoslavia there was no dominant culture conception, nor a significant frame of the coherent theoretical and aesthetical opinion. One cannot isolate a complex of theoretical thought that defines culture in an autochthonous manner, as critical philosophy of language defines the British culture, pragmatism and empiricism, or Greenbergian Modernism defines American culture, structuralism defines the French cultural sphere, phenomenology defines the German culture. At the turn of the 60s into the 70s, Marxism (real-socialism and autonomous socialism) in Novi Sad was the outer frame of the actual culture, but it is more a state-building mechanism of the government and a hypocritical discourse of identification, and not a productive and critical frame. In that kind of situation, the members of the groups *KÔD* and \exists had to create the productive, critical, spiritual and semantic base of their work on an open and eclectic base, which was also the case with the other groups, from *OHO*⁴⁸², through the group *Penzioner Tihomir Simčić*, or individual works of Dimitrijević Brothers and Goran Trbuljak⁴⁸³, to the Belgrade conceptualistic groupings (*grupa šest autora* [group of the six authors] and *Grupa 143* [Group 143])⁴⁸⁴. The creation of the productive, critical, spiritual and semantic base for their work was realized by testing models and

475 Patrick Ffrench, *The Time of Theory. A History of Tel Quel (1960–1983)*, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1995

476 Ludwig Wittgenstein, *Tractatus Logico-Philosophicus*, Veselin Masleša and Svjetlost, Sarajevo, 1987

477 Ursula Meyer, *Conceptual Art*, A Dutton Paperback, New York, 1972

478 The Slovene reistic poetry, textual experiments and works of conceptual art were translated in the magazine *Polja*, thanks to the efforts of the interpreter Dejan Poznanović: poetry of Tomaž Šalamun, Franci Zagoričnik, I.G. Plamen, *Polja* No. 139, Novi Sad, 1970, pp. 7; then, “Pu”, Marko Pogačnik, “Grafčki Materijal” and David Nez, “Putovanje Ljubljana – Vašington”, *Polja*, No. 140 – 141, Novi Sad, 1970, pp. 17-18, 19, 34-35, and “Beli ljudi (the first film of Naško Križnar on the 35 mm tape)”, *Polja* No. 143, Novi Sad, 1970, pp. 31; and thanks to the efforts of interpreter Gojko Janjušević: Iztok Geister “Za slobodu onoga što se kritikuje” and I.G. Plamen, “Muva”, “Podne”, *Polja*, No. 115-116, Novi Sad, 1968, pp.29

479 Tomaž Brejc, Ješa Denegri, Željko Koščević, Irina Subotić, Tomaž Šalamun, Biljana Tomić (eds.), *Galerija 212 '68*, Gallery 212, Belgrade, 1968

480 Bora Ćosić (ed.), *Rok*, br. 1, 2, 3, 4, 4a, Belgrade, 1969–70; Bora Ćosić (ed.), *Mixed Media*, autorsko izdanje, Belgrade, 1970.

481 Germano Celant, *Arte Povera: Earthworks, Impossible Art, Actual Art, Conceptual Art*, Praeger, New York, 1969

482 Tomaž Brejc (ed.), *Grupa OHO 1966–1971*, Student Cultural Center, Ljubljana, 1978

483 Marijan Susovski (ed.), *Nova umjetnička praksa 1966–1978*, Gallery of Contemporary Art, Zagreb, 1978; and Marijan Susovski (ed.), *Inovacije u hrvatskoj umjetnosti sedamdesetih godina*, Gallery of Contemporary Art, Zagreb, 1982

484 Marijan Susovski (ed.), *Nova umjetnička praksa 1966–1978*, Gallery of Contemporary Art, Zagreb, 1978

schematisation of different origin in the specific work and its discursive surroundings. If the process of building context can be understood that way, then one can conclude that two important moments are the parts of the very base:

1. Intertextuality: individual art work has aspects of the intertextual mapping in the field of potential and available discourses of homogenous origin; and

2. Inferiority: an art work does not start as superior to evolve to the meta-lingual functions, but the forming of the inferior frames and superior realizations happens synchronous through the developing of the context of the work of the group.

Eclecticism and radical questioning of various artistic, existential and political contents and modus of expression, presenting and behavior worked as a provocation or *shock therapy* in the environment of a strong bureaucratic real-socialistic structure which sees art as a “moderate modernistic” super-structure of party and therefore social interests. The groups KÔD and (∃ explicitly cast doubt on:

1. Moderate modernistic values of the artistic production, both on theoretical and production level;

2. Bureaucratically determined borders of art, culture and politics through the intermediality and intertextuality; and

3. The behavior of the bureaucrat artist; they created the new concept of an artist in the range from the theoretician artist, through the shaman artist, to the anarchist which destroys social values (family – commune, rational consciousness – drugs, party politics – individual ideological and mythical worlds, institutional – non-institutional, artist as individuality – artistic collective, aesthetical value – existential value).

The history and practice of the group KÔD (Serbian edition, p.260)

The group KÔD was founded on 8th April, 1970 in Novi Sad.⁴⁸⁵ The members of the group were Slavko Bogdanović, Miroslav Mandić, Mirko Radojičić, Slobodan Tišma, Janez Kocijančič and Branko Andrić. Immediately after the founding, Branko Andrić left the group. Janez Kocijančič remained a member of the group until the action on Tjeniste in July of 1970. Ferenc Kiš-Jovak worked with the group on the realization of the project Zglob (Joint). Peđa Vranešević joined the group in December of 1970. During the functioning of the group and later in the “postperiod”, Boško Mandić and Dušan Bjelić cooperated with the group.

485 Mirko Radojičić, “Aktivnost grupe KÔD”, from: Susovski, M. (ed.), *Nova umjetnička praksa 1966–1978*, Gallery of Contemporary Art, Zagreb, 1978, pp. 36–43; Miško Šuvaković (ed.), *Retrospektiva: Grupa KÔD, (∃ i (∃ KÔD*, Contemporary Visual Arts Gallery, Novi Sad, 1995; Miško Šuvaković, *Konceptualna umetnost*, Museum of Contemporary Art of Vojvodina and Cultural Center of Novi Sad, Novi Sad, 2007; Ješa Denegri, *Fragmenti / šezdesete – devedesete / umetnici, iz Vojvodine*, Prometej, Novi Sad, 1994; and Ješa Denegri, *Sedamdesete: teme srpske umetnosti*, Svetovi, Novi Sad, 1996

The founding of the group KÔD was announced on 9th April 1970 during the action *Prostorne interakcije* (*Spatial Interactions*) in the parquet-showroom of the Youth Stand in Novi Sad. The first actions of the group KÔD had the character of neo-Dadaistic and Fluxus happenings and interventions in the urban space. Slobodan Tišma realized the action *Kocka* (*The Cube*) on 18th April, and Mirko Radojičić photographed the neon sign of the construction company “Estetika”. Slobodan Tišma and Miroslav Mandić performed the action *More – Antimore* (*Nightmares – Anti-nightmares*) in front of the cathedral in the center of Novi Sad on 22nd April 1970. The realization of the para-theatrical event called *Zglob – tretiranje teatra* (*The Joint – Treatment of the Theater*), on the occasion of Sterijino Pozorje Festival, was realized on the Youth Stand on 24th May 1970. The next day the action *Ogledalo u gradu* (*The Mirror in the City*) was performed. Between the 23rd and the 28th of July 1970 on Tjeniste, as a part of the manifestation “Mladost Sutjeske ’70” (*The Youth of Sutjeska ’70*), a series of projects-interventions was performed, which can be called interventions in the free space and *land-art works* (Slavko Bogdanović, *Kaskade* [*Cascades*]; and Mirko Radojičić and Slavko Bogdanović, *Apoteoza Dzeksonu Poloku* [*The Apotheosis of Jackson Pollock*], 1970). The para-theatrical performance of Miroslav Mandić, *TRI TRI*, in which Mirko Radojičić, Slavko Bogdanović, Slobodan Tišma, Vladimir Mandić, and Božidar Mandić participated, was held in the auditorium of the Youth Stand on 9th October 1970. On the Danube quay in Novi Sad, the action of the group KÔD was held in cooperation with a conceptual artist from Zagreb, Goran Trbuljak, called *Javni čas umetnosti* (*The Public Art Class*). In October of 1970, Miroslav Mandić realized the action *Beli Čovek* (*The White Man*), performed on the streets of Novi Sad. In the student magazine *Index* (issue No 201 to No 209, from May to November of 1970) textual experiments of the members of the group KÔD were published, ranging from drawings, through conceptual poetry and texts of conceptual art, to essays and translations. *Index* No 209 was not printed, the editorial board was dissolved after the party punishing of some members of the editorial board, and the type matter was cancelled. Between the 15th and the 18th of January 1971, the group appeared with its performances on the stage of the film festival FEST in Belgrade.

Throughout 1971 there was a series of performances of the members of the group KÔD in exhibitions of conceptual art. They took part in the exhibition *Primeri konceptualne umetnosti u Jugoslaviji*⁴⁸⁶ (*The Examples of Conceptual Art in Yugoslavia*) in the organization of Biljana Tomić and Ješa Denegri

486 Ješa Denegri, Biljana Tomić (eds.), *Primeri konceptualne umetnosti u Jugoslaviji*, the showroom of the Museum of Contemporary Art, Belgrade, 1971; Ješa Denegri, “Primeri konceptualne umetnosti u Jugoslaviji”, *Život umjetnosti*, No. 15–16, Zagreb, 1971, pp. ??–??

in 1971. In the occasion of the exhibition *Primeri konceptualne umetnosti u Jugoslaviji* (*The Examples of Conceptual Art in Yugoslavia*), in the showroom of the Museum of Contemporary Art in Belgrade, at the Youth Stand⁴⁸⁷ in Novi Sad, in April of 1970, a discussion on conceptual art was held in which the participants were Marko Pogačnik, Milenko Matanović, Andraž Šalamun, Goran Trbuljak, the group KÔD and group (∃. The exhibition *At the Moment*⁴⁸⁸, in the organization of Nena Baljković and Braco Dimitrijević was held in the passage of the Frankopanska Street 2A in Zagreb, on 22nd April 1971. In the *7e Biennale de Paris*⁴⁸⁹ in September of 1971, they did not participate as the group KÔD, but Slavko Bogdanović exhibited independently, Peđa Vranešević and Mirko Radojičić exhibited with the group (∃-KÔD, Miroslav Mandić refused to participate, and Slobodan Tišma withdrew from participating. The participation in the Parisian biennial was of significance, since that was one of the moments when Yugoslav art directly and in time stepped out onto the world art scene. All the important representatives of conceptual art participated in the exhibit: *Art&Language*, Joseph Kosuth, Lawrence Weiner, Robert Barry, Victor Burgin, Ian Burn, Hane Darboven, Bernar Venet, group OHO, group *Penzioner Tihomir Simčić* (Braco Dimitrijević and Goran Trbuljak), etc.

The group KÔD stopped working in April of 1971. The group stopped working because of disagreements about the place and the functions of the artistic work and exhibiting. The direct motive was the invitation for the Parisian biennial. During the spring, the members of the group KÔD had interviews with Oto Bihalji Merin, Zaneti, Damnjan and Reljić. During the spring of 1971, Miroslav Mandić decided to stop doing art, having the need for a deeper, unknown and miraculous experience. During the summer, Miroslav Mandić, Slobodan Tišma and Dušan Bjelić decided to travel around Europe and talk to artists. They stayed in Zagreb, Kranj, Sempas and Milan. After their stay in Milan, they came back to Novi Sad. Miroslav Mandić, Mirko Radojičić, Slobodan Tišma and Slavko Bogdanović founded an *intimate circle* as a group on 23rd July 1971. Mirko Radojičić, Peđa Vranešević and Slobodan Tišma cooperated with the group (∃-KÔD (founded in June, 1971) and under its name performed during 1971, 1972 and 1973.

From 1971, the associates of the groups KÔD, (∃ and (∃-KÔD with several friends worked on the founding of the city commune. The commune existed during 1973 in the house (ground-floor and garret) in Teslina Street 18. During 1977,

Boško Mandić, the younger brother of Miroslav Mandić, who was close to the groups KÔD and (∃ in the village Brezovica on the mountain of Rudnik founded a village commune which can be considered, at least in the first period of work, a spiritual successor of the group KÔD.⁴⁹⁰

Textual conceptualism and *invisible art*: the case of Slobodan Tišma (Serbian edition, p.265)

Slobodan Tišma was born in Stara Pazova in 1946. He studied at the Faculty of Philosophy in Novi Sad. He wrote poetry. He was a member of the groups KÔD and (∃-KÔD⁴⁹¹ (1970 – 1971). He realized regulatory works in nature. He drew a self-portrait on the pavement during “The Public Art Class” on the Novi Sad quay in 1970. He hung a metal contour of a cube above the street near the Youth Stand. He pulled colored ribbons through the building of the Youth Stand. He produced conceptual art. He faced the borders of art and life. With the other members of KÔD, he tried to reach the “invisible art”.⁴⁹² Slobodan Tišma is in constant turns and suspensions. Those were also the years of rock bands, music, the group *Luna*, turning to people and people scattering about. Today, the scattering leads to monologue, concentration on the hidden inscription, searching for nature of the speaking/writing *voice* inside the text and song, religiousness put between the hedonistic indolence and noble distance of the outcast who endured.⁴⁹³ In his post-poetic⁴⁹⁴ and proto-conceptualistic textual experiments, Tišma tears apart what was given as a textually-narrative structure whose members were differential, relatively free, reducible and extensible; he offers it as the subject of text, the subject of poem, the subject of enjoyment in writing and reading. For example, in the note for the text “*Kao neko*”⁴⁹⁵ (*Like Somebody*) he wrote:

“Everything that can be a subject, object or a predicate in a statement is not a word. Nouns are not words. House, for example, is not a word nor is it less of a word than others. Also, verbs, perhaps, are not words. Adjectives? Real words are, for example, LIKE, WHERE, OR, ALWAYS, WITH. I always say: seen from the outside. What does that mean? This is designed from the outside or from the inside. But not to the statement. The exterior is undirected and unbound. It was appearance. Language is not EVERYTHING. I cannot take responsibility for this note. Everything that is in it is probably wrong and senseless and, what is even worse: arbitrary. I am babbling and I am now completely frantic. Long

487 The exhibition was held at the Youth Stand in Novi Sad through May and June of 1971 too.

488 Nena Dimitrijević, Braco Dimitrijević (eds.), *In Another Moment*, Student Cultural Center, Belgrade, 1971.

489 N. Auberge, C. Millet, A. Pacquement (eds.), “Concept”, from: *Septieme Biennale de Paris*, Paris, 1971

490 Božidar Mandić, *Porodica bistrih potoka*, Dnevnik, Novi Sad, 1989

491 Miško Šuvaković (ed.), *Retrospektiva: Grupa KÔD, (∃ i (∃ KÔD*, The Contemporary Visual Arts Gallery, Novi Sad, 1995

492 Mirko Radojičić, “Aktivnost grupe KÔD”, from: Susovski, M. (ed.), *Nova umjetnička praksa 1966–1978*, Gallery of Contemporary Art, Zagreb, 1978, pp. 43

493 Miško Šuvaković, “Tekstualnost teksta Slobodana Tišme”, from: *Asimetrični drugi. Eseji o umetnicima i konceptima*, Prometej, Novi Sad, 1996, pp. 65–73

494 Slobodan Tišma, *Vrt kao to*, edition *Ruža lutanja*, Belgrade, 1997

495 Slobodan Tišma, “*Kao neko*”, *Index*, No. 207–208, Novi Sad, 1970, pp. 12

time ago humiliated, LIKE is a very abused and wrongly used word, up until today. Too authoritative on my behalf.”

What does Tišma do in the note for the text “Kao Neko” (Like Somebody)? He destroys, and destruction is a degree that goes beyond the deridian sophisticated and erotic deconstruction of the western tradition. He tears the subject of the text down, the subject which is introduced as a hypothesis in the work of the text, so by the very fact that it is a sign, it can become a marker and be confirmed as an index of the absent subject of not just textuality, but metaphysics. By appearing as a hypothesis or an event of the marker of the text, it (the subject) is given to words, and that is why Tišma takes the name “word” away from words, leaving that the words are only the words that do not bear a name (LIKE, WHERE, OR, ALWAYS, WITH). By taking the subject away from the text, like in the mirror, Tišma faces the removal of the subject from the text, the subject which takes the subject away from the text: he faces Slobodan Tišma. The note for the text “Kao Neko” (Like Somebody) is a *statement* of conceptual art: Tišma’s phenomenology of statement corresponds to the analytics of Robert Barry, Lawrence Weiner or Ian Wilson. But, the note for the text “Like Somebody” is in the provocative relations and with quilted points of experimental literature. Tišma’s scepticism is synchronously the scepticism of a conceptual artist and the dissatisfaction that also imbued Mallarme’s (Stephane Mallarme, 1842 – 1898) introduction to, we will call it writing “A Throw of the Dice Will Never Abolish Chance” (1897). Tišma wrote: “For this note I cannot take responsibility. Everything that is in it is probably wrong and senseless and, what is even worse: arbitrary.”

The analysis of the poems and texts of Slobodan Tišma indicates, formally, these three cases:

1. The texts, or poems, which move towards the “being” and the “phenomenology” of the poetic discourse, becoming the discourse themselves;

2. Texts, or poems, that move towards the confrontation of “semantic production” and “quilted points” (markers that stop the interminable sliding of the meaning); and

3. Texts that can be called *theoretical objects*, since they offer the phenomenology of the text in order to reveal the mechanisms of text to the mind’s eye, to demonstrate that, as Joseph Kosuth implied, the definition of art (text) is art (text).

The installations *Crna i žuta vrpca* (*Black and Yellow Ribbon* 1970), *Kocka* (*Cube* 1970), and drawings *Kvadrat Kazimira Maljeviča* (*A Square of Kazimir Maljevič*) and *Dimenzija greške* (*The Dimension of Error*)⁴⁹⁶ are significant conceptualistic realizations. At the first step the works indicate Tišma’s urgent and obsessive affinities: the relation with Mallarme’s dice of chance

and relation to Maljevič’s square of metaphysics. The *Cube*, for example, was a wire contour of a cube (edges of a cube) hung above the street at a height of nine meters. The placement of the cube, the platonic idealness, into the concrete urban space is a system of the Neo-Avant-garde strategies of intervention, but, it is also *the throw of the dice that will never abolish chance*. The *Cube* shows that the discussion between the text (Mallarme) and the non-textual (Tišma) is possible. Indicating that the discussion is possible is the determining of the hierarchy of discourses about discourses: examples (sensation of examples) are not the only things that are confronting, but also the knowledge about the place of the example in the hierarchy of the discourse of the worlds of art. And *A Square of Kazimir Maljevič* and *The Dimension of Error* locate, although not explore, the thin borderline of the topology of drawings and the topology of text in relation to the non-presented, or the metaphysical. The works show that the topologies of the markers and their geometrics of textuality and drawings are similar, although not identical. There are no correspondences of text and drawings, something is always left out, there is a shortage that controls the differences between the writing and the drawing creature.

Tišma’s work was greatly determined by the search for the “invisible” from the linguistic borders of a poem to the visual-spatial borders of the sensory perception to the pseudo-ritual or para-ritual in the forest, on the street, and on the concert rock stage. Certainly a distinctive artistic performance work (1973) is a work that was performed with Čeda Drča on the streets of Novi Sad. There are a number of photographic sequences that document this “invisible” work in everyday life. It is a paradoxical presence between the urban and the transcendent.

The case of Slavko Bogdanović: Novi Sad actionism or the new concepts of political art (Serbian edition, p.268)

Slavko Bogdanović⁴⁹⁷ (1948) started his work in art as an experimental poet and a conceptual artist. His early works from the end of the 60s and the beginning of the 70s were anarchistically-excess, actionistic, of emphasized gesturalness, intermedial and conceptual. Bogdanović wrote poems that became texts and projects of intentional structurations of object, for example, “200 ideja” (“200 Ideas”).⁴⁹⁸ The text was about possible/potential artistic work (dig a hole, make a book, burn a book, exhibit the Sun and the Earth, etc.), the text was a speech about the intentions of an artist, and with the book “Močvara” (*Swamp*)⁴⁹⁹ it became analytical linguistically-se-

496 Slobodan Tišma, *Kvadrat Kazimira Maljeviča i Dimenzija greške*, Index, No. 201, Novi Sad, 1970

497 Miško Šuvaković, *Politika tela. Eseji o Slavku Bogdanoviću*, Prometej and K21K, Novi Sad, 1997

498 Slavko Bogdanović, “200 ideja”, Index, No. 201, Novi Sad, 1970

499 Slavko Bogdanović, *Močvara*, auctorial edition, Novi Sad, 1970

miotic work with the materiality of the spoken language as a work of art. On the other hand, the expressive gesture of hammering books with nails (*Zakovana knjiga* [*The Hammered Book*], 1971) started an avalanche of archetypal potential breakthroughs behind the linguistic utilitarian conventions. The book was the very subject (in the phenomenological sense), the operational area of the gestural *mixed-media* work of art, but it could also be an allegory of Christ's body, or the demolished, dishonoured and destroyed object of the high culture. Slavko Bogdanović offered the following autocritical comment: "I just hammered them. Therefore, the crucifixion as a connotation can only stand as an intermediary executed paradigm. Otherwise, I didn't have it in my mind. *The Hammered Book* is, in the context of other works, explainable as the relinquishing of previous experiences: the need for the layers of education, conventions, considerations, political pressures, fears – all accepted from the outside as a personal experience – to be removed (or, perhaps, close into a, some sort of, Pandora's box), so that the clean, liberated (emptied) Being can be exposed to the effect of selected experiences (influences). So that the cup that somebody else filled with tea can be emptied. So that one's own tea can be drunk. So that one's own God can be found. In that context a line (gradation) could be found, made of:

- *The medium is the message* (1970);
- *T-T'* (1970);
- *Otvorene knjige* (The Open Books, 1971);
- *Zatvorene knjige* (The Closed Books, 1971);
- *Zakovane knjige* (The Hammered Books, 1971);
- *Močvara* (The Swamp, 1970).

"In that sequence, the text was the first to serve the reistic game, and then the book. The end of everything is, definitely, *The Swamp*, as the final destruction, decomposition of words, but also as the beginning, because by deconstructing the words book was created (which means, a new composition-construction). The circle of experiences was thereby closed."

Proto-Conceptualism was a step out of the culture of the High Modernism (culture of intermediary meanings, experiences, emotions, expressions, symbolisation) towards the real HERE presence (often tautological presence) of the object itself, the direct meaning, the immediate experience, the imminent emotion, the pure expression and unambiguous symbolisation. The search of the marker, the zero alphabet, the performative voice and the dematerialized object of art was in the function of reaching the departure point (the zero stage of culture), or the possibility for the culture to be rebuilt and for the symbolization to start from the very beginning.

In the autumn of 1971, Slavko Bogdanović started a low-circulation magazine *L.H.O.O.Q.*, which was printed in 13 issues. The name of the magazine was taken from the famous

Duchamps's ready-made⁵⁰⁰ and indicates the pro-Dadaistic neo-anarchistic strategy of activity. The magazine was published six times with the subheading "List za permanentnu destrukciju svega postojećeg" ("The magazine for the permanent destruction of everything existent", Issue Nos. 1-6), three times with the subheading "Underground list za razvijanje međusobnih odnosa" ("Underground magazine for the development of mutual relations", Issue Nos. 7, 9, 11) and three times as "Underground list za novu revoluciju" ("The underground magazine for the new revolution", Issue Nos. 8, 10 and 12), and the thirteenth issue was published under the name "List za prijatelje" (The magazine for friends). The first issue of the magazine *L.H.O.O.Q.* with the texts of Slavko Bogdanović and Miroslav Mandić "Mi smo dražesni dečaci II" ("We are charming boys II") came out translated into Hungarian (translation of Katalin Ladik) as part of the magazine *Új Symposion*.

The way out of conceptual art took through the discourses of the political new left actionistic anarchism. Those were the texts⁵⁰¹ that entered the direct activist settling of accounts with the cultural and artistic politics in Novi Sad and Vojvodina. For Bogdanović, the deconstruction of utilitarian and pragmatic languages of culture was not just a deconstruction of aesthetical, but also a step into the terror of the political powers in the language and behind the language. Bogdanović was accused and sentenced to imprisonment for the text "Pesma underground tribina mladih novi sad" ("The Poem of the Underground Youth Stands Novi Sad"), published in the newspaper *Student*. That issue of *Student* was banned before the newspaper was publicly distributed. Slavko Bogdanović was sentenced to eight months imprisonment by the verdict of District Court of Novi Sad No. K.77/72 for the violation of Article 292 of the Criminal Code and Article 116 of the Law on Press and other Types of Media. The sentence was pronounced on 12th May 1972. In the argumentation of the verdict, it was explained that in the text "Pesma underground tribina mladih novi sad" (The Poem of the Underground Youth Stands Novi Sad), published in the newspaper *Student*, Slavko Bogdanović stated "... the false news, and also allegations considering various issues and events".⁵⁰² The paradox of this verdict was in the fact that Slavko Bogdanović was sentenced for the publishing

500 Thierry de Duve (ed), *The Definitively Unfinished Marcel Duchamp*, The MIT Press, Cambridge MA, 1993

501 Slavko Bogdanović, Miroslav Mandić, "Mi smo dražesni dečaci I" – unique item, 1971; Slavko Bogdanović, Miroslav Mandić, "Mi smo dražesni dečaci II", from: *L.H.O.O.Q.*, Novi Sad, 23rd March 1971; Slavko Bogdanović, "Pesma underground tribina mladih novi sad", from: "Specijalni broj posvećen Undergroundu" (themat), *Student*, Belgrade, 1971, pp. 31; Slavko Bogdanović, "Otvoreno pismo Jaši Zlopocu", Bosut, 11th December 1971. (unpublished at the time it was written)

502 See documents "Presuda" (The Verdict), Business No. K. 77/72 from 12th May 1972, signed by the head of the court council, Đorđe Rogulja for the District Court in Novi Sad. The Supreme Court of Vojvodina denied the appeal to the "Presuda" (Verdict) – Business No. Kž. 621/72, signed by the head of the court council Dr. Branko Petrić, 6th October 1972.

of a text that was never publicly distributed. The whole process led to the dismissal of the executives of the Youth Stand and, actually, to the shutting down of the experimental artistic and cultural scene in Novi Sad during 1973. The politically-judicial settling of accounts with Slavko Bogdanović and Miroslav Mandić, and the administration with the executives of the Youth Stand during 1972 and 1973 was the consequence of complicated political, but also cultural struggles in Serbia, Vojvodina and Novi Sad. That conflict was not only an expression of the state repression over the young experimental and critical artists, but also a reaction of the dominant artistic and cultural system inside the socialistic Modernism, to the excess that was not fit in or controlled, and that happened from the formally-linguistic and new media innovations to the politically-spiritual life attitudes and activist and actionistic subversions.⁵⁰³

An important “digression”: in the middle of the first decade of the 21st century, Slavko Bogdanović executed two politically oriented works of art in the transitional conditions of nationalistic and conflicting Serbian sociability. Both works were set as the *symptoms* of contemporary social, political and religious hegemonies and censorships: a series of paintings/icons on a tree (*W*)holly Composite Singularity (Byzantine XXI)⁵⁰⁴ (2005 – 2006) and the short motion picture *Final Shot Final Cut*⁵⁰⁵ (2007). Both these works were not “artistic decorations” of the actualities, but provocations of the post-socialistic taboos of the religious and theocratic conception of the modern lifestyle, or brutal confrontation with the symbols of the national mythology and national political program as the only project of the post-communistic Serbia.

The case of Miroslav Mandić: *art between provocation and walking* (Serbian edition, p.273)

Miroslav Mandić (1949) started his artistic work in the context of experimental poetry⁵⁰⁶ para-theatrical expressions⁵⁰⁷ and conceptual art in the context of the work of the group KŌD.

Mandić conducted conceptual researches of the language of art by means of tautological interventions in the public space during 1970: for example, by releasing Styrofoam letters forming the word “Dunav” (Danube) into the river Danube or by placing the word “Trava” (Grass) cut out of paper letters onto the grass surface. The conceptual drawings *Čelik* (Steel), *Delo A,B,C* (Work A, B, C) or *300 tačaka* (300 spots), or *Ulaznica u galerije savremene umjetnosti* (The Ticket to the Galleries of Contemporary Art) are conceptually-mental exercises based on repetition, tautology, reduction, seriality and metalinguistically-institutional description. The work *Ulaznica u galerije savremene umetnosti* (The Ticket to Galleries of Contemporary Art) is a linguistic game with the institution of museum and gallery as a closed, guarded and controlled public space. With the text “Galerije” (Galleries)⁵⁰⁸, Mandić asked questions about the *system of art* as the contradictory space of social, cultural and artistic politics of exhibiting. Close to this text, a range of critical texts about exhibits, films or cultural circumstances emerged.⁵⁰⁹

On the occasion of the performance of the groups JANUAR and FEBRUAR he realised 10 messages (1971) by which he introduced the role of the political slogans and political expression in the artistic work. In the late period of work of the group KŌD and just after its disbandment, he wrote manifest critical and subversive texts with Slavko Bogdanović and Dušan Bijelić: “*Mi smo dražesni dečaci I&II*” (“We Are Charming Boys I&II”, 1971) or “*Droga ili revolucija – Narkomani svih zemalja ujedinite se*” (“Drugs or a Revolution – Junkies of all Countries Unite”, 1971) or “*Pesma o filmu*”⁵¹⁰ (“Poem about Film”, 1971). In the history of Vojvodinian portrait, the work of Miroslav Mandić “*Pesma o filmu*” (“Poem about Film”) is an important exception that offers conceptual version of the political portrait or, more precisely, the anti-portrait of Marshal Josip Broz Tito, in a way that had subversive consequences and provocation of the political system. For that text-portrait, Mandić was sentenced by the criminal law.

After the conceptual art, and after the serving of his sentence of imprisonment, Miroslav Mandić had a one year long suspension in public exhibiting and performing, to start building and performing in isolation the “character” of the charismatic figure on the other scene of Vojvodinian, Serbian and Yugoslav art. About his “stay” in prison he wrote the diary poetic notes “*Zatvor*” (“Prison”), which were published in the book *Ne, ne verujem da se ova rečenica ne čuje* (No, I Don’t

503 Center for New Media Media_kuda.org (eds.), “Izostavljena istorija – The transcription of the debate held on 18th November 2005 on the occasion of the opening of the exhibit *Trajni Čas Umetnosti, Novosadska neoavangarda '60-ih i '70-ih godina XX veka* in the Museum of Contemporary Art in Novi Sad, from *Izostavljena istorija*, kuda, read, Novi Sad, 2006, pp. 18-48.

504 Miško Šuvaković (ed.), *Hibridno imaginarno: slikarstvo i/ili ekran – O slici i slikarstvu u epohi medija*, Museum of Contemporary Art Vojvodina, Novi Sad, 2006, pp. 54-55, 83

505 Slavko Bogdanović, *Final Shotfinal Cut*, Exit, Novi Sad, 2007

506 Miroslav Mandić, “201”, “Mirko Radojičić”, “Pesma o sebi”, *Index* No. 201, Novi Sad, 1970, pp. ???.

507 Slobodan Tišma and Miroslav Mandić, action *More - Antimore* in front of the Cathedral in the center of Novi Sad 22nd April 1970; Performance of the group KŌD, *Zglob* (The Youth Stand, 24th of May 1970), see: Miško Šuvaković (ed.), *Retrospektiva: Grupa KŌD*, (Ži) (KŌD, pp. 35; group action *Ogledalo u gradu* (25th of May 1970, Novi Sad); para-theatrical performance of Miroslav Mandić *TRI TRI* in which Mirko Radojičić, Slavko Bogdanović, Slobodan Tišma, Vladimir Mandić, Božidar Mandić took part, was held in the hall of the Youth Stand on the 9th of October 1970, and others

508 Miroslav Mandić, “Galerije”, *Index* No. 202, Novi Sad, 1970, pp. 7

509 Miroslav Mandić, “Suma 2N – Povodom izložbe Slobodana Dimitrijevića - Braca” and “Film govori sam za sebe – Filmovi Tomislava Gotovca”, *Index* No. 3, Novi Sad, 1970, pp. 10

510 Miroslav Mandić, “Pesma o filmu” (translation into Hungarian by Katalin Ladik), *Új Symposion* No. 77, Novi Sad, 1971, pp. 389

Believe that this Sentence Isn't Heard)⁵¹¹ from 1987, fifteen years after the serving of his sentence in prison. He devoted himself to wandering, everyday life, physical work, meditative drawings and paintings, rituals of everyday life, mysticism, documenting of everyday life, etc.⁵¹² It all happened in private spaces, on the margins of late-socialistic society. He started the lifelong project called Čovek (Man), based on the photographic shooting of his own face once a month his whole life. He worked on a ten year long project of drawing *Lišće – Drvo Života* (*Leaves – the Tree of Life*, 1975 - 1985), when over 3650 drawings were created, together covering an area of 2.7x20 meters. He returned to public artistic work in 1981. He published poetry.⁵¹³ He started creating works of art with walking and interactions with the environmental and human situations. He aspired to art as a heroic deed. He copied twenty novels between 1985 and 1987. He realised his ten year long project *Ruža lutanja* (*The Rose of Wandering*) between 1991 and 2001.⁵¹⁴ Those works of his emerged in the spirit of the postmodernist nomadism, eclecticism and individual mythologies. The artist is the one who starts his walk towards the eternity in the inter-spaces of the mythical and literally existential.

A case of political repression: *Új Symposion* magazine, issue 77, 1971 (Serbian edition, p.275)

The *Új Symposion* (*The New Symposium*) magazine has been published in Hungarian in Novi Sad since January 1965. It was published by *Tribina mladih* (*Young People's Tribunal*). Many Hungarian and Yugoslav authors wrote for the magazine: Tolnai Ottó (1940), Domonkos István (1940), Sziveri János (1954-1990), Fenyvesi Ottó (1954), Végel László (1941), Balázs Attila, Thomka Beáta, Balint Szombathy, Radics Viktória, and many others. At the time when Tolnai Ottó was the editor, and Balint Szombathy was the graphical editor, the magazine was supporting experiments of Neo-Avant-garde and conceptualistic nature.

Issue 77 of the magazine from September of 1971 was devoted to cinema: "*Művészeti-kritikai folyóirat*". It was one of the key critical, theoretical and artistic provocations of the status and effects of film in real-socialist countries, and, before all, in Hungarian and Yugoslav society. Cultural, filmographic and artistic fascinations with "powers" of film as the new mass and totalitarian medium for communication and shaping

of public opinion were provoked by means of experimental text "products". Kovács Lukács wrote about the Hungarian Neo-Avant-garde director Jancsó Miklós, and Fekete Elvira wrote about the critic of film critic. Tolnai Ottó analyzed the Neo-Avant-garde film, a comic by Branko Andrić *Tou Boof* was published, among other things. Miroslav Mandić wrote the essay *Vers a Filmröl* (*A poem about the film – a sonnet or 14 stanzas*), in which he pulled out a characteristic *post-Code* political provocation inside the discourse about the film in socialist Yugoslavia. The essay itself contained experiments and conceptual works of Slobodan Tišma, Milan Živković, Mihovil Pansini, Goran Trbuljak, Božidar Mandić, and Miroslav Mandić himself⁵¹⁵. The magazine *Új Symposion*, issue 77, was banned by the decision of the County Prosecutor's Office in Novi Sad on 9th December 1971. The decision reads as follows:

THERE IS A TEMPORARY BAN on distribution of *Új Symposion* art and critic magazine in Hungarian from Novi Sad, issue 77 – Katolička porta street 5/II – due to publishing the essay by Miroslav Mandić: *Vers a Filmröl* (*A poem about the film – a sonnet or 14 stanzas*), on pages 376-389, translated by Ladik Katalina, which soils the honor and reputation of the President of the Republic, the people and the State of SFRY, and gives false and twisted claims that may cause unease among citizens – breaking the Law of Press and other media under section 52, paragraph 1, points 2 and 7.⁵¹⁶

Explanation of the decision was formulated so that Mandić's critique of Yugoslav cinema seemed as an "attack" of the poet/artist on the *character* of the President, therefore, on the very foundations and symbols of socialist society of Yugoslavia. Among the numerous quotations, one about Josip Broz Tito was also singled out:

On the page 389, in chapter IX, the title says: "instructions for making a film about the revolution", and the subtitle says: "A script for making a film JOSIP BROZ TITO", under which follows:

"...take a photograph of Josip Broz Tito in color, one take, lasting for two hours. Static camera. With the end credits, a voice says that this was Josip Broz Tito⁵¹⁷."

Also, as the finishing evidence, the following is quoted:

On the same page, chapter XIV, titled: "Why I have written this text":

"...Because I believe only in Yugoslavian society, even though it is in deep shit."

As the above mentioned incriminations contain characteristics of criminal acts from paragraph 174 of the Criminal Law, and such writing causes uneasiness among citizens today, due to false and

511 Miroslav Mandić, *Ne, ne verujem da se ova rečenica ne čuje*, Literary Association of Novi Sad, Novi Sad, 1987, pp. 13–73

512 Miroslav Mandić, *Ne, ne verujem da se ova rečenica ne čuje*, Literary Association of Novi Sad, Novi Sad, 1987

513 Miroslav Mandić, *Ja sam ti je on*, Matica srpska, Novi Sad, 1984; Miroslav Mandić, *Kaja*, Matica srpska, Novi Sad, 1993

514 See: Miroslav Mandić, *Ruža lutanja 1*, Društvo prijatelja "Ruže lutanja", Belgrade, 1992; *Ruža lutanja 2*, Društvo prijatelja "Ruže lutanja", Belgrade, 1994

515 Miroslav Mandić, "Vers a Filmröl – szonett avagy tizennégy versslor", *Új Symposion* 77, Novi Sad, September, 1971, pp. 376-389.

516 Decision of the County prosecutor's office 79/71, December 9, 1971, Novi Sad, signed by the public prosecutor A. Miškov.

517 Explanation of the County prosecutor's office 79/71, December 9, 1971, Novi Sad, page 3

twisted statements being made, it also violates section 52, paragraph 1, points 2 and 7 of the Law of Press and other media, which fulfills the lawful conditions from section 53 of the said Law, and allows a temporary ban and reach this decision.⁵¹⁸

Legal action against Miroslav Mandić followed, and he was sentenced to nine months of prison by the Municipal Court in Novi Sad.

The banning the *Ūj Symposion* magazine is one of the characteristic paradoxes of socialist Yugoslavia. This magazine was not one of the “right-winged dissident” anti-communist and anti-left magazines or *semi-public spaces* for dissident nationalism, quite the opposite, it was a left-winged magazine of experimental and critical opinion, committed to the “revolution”, the revolutionary cultures and arts in a multinational society. Still, the literally understood and developed “aesthetical-ethical attitude” and the policy of action were the challenges of carrying out the socialist-bureaucratic modernism in culture and art, thus, canonizing and *freezing* the ideals of the revolution. As in the case of Želimir Žitnik’s films and Slavko Bogdanović’s texts, in *Ūj Symposion* magazine and the text-poem by Miroslav Mandić we are talking about subversive and critical action by artists who understand the revolution seriously, instead of the cynical⁵¹⁹, conformist and measured bureaucratizing of the self-ruled culture and art by culture workers, artists and politicians, that is, the police and the judicial system.

The case of Mirko Radojičić: From analytical to spiritual conceptualism (Serbian edition, p.278)

Mirko Radojičić (1948-2003), after a short engagement with processual art, interventions in natural and urban space, and performance art, during 1970 turns to the text and textual analysis: conceptual art. Works from that period were presented on several important exhibitions of conceptual art: *Seventh Young Artists’ Biennale in Paris*⁵²⁰ (1971), *Examples of Conceptual Art in Yugoslavia*⁵²¹ (Zagreb, 1971), *At the Moment* (1971), *In Another Moment*⁵²² (SKC gallery, Belgrade, 1971), etc. Like other contributors of groups KÔD and (Ξ), Radojičić worked at *Young People’s Tribunal* in Novi Sad on organizing exhibitions. He also organized interviews and worked as an editor of several publications. He was the editor of a special issue of

Polje devoted to conceptual art (issue 156, 1972), with text of Joseph Kosuth, the *Art&Language* group, Catherine Millet, Marko Pogacnik, Victor Bergin, Vladimir Kopicl, Sol Le Witt, etc.⁵²³ He taught grammar in a school for typists, was a lector in Dijon, Bucharest and Nancy. He translated from and to French, presented books and magazines. He contributed with ZzIP (Community for Spatial Exploration), with exhibitions and the publishing of *Mental Spaces*⁵²⁴; he prepared one of the ZzIP seminars dedicated to Jacques Lacan (*Jacque Lacan and the Theory of Art*) for publishing in *Letopis Matice srpske*⁵²⁵.

Three periods and contexts of Mirko Radojičić’s work as an artist are important:

1) Examples of analytical conceptualistic textual practice from 1971;

2) Examples of exploration of natural morphologies and topologies of the transfigurational shapes of nature, started in 1971 with drawings, developed to a rounded-off project after 1975; and

3) Examples of complex meaning models of eclectic *baroque conceptualism* during the 80s.

Textual practice of conceptual art is determined through demands that the text is the object of art at the visual or spatial area, and that the text is a second-degree (target having n-degrees) discussion of the nature of art, paradigm of art, world of art, etc. It is a characteristic of conceptual art at the transition from the 60s to 70s, especially the Anglo-Saxon authors (Kosuth, *Art&Language*, Bergin, Weiner, Barry),⁵²⁶ to reduce the text to tautological expressions and analytical expressions, working with propositions of art, during which the text phenomenon and *language work* are neglected (subjected to a firm order of unambiguity of the document). For Radojičić, as well as some other members of KÔD and (Ξ), the potential of sensual and intelligible appearance of text and *language work* was the goal, while tautological and analytical expressions (proportions) were the means. In a way they anticipated the idea of *non-visual abstraction* that Ian Wilson⁵²⁷ developed at the beginning of the 80s, defining the character of non-referential textuality. Radojičić’s *Text 1* (1971) was written in the form of statements, owing to the long traditions of manifestos/state-

518 Explanation of the County prosecutor’s office 79/71, December 9, 1971, Novi Sad, page 3

519 Slavoj Žižek, *Birokratija i uživanje*, SIC, Belgrade, 1984.

520 N. Auberger, C. Millet, A. Pacquement (eds.), “Concept”, iz: *Septieme Biennale de Paris*, Paris, 1971

521 Ješa Denegri, Biljana Tomić (eds.), *Primeri konceptualne umetnosti u Jugoslaviji*, Hall of the Museum of Modern Art, Beograd, 1971.

522 Nena Dimitrijević, Braco Dimitrijević (eds.), *In Another Moment*, SKC, Belgrade, 1971

523 Mirko Radojičić (ed.), “Konceptualna umetnost”, *Polja*, issue 156, Novi Sad, 1972

524 Zoran Belić, Juraj Dobrović, Darko Hohnjec, Miroslav Mandić, Nenad Petrović, Marko Pogacnik, Mirko Radojičić, Maja Savić, Paja Stanković, Miško Šuvaković M., *Zajednička škola o prostoru* (zbornik), Hall of the Museum of Modern art, Belgrade, 1981; Zoran Belić, W., Dubravka Đurić, Miško Šuvaković (eds.), “Kulture Istoka – vizuelna umetnost Zapada XX veka”, *Mentalni Prostor*, issue 3, Museum of ethnography in Belgrade, Belgrade, 1986; Zoran Belić, W., Dubravka Đurić, Miško Šuvaković (eds.), “Analiza – tekstualnost – fenomenologija i vizuelne umetnosti”, *Mentalni Prostor*, issue 4, SKC, Belgrade, 1987

525 Mirko Radojičić, Matjaž Potrč, Nenad Mišćević, Radoman Kordić, Miško Šuvaković, Zoran Belić and Žak Lakan, “Žak Lakan i teorija umetnosti”, *Posebne sveske LMS* (2), Novi Sad, 1987

526 Ursula Meyer, *Conceptual Art*, A Dutton Paperback, New York, 1972

527 Ian Wilson, “Conceptual Art”, *Artforum*, New York, February 1984, str. 60–61. Prevedeno u časopisu *Mentalni prostor*, br. 4, Beograd, 1987, str. 157

ments, i.e. the speech of an artist in the first person. *Text 2* (1971) is a theoretical object set for a gallery exhibition.

In a series of drawings *Structure of growth – circle (square, triangle)* from 1971, published in the magazine *Problemi*⁵²⁸, Radojičić marked the problems with which he would deal in the 70s and 80s. From the analysis of the language (the conceptual character of art) he moved, during the 70s, to studying and exploring specific lingual (symbolic, therefore archetypal) models, pointing out uncertain “universal” invariants in human nature, consciousness/subconsciousness, unaware of the markers and tracks of cultural economies of identifying. It meant a move away from Wittgenstein’s meta-analysis towards Jungian⁵²⁹ psychoanalysis of the collective unconscious and the process of symbolization. Radojičić’s work of this period corresponds to certain original memories/emotional connections to nature/space of his background (landscape of Hercegovina), live and work of the commune/family in Sempas⁵³⁰, and the interest in Western (alchemical, romantic) and Eastern (zen, taoism) “sacredness”. It is noticeable that Radojičić, although pointing out distinctions (of symbol and sign, nature and culture, matter and spirit, language and the extralingual, circle in nature and circle in art), does not take sides, does not create the synthesis of the cognitive (external and internal). His work remains conceptualistic to a degree that allows for the art work to be seen, experienced, contemplated, understood, etc, as the nature of the phenomenon and the discourse of different natures and functions. Radojičić, through his readings of Jung, shows us how the symbolic order has the power to blind us and bind us, but also shows that without it there is no culture (civilization). Radojičić’s work in the 80s, however small it may have been in the number of works, it was rich and expansive in crossbreeding extentional transparency of references with intentional opaqueness of nominalistic consistencies of visual and discursive: *With Blue* (1982), *The Ambivalent Line*⁵³¹ (1982), *The Moon* (1983) etc. During the 80s, Radojičić visited France twice and this was not without trace. The Jungian concept of archetypal symbolization was pushed forward, and the deconstructive semiotic of postmodern culture was emphasized, along with the dialectics of the marked and the marker. He was, at the time, translating Roland Barthes and Jacques Lacan, and that is when his short, almost program-like text for the new semiology of art was created: *Lines and dots / for the study of the presence of the East in the works of French*

authors from Clotel to Barthes.⁵³² Radojičić worked with non-formal institution from Belgrade, ZZIP (*Community for spatial exploration*) on theoretical projects of analytic, semiological and phenomenological art after modernism.⁵³³

History, and the context of group (Ξ) (Serbian edition, p.282)

The people who contributed to group (Ξ)⁵³⁴ were Ana Raković, Vladimir Kopić, Čeda Drča and Miša Živanović. Cooperation of future members of group (Ξ) began during year 1970. Before founding (Ξ) they participated in groups *JANUAR* (Young People’s Tribunal, Novi Sad) and *FEBRUAR* (Dom Omladine, Belgrade). Group (Ξ) was founded at the end of February 1971. Miša Živanović left the group in March 1971. During May of 1971, group (Ξ-KÔD) was created.

Members of (Ξ) group were students of literature. They were interested in theory of literature, linguistics, theory of information, philosophy of the language and the theory of sets (Ana Raković, Čeda Drča), philosophy of the language, most of all the philosophy of Ludwig Wittgenstein (Vladimir Kopić) and linguistics (Miša Živanović), set their work towards analytical and theoretical conceptual art since the beginning⁵³⁵. In the artistic area they were interested in the American Avant-garde from John Cage, through beatniks, to conceptual art and experimental poetry. They were very close to KÔD group since their beginnings.

The work of (Ξ) starts from literary experiments by introducing metalingual interpretive aspects in the poetical text and its transformation into a metalingual work of conceptual art. Metalingual work of conceptual art is no longer defined by disciplinary specifications, but hermeneutic discussion realized through “concept” (textual-diagram art work or project) and through textual analysis of status, functions and effects of the world of art, notion of art, artist, art work, discourse in art and about art. We recognize:

- 1) Group works;
- 2) Joint works of Ana Raković and Čeda Drča; and
- 3) Individual works of group members during and after its existence.

528 Mirko Radojičić, drawings, *Problemi*, issue 101, Ljubljana, 1971

529 Carl Jung (ed.), *Man and his Symbols*, Pan Books, London, 1978

530 Tomaž Brejc, “Obitelj u Šempasu”, iz: Marijan Susovski (ed.), *Nova umjetnička praksa 1966–1978*, Gallery of contemporary art, Zagreb, 1978, pp.19–20

531 This was partially published in the catalogue of the exhibition *Examples of photography in conceptual and postconceptual art in Yugoslavia*, Photo lounge, Belgrade, 1985, and *Photography in Serbia 1839–1989*, SANU, Belgrade, 1991

532 Mirko Radojičić, “Crte i tačke \ za studiju o prisustvu kultura Istoka u delima francuskih stvaralaca od Klodela do Barta”, *Mentalni Prostor*, issue 3, Belgrade 1987, pp. 155–156

533 In ZZIP there were, apart from Radojičić: Zoran Belić W., Nenad Petrović, Marko Pogacnik, Dubravka Đurić, the author, and, at times, Miodrag Lazarov Pashu, Miroslav Mandić and others. See: Miško Šuvaković, “ZZIP: teorija u umetnosti”, from: *Konceptualna umetnost*, MSUV, Novi Sad, 2007, pp.569–575

534 Mirko Radojičić, “Grupa (Ξ)”, from: Marijan Susovski (ed.), *Nova umjetnička praksa 1966–1978*, Contemporary art gallery, Zagreb, 1978, pp. 43–45; Miško Šuvaković (ed.), *Retrospektiva: Grupa KÔD, (Ξ) i (Ξ KÔD)*, Contemporary Visual Arts Gallery, Novi Sad, 1995

535 Filiberto Mena, *Analitička linija moderne umetnosti*, Clio, Belgrade, 2001

Several group projects were realized in the form of diagram-textual work to do with the psycho-physical states of the artist, mental notions, conceptual formulations and world phenomena. These are analytical auto-reflexive works, showing how certain idea is formulated (described, planned, documented) and represented in the formal model of diagrams and text.

Vladimir Kopić, Ana Raković and Čeda Drča realized the following works: *Transformation of a three-dimensional system into an N-dimensional one*, *System of absolute measurements*, *66 squares*, *An attempt to establish continuity achieved through the method of exhausting the organism*, *An action of setting spatial distances* and *1-10* (all from 1971). In the text of Mirko Radojičić about (∃) group, there are also works mentioned that are based on:

- 1) The analysis of the relationship of moving cubes, one marked and one unmarked, that can be set as the relationships of space and time, absence and presence of communication;

- 2) The fulfilment of a situation in real space and time – each of the participants go to a different city and spend some time performing planned actions, the goal is to make individual experiences mutual.

Diagram-textual studies, *Transformation of the three dimensional system into an N-dimensional system* and *Absolute measurement system*⁵³⁶ are realized as conceptual hypothetical models. Their goal is to show that the characteristic art phenomena, like space and color, can be conceptually and mentally presented through formal combinations and correspondences. In *Transformation of the three dimensional system into an N-dimensional system* the correspondences are formally established between the spatial model (coordinate system x, y, z) and the color system (blue, red, yellow). By introducing conventions about identity of the system and colors, as well as the infinite number of colors in the system, a formal transformation of the spatial system (three dimensions) into an N-dimensional system is established. The defining quality of this is the 'power' of creating analytical proportion about the terms that potentially have references towards the world phenomena (color and space). In other words, extentional terms (terms with outside reference) are transformed into an intentional system (a system of abstract formal structure). In their *Absolute measurement system*, the starting point is the tautological model of analytic proportions by which the metaphysical judgments of the absolute characters of each color (blue, red, yellow) are made. For this study it is characteristic that the analytic proposition (a formally composed expression) is speculatively developed as a metaphysical expression (synthetic proposition). Group (∃) shows that extentional terms can be treated just as

the intentional ones. This way the language as a descriptive system is transformed into the language as a productive system.

Their study *66 squares* is realized as a net made of 66 squares with 66 words inside them. The study has a supplement of six smaller diagrams with 66 squares in which suggestions for reading the text (the words in squares) are given diagrammatically. The idea is expressed with the attitude: 'by acting towards creating lingual connections among the elements of the system, it is possible to get an infinite number of linguistically-aesthetical values.' A study with this concept points to two basic stand-points:

- 1) The idea of linguistic language as the material basis of formal combining; and

- 2) The idea of language game, developed by Ludwig Wittgenstein, as the basis for building a text.

Text is not a consistent structure of referential meaning full of sense, but the effect of possible formal combining in the language game. Also, a characteristic conceptual move: the rules of combining are given as graphical signs (reading diagrams), and the phenomenon that creates the aesthetic effect is given as linguistic material. The traditional visual arts scheme in which the aesthetic phenomenon is an image has been inverted and the rules of aesthetic-artistic activity are linguistic.

Study *1-10* has been done as the order based on analytic propositions of ordinal numbering in the decimal number system. The study is simple. Two number columns have been given, consisting of numbers from 1 to 10. The first column is made from rising numbers from 1 to 10, in accordance with numbering in the integer set, and the other one is given as a random list of numbers from 1 to 10. When correspondence is set between these two columns, the first column represents an ordinal number or the place of the number from the second column. For example, number 4 from the second column has the ordinal place 1, and number 9 from the second column has ordinal place 6. This study shows that it is possible, between any two sets of elements, to establish a formal relationship of order based on a rule (analytical proposition). When such an analytical correspondence has been set, the connected elements, in accordance with the given rule, are in a tautological relationship. In other words, the relationship between the elements of the first and the second column is always true if the rule of their correspondence is accepted. This type of study has in its matrix the position of ready-made (choosing an inartistic phenomenon as the object of artistic study, like a number list), and in its developed form it has the position of a mental exercise (non-visual expression, expression with linguistic, mathematical or mental presentations).

The projects *Attempt of reaching continuity by the method of organism exhaustion* and *Action of establishing spatial distances*

536 Grupa (∃), "Transformacija trodimenzionalnog sistema u N-dimenzionalni" i "Sistem apsolutne mere", *Problemi*, issue 101, Ljubljana 1971

are concepts that have real world references and therefore they are structured as synthetic propositions.

The *Attempt of reaching continuity by the method of organism exhaustion* is realized as:

- 1) An event;
- 2) A document; and
- 3) A metalingual interpretation.

An event: after running a certain distance the participant draws a line that characterizes his/her state.

A document: the drawings made after organism exhaustion through running.

Metalingual interpretation:

- 1) The rules of *Attempt...* are given. After running different distances, the participant marks the degree of possibility of continuity (drawing the line). In an ideal case, due to the exhaustion of the organism, the line would reach continuity; and
- 2) The event would be represented via a diagram model that conceptually shows the experiential relations of organism, physical condition, psychological condition and the effect (continuity).

The *Action of establishing spatial distances* is part of the distance project (distance as non-visual, spatial, behavioral and mental relationship). The study is realized as an event and as a concept. The event is based on establishing hypothetical concordance between three participants in the action, who are in Zrenjanin, Novi Sad, and Belgrade. They make hypothetical contact by tuning in on the program of Radio Novi Sad, wavelength 236.6m, at a certain time (13:00 hours, 20th March 1971) at different places. An event realized like this is an example of dematerialization of an artistic object. As an art form, it is not the object that is offered, but the existential situation defined by a certain 'invisible' and 'macro-spatial phenomenon', i.e. radio waves. Radio wave is input in the art world as a ready-made, and then it is used as an element of a language game between three people. It is a 'conceptual ambient' and a 'conceptual sculpture', in a sense that the *Art&Language* group did hypothetical structures with pillars of air, or Robert Barry's⁵³⁷ work with radioactive materials and inert gasses. The description of the event and its analysis is a document that speaks factographically about the action of group members and gives you the opportunity to analyze space, condition, time and consciousness before and during communication.

A very short history of (\exists -KÔD group (Serbian edition, p.286)

People who participated in (\exists -KÔD group's work between 1971 and 1973 were, among others, Čeda Drča, Vladimir Kopicl,

Mirko Radojičić, Ana Raković, Slobodan Tišma (only on the *Young Artists and Young Critics '71*⁵³⁸ exhibition, 1971) and Peda Vranešević. (\exists -KÔD can be understood in three ways.

- 1) as a short term cooperation of some members of (\exists and KÔD on rounding off the conceptual art (project *Moving is the other in the same*, 1971);
- 2) as a relative and tolerant frame for individual work; and
- 3) as existential inter-space of 'invisible art' realization and creating a commune as a form of *different existence*.

The group exhibited at the *Seventh Young Artists' Biennale in Paris* and at the *In Another Moment*⁵³⁹, *Young Artists and Young Critics 71*.

The only thing the group (\exists -KÔD did 'together' was the text of *Moving is the other in the same*. The text was written for the *Seventh Young Artists' Biennale in Paris* 1971. The text was one of the possible solutions of Kopicl's 'private and public language' dilemma that is Radojičić's paradoxical meeting with the ideals of a perfect language (or artwork) and the necessary non-wholeness of every human act. The solution was behavioristic, and existential. Behavioristic because the offered artwork (the text) was not theirs, it is a process of thought and existence of four people. The text is just a document or index of a process that is outside of the text, and it can belong to the game of life itself, the language of thoughts, or consciousness. The solution is existential since the members of the group have channelled their interests and activities from an analytical work (the exploration of language, text, the mental) towards existence itself (a social-psychological situation that emerges from a speech situation). In that direction, one of the goals of the group was to establish a commune. The range of the works of KÔD and (\exists was a paradoxical confrontation with two great ideals of contemporary art: the obsession with knowledge and the obsession with existence.

A case of analytical art: Vladimir Kopicl (Serbian edition, p.287)

Vladimir Kopicl⁵⁴⁰ was a member of (\exists and (\exists -KÔD groups that were created in Novi Sad during 1970 and 1971. Vladimir Kopicl, after several studies, abandoned simple conceptualizations and formal schematizations of the 'idea' and dematerialization of artwork in order to initiate the problem of textual analytical practice of the artist. While conceptual art, based on dematerialization of an artwork, aspired to substitute the object-as-artwork concept; in the analytical line of conceptual art the subject was

538 *Mladi umetnici i mladi kritičari 71*, Museum of Modern Art, Belgrade, 1972.

539 Nena Dimitrijević, Braco Dimitrijević (eds.), *In Another Moment*, SKC, Belgrade, 1971.

540 Miško Šuvaković, "Oko teksta i jezika – Ko je Vladimir Kopicl?", from: Miško Šuvaković, *Asimetrični drugi. Eseji o umetnicima i konceptima*, Prometej, Novi Sad, 1996, pp. 107–121; Nebojša Milenković, *Vladimir Kopicl. ništa još nije ovde ali neki oblik već može da mu odgovara...* Retrospektivna izložba, Museum of Contemporary Art of Vojvodina, Novi Sad, 2007

537 E. Franz (ed.), *Robert Barry*, Karl Kerber Verlag, Bielefeld, 1986.

the language or the art of nature. Unlike American conceptual artists (Ian Wilson, Robert Berry, Huebler, Winner), Kopicl does not follow the path of reduction but a path of textual transfiguration. He transfigured the language based on reference (mimetic text) into a text whose reference is the process of writing the text, of locating private language of thought of the one who is writing it down, thus he is the subject outside the text, talking through the text, transforming into the subject of the text (Barthes' paper subject). It was all possible only when text, textual practice, words, phrases, punctuation, auto-reflexion, writing exercises, bared quotes of quotes and logical constructions were set as the object and subject of artistic creation – as matter and phenomenon of shaping the discourse within discourse. The attitude that language is the matter of artistic work is only possible as the discourse of a higher level (meta-language) through which the artist comes out of his everyday surroundings of speech, writing, painting, running and enters a world of auto-reflexive analysis and demonstration of what writing down his/her being really is. When Kopicl talks about himself and his relationship with the text in the text (*I, IV 1971*)⁵⁴¹ he carries out the needed tasks of lexicography, grammar, language of writing, forwards and backwards, so as to frame an ontological viewpoint of the text, different from the ontological subject of writing, the object of description, and all the inter-propositions that make a conceptualist discourse. Kopicl's texts from between 1971 and 1973 (including the materials for the exhibition at the Young People's Tribunal), start from defining conceptual art ('Conceptual art is only what could not exist as such' or '...but in conceptual art the work is yet still recorded' or '...thus, conceptual art is not the one it is') in terms of negative heuristic (exploration that does not project a possible method or a vision of the world, but points out the paradox, the borders, cul-de-sacs and problems of talking of and being in the art), and go to discursive shaping of an absent visual shape ('between one and the other, the distance has been brought down with the same...' ⁵⁴² or 'outside of the one that was wanted to be (here)...' ⁵⁴³ or 'nothing (that by itself) still is not (is <is not>) here...' ⁵⁴⁴ 'nothing still is not here, but some form may already fit it' ⁵⁴⁵). The evolution from metadiscourse (negative heuristics) to the visual abstraction points out to the fitting of the language into language. Kopicl's work on the text, i.e. his variety of analytical art starts as explanatory (even negative) text and moves towards

the productivity of the text. Saying that text is productivity means that the textual alphabet presupposes, as its tactics, thwarting the descriptive orientation of the language and introducing one procedure that creates room for the full swing of its generative abilities, i.e. syntax artificiality, the discontinuity of transparent-nontransparent semantics and fictionality of pragmatics.

Conceptual art in Vladimir Kopicl's surroundings was not subordinated to the task of finding high objectless art, however, it did not have to do with expanding or opening a concept of art to the new media, witticism or puns. Quite the opposite, his work is strict, but not without irony or humour, a step outside the hermeneutical circles of expected art. In that sense, conceptual art and the corresponding textual practice are not Neo-Avant-garde projects (the renewal of the Avant-garde excess, novum and the project of social change in synthesis with a scientific view of the world), but critical and sceptic voices of modernism confronting the borders of seen, written, said and thought. Wittgenstein said that the borders of language are the borders of our world – and conceptual art has shown that the borders of the (art) world are not natural borders. While modernity mythologized an exceptional individual (the artist), who creates an autonomous world of images, poems or fleeing intuition, and postmodernity transcendentalized cultural arbitraries to universal laws of a semiotic creation of the world, beings, even art, the analytic line of conceptual art was more an invitation to doubt and withholding the judgment: 'A work of art is a record of awareness of the impossibility of recording a work of art.' ⁵⁴⁶ – said Kopicl. He showed that the text is the ambivalent space only of textual and non-fitted place-shaping subject in the text. A conclusion can be made that Kopicl's textual practice oscillates between the analytical text (a text that opens its structure tautologically, through autoreflexion) and the phenomenological text (a text by which an abstract propositional world of non-visual conceptuality is shaped). His works for the exhibition at the Young People's Tribunal (1973) use the already described textual, productive and phenomenological patterns – for example, from the poster of the exhibition we read 'nothing still is not here, but some form may already fit it'. However, the presentational media (slides, projections, a record of the writing procedure, just like on a film) place the text, based on discursive shaping of abstract propositional (non-visual) conceptualities, to a concrete space of visual presentation (the gallery) as visual presentation (projected image). With this Kopicl broadens his negative heuristics to the oppositions: visual space, projected text of tautological reticence (non-visual discursive shaping), the remnants (record) of the idea (mental image, state of things). Kopicl's ambientization has its relations to the slide-projections of Robert Berry, in which textual slides and photos interchange

541 Vladimir Kopicl, (*I, IV 1971*), from: Mirko Radojičić (ed.), 'Konceptualna umetnost', *Polja*, issue 156, Novi Sad, 1972, pp. 18.

542 Vladimir Kopicl, (*III/IV 1971*), from: Mirko Radojičić (ed.), 'Konceptualna umetnost', *Polja*, issue 156, Novi Sad, 1972, pp. 18.

543 Vladimir Kopicl, (*I/III*), from: Mirko Radojičić (ed.), 'Konceptualna umetnost', *Polja*, issue 156, Novi Sad, 1972, pp. 18.

544 Vladimir Kopicl, (*I/III*), from: Mirko Radojičić (ed.), 'Konceptualna umetnost', *Polja*, issue 156, Novi Sad, 1972, pp. 18.

545 Vladimir Kopicl, 'nothing still is not here, but some form may already fit it', a text on a poster on his one-man exhibition in the Visual Arts Hall of Young People's Tribunal, Novi Sad, 21st June to 21st July 1973.

546 Vladimir Kopicl, (*I, IV 1971*), from: Mirko Radojičić (ed.), 'Konceptualna umetnost', *Polja*, issue 156, Novi Sad, 1972, pp. 18.

in the articulation of time, or with textual ambients of Joseph Kosuth, Berry and Winner.

The exhibition held in the SKC Gallery in Belgrade 1976 was a surprise, in a way, since it showed an interruption in the textual practice. The interruption was emphasized also with confronting new studies (fabrics and threads) with samples of earlier textual works that were also exhibited. Kopicl exhibited a structural system based on knitting, the placing of threads in knitting, isolating threads from knitting, and pointing out to an idealized isolated thread (a golden thread). The exhibited works are visual, relief-like, tactile, of archetype-symbolic kind (Jungian primarity in the sense of structure and the kind of material, as well as the basic forms)⁵⁴⁷.

A controversy, from modernist critic over acritic to metacritic (Serbian edition, p.290)

Visual arts critic in Vojvodina during the 20th century passed through the typical phases – from literary-essayistic writing about it (Veljko Petrović⁵⁴⁸, Todor Manojlović⁵⁴⁹, Miloš Crnjanski), establishing a national history of art (Veljko Petrović, Milan Kasanin⁵⁵⁰) and critical writings of artists who created between the two world wars (Sava Šumanović, Petar Dobrović, Vasa Pomorišac), through soc-realistic propaganda and normative criticism (Oto Bihalji Merin, Đerđ Sabo⁵⁵¹, Stojan Trumić⁵⁵², Bosko Petrović⁵⁵³, Đorđe Bosan⁵⁵⁴), in the late 40s and 50s, to the criticism in the epoch of socialist modernism (Stojan Trumić⁵⁵⁵, Bela Duranci⁵⁵⁶, József Ács⁵⁵⁷, Imre Safranji⁵⁵⁸, Đorđe Jović⁵⁵⁹,

Miloš Arsić⁵⁶⁰, Grozdana Šarčević⁵⁶¹, Ana Baranji⁵⁶², Imre Bor⁵⁶³, among others), over the 60s to the 90s and the critics in the postmodernity (Miloš Arsić⁵⁶⁴, Sava Stepanov⁵⁶⁵, Svetlana Mladenov⁵⁶⁶, Andrej Tišma⁵⁶⁷ and others) of the 80s and 90s. This historization of the critic, only promised by this, shows a profiling of a discipline called ‘art criticism’ and the authority of the ‘art critic’ in the field of painting, sculpturing, graphics and photography in the field of art history. A crucial impact on forming modern and postmodern criticism in Vojvodina was provided by the methods of a Belgrade art history professor, Lazar Trifunović⁵⁶⁸, and Miodrag B. Protić⁵⁶⁹, the manager of the Contemporary Art Museum in Belgrade. They offered, through their works about criticism and art history, a methodological and normative model-paradigm for the development of Vojvodinian art criticism and the discourse of custodial practice in socialist Modernism and Postmodernism.

Based on that, a critical identification of art in Vojvodina as ‘Vojvodinian art’ was realized. It was a relatively coherent regionally-oriented idea of ‘Vojvodinian modern art’, via ideals of modern liberty and regional landscapism and intimism. A critic, Đorđe Jović, in his lengthy practice as a ‘Vojvodinian art critic’, which started in 1956, developed criticism discourse genres of art of the socialist Modernism: ‘texts for group exhibitions’, ‘texts for one-man exhibitions’, ‘monograph texts’, ‘television texts’⁵⁷⁰, while his discourse functioned as a discourse of a chronicler who identifies, contextualizes and judges current works of art. A discussion by Miloš Arsić, ‘Universal and local – Milan Konjović

547 Ješa Denegri, ‘Vladimir Kopicl’, *Umetnost*, issue 51, Belgrade, 1977, p.68

548 Predrag Protić, *Pisci kao kritičari pre Prvog svetskog rata: izabrani kritički radovi Jovana Dučića, Svetislava Stefanovića, Milana Ćurčina, Sime Pandurovića, Veljka Petrovića, Dušana S. Nikolajevića, Dimitrija Mitrinovića, Vladimira Gačinovića, Miloša Vidakovića, Milutina Bojića*, Matica srpska, Novi Sad, Institute for Literature and Art, Belgrade, 1979

549 Todor Manojlović, *Likovne kritike*, Public library ‘Žarko Zrenjanin’, Zrenjanin, 2007

550 Milan Kasanin, *Art and artists*, Bureau of text books and educational aids, Belgrade, 2004

551 Đerđ Sabo, *Đerđ Sabo likovni umetnik Vojvodine*, *Letopis Matice srpske*, issue 5-6, Novi Sad, 1948, pp. 377-380

552 Stojan Trumić, *Devedeset izložaba savremenih likovnih umetnika Vojvodine*, *Letopis Matice srpske*, Novi Sad, December 1950, pp. 643-644

553 Boško Petrović, *Već izložaba savremenih likovnih umetnika Vojvodine*, *Letopis Matice srpske*, December 1949, pp. 375-379; Boško Petrović, “Četvrta izložaba likovnih umetnika Vojvodine”, *Letopis Matice srpske*, December 1950, pp. 460-465

554 Đorđe Bosan, *Kritički beleške o savremenim likovnim umetnicima Vojvodine*, *Slobodna Vojvodina*, Novi Sad, 6th November, 1949

555 Stojan Trumić, *Eseji o vojvodanskim slikarima i drugi eseji*, Writers Association, Pančevo, 1997

556 Bela Duranci, *Umetničke kolonije*, Osvit, Subotica, 1989

557 József Ács, *Az izložaba vajvodanis kékalkar sorsomból*, *Letopis Matice srpske*, Novi Sad, January 1957, pp. 15; Jozef Ač, “Električni rekvijem Ferenc Mauritsa”, *Polja*, No. 166, Novi Sad, 1972, pp. 15; Jozef Ač, “Šta je naivna umetnost = Mi a naiv művész”, *Ulaznica*, No. 34-35, Zrenjanin, 1973, pp. 85-87

558 Imre Safranji, *Na tragu – putopisi, eseji, kritike*, Osvit Subotica, 1971

559 Đorđe Jović, *Savremeni likovni umetnici Vojvodine*, Novi Sad, 1975; Đorđe Jović, *Ka umetnosti – izbor tekstova*, Cultural Center ‘Olga Petrov’, Pančevo, 1987

560 Miloš Arsić (ed.), *Aktuelnosti u slikarstvu Vojvodine 1973–1993*, Contemporary Visual Arts Gallery, Novi Sad, 1994

561 Grozdana Šarčević (ed.), *Milan Kečić*, Mestna gallery, Ljubljana, 1976; Grozdana Šarčević (ed.), *Petrik Pal*, Contemporary Visual Arts Gallery, Novi Sad, 1979

562 Ana Baranji (ed.), *Nandor Glid*, City Museum, Subotica, 1990

563 Imre Bor, *Balazs G. Arpad*, Forum, Novi Sad, 1980

564 Miloš Arsić (ed.), *Stabilna konvencija slike – trenutak koji traje*, Museum of Contemporary Visual Arts, Novi Sad, 2002; Miloš Arsić (ed.), *Tradicija tautološkog – plastičke norme ne-konačnog*, Museum of Contemporary Visual Arts, Novi Sad, 2002; Miloš Arsić (ed.), *Paradoksi eklektičkog – Realne vrednosti kontinuiteta obnavljanja*, Museum of Contemporary Visual Arts, Novi Sad, 2003; Miloš Arsić (ed.), *Između geometrije i geometrijskog – Kontekst retrostanja*, Museum of Contemporary Visual Arts, Novi Sad, 2005.

565 See the catalogues published by the Center for Visual Culture “Golden Eye”, Novi Sad, from 1993; Sava Stepanov, *Potreba za slikom*, Contemporary Art Gallery of the Cultural Center ‘Olga Petrov’, Pančevo, 1998

566 Svetlana Mladenov (ed.), *Prilog novijoj istoriji vojvođanske skulpture*, Contemporary Art Gallery, Pančevo, 2002; Svetlana Mladenov, “Devedesete”, from: Jasmina Čubrilo, Svetlana Mladenov, Irina Subotić, Dušan Todorović, Suzana Vuksanović (eds.), *MADE + IN NOV I + SAD – Savremena umetnička scena*, Tableau Gallery, Novi Sad, 2006, pp. 10–12.

567 Andrej Tišma, *Sublimni objekti: primeri likovne umetnosti u Jugoslaviji na kraju 20. veka*, Prometej, Novi Sad, 2002

568 Lazar Trifunović, *Srpska likovna kritika – a selection*, SKZ, Belgrade, 1967; Lazar Trifunović, *Srpsko slikarstvo 1900–1950*, Nolit, Belgrade, 1973

569 First of all, methodological and normative influence on Vojvodinian criticism was done by monographic ‘decennial’ catalogues edited by Miodrag B. Protić in the Museum of Modern Art in Belgrade

570 Đorđe Jović, “Predgovor”, from: *Ka umetnosti – izbor tekstova*, Cultural Center ‘Olga Petrov’, Pančevo, 1987, pp. 7

and the landscapes of Vojvodina', shows a problem in a critical way, concerning the paradigm of 'Vojvodinian art'.

Instead of that, let's really say it, 'greatcoat of Konjović', out of which many 'Vojvodinian landscapists' came, the 'grand master' stands alone today with his views on art (we don't count other painters of Vojvodina) and his paintings. New times 'break down old idols', the ideal of, let's call it, 'Vojvodinian realism' (maybe even 'romanticism') is exchanged today for another, more European, more universal, current, more of a 'plastic objectivism'. People of the new art 'run away' from this artificial 'Vojvodinian bastion', while the desire for 'opening up' towards more general Yugoslav ways of art has prevailed over the 'need for a regional type of artist'⁵⁷¹.

Artistic and critical confrontation with the poetics and implied 'ideologies', and 'pragmatic politics' of the Vojvodinian regionalism, and, what is more, characteristics of projected socialist Modernism as provincial art was possible only in one excessive exit outside the art that happened in practice and theory of conceptual art at the transition between the 60s and the 70s.

As opposed to the values of moderate modernisms and, later, postmodernisms, a radical and experimental critical and custodial practice was offered by the Belgrade critic Biljana Tomić, Zagreb critic Zvonko Maković and the conceptual artist Mirko Radojičić⁵⁷² in the early 70s, and Balint Szombathy⁵⁷³ from the 70s to the 90s. In the art program of the Young People's Tribunal in Novi Sad the custodians were: Bogdanka Poznanović, Biljana Tomić and Zvonko Maković (1970); Biljana Tomić and Zvonko Maković (1971); Biljana Tomić, Mirko Radojičić, and Atila Cernik (1971–1972). During this period in the Art Lounge and the Center for Art of the Young People's Tribunal, exhibits were held by various artists: David Nez, Goran Trbuljak, Zoran Popović, Vladimir Kopić, Miša Živanović, Janez Kocijancic, Balint Szombathy, and Slavko Matković; there was a section of conceptual art from *Seventh Young Artists' Biennale in Paris*, then the works of Mangelos, Paul Pignon, Vladan Radanović, Andraz Salamun, and Tugomir Susnik, and there was also the first retrospective exhibition of *Zenit* after WWII. Neo-Avant-garde experimental, conceptual and postmodern practice in Vojvodina was supported also by a custodian, critic, and later a professor of modern arts history, Dr. Ješa Denegri⁵⁷⁴.

The first serious critique of mild modernist artistic critics were the works of Bogdanka and Dejan Poznanović (1977–1996). Dejan Poznanović⁵⁷⁵ was the editor-in-chief of the literary maga-

zine *Polja*, from 1958 to 1962, at a time when that magazine published the works of Slovenian, Croatian, and Macedonian artists, as well as artists from Vojvodina. He was actively translating from Slovenian, Macedonian and Russian. In his translation, the dramas *Congress* (1969) by Primož Kozak and *Liberation of Skoplje* (1979) were performed at Sterijino Pozorje. He was the first one to translate Slovenian texts about the work of a conceptual group OHO, by which he affected their promotion and joined with other tendencies of conceptual art in Yugoslavia and Novi Sad of the time. He published his literary research in many magazines: *Delo*, *Student*, *Vidici*, *Rok*, *Politika*, *Polet*, *Borba*, *Književnost*, *Književna reč*, *Scena*, *Književne novine*, *Letopis Matice srpske*, etc. In the atelier of Bogdanka and Dejan Poznanović a very influential exhibition, *A book as a place of exploration*, was held from 21st December 1974 to 18th January 1975. The books exhibited were by Marko Pogačnik, I. G. Plamen, Franci Zagoričnik, Matjaz Hanzeka, Milenko Matanović, Dreje Rotar, Miroljub Todorović, Olga Vicić, Slavko Bogdanović, Slavko Matković, Branko Andrić, Laszlo Kerekes, Slobodan Tišma, Žarko Rosulja, Bogdanka Poznanović, Predrag Sidanin, Atila Cernik, Balint Szombathy and others. The phenomenon of the 'book' as an object and space of artistic interventions was presented and documented by this exhibition.⁵⁷⁶

Bogdanka Poznanović introduced a critical approach to current art at the end of the 60s, based on *cold* and direct presenting of the information concerning modern international art. Her critical procedure⁵⁷⁷ was close to the *acritic critic* of Germano Celant. This is a method of criticism based on organizational, documentary and impersonal representation of a work of art. The term was introduced in 1970 by Italian critic Germano Celant, in order to show the demands that poor and conceptual art asks from the critics, starting from a theses by Susan Sontag that every subjective interpretation of art and the artistic work is an act of violence. The basic task of the critic is to document the events from the world of art, not to analyze, interpret and value the artistic work. A critic, like the artist, is not preoccupied with the aesthetic and the aesthetic character of his object, but with his own doing and acting in the concrete artistic and social conditions. A joint act is asked from criticism and art, since the criticism wants to cooperate, not to be a privileged interpretive discipline outside the contemporary world of art. Critical work gets a new active dimension: instead of judging or establishing, the critic becomes an accomplice in the articulation of a new movement or a concept of artistic exploration and expression. Criticism does not, however, become art, but establishes itself as a documentary practice that collects data about the work of an artist or a movement. It

571 Miloš Arsić, "Univerzalno i lokalno – Milan Konjović i vojvodanski pejzažisti", *Art*, issue 51, Belgrade, 1977, pp. 47

572 Mirko Radojičić (ed.), "Konceptualna umetnost", *Polja*, issue 156, Novi Sad, 1972

573 Szombathy Bálint, *Új idők, új művészet – Modernista törekvések Jugoszláviában századunk második felében*, Forum, Novi Sad, 1991

574 Ješa Denegri, *Fragmenti / šezdesete – devedesete / umetnici iz Vojvodine*, Prometej, Novi Sad, 1994

575 "Legat Bogdanke i Dejana Poznanovića", from: <http://www.kuda.org/?q=sr/node/612>

576 "The Book...", *WoW*, br. 3, Novi Sad, 1975, str. 4.

577 Miško Šuvaković, "Kritika, metakritika, kritika kritike, dekonstrukcija kritike", *Projekta**, issue 7, Novi Sad, 1996, pp. 33 and 47

instigates art, challenges its speech, and rejects its own. It offers documented and informational activity that allows direct understanding of artistic activity. New means of criticism are not just words, but film, photography, book, tape recorder, magazine, and exhibition. In this context of critical activities, for the scene in Novi Sad, most of all, the work of Bogdanka Poznanović was important, constitutional and influential. She published articles in the spirit of 'acritical criticism' in the magazine *Polja*, under the title 'Information About Visual Arts'.⁵⁷⁸ Close to this criticism procedure was Mirko Radojičić in organizing exhibitions (*Zenithism, Mangelos, Goran Trbuljak, OHO group*)⁵⁷⁹ at the Young People's Tribunal, and Vladimir Kopicl with the book *Body of an Artist as the Subject and Object of Art*.⁵⁸⁰

With his text 'A rulebook for the consumer of a *basic essay*'⁵⁸¹, Vladimir Kopicl stepped away from the formalist and then acritical criticism towards the meta-criticism and meta-art by setting one work of Slobodan Tišma, *The Square* (1970), as the object of analysis done through another artistic – analytically orientated conceptualistic – work. *Basic essay* is a breach in the real sense of the word, a step from one into another hermeneutics, a step out of literature (first degree discoursiveness) into conceptual art (second degree [meta]discoursiveness). *Basic essay* came to be as a text or a study about a study (drawing-text, drawing that is the second degree discourse or representation of Maljević's square). The study consists of five sheets of milimetric A4 paper and one page of 'A rulebook for the consumer of a *basic essay*'. It begins with a quotation from Amy Goldin: '...a critic tries, often at any cost, to interpret a work of art by itself, i.e. he tries to diagnose the degree to which an artist uses the possibilities of the medium'. It is followed by artificial logic (or as logic) second-degree writing that analyzes the aspects of Tišma's work. 'A rulebook for the consumer of the *basic essay*' says:

- 1) What the creator creates is a work of art.
- 2) Slobodan Tišma = creator.
- 3) 'Square' = work of art.
- 4) Work of art demands CRITICISM.
- 5) A CRITIC provides criticism.
- 6) Criticism shows WHAT the work of art IS.
- 7) Criticism shows HOW the work of art IS.

- 8) A work of art CONTAINS the possibility of an error.
- 9) Criticism ALLOWS for an error to be present.
- 10) Criticism POINTS OUT the presence of an error.
- 11) Criticism IS NOT ALLOWED to contain the possibility of an error.
- 12) Criticism MUST be infallible.
- 13) CRITICISM contains a certain method.
- 14) THE METHOD of the criticism MUST CORRESPOND TO THE FACTURE OF THE WORK OF ART.
- 15) Points of the 'Rulebook' 1-15 ARE CORRECT.
- 16) A consumer of the 'Basic essay' IS OBLIGED TO ACCEPT the points of the 'Rulebook' 1-15.
- 17) 'Basic essay' SATISFIES points 1-15 of the 'Rulebook'.
- 18) 'Basic essay' = CRITICISM.
- 19) Creator of the 'Basic essay' = A CRITIC.
- 20) The square is open.

The point of the described work is the movement of the artist through the hierarchy of the language about a language (metalanguage). In order to emphasize this hierarchy, the artist takes a work by another artist (Slobodan Tišma) as the object of analysis, which is usually possible as the analysis of criticism (the critic). However, the analysis is done with the untypical apparatus of criticism by combining the discourse of the natural utilitarian language with logically-symbolic descriptive writing, which takes elements of Tišma's drawing as propositions. The inversion appears at the moment when hierarchy of discourse about discourse (recognized in the span from critical to philosophical [logical] discourse) inverts into a work of conceptual art (language of the first degree). Inverting from higher discursive levels of criticism into first degree emerging of a work of art, even if it is conceptualistic, is an opening or a step outside the hermeneutical circle. This discursive analytically orientated change brought into question the status of canonical *gibberish* and the apparent apolitical status of modernist criticism, but also the *dumbness* of acritical criticism. What metacriticism brought to the edge is the possibility for criticism to be *aposteriori* practice of interpreting art that is already created, i.e. works of art. The critic had to join the scene and become an intervening factor in production of art. In the 80s and the 90s there will be a disappearance of 'traditional modernist' critic that interprets the work of art to the audience, and a new *character* – custodian, or, in jargon, a 'curator'. The custodian takes on the roles of both the actor and the performer of the art scene by way of an art project that now takes the place or artwork about a created neo-liberal and transitional system of art and culture. The critical position is replaced with a custodial position that sits between organizing artistic production, artistic and cultural politics. This paradigm has been set in the most developed way by a group/platform 'kuda.org' in the late 90s and the beginning of 21st century.

578 Bogdanka Poznanović, "Informacije o vizuelnim umetnostima", *Polja*, No. 140–141, Novi Sad, 1970, pp. 42–44; or "Informacije o vizuelnim umetnostima – Festival snega", *Polja*, No. 143, Novi Sad, 1970, pp. 40. Names and works of numerous international artists are also mentioned: Dufo, Cristo), Rubens Gerchman, Filippo Pansecà), Rafael Soto, Richard Long and others.

579 OHO KATALOG Prapradedovi, Young People's Tribunal, Novi Sad, 1969; *Zenitizam (predlog za jednu izložbu)*, Young People's Tribunal, Novi Sad, 1972; *Mangelos, Fenomen Picasso*, Young People's Tribunal, Novi Sad, 1972

580 Vladimir Kopicl, *Telo umetnika kao subjekt i objekt umetnosti*, Young People's Tribunal, Novi Sad, 1972

581 Vladimir Kopicl, "Pravilnik za konzumenta bazičnog eseja", *Index*, issue 209, Novi Sad, 1970

From conceptual through fundamental to postmodern art: the case of Gergej Urkom (Serbian edition, p.293)

Fundamental painting appears as the artists' application of 'analytical work' from conceptual art to a 'still autonomous' medium of painting (Gergej Urkom, Verbumpprogram and Dragomir Ugren) in the 70s and early 80s⁵⁸². Fundamental art is, paradoxically, an expression of minimalist and conceptualistic intentions, as well as anticipating, again, postmodernist interest in painting.

Gergej Urkom⁵⁸³ (Skorenovac, 1940) was born in a Hungarian community in Vojvodina. He studied in Belgrade. He worked with *Group of Six Artists* (Abramović, Milivojević, Paripović, Popović, Todosijević, Urkom)⁵⁸⁴ from SKC until 1973. He lived in London from 1973, and occasionally stays in Belgrade, Pančevo and Budapest. His work developed gradually from academically-modernistic figurative painting of the 60s towards processual and conceptual art of the early 70s, i.e. towards the fundamental, analytic and postmodern painting of the late 70s, 80s and 90s.⁵⁸⁵

At the beginning of the 70s, Urkom starts from a characteristic conceptualistic critical attitude towards the high socialist modernism and its aesthetic based on a vision that art work precedes language and knowledge of what art is by its original creative step forward. Urkom show that linguistic language, as a representative of propositions represented by intentional (and other higher cognitive) states, precedes the act of creation by setting an optical order in the painting. By forming a cross-section of discursive and visual, Urkom pointed out the correlations of linguistic, mental and visual in the processes of *perception* and *apperception* of painting. Observing a painting is not just an immediate experience of visual order in front of the eye, but also the gathering of knowledge of the optical order and the relationship brought about by this order between the intentions of the artist and the intentions of the observer. The image exists just by representing one optical order for all other optical orders (subjects in the optical relationship).

The painting of Gergej Urkom is focused on two problems:

(I) The optical and conceptual border of painting; and

(II) The optical and conceptual reconstruction of generative ways of building (painting) and establishing the painting as a work of art.

His painting is conceptual in the sense that he aims for a linear relationship of concept as a *pre-notion* for the painting generation, i.e. achievement of its material appearance. A series of paintings connected with the problem of 'inter-layer', exhibited in the Gallery of SKC in Belgrade in '77, is explicitly connected with the problem of language games in painting. Proposition is a conceptual scheme from which structural relations of colored layers of the painting are made. Proposition is the project that determines the painting, discovering the proposition in the painting at the same time. Translation from discursive to visual system (producing the painting) and from the visual to discursive system (the reception of the painting) are language games in which two different activities, typically with different ontological points of view are written one into the other. Writing an ontological point of view of discursive expression of proposition into a visual expression of proposition confronts the logic of discursive order and visual order. The final instance (ideal range) of Urkom's work is the ambition to show that, as you can express one proposition by different linguistic languages, so can one proposition be expressed with different language games (speech, diagrammatic schematism, painting): for example, the triptych *White Interlayer*⁵⁸⁶. A return to painting, for example, the series of paintings *Indicative Propositions* or *Images* (Serpentine Gallery, 1980) appears like a paradoxical penetration into the paradigm of new art after conceptual art. At a certain moment of achieving the fulfilment of optical completeness, i.e. self-sufficiency, to be an autonomous work of art, a painting as a theoretical object has separated itself from theoretical propositions and auto-reflexive intentions, being a self-sufficient, complete, fulfilled and present HERE, in its physical appearance. The painting becomes an autonomous aesthetic object. The propositions now appear as either that what precedes the work of art, but is no longer necessary for its reception, or as something extra that over-determines the work of art. In other words, Urkom has indexed those ontological moments of painting that show that painting is a discipline that possesses its own – inner – powers to produce itself as art and as history of art.

Anticipations of Postmodernism – towards postconceptual and eclectic Postmodernism (Serbian edition, p.295)

With Neo-Avant-garde experiments and conceptual art an essential change in understanding art in Vojvodina came about.

582 Suzana Vuksanović Soleša, "Prostor (i) slike: mišljenje slikarstva (Gergej Urkom, Verbumpprogram, Dragomir Ugren)", from: Dragomir Ugren (ed.), *Centralnoevropski aspekti vojvodanskih avangardi 1920–2000. ... Granični fenomeni, fenomeni granica*, Museum of Contemporary Visual Arts, Novi Sad, 2002, pp. 162–177.

583 "Gergej Urkom: Predviđam red novog reda" (interview with Gergej Urkom, by Ješa Denegri and Jovan Cekić), *Moment*, issues 23–24, Belgrade (1991) 1995; Miško Šuvaković, "Optička i konceptualna granica slikarstva – Gergej Urkom", from: *Asimetrični drugi*, Prometej, Novi Sad, 1996, pp. 131–144; Ješa Denegri, "Gergej Urkom", from: *Sedamdesete: teme srpske umetnosti – Nove prakse 1970–1980*, Svetovi, Novi Sad, 1996, pp. 140–147.

584 Jasna Tijardović, "Marina Abramović, Slobodan Milivojević, Neša Paripović, Zoran Popović, Raša Todosijević, Gergej Urkom", from: Marijan Susovski (ed.), *Nova umjetnička praksa 1966–1978*, Gallery of contemporary art, Zagreb, 1978, pp. 55–59

585 Ješa Denegri, *Monograf Gera Urkom*, Macura Publication, Vienna, 2005

586 Gergej Urkom, *Urkom*, Gallery of SKC, Belgrade, 1977

This change led to *hybrid atmospheres* of manifold and unclear actuality. Hybrid, manifold and unclear actuality of art meant the transition from the position of *international-local*, i.e. *margin-center*, to the position of synchronisation and historically stylish arbitrariness.⁵⁸⁷ Postmodernism is, therefore, called art, a culture based on criticism and overcoming of historically organized values, meanings, meaning and way of life inside internationalized modern societies, cultures and arts. Post-modernity is defined as a technical term of marking different tendencies, occurrences and individual practices in art and culture in the last two decades of the 20th century. Post-modernity wants to overcome modern cultural and artistic hegemonies. In a more narrow sense, Postmodernism or Postmodernist art is the art that was created from the late 70s based on the critique of the high Modernism cannon, that is the hegemonies and bureaucratically centered dominations of moderate or socialist Modernism. It was the source of practices like: bad painting, new image, pattern painting, Trans-Avant-garde, anachronism, neo-expressionism, the new wild, Retro-Avant-garde, perestroika art, techno-art and modernism after modernism, etc.⁵⁸⁸

In the specific Vojvodinian context post-modernity had a double 'impact':

- (1) Starting to free from poetic, aesthetic, even cultural dependence of marginal cultures on the big culture; and
- (2) Creating 'local' eclectic solutions inside global maps.

We can also say that conceptual art had shown that socialist moderate Modernism is not untouchable, but it can be criticised, subverted and rejected. A step towards the Post-modernism was done by some of the conceptual artists in the second half of the 70s or during the 90s: Slobodan Tišma has published a grand neoclassical and neo-symbolist poem 'The garden as it'⁵⁸⁹ (1977), in which he made a turn from auto-reflexive conceptualistic text 'Like someone'⁵⁹⁰ (1970), and in the early texts 'Sacral art of painting – sculpturing'⁵⁹¹ and 'Janus Gallery' (1973) anticipated the atmosphere of neoclassical and neo-romantic Postmodernism:

Today when not even my Indian eye can discern its own appearance (it meant so much once) on the surface of the lake, I, so far from the Birth, am ready to fall asleep in the Gallery. The

Exhibition and the Body of the artist will turn to stone. There will be dust alone, the complete and untouchable will remain. Colors will leave my body slowly. Colors will separate from the light and will turn dark. Body will become pure see through shape, and will have concentration of the light. The body will shine.

Will anything change in these paintings?

Will this change be noticeable in the mirrors?

Will the double body from the mirrors come close, join the body of the artist in sleep?⁵⁹²

Tišma promised an uncertain future for the mirroring powers of art between the body and the superior *spirit*.

Slobodan Tišma anticipated through his work another characteristic postmodern 'practice', and that is his entrance into the world of popular music (*rock, punk and new wave*). Tišma played in the new wave groups *La Strada* (1979) and *Luna* (1984).⁵⁹³ From the conceptualist context of *KÔD* group a new wave pop-rock band appeared – *Laboratorija zvuka* (1978), formed by brothers Peđa and Mladen Vranešević. The connection between conceptual art and the rock or new wave scene marked a significant critical and intellectual character of the Novi Sad music scene. On the other hand, conceptual artists taking part in the rock and new-wave scene meant that there is a significant postmodernist action that relativised the borders of high and popular culture. The *Punk* scene of Novi Sad⁵⁹⁴ has been developing since 1978 as a characteristic alternative world with anarchistic life style, cynical taste in fashion and eclectic character of graphic design (posters, flyers, record and CD sleeves). If this line of *rock, new age* and *punk* in Novi Sad is followed, one can get to the conceptual and ideological frame of the *EXIT* festival⁵⁹⁵ (founded in 2000). The *EXIT* festival signified a macro-cultural realisation of the alternative scene as it is becoming *mainstream*.

However, a resolute breakthrough from post-conceptualism towards the postmodernist para-stylistic practices was done by artists Laszlo Kerekes, Slavko Matković and members of *Verbumprogram* group, Ratomir Kulić (1948) and Vladimir Mationi.

Kerekes entered the adventure of brutal neo-expressionism in painting at the beginning of the 80s. He left conceptually orientated work (art analysis, space interventions, behavior of the artist as art) in order to create some paintings, although with strong gestures, but otherwise faulty (*No name*, 1984).

587 Hal Foster (ed.), *Postmodern culture*, Pluto Press, London, 1983; Ješa Denegri, Bojana Pejić, Tahir Lušić i Mileta Prodanović (eds.), "Era postmodernizma – umetnost osamdesetih", *Polja*, issue 289, Novi Sad, 1983; and 'Postmodernizam', *Republika*, issues 10-12, Zagreb, 1985

588 Achille Bonito Oliva, *The Italian Transavanguardia*, Giancarlo Politi Editore, Milano, 1980; Achille Bonito Oliva, *Transavanguardia International*, Giancarlo Politi Editore, Milano, 1982; Achille Bonito Oliva, *Avanguardia Transavanguardia*, Electa, Milano, 1982; Aleš Erjavec (ed.), *Postmodernism and the Postsocialist Condition. Politicised Art under Late Socialism*, California University Press, Berkeley, 2003

589 Slobodan Tišma, "Vrt kao to", *Letopis Matice Srpske*, issue ??, Novi Sad, 1977, p. ??

590 Slobodan Tišma, "Kao neko", *Index*, issue 207-8, Novi Sad, 1970, pp. 12

591 Slobodan Tišma, "Sakralna umetnost slikarstvo – kiparstvo", from: Miško Šuvaković (ed.), *Grupa KÔD, grupa (3, grupa (3-KÔD – Retrospektiva*, Contemporary Visual Arts Gallery, Novi Sad, 1995, pp. 84

592 Slobodan Tišma, "Galerija Janus", from: Miško Šuvaković (ed.), *Grupa KÔD, grupa (3, grupa (3-KÔD – Retrospektiva*, Contemporary Visual Arts Gallery, Novi Sad, 1995, pp. 84

593 Vladimir Jovanović, "Luna i La Strada – Intervju sa Slobodanom Tišmom", *XY Zabava*, issue 21, 1998, see also: www.akordi.co.yu/arhiv/ostali/luna.htm+Luna+La+strada&hl=en&ct=clnk&cd=2

594 Sava Savić, Igor Todorović, *Novosadska punk verzija – Prilog istoriji novosadske punk-hardcore scene: 1978–2005*, Novi Sad, 2006

595 Group of authors, *Knjiga nepotrebnih informacija*, Novi Sad, 2006

Matković's paintings are real 'outbursts' of gesture work through the color that transfers articulated basins (a series of paintings *I paint like that*, 1989). Kerekes and Matković succeeded to reach that level of uncontrolled brutality and 'spit-out' subjectivity that connected them to German painting of neo-expressionism, most of all the appearance of 'the new wild ones'.

A conceptual radicalization on the body of postmodernist productions: the case of *Verbumprogram* (p.298)

Verbumprogram group set their post-modern project 'new paintings' or 'retro paintings' through a slow and pedant development of post-geometric art that was close to American neo-geo painting of the 80s. The painting and sculpture production of *Verbumprogram*, started in 1985 (and finished, in this phase, in 1990), sets a sequence of characteristic aspects:

(1) The power of reconstruction and development (correction) of modernist geometrical abstraction;

(2) Establishing an ontological approach to painting (and sculptures); and

(3) Pointing out the border areas (and effects) of phenomenology and semiology of paintings (and sculptures).⁵⁹⁶

Kulić and Mationi, do not approach the 'geometrical' as simple and formally indicative sample of 'painting itself' as was done in Modernism, but as models, systems and effects of painters' practices that 'design' the visible world in the crevice between the aesthetics or the ideology of the 'new' and the 'retro' ideology. The idea of 'retroact' or 'retro-production', set or just anticipated in painters' and sculptors' productions of *Verbumprogram*, becomes the basic and obsessive 'object' of joy, simulation, derailment and provocation of the *Autopsia*⁵⁹⁷ project. *Autopsia* is an artistic project in music and visual productions. Various artists are taking part in multimedia projects. The project started in London in the late 70s, to continue in ex-Yugoslavia during the 80s, and from the early 90s, *Autopsia*, is active in Prague. Musical production is classified as experimental, Avant-garde, ambient or industrial. The role of graphic design is important and defining – they created various posters, flyers, CD sleeves, experimental films and audio-installation. Their work is connected to pop culture and the market. That is why they take performative modes of mystification as the strategy of power. Their projects, i.e. *Autopsia*, therefore function as a 'radical machine' that leads to the basic 'problem' of their work, and that is *death* and *compassion*.

596 Paintings *Achromia* (1985-89) and *Forma Occidit*, from the *Verbumprogramkatalog* catalogue, Contemporary Visual Arts Gallery, Novi Sad, 1995, il. XVII–XVIII and XIX–XX

597 <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Autopsia>

The case of Laszlo Kerekes: brutal expressionism after modernity (Serbian edition, p.299)

Neo-expressionisms⁵⁹⁸ were radically marked by the works of Laszlo Kerekes and Slavko Matković, and other noticeable works are by József Ács, József Klátik (1949), Ferenc Mauric, Milenko Prvacki (1951), or Vesna Olujić (1961) from the 80s and early 90s.

The (Neo) expressionist art of Laszlo Kerekes⁵⁹⁹ is based on auto-criticism and inverting of thoughts and realizations of processual and conceptual art, as well as on recycling the mimesis of expressionism as a historical style. He worked on brutal deconstruction conceptually and physically, i.e. on decomposing the metaphysics of expression and style as the context of expression of inner-necessity, anxiety, consciousness, and spiritual energy. His relationship towards the 'models of art' is specific, he fragments the lexis of allegoric, expressive and romantic historical painting to narrative colored traces and then doubles them in a postmodernist⁶⁰⁰ brutal, almost inexpert and parodic way. The pictorial topologies created thusly seem to be almost phrases or texts of speeches in some alien language. Its images, metaphorically, speak with a sensual appearance for the *language of the Other*. Lack of understanding is a form of translation that eclectic post-modernity uses lucidly, destroying stable criteria of vision. An important characteristic of Kerekes' work is in producing differences in comparison with conceptual idealism of processual and conceptual art, as if the artist shows via his mind and body that one paradigm – processual and conceptual art – experiences a catastrophic end becoming its own contradiction. The intellectually orientated post-Duchamp artist becomes a *sensual creature*, directed towards the appearance of the material of art, that is, a subversive participant becomes an ecstatic and erotic subject, a cynical anarchist becomes a funny parodist of historical iconographies and themes of Modernism. Kerekes shows that expressionism, i.e. the expression of one's inner otherness, is nothing but mimesis (a re-presentation, copy, quote, paraphrase, simulacrum) of archived historical expressionisms. Paradoxically, originality and authenticity inside the practice of neo-expressionism shows up in the fact that there is no original 'matrix' expression, that there are only re-presentations of re-presentations (the signs of signs, mimeses of mi-

598 Miloš Arsić (ed.), *Aktuelnosti u slikarstvu Vojvodine 1973–1993*; Contemporary Visual Arts Gallery, Novi Sad, 1994

599 Laszlo Kerekes, Koprivnica Gallery, Koprivnica, 1983; *Laszlo Kerekes*, Likovni susret Gallery, Subotica, 1985; *Umjetnost – kritika usred osamdesetih*, Collegium artisticum, Sarajevo, 1986; *Laszlo Kerekes*, catalogue, Center for the Young, Osijek, 1987; *Yugoslavian documents '87*, Olympic Center 'Skenderija', Collegium artisticum, Sarajevo, 1987; *Yugoslavian documents '89*, Olympic Center 'Skenderija', City Galleries of Sarajevo, 1989; Ješa Denegri, "Laszlo Kerekes", from: *Fragmenti – šezdesete–devedesete umetnici iz Vojvodine*, Prometej, Novi Sad, 1994

600 "Era postmodernizma – umetnost osamdesetih", *Polja*, issue 289, Novi Sad, 1983

mesis). Kerekes's art is post-semiological art in the sense that he shows that historical signs of 20th century expressionism have doubles in the endless portraying of human drama. The signs appearing in his paintings (iconic and non-iconic signs of expressionism) are brutally deformed into empty matter and affective vibrations of color, which is a trace – in fact, an erased trace of painting is the marker of a painting.

Kerekes's brutality is the brutality of 'meaningless violence' that was brought about by urban and accelerated postmodern arbitrariness. He shows his impotence and anger that comes from historical finiteness of painting, the utopia of modernism. Out of the impotence of art to become the new history comes the brutal cut through the colored body of a painting. Out of impotence to make this art alive, painting is ecstatically lived in its dramatic tendency to 'devour' its own histories – modernity, tradition. Cannibalism of the painter who devours painting becomes a way for painting to survive, at least for the moment, as an ecstatic flash.

Art in the age of opaqueness: from plurality of Postmodernism to globalism (Serbian edition, p.301)

In Vojvodinian art of the 80s and 90s appeared several different strategies of artistic work that were searching for a post-modernist *expression*, realizing the postmodernist demands of post-historicism, eclecticism and starting the deconstruction of postmodernist arbitration. In other words, a clear difference can be noticed in Vojvodinian art between postmodernist phenomena and the phenomenon of art in the age of culture, i.e. art in the epoch of globalism.

New decorativeness is the postmodern realization of art based on ornamentalization of the painting surface or doing patterns or other abstract or decorative schemes whose goal is not the conceptualization of the painting face, but achieving the decorative aesthetics, which means visually sensual impression (Vladimir Tomić [1948], Rada Čupić [1951], Dragan Jankov [1961], Lidija Srebotnjak-Prišić [1961], Pal Dečov [1951])⁶⁰¹.

The occurrence of *second modernity*⁶⁰² or *modernity after postmodernity*⁶⁰³ appears as *hard* and *centered* criticism, and deconstruction of *soft* postmodernist eclecticism, turning towards historical thematization of romanticism, expressionism, geometric abstraction, in the name of post-historical re-examination of the language and the borders of high modernity

(Dragomir Ugren [1951], *Verbumprogram*, Petar Lolić [1950], Miroslav Pavlović [1952], Rastislav Škulec, Ratomir Kulić). The paradox of *second modernity* is in that only through problem perspective of postmodernist deconstruction could highly sophisticated and autonomous painting, sculpting and ambient results be achieved, and which were not being achieved at the time of moderate socialist Modernism, high socialist Modernism, and late socialist Postmodernism from the end of the 50s to the early 80s. Critical and exhibitional promotional appearance of *Modernism after Postmodernism* created a turbulent discussion on the Serbian artistic scene in mid-90s. The discussion started over theoretical and custodial set-up of the problem of the Modernism and Postmodernism relationship at the *First Young Artists' Biennale*⁶⁰⁴ in Vršac, 1994. The reason for the discussion was Ješa Denegri's text 'Priority of form and the new spirituality in the art of the 90s'.⁶⁰⁵ The discussion started at the symposium 'Modernism after Postmodernity'⁶⁰⁶, with the critical presentations of Lidija Merenik and Dejan Sretenovic. Later on the discussion spread to a large number of critics, historicists and theoreticians of art (Lidija Merenik, Sava Stepanov, the author of this text, Slavko Timotijevic, Đorđe Kadijevic, Andrej Tišma and others) during the second half of the 90s. The discussion polarized concerning the stand points in relation with the autonomy of art and the artistic engagement, i.e. the real or the apparent confrontation of formalism and anti-formalism in contemporary Serbian art of the 90s. On the other hand, it was a question of distribution of custodial, critical and theoretical powers in Belgrade and Serbia between various criticist-custodial groups. A number of artists were involved in the discussion: Dragomir Ugren, Mirjana Đorđević, Ivan Ilić, Marija Vauda, Nikola Pilipović, Zoran Naskovski, Aleksandar Dimitrijević, Neša Paripovic, Ratomir Kulić and others. With his radical painting⁶⁰⁷, custodial⁶⁰⁸

604 Under the name of *Yugoslavian Young Artists' Biennale* five exhibitions were held, organized by the Center for Contemporary Culture 'Konkordija' in Vršac from 1994 to 2002. Head of all five biennales was the painter Živko Grozdanić. Artistic directors of the biennale were: Sava Stepanov (1994, 1995), Lidija Merenik (1998), Jovan Cekić (2000) and Slavko Timotijevic (2002)

605 Catalogue of the *First Yugoslavian Young Artists' Biennale*, Konkordija, Vršac, 1994

606 Lidija Merenik, Dejan Sretenović, "Simpozijum – moderna posle postmoderne", *Zlatno oko*, issue 1, Novi Sad – Vršac, 1994, pp. 65-67

607 Ješa Denegri, Sava Stepanov and Miško Šuvaković, *Dragomir Ugren – Slike posle slikarstva*, IKA Prometej, Novi Sad, 2001

608 He was the director of a Contemporary Visual Arts Gallery and the Museum of Contemporary Art in Novi Sad from 1992 to 2002. In the period of his director work many retrospective and authorial exhibitions have been done: Ješa Denegri, Miloš Arsić, Petar Čuković (eds.), *Rane devedesete – jugoslovenska umetnička scena*, Contemporary Visual Arts Gallery, Novi Sad, 1993; Miško Šuvaković (ed.), *Retrospektiva: Grupa KOD, (Ei) (EKOD)*, Contemporary Visual Arts Gallery, Novi Sad, 1995; *Verbumprogram-katalog*, Contemporary Visual Arts Gallery, Novi Sad, 1995; Šuvaković, M., Denegri, J. (eds.), *Prestupničke forme devedesetih. Postmoderna i avangarda na kraju XX veka*, Museum of Contemporary Art, Novi Sad, 1998; Dragomir Ugren (ed.), *Fatalne devedesete: strategije otpora i konfrontacija – Umetnost u Vojvodini krajem XX i početkom XXI veka*, Museum of Contemporary Art, Novi Sad, 2001; Dragomir Ugren, Nebojša Milenković (eds.), *Neuporedivi identiteti – Kolekcija vojvođanske umetnosti za Muzej XXI veka*, Museum of Contemporary Visual Arts, Novi Sad, 2003; and the concept of the new Museum of Contemporary Art, see: Dragomir Ugren (ed.), *Muzej savremene likovne umetnosti Novi Sad*, Museum of Contemporary Visual Arts, Novi Sad, 2001

601 Miloš Arsić (ed.), *Aktuelnosti u slikarstvu Vojvodine 1973–1993*; Contemporary Visual Arts Gallery, Novi Sad, 1994

602 Hajnrih Kloc, *Umetnost u XX veku / moderna – postmoderna – druga moderna*, Svetovi, Novi Sad, 1995

603 Tomaž Brejc, *Iz modernizma v postmodernizem I & II – eseji*, Artes Edition, Coastal Galleries, Piran, 2000

and editorial engagement in books about contemporary art⁶⁰⁹, and the magazine *Projekta*t*⁶¹⁰ (Novi Sad), Dragomir Ugren came out as the central figure of *second modernity* and the new painting and ambient abstraction.⁶¹¹

The new sculpture marks, in principle, three sometimes connected occurrences: postmodern eclectic sculpture, sculpture of the second modernity and the 'new sculpture' in the style of the British new sculpture.⁶¹² The *new sculpture* is characterized by performing the 'narrative' through plastic means, opening the sculpture to the outside and the transforming of the sculpture as a piece into the installation of pieces – people who worked in this area: Igor Antić⁶¹³ (1962), Mira Brtko, Živko Grozdanić, Dragan Jelenković (1959), Miroslava Kojić (1949), Slobodan Kojić (1944), Ratomir Kulić / *Verbumprogram*, Zoran Pantelić, Dragan Rakić (1957), Rastislav Škulec⁶¹⁴, Zvonimir Santrač (1952), Branislav Petrić (1959), and Jelena Janev⁶¹⁵ (1972). Searching for new sculpture in the domain of spatial exploration (ambient and installations) are Manojlo Maravić (1977) and Goran Despotovski.

The new abstraction in painting is connected to developments, renewals, simulations, researches and reinterpretations of artistic productions and postproductions during the 90s and the first years of the 21st century. The question of 'painting' and art has been treated from painters' installations to statuses, functions and effects of painting in the context of new media artistic and mass productions, that is, in searching for the limits of manually produced paintings inside the paradigms

of art.⁶¹⁶ What stands out are the research and the works of Ratomir Kulić and Vladimir Mationi, Dragomir Ugren, Živko Grozdanić, Zdravko Santrač (1954), Zvonimir Santrač, Rajko Petković, Miroslav Pavlović, Dušan Junackov, Mira Brtko, Vesna Petrović, Rastislav Škulec, Ljubiša Bogosavljević, Rade Čupić, Goran Despotovski, Jozef Klacik (1949), the group *Emisao* (B. Petrić, D. Stojanović), Nikola Džafa, Dušan Stošić (1977) and others.

Post-pop-art or the post-nova figuration of the 80s and the 90s are hybrid practices in painting⁶¹⁷, performance, photography and video, that were turned towards the presenting or expressing urban social atmosphere, discourse of popular culture and cultural otherness in the contemporary stratified life: Miodrag Miljković (1956), Ljubiša Bogosavljević (1960), Milan Blanuša (1943), Tibor Bada Dada, Dr. Marijaš, Stevan Markuš⁶¹⁸ (1962), and Slobodan Wiltschek Willy (1963). Characteristic are also the works of Ljubiša Bogosavljević, *Mija the bat* (1984), Miodrag Miljković, *Alone* (1985), Bada Dada, *The monster of Palić retreats* (second half of the 80s), Dr. Marijaš, *The Chessplayer* (1989), and Milan Blanuša *Schatten der engel* (1990-91) or Stevan Markuš *Everybodykid* (2001). Some productions in the first decade of 21st century are also connected with the relations of public and private, exhibitionistic or intimist, media images (photographies, TV, computer screen) and paintings.

Milica Mrđa Kuzmanov⁶¹⁹ (1960) initiated the project *Dada Symposion* (Katolička porta, Novi Sad, 12th December, 1992). *Dada Symposion* was a mass spectacle devoted to the 70th anniversary of Yugo-Dada Dragan Aleksić.⁶²⁰ In the area of Katolička porta, a cubo-futuristic stage was set, over which there was a defile of masked participants (Slavko Matković, Vojislav Despotov and others). Around 400 Dadaist collages by students of primary schools in Novi Sad were exhibited and were given away to visitors. All this happened next to a large crane, a fire engine and a refrigerator truck of the Novi Sad abattoir. It was a Post-Avant-garde work, meaning a complex event that re-actualizes, summons, quotes and transfigures

609 Ješa Denegri, *Fragmenti / Šezdesete - devedesete / umetnici, iz Vojvodine*, Prometej, Novi Sad, 1994; Kosta Bogdanović, *Svest o obliku II*, Prometej, Novi Sad, 1995; Lidija Merenić, *Belgrade: osamdesete – nove pojave u slikarstvu i skulpturi 1979-1989 u Srbiji*, Prometej, Novi Sad, 1995; Miško Šuvaković, *Autoporeti. Eseji o Neši Paripoviću*, Prometej, Novi Sad, 1996; Miško Šuvaković, *Asimetrični drugi. Eseji o umetnicima i konceptima*, Prometej, Novi Sad, 1996; Miško Šuvaković, *Politika tela. Eseji o Slavku Bogdanoviću*, Prometej and K21K, Novi Sad, 1997; Ješa Denegri (ed.), *Clement Greenberg, Ogledi o posleratnoj američkoj umetnosti*, Prometej, Novi Sad, 1997; Ješa Denegri (ed.), *Harold Rosenberg, Ogledi o posleratnoj američkoj umetnosti*, Prometej, Novi Sad, 1997; Miško Šuvaković, *Pojmovnik moderne i postmoderne likovne umetnosti i teorije posle 1950*, SANU and Prometej, Belgrade and Novi Sad, 1999; Miško Šuvaković, *Luminokinetika. Eseji o Kolomanu Novaku*, Prometej, Novi Sad, 1999.

610 First issue of *Projekta*t* – časopis za vizuelne umetnosti came out in May 1993, in Novi Sad. Editorial board: Grozdana Sarčević, Ljiljana Ivanović, Miloš Arsić, Balint Szombathy, Kosta Bogdanović and Ješa Denegri, editor-in-chief Dragomir Ugren. Publisher: Contemporary Visual Arts Gallery in Novi Sad. From the fourth issue the editorial board are: Ješa Denegri, Kosta Bogdanović and Balint Szombathy. Publisher: IK Prometej, Novi Sad. 15 issues were published.

611 Dragomir Ugren (ed.), "Hijatusi modernizma i postmodernizma. Jedna teorijska kontroverza", *Projekta*t*, issue 11-15, Novi Sad, 2001

612 G. Beal, L. Cooke, C. Harrison, M. J. Jacob (eds.), *A Quiet Revolution – British Sculpture Since 1965*, Thames and Hudson, London, 1987

613 Igor Antić 1994-1995, catalogue, Novi Sad, 1995

614 Katalog *Apsolutno Rastislav Škulec – Permanentna kriza*, Contemporary Visual Arts Gallery, Novi Sad, 1994

615 Suzana Vuksanović (ed.), *Nova skulptura u Vojvodini 1980-2000*, Museum of Contemporary Art of Vojvodina, Novi Sad, 2006

616 Miloš Arsić (ed.), *Stabilna konvencija slike – trenutak koji traje*, Museum of Contemporary Visual Arts, Novi Sad, 2002; Miloš Arsić (ed.), *Tradicija tautološkog – plastičke norme ne-konačnog*, Museum of Contemporary Visual Arts, Novi Sad, 2002; Ješa Dneegri (ed), *Slikarstvo, Konkordija, Vršac*, 2003; Miloš Arsić (ed.), *Između geometrije i geometrijskog – Kontekst retrostanja*, Museum of Contemporary Visual Arts, Novi Sad, 2005, and Miško Šuvaković (ed), *Hibridno imaginarno: slikarstvo i/ili ekran – O slici i slikarstvu u epohi medija*, Museum of Contemporary Art of Vojvodina, Novi Sad, 2006; catalogues of the Vršac cplony *Tragom Paje Jovanovića*, Cultural Center Vršac and Center for Visual Culture Zlatno oko Novi Sad, 2005, 2005, 2007.

617 Miloš Arsić (ed.), *Aktuelnosti u slikarstvu Vojvodine 1973-1993*; Contemporary Visual Arts Gallery, Novi Sad, 1994; Szombathy Baling catalogue, *drMáriás képzőművészete*, A38 Kulturális Kht. – Magyar Műhely Kiadó, Budapest, 2007

618 Zoran Eric, 'Stevan Markuš', *Projekta*t*, issue 3, Novi Sad, 1994, p. 89

619 Ješa Denegri, "Milica Mrđa Kuzmanov", from: *Devedesete: teme srpske umetnosti (1990-1999)*, Svetovi, Novi Sad, 1999, pp. 204-206

620 Milica Mrđa Kuzmanov, "EX NIHILO ili altruistički projekt duše", *Projekta*t*, issue 6, Novi Sad, 1995, p. 89

historical shapes of Avant-garde behavior and activities. People contributing to the spectacle, especially students of primary schools, were 'recruited' into the membership of a new artistic performance group. Ideas and gestures of scandals, liberty and actionism were offered as a large interventionist city spectacle.

A special phenomenon in the art of the 90s was the political and the activist⁶²¹ art in late socialist, post-socialist and transitional society. Post-socialism is a *post-modern condition* or *state (condition of post-modernity)*⁶²² of ex-real-socialism states/countries, i.e. cultures. It is described as the transit period between the bureaucratic real-socialist society and a liberal market-orientated late capitalism. Post-socialism is characterized, above all, by the paradoxical connection of various and confronting socio-political systems and ways of production and consumption inside a culture. It is the matter of the relationship of a concrete social order (confrontation of the material institutions of real-socialism and setting up of the market relations of late capitalism) and fictional social order (confrontation of presentation forms of pre-modern sources of nation and society, skipped/censored phases of Modernism in the period of real-socialism and unachieved forms of expenditure or hedonism of late capitalism). In the artistic sense, post-socialism is characterized by a system of art presentation that is a *symptom* of real-socialist ideological powers (phantasms), which means some sort of subversive production of the *wrong meaning*, as in Russian perestroika art, or the Chinese cynical realism, or Slovenian retro-garde. Politically orientated art of the 90s in Vojvodina comes as a reaction to the dramatic breakdown of the second Yugoslavia⁶²³, but also as the 'practice' that was supported by the transitional processes of emancipation of a late socialist society into a 'transitional' liberal capitalistic society. With that, Vojvodinian political art of the 90s emerges in the frame bordered by 'post-modern eclecticism' of connecting the incompatible promised by the Russian perestroika art (Živko Grozdanić, Zvonimir Santrač) and 'death of the symbols' (*Autopsia*), as well as media and bodily provocations of the horizon of constituting new national states (Balint Szombathy)⁶²⁴ or introducing activist⁶²⁵ practices

(*Led Art*, *Art klinika*, Nikola Džafo) and the craft of activism that is brought to the artistic practice as the institution of performing *cultural politics* (groups *Apsolutno*, *Kuda.org*, Zoran Pantelić). Zvonimir Santrač created two monumental allegoric works – *The Balkan Train of Destiny* (1996) – made of a composition of train carriages with dangerous contraptions attached, and an installation, *The Wall* (Konkordija, Vršac, 1998), which is set as a brick corridor with pointed pieces of glass protruding out of it. Both of this works are an 'allegoric provocation' described by the time of the 90s.⁶²⁶ On the other hand, it can be supposed that certain provocative and critical Internet actions of a fictional screen 'para-terrorist' character Leon di Zampe come from the scenes of Belgrade and Novi Sad. It is a digital post-situational comic, i.e. web-site⁶²⁷ and a fanzine: Zampa di Leone, *In the Ass of the Balkans 2000-2005*. This parodies comic and provokes the transitional system of art and artistic institutions in the area of ex-Yugoslavia and the Balkans. At the scenes of the transition of Balkan art, a 'raw' discourse of parody and grotesque known in politics is introduced, i.e. a *Performance* of political or national hatred through which the brutality of neo-liberalization and claustrophobia of transitional actuality.⁶²⁸

A specific genre of photography, also known as 'photograph of the artist' was set up in conceptual art and developed to post-conceptual and neo-conceptual art of today. The photograph of the artist is characterized by institutional use of photography as a medium by the visual artist who explores or produces visual discourse on art and artist (conceptual art) or culture and society (post-modern artist, artist in the age of globalism). The photograph of the artist becomes important in different 'uses' of the photographic medium: from performance documents, over narrative photography, to different photographic discourses in mass and popular culture. The photograph of the artist was used by conceptual and post-conceptual artists: Mirko Radojičić, Miroslav Mandić, Slobodan Tišma and Čeda Drča, Vladimir Kopić, Slavko Bogdanović, Balint Szombathy, Slavko Matković, Laszlo Kerekes, *Verbumprogram*, Ratimir Kulić⁶²⁹, Bogdanka Poznanović, Katalin Ladik and others. In post-modern and art in the age of globalism, the medium of photography was used by Balint Szombathy,

621 The general theory of political and activist art was developed by Marina Gržinić (*Fiction Reconstructed – Eastern Europe, Post-Socialism & The – Retro-Avant-Garde*, Springerin, Vienna, 2000) and Inke Arns (*Avantgarda v vzvratnem ogledalu – Sprememba paradigme recepcije avantgarde v (negdanji) Jugoslaviji in Rusiji od 80. let do danes*, Maska, Ljubljana, 2006)

622 Ales Erjavec (ed.), *Postmodernism and the Post-socialist Condition. Politicised Art under Late Socialism*, California University Press, Berkeley, 2003

623 Dejan Sretenović (ed.), *Art in Yugoslavia 1992-1995*, SCCA, Belgrade, 1996; Ješa Denegri, *Opstanak umetnosti u vreme krize*, Cicero, Belgrade, 2004; Branislava Anđelković, Branislav Dimitrijević, Dejan Sretenović, Borut Vild (eds.), *O normalnosti: umetnost u Srbiji, 1989–2001*, Museum of Modern Art, Belgrade, 2005

624 Nebojša Milenković (ed.), *Szombathy Art*, Museum of Contemporary Visual Arts, Novi Sad, 2005

625 The term 'activism' is used according to the term from Croatian-Slovenian theoretician Aldo Milohnić, from: 'Performing Action, Performing Thinking', *Maska*, issue 1-2 (90-91), Ljubljana, 2005, pp. 15-25

626 Ješa Denegri, "Ogromni, dugački, preko normalne ljudske mere...", from: Miško Šuvaković, Ješa Denegri (eds.), *Prestupničke forme devedesetih. Postmoderna i avantgarda na kraju XX veka*, Museum of Contemporary Visual Arts, Novi Sad, 1998, pp. 42; Ješa Denegri, "Vršačka umetnička scena devedesetih: Živko Grozdanić i Zvonimir Santrač", from: *Devedesete: teme srpske umetnosti (1990–1999)*, Svetovi, Novi Sad, 1999, pp. 212-218

627 <http://www.various-euro.com/zampa/>; <http://seecult.org/v-web/gallery/ZampaDiLeone>

628 Sezgin Boynik, "Learning from underground" (2006): <http://zeitgenoessischekunstserbien.blogspot.com/2006/07/sezgin-boynik-lernen-vom-underground-1.html>; Suzana Milevska, "Inscenirana (ne)vidljivost" (2005), <http://eipcp.net/transversal/1202/milevska/en>

629 Ratimir Kulić, *Amorfoze*, Museum of Contemporary Visual Arts, Novi Sad, 2004

Jaroslav Supek⁶³⁰, Živko Grozdanić, Zvonimir Santrač, Milica Mrđa Kuzmanov, *Led Art*, *Art klinika*, Nikola Džafo, Ivan Grubanov (1976), Stevan Markus, Ljubomir Maksimov (1972), *Apsolutno*, *Kuda.org*, Zorica Čolić (1977), Biljana Klarić (1973), Jelena Kovačević Jureša (1974), Jelena Kovačević (1975), Lidija Srebotnjak, Marko Stojanović (1982), and Zsolt Kovács (1975). Photography, digital prints above all, became a dominant medium in visual productions of contemporary art at the transition between the 20th and 21st centuries, and it appears from 'framed photograph', to projected photograph, to photo objects and installations.

Video art⁶³¹ appeared through a slow process of exploration and use of the 'new medium' to setting up of the production means in performing neo-conceptual and culturally orientated exploration in contemporary culture and society. Pioneer work on video was started by Bogdanka Poznanović, Balint Szombathy, Predrag Sidanin (1953), and developed new media practice were set up by Lidija Srebotnjak, Vesna Tokin (1969), Nataša Teofilović, Aleksandar Davić (1961), Dragan Jelenković, Željka Jović (1973), Ksenija Kovačević (1974), Katarina Šević (1979) and others. For promotion and development of video art, pedagogical activity of Bogdanka Poznanović and Lidija Srebotnjak was important, at the Academy of Arts in Novi Sad, and also the opening of 'Visual Studio' and the Department of Inter-medial Research, also at the Academy of Arts in Novi Sad, then the NGO-festival *VideoMedeja*. It was started by Vera Kopić at the end of 1996, within *Network of Female Initiatives Multimedia* and *Artistic Association Apostrophe*, while the initiative to gather several initiatives on one project was provided by the Fund for Open Society. The first *VideoMedeja* festival was held in 1996, it was an international video summit of authors from Eastern Europe. The next festival was not regional, and in 1998 the festival becomes independent. The art director of the festival was Vera Kopić. Other people who worked on the festival as selection bodies and editors were: Biljana Tomić, Lidija Srebotnjak, Balint Szombathy, Kathy Rae Huffman, Nina Czegledy, Dragana Žarevac and others. Video works of the following artists were presented: Marina Abramović, Tanja Ostojić, Breda Beban, Sanja Iveković, Jasmila Zbanic, Yenin Higgins, Pari Bard, member of VHS Matrix, Marina Gržinić, Emma Kugler, Milica Tomić, Alicija Zebrowska and others. *VideoMedeja*, as an international festival, marked the transitional and global processes on the artistic scene of Novi Sad in the 90s.⁶³²

In the late 90s and the first decade of the 21st century, a different new media practice becomes important. New media practices are artistic productions based on programmatic digi-

tal technologies (computer art with its subforms: internet-art, cyber art, digital design). The pioneer of the 'communicational experiment' is Balint Szombathy who researched different shapes and ideologies of communication, from mail-art to teleprinter fax art and digital graphics. Vesna Todorović Miksić (1956, Novi Sad) got her degree at the Academy of Arts in Novi Sad, her master's degree in video and photography at Syracuse University, in New York state. She worked with installations, digital photography, video and cable TV. She worked as a lecturer of 'new media' and 'interdisciplinary arts' in various artistic schools in the USA during the 80s and 90s⁶³³. In the domain of exploration and interdisciplinary *ideologies* were: group *Apsolutno*, Andrej Tišma (1952), Karolina Mudrinski⁶³⁴ (1973), Nataša Teofilović, Vesna Tokin, Srđan Jovanović Weiss, Biljana Klarić, Lidija Srebotnjak, Đula Santa, *Urtica* (founded in 1999), Radišić/Trkulja Production (p.RT™), Vladan Joler (1977), and Mirko Žarković (19??). Some authors use visual phenomenology and others use the semantics of the new media in outlining a work of art. They turn to procedures of pictorial presentation and transferring mass media electronic images into the 'traditional medium of painting' (Danijel Babić [1967], Jelena Janev, Dejana Nešović [1976], Igor Vlasisavljević [1965] and others)⁶³⁵.

Art in the age of culture is a complex macro-phenomenon of artistic productions that gets more active in the second half of the 90s, and the beginning of the 21st century. These phenomena and numerous artistic practices are short media circuits or corridors between the field of *art* and the field of *culture*. There is movement where art turns to culture – production, multiplication, exchange, use, application, but also the enjoying of 'phenomenality' or 'sense' of art as an artefact of every day life – by which culture is incorporated into art (quotations, collages, montages, paraphrases, simulation, *memis of mimesis*, use, *ready-made*, transfiguration, transformation, intertextuality). Between the theory of art and theory of culture, today, there (seems to be) various transparent, soft (shaping) and porous (through or over) borders. This is about artistic practices of research and testing of transparency, softness and porousness of relationships between contemporary mega-cultures and *macro-ideological practices and art systems* (Western Europe, North America, countries of post-socialism, transitional societies, the Third World countries) towards the micro-cultures and activating local knowledge, power, identity, etc. By way of a model of identification and presenta-

630 Catalogue Jaroslav Supek – Suva planina – Zaplanje – Umetničko događanje 1995-2004, Museum of Contemporary Visual Arts, Novi Sad, 2004

631 Dejan Sretenović (ed.), *Video umetnost u Srbiji*, CSU, Belgrade, 1999

632 Vera Kopić (ed.), *VideoMedeja 1996–2000*, JUZVU 'VideoMedeja', Novi Sad, 2000

633 Grozdana Šarčević (ed.), *Vesna Todorović Miksić: Ž – Ili duša koja putuje dok telo spava – Fotografije, video, unikatne knjige, instalacije, kseroks 1882-1990*, Contemporary Visual Arts Gallery of Novi Sad and the Hall of the Museum of modern art, Belgrade, 1990

634 Karolina Mudrinski, *Konačna polja*, Gallery of Youth Center, Belgrade, 2005

635 Jasmina Čubrilo, Svetlana Mladenov, Irina Subotić, Dušan Todorović, Suzana Vuksanović (eds.), *MAD E + IN NOVI + SAD – Savremena umetnička scena*, Tableau gallery, Novi Sad, 2006

tion of ideology as a constitutional and orientating *vector* of establishing and performing culture, politics, and art, current identities of 'subjects' of possible culture and art contexts are being drawn. Ideology as matter for art represents imaginary relationships of individuum towards the real conditions of their existence. In other words, what is represented with ideology is not the system of real relations that rules the existence of an individual, but the imaginary relations of the individuals towards the real conditions in which they live. After the fall of the *Berlin Wall*, the disintegration of the Soviet Union and the second Yugoslavia, and de-structuring the *dialectic* division of the world into blocks, ideology shows to be the expression of events of marking effects in shaping and organizing life. In contemporary life, ideology is represented as a fragmentary local or individual or transgressive (delinquent) story that is the erased, postponed or transposed of utopia (phantasm) or the erased, postponed or transposed mark of identity (the penetration of first-degree language of presentation into the legitimacy of the master meta-language, loss of borders of understanding between the language of thoughts, private language, the unspoken knowledge of paradigm and the public language).⁶³⁶ In the moment when art is presented as the 'instrument' or the 'apparatus' of culture, i.e. the structure of the field of ideology, the role of art (function, presentation, expression, simulation) became important in performing *marking/markers'* practice in the actuality of shaping the life in very specific and local situation in comparison with global referents. In the transitional period, this kind of problem was set up by very various artists that worked with actuality through the media. Numerous artists worked in this frame, and some of the productions (installations, video-works, photographs) became the paradigmatic samples of cultural interventionism. One of the characteristic 'art in the age of culture' works is the analytically-critical work of Nikola Pilipović (Kikinda, 1957), i.e. the group *MANIK*⁶³⁷, named *From China to Banat*⁶³⁸ (2000-2001). This work indexes the controversial ideological construction of confronting 'local European multiethnic space' with the new race group, i.e. the Chinese immigrating to the countries of Eastern Europe, Banat, to be more precise. Banat was an area of complex national and ethnical processes in the 20th century, with Serbs, Hungarians, Germans, Romanians, Slovaks, Croats, Montenegrins, Romany people, and at the intersection of the 20th and 21st centuries, Chinese came. The very cultural and sociological practice with all the paradoxes of racial and national identification becomes the medium of artistic research and

presentation. Zoran Naskovski (Izbiste, 1960) realized a work based on indexing and transferring cultural marks and traces (documents on the murder of president Kennedy and singing with the accompaniment of a gusle dedicated to that event) from one context (USA) to the other (Serbia) in *Death in Dallas* (2003). People who worked with different cultural aspects were Ivan Grubanov (*Have you ever seen your best friend bleed*, 1999), Igor Antić (*Humanitarian*, 1999), *Apsolutno* (*Azbuka Absolut in Vienna*, 1995), Biljana Klarić (*Renounce for better ones*, 2003), Jelena Kovačević Jureša (*Tourists*, 2003), Kovács Zsolt, 1975 (e.g. *Aesthetical experience develops supernatural abilities*, 2001), activities of Vladan Jeremić (1975) and Renate Rädle (1970) during their work in Novi Sad, e.g. *Psycho-geographical Research* (2003-2004).⁶³⁹ *Led Art* and *Art Clinic*⁶⁴⁰ pointed their entire production towards the cultural practices (1993-2007), etc.

A specific case of 'cultural work' in art is the work of composer Boris Kovač.⁶⁴¹ He is an instrumentalist composer and multimedia artist. His musical work has to do with the theater. He works with orchestras and groups: the ensemble *Ritual nova*, orchestras *LaDaABa* and *La Campanella*, chamber music theater 'Mirror', the Academy of Fine Tools. He worked in Italy, Slovenia and Austria between 1991 and 1995, and he performed all across the world. Kovač's music originates as the shape of *new humanism*, i.e. exploration of the human condition through music and theater. The research character of his work is done, roughly speaking, through experimental *world music* (*World Fusion*, *World Jazz*), which means performing eclectic multicultural, existential, musical and theatrical situations. The author himself once said that it is hard to tell from which folklore his music comes:

'My musicians and I live an urban situation, we are outside the village, we cannot reconstruct where our music comes from. I don't think that is necessary. The essential point is that we use different sources to feed our creativity.'⁶⁴²

That is why his work can be identified as the cultural and multicultural situationism.

Activism and the art of resistance: *Led Art* (Serbian edition, p.320)

*Led Art*⁶⁴³ is a project of provocative artistic intervention in the field of ideology and in the field of contemporary soci-

636 Žan-Fransoa Liotar, *Raskol*, Zoran Stojanović Publishing House, Sremski Karlovci, 1991; and *Documenta 11_Platform 5: Exhibition – Catalogue*, Cantz, Ostfildern-Ruit, 2002.

637 Marija Vauda and Nikola Pilipović formed *MANIK* group in 1999 in Belgrade.

638 Marija Vauda and Nikola Pilipović, *Art gallery*, Maribor, 2001

639 Vladan Jeremić and Renata Rädle, *Psychogeographical Research*, <http://traedle-Jeremić.modukit.com/> 2007

640 Svetlana Subašić, Vladimir Mitrović, Vesna Grginčević (eds), *Art klinika – Prva petoletka*, MMC *Led Art* and the Student Cultural Center, Novi Sad, 2007

641 Boris Kovač, *Novi ritual*, SKC, Nis, 1990; Boris Kovač, *Mirror of the Voice/Music as the Way*, Katchara edition, 2000

642 See: http://worldmusic.nationalgeographic.com/worldmusic/view/page.basic/artist/content.artist/boris_kovač_33543

643 *Vreme zamrzavanja*, supplement to newspaper *Vreme*, Belgrade, 17th May 1993; catalogue: Nikola Džafo (ed.), *Ikonomanija*, CZKD, Belgrade, December 25, 1998

ety and culture. To be more specific, Led Art is the *modus* (a group, a movement, a phenomenon)⁶⁴⁴ of artistic activities, done at the dramatic, cruel and rough borders of art, ideology, politics, and, of course, everyday late-socialistic and post-socialistic existence. It is a dynamic inter-subjective confronting of intentional or accidental cooperators and collaborators inside a concrete artistic project. This confronting through art problematically mirrors the social situation. It is about the current dynamic system of inter-subjective relations, and not a stable, fixed and set group of artists or actionists. The concept of Led Art is formulated as cynical and allegoric orientated project of frozen art in a late totalitarian Serbian society. Concept and phenomenon of freezing were chosen as an acceptable sign (symbol, metaphor, allegory – slogan, anti-slogan, a cleared motto) of a critical and cynical state that a society goes through in totalitarianism, metastasis of legal institutions, entropy of ideologies, civil and para-civil wars, brutal violence, political transformations and social transitions, etc. Projects of Led Art were some sort of screens on which a society of terror is confronted with its own demonic characters, ghastly figures, shown darkness, censured transparency, summoned illusions and hidden constructions. Because, Led Art acted and acts in complex conditions of disintegration of Tito's Yugoslavia self-ruled socialism, in the conditions of nationalist-communist dictatorship of Slobodan Milošević, under the conditions of explosion of nationalist-racist *mood* inside post-communist society, under the conditions of emancipative civil protests and in the time of establishing a transparent, or, what is more often done, non-transparent pro-liberal transitional post-socialism. For each of the marked social situations, Led Art creates, i.e. performs in a simulacrum way, localized tactics of confronting the *machines* of social production, exchange, and consumption of concrete reality. Their work is sometimes mimetic, sometimes metonymic, sometimes illusionist, sometimes sophisticated, sometimes infantile, sometimes protesting, sometimes brutal, sometimes likeable, sometimes erotic, sometimes self-critical, sometimes anti-war, sometimes post-war, sometimes economic, sometimes entropic, etc. No position of their work is stable and secure. Instability and insecurity are the reactive means of indication inside concrete social struggles.⁶⁴⁵

644 The leader of the group/movement was Nikola Džafa (1950). The people who participated were: Dragan Zivancevic, Ratko Vucinic, Ljubiša Bogosavljević, Vesna Grgincevic, Zeljko Piskoric, Slobodan Vilcek, Sasa Markovic, Dragan Krnajska, Mileta Prodanovic, Mrđan Bajic, Rasa Todosijeovic, Jovan Cekic, Dejan Andjelkovic and Jelica Radovanovic, Darija Kacic, Misko Lazovic, Zoran Pantelić, Pankov Dragan, Radovanovic Jelica, Savanovic brothers, Miodrag Smajic, Vera Stevanovic, Lidija Srebotnjak, Zizi Stone, Talent, Slobodan Vilcek Willy, Jovanović Srdjan Weiss, Vladislav Seslija, Predrag Kocovac, Nebojša Milikic, Sasa Stojanović, RatSlobodan

645 Vesna Graničević (ed.), *Led Art: Dokumenti vremena: 1933–2003*, MMC Led Art and Samizdat B92, Belgrade, 2004

The case of the 'late works' of Balint Szombathy:
the artist as a *moving map* (Serbian edition, p.322)

The artistic practice of Balint Szombathy⁶⁴⁶ in the period between 1969 and 2005 was set and developed by performing nomadic and hybrid productions and tactical behavior in the epoch of late-socialist Modernism, late-socialist and post-socialist post-Modernity, and the current multi-cultural, before all transitional, globalism. Szombathy is the artist who creates in the spaces of confronting the borders of Serbian, multi-ethnic Yugoslavian, and Hungarian culture, i.e. according to political criteria, he works on the borders of real-socialism (Hungary as a part of the Warsaw pact or Eastern European pro-Soviet real-socialism), self-ruled socialism (the interposition of socialist Yugoslavia between Warsaw and NATO pact, i.e. Yugoslavia in the 'non-aligned' politics) and the West. This life and art border position allowed Szombathy to position himself as a *nomadic subject* that creates in the area of open Yugoslavian artistic space in communication between East and West. Szombathy is a Yugoslavian, or Vojvodinian Hungarian, and this means a 'subject' that exists simultaneously in several languages and modi of cultural communicate possibilities. During the *iron 70s* he brought *East* the concepts and information on contemporary international art (conceptual art, mail-art, body-art, land-art, performance art) and took *West* the information of a completely unknown Eastern European underground, conceptualism and Neo-Avant-garde. Szombathy creates in the area of drawings, graphic, design, comic, photography, performance art, artistic interventions, semio-art, conceptual art, mail-art, visual poetry, underground art, political art, digital and communicational art.

Szombathy's work was not done in a straight line formal or conceptual evolution, it was in a constant anarchic movement, offence, defence, masking, repeating or innovative excess. In completely different periods, from the late 60s until today, he left graphical marks (drawings, photo-copies, digitally processed photographs, collages) that had reference to current political situations, happenings or phenomena. These artistic works or anti-works did not have the character of a 'finished piece' (traditional artistic work), but more the character of uncertain meaningful derailment inside symbolic orders in culture. Those are the works of different formats, shapes and presentation. The artist showed through them how the subject is structured towards an individual political challenge. For example, on a facsimile of a 10\$ bill, he exchanged the phrase 'In God We Trust' for a new one, 'In Art We Trust'. Money, God and Art were brought into a potential and multi-dimensional

646 Nebojša Milenković (ed.), *Szombathy Art*, Museum of Contemporary Visual Arts, Novi Sad, 2005

relationship. Drawings and collages from the *Art Pen* series (1988-89) are visual commentaries of political happenings and crisis in the second Yugoslavia, i.e. the changes of the political system in Hungary. Collages from *Balkanology* series (1999) were made during the NATO bombardment of FR Yugoslavia and are referring to the works of soc-realist artists of Yugoslavia. Szombathy makes a parabola of those works, draws the iconography in a sarcastic, critical way. He unmasks politics, as well as art itself, of an ever-present inhuman totalitarian system. At the same time he concentrates a large dose of irony to the tragic events he observes, and even suffers (Viktim = the name of the main character in the novel *Europe number two* by Vojislav Despotov). In this context, other works were created too: *Vojvodinian elegies*, collaged drawings (1989), *Flags*, computer graphic (1989), *Partito glorioso*, collage (1996), *Pages from the eternal calendar*, collage (1997-98), *Millennium pictures: Reversible memory*, digital print (2002), *Overlapping I, II, III*, processed prints (2004). For example, in *Millennium pictures: We were heroes*, digital works (2002-2004), he gathered real-socialist documents in Hungary at the beginning of the transition⁶⁴⁷.

Szombathy's early performance called *Lenin in Budapest*⁶⁴⁸ (Budapest, 1972) is an example of inserting disturbance in the ideological structure of real-socialist society. It is about an anonymous photo-performance. Posters of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, the leader of a Soviet Bolshevik revolution from 1917, were fetish-pictures or symbols of revolutionary tendency that were exhibited at party congresses, state rallies and parades with the pictures of local party leaders as well as the classics of Marxism, Marx and Engels. Szombathy took the poster with Lenin's character through Budapest as an ad poster or a poster with protest slogans. Through this it removed the function of fetish from Lenin's picture, setting it in the trivial everydayness of real-socialist life, at the same time parodying the status of commercials. He was a citizen of a real-socialist society that carried the image of a revolutionary leader without being authorized for it, by which he pointed out to the derailment from the field of control. The symbol of revolution outside the field of party control could have been a challenge for the bureaucratic system as well as a twist to western new-leftism or a ludistic game that, humorously, ironically or cynically deteriorated Lenin's autocratic power.

Balint Szombathy developed a whole *genre* of performance art that he called 'photo-performance'. Photo-performance is the anonymous, private or public activities of an artist that are

not meant for the public, apart from an accidental public, but are meant for photographic documentation of the events. The only document on the performance is a series of photographs (sequences), which allows the reconstruction of events. Apart from the photo-performance *Lenin in Budapest*, there are also *Bauhaus* (1972), *Resurrection* (1973), *With Ida Biard in Novi Sad – With Balint Szombathy in Paris* (1975), *Signalization of the body* (1973), *Hammer and sickle* (1973, Florence), *Criminale attentate* (1973, Florence), *Go my way!* (1976, Amsterdam) etc.

In the 90s, Balint Szombathy starts a new and dramatic cycle of politically orientated performances and installations through which he reacts to the disintegration of the second Yugoslavia, emergence of national states and the beginnings of transition. His performance work, unlike the 'cynical indifference' of the 70s, starts to become expressive, dramatically isolated and shocking. The artist starts to speak in the first person to present, through his direct experience, the key questions of the new age after the fall of Berlin Wall, disintegration of the USSR and second Yugoslavia. In installations and productions *Balkan Dialogue* (1995), *Far-viewer* (1995), *Case* (1997), *Yugoslav Story* (1996), *Crossroads* (1998) and *Meeting Place* (1998), Szombathy works with concrete and literal traces of real-socialist culture: the portrait of the Yugoslavian president Josip Broz Tito, guns, bullets, corn, shoe-making tools, boards with names of final train stations in former Yugoslavia, plastic soldiers, screens where political programs of Serbian and Croatian national television emitted via satellite can be seen, etc. These are not innocent *ready-mades* of post-Duchamp elitism in art after 1968, but raw and brutal marks of civil/intervening war, a state in a shambles, creation of ethnically pure territories and cultural closing in of national cultures. Szombathy thematizes the moment when one history is brought to its end in macro-political, artistic, cultural, national, ethical and geographical sense.⁶⁴⁹ The project *Flags*⁶⁵⁰ (Ludosh lake next to Subotica, 1972) was created by exhibiting various flags in outdoor spaces. It is about interventions in free space, which means exhibiting samples of the Yugoslavian flag in natural (Glavica, Fruška Gora, 1972) or urban (Hajdukovo, 1972) exteriors. This work served as a starting point for the performances with the same name from 1993 and 1995. Later, in 1993, the process was developed in space into a performance. Exhibition of a Yugoslavian flag points to a dramatic *erasing of tracks*. Performances done in the 90s are events through which an attempt of breaking up the mimetic and mimicric work with symbols (symbol, erased symbol, trace, symbol-brought-to-

647 According to the manuscript *Szombathy Art – Umetnička dokumentacija 1* 969-2004, p. 7

648 Bálint Szombathy, *Lenin in Budapest* (1972), from: Dragomir Ugren (ed.), *Central-noevropski aspekti vojvodanskih avangardi 1920–2000. Granični fenomeni, fenomen granica*, Museum of Contemporary Visual Arts, Novi Sad, 2002, pp.102-104

649 Miško Šuvaković, *Balint Szombathy*, in: 'Art as a Political Machine', from: Ales Erjavec (ed.), *Postmodernism and the Postsocialist Condition – Politicized Art under Late Socialism*, University of California Press, Berkeley, 2003, pp. 116–120

650 *Catalogue Szombathy Art Zastave*, Most Gallery, Novi Sad, 1993

life) is attempted. Szombathy's performance *Flags I&II*⁶⁵¹ (Most Gallery, Novi Sad, 1993, documented on video) was provoked by then current social-political events through the metamorphosis of the flag of Titoistic self-rule second Yugoslavia⁶⁵². This work of Szombathy is, by all means, one of the most important post-modern and post-socialist spectacular confrontings with the terrors of disintegration of SFRY through provocative and directly presented experience from the artist himself, who takes the responsibility to use his body and his empirics in order to recreate the 'horrors of war' for all of us (who ever, or wherever we were).

A case of deconstruction – relative relations of margin and center of Modernism: Ratomir Kulić after *Verbumprogram* (Serbian edition, p.326)

Ratomir Kulić, after the end of *Verbumprogram*⁶⁵³ in 1991, did several post-Dadaistic or para-Dadaistic gestual works in which, on one side, he provoked the claustrophobic and paranoid culture of the third Yugoslavia in which he lived, and, on the other side, deconstructed his high-style, cold and rationally controlled work as a subject in *Verbumprogram*⁶⁵⁴. Kulić, as a subject of *Verbumprojekt* developed works of analytical and neo-geo orientation, which meant a cold and conceptual approach. Subject-Kulić and subject-Mationi were outside the work of art. The work was 'there' in its indicativeness and presence. A resistance to expressing, writing down, presenting the sensual indicativeness of identity, selfness, subject, was obvious in their neo-geo works. Visual order, which precedes the language, resists shaping the figure that the viewer will see as a certain visualized *I* of the artist. When the abstract painter, even a post-modern abstract neo-geo painter, starts to question, to develop his character in the *mirror* of art, the questions who? when? and where? become important. Autobiographical work of an artist starts by avoiding, resisting the identification of a consistent and whole hypothesis about the place where the existential 'I' could be. As opposed to the idealized abstract intellect – Kulić tries to adopt a figure for which he would say: 'I, it is I. Look at me, and you will notice you are being watched!'

Kulić's independent work starts after the realization of a retrospective exhibition and catalogue of *Verbumprogram* group in the Gallery of Contemporary Arts in Novi Sad, in 1995. His first independent exhibition was on *Energies: Con-*

temporary Art in Vojvodina (Konkordija, Vršac, June 1995). Kulić's works after *Verbumprogram* are not numerous, but are very characteristically realized: *Without title – Third excursion* (1996), *Rhetoric and demagogy, or demagogy and rhetoric, or both demagogy and rhetoric* (1998), a large drawing on a wall, *Excursion III* (2003), and a series of photographs, *Anamorphoses* (2004). Kulić organized a cycle of author-outlined exhibitions *Identity and difference: a double articulation* in the Center for Visual Culture 'Golden Eye' in 1997. With that cycle he entered a then current discussion about the relations of Modernism and Post-modernism.

The installation *Rhetoric and demagogy, or demagogy and rhetoric, or both demagogy and rhetoric* was done as a part of a cycle of exhibitions *Discreet Modernism*, which was prepared by the custodian of the 'Golden Eye' Gallery, Sava Stepanov, in 1998. The installation came to be by collecting and confronting various collected or made objects in the period from 1988 to 1998. The exhibition contained arranged works of art from the *Verbumprogram* period, as well as everyday objects. It seems a Duchampesque *ready-made* gesture, although it is not another defence of the Duchamp tradition, on the contrary, it is an artistic-productive polemic with Duchamp installations and political commentaries of another artist, Balint Szombathy. The polemic character is, in fact, a deconstructive gesture that opens up questions on status and conditions of autonomy of artistic work, art and artist's behavior.

A series of photographs, *Anamorphoses*, was done with large format photographs digitally printed onto canvas (16 pieces, 168x120 cm). The artist shows his body as a case of study:

I am Oedipus. I am Ulysses. I am Narcissus. I am triple John. I am the wound of Christ. ...My name is Ludism. My name is Irrationalism. My name is Nobody.

A visual autobiography – sequences of visible masked figures and artistic poses – is a procedurally orientated trace of a visual text among other texts about culture, history, geography, which pose questions on the status and the phenomenon of the artist. That is why autobiographically visual, i.e. figurative text, is not a truthful text, but a disturbance of classification of disciplines and genres – it is an individual hypothesis placed inside other hypotheses and genre borders or with other hypotheses and genre borders instead of the truth. Autobiographically visual text produces figures of phenomenal *language of images*, and not of blood, meat, sperm, amino-acids, genes. Autobiographical text is plural, it almost always contains at least one 'I' more than the expected *I* (that is close to us). There is an obscene extra of *I*. That is why the autobiography is the anomaly in the historically narrative chain of visual storytelling. It disturbs every meta-history: the great story of lawful or contracted hero. Autobiography is a product of consumption,

651 Apart from Szombathy, the other participants were: Igor Bartolec, Kálmán Jódal, Sava Kuzmanov i Severin Trifunović.

652 "Balint Szombathy", in: Majda Adlešić, "Krv a ne boja: razgovor sa Balintom Szombathyjem", from: Sava Stepanov (ed.), *Performans 95*, Zlatno oko, Novi Sad, 1995, pp. 7

653 See the retrospective catalogue of the group, *Verbumprogramkatalog*, Contemporary Visual Arts Gallery, Novi Sad, 1995

654 Ratomir Kulić, *Anamorfoze*, Museum of Contemporary Visual Arts, Novi Sad, 2004

it consumes meanings of the text at the expected places of the experienced. Autobiography is the economy of a visible desire: languages circle, intertwine, chain together and lose in the distance and the time of what was read (given as a desire, the desire of Other).

Ratomir Kulić, after *Verbumprogram*, enters the game of manifold traps of artistic expressions of art in a time of opaqueness. The artist works with 'bodies' and 'figures' of his own phantasms and myths, turning them into a field of desymbolization and uncontrolled exchanges between the history of art and everyday life.

Permanent excess – the unbearableness of *art* and the acceptability of *politics*: the case of Živko Grozdanić (p.329)

Živko Grozdanić⁶⁵⁵ is an unusual, delinquent and dramatic 'appearance' on the Vojvodinian art scene of the 80s and 90s. If there is an artist who, with his radically excessive works, had presented the happenings and atmosphere of a catastrophic breakdown of second Yugoslavia, then that artist is Živko Grozdanić.

He was born in Vršac in 1957. He finished the Academy of Arts in the class of Professor Ljubomir Perlinčić in Sarajevo, 1983. He has group exhibitions since 1982, and one-man exhibitions since 1984. The beginnings of his artistic work are connected to the alternative scene in Sarajevo. He worked in the domain of fundamental painting, e.g. the project *100 hours of painting*⁶⁵⁶, and then in post-arte-povera installations and performances in Sarajevo and on Hvar, in the period of 1986-1989. In Vršac he starts to work from 1991 on several different planes: as a painter, sculptor and performer of allegoric installations and performances, as organizer of *Yugoslavian Young Artists' Biennale*⁶⁵⁷, founder of the Contemporary Culture Center 'Konkordija'⁶⁵⁸, contributor for the opposition magazine *Kosava* for the Other/New Serbia (during the 90s), founder, editor-in-chief of *ArtContext – a mazine for visual arts* (started on 1st April 2001), a politician in Vršac and a member of city council, and a head of the Museum of Contemporary Art of Vojvodina, Novi Sad, from 2005. Grozdanić is one of the leading figures in the re-articulation of the art scene

of Vršac and Vojvodina in the 90s and the beginning of 21st century.⁶⁵⁹

Allegoric sculptural, painting or *mixed-media* installations of Živko Grozdanić are realizations of critical phenomena of political life of contemporary post-socialist and transitional society in Serbia. Post-socialism is a *postmodern state* of ex real-socialist states. It is described as a transitional period between a bureaucratic real-socialist society and a liberal, late capitalism. Post-socialism is characterized, above all, by a paradoxical union of different and heterogeneous social systems or fragments of social systems, and ways of producing and consuming culture, for example, there are institutions of real socialism, liberal capitalism and national bourgeois-Christian early modern capitalism. Grozdanić uses very eclectically all these tactics of 'culture', 'politics' and, of course, 'art' of post-socialism to create a critical excess between the visible and invisible, politically articulable and politically non-transparent, between singularities and universalities of shaping a transitional life in the midst of a fight for power among different social institutions. Allegoric exploration that he started with the picture installation *Knifer-Kiefer*⁶⁶⁰ by which he confronted, in a brutal/gentle way, painting strategies of Croatian anti-painter of modernism, Julio Knifer, and German ecstatic neo-expressionist Anselmo Kiefer, at the time when the wars on the territory of the second Yugoslavia were starting. Grozdanić made several versions of the installation *Wire*, with over 2,000 meters of barb-wire with glass.⁶⁶¹ With this work Grozdanić is setting up a basic principle of his 'explorations': the literal relationship of materials or objects confronts potential allegoric meanings and social symbolic possibilities. Grozdanić, after that, realized several installations in which he provoked phenomenology of actuality and its allegoric consequence in social distribution of identity, power, control, supervision, punishment or perverting every form of enjoyment: *Table* (Konkordija, Vršac, 1996), *A sample of view* (GSU, Pančevo, 1997), *Leader* (Konkordija, Vršac, 1998), *Spade* (Konkordija, 2000), *Yellow lemon for Jerko Denegri* (Lounge of MCA, Belgrade, 2004), *The great secret of Marina Abramović* (2006), etc.⁶⁶²

Živko Grozdanić, with his installation *Made in China* (2007), which comes within a broader artistic project *ИОП Art*, has set up and made even more visible another contradiction of a modern, religious, social nad political shaping of every-

655 Grozdanić catalogue, Konkordija, Vršac, 1996

656 Živko Grozdanić, izložba *Sto sati slikanja*, Gallery of Young People's Center 'Skenđerija' in Sarajevo, 1984

657 Under the name of *Yugoslavian Young Artists' Biennale* five exhibitions were held, organized by the Center for Contemporary Culture 'Konkordija' in Vršac from 1994 to 2002. Head of all five biennales was the painter Živko Grozdanić. Artistic directors of the biennale were: Sava Stepanov (1994, 1995), Lidija Merenik (1998), Jovan Cekic (2000) and Slavko Timotijević (2002)

658 Dragomir Ugren, Ješa Denegri, Živko Grozdanić (eds.), *Deset godina Konkordije – Izlagačka praksa kao kulturno-politička strategija*, Contemporary Culture Center 'Konkordija', Vršac, 2004

659 Ješa Denegri, "Vršačka umetnička scena devedesetih: Živko Grozdanić i Zvonimir Santrač", from: *Devedesete: teme srpske umetnosti (1990–1999)*, Svetovi, Novi Sad, pp. 212-218

660 Živko Grozdanić, *Kiefer-Knifer* exhibition, National Museum, Vršac, 1991

661 Živko Grozdanić, *instalacija Žica*, Konkordija, Vršac, 1994 i 1998. See: Ješa Denegri, "Rad Žica...", from: Miško Šuvaković, Ješa Denegri (eds.), *Prestupničke forme devedesetih. Postmoderna i avangarda na kraju XX veka*, Museum of Contemporary Visual Arts, Novi Sad, 1998, pp. 40

662 Živko Grozdanić, *Allegoric of theory*, Beograd gallery 1&2, Ljubljana, 2007

day life in transitional Serbia. Grozdanić started the *ИОП Art* project as an artistic discussion or a discussion in the world of art with current post-socialist and transitional performances of the traumatic role of the religious, church-institutional, activity in Serbian, and almost any other Christian society. With artistic works – installations of sculptures: *Meteor Rain* (2005) and *Bishop Pahomije at the Sunset Boulevard*⁶⁶³ (2006) confronted us with that universalistically orientated field of symbolism that covers the essential confrontation of politically-religious power, perverting desire and the super-ordinate position of institutions in today's transitional societies.

Živko Grozdanić, in his installations *Meteor Rain* and *Bishop Pahomije at the Sunset Boulevard* set up contradictory figurative installations that provoke the taboo themes of dominations of religious authorities in transitional Serbia. He used the important elements of critical and realistic figurative and media art to pose questions, through there allegoric 'riddles', about political power, sexuality and cultural functions or consequences of religion/church and church material practices of 'desire' in post-socialist and transitional society.

Art and culture: the case of a culture worker –
Zoran Pantelić (Serbian edition, p.332)

Zoran Pantelić was born in Novi Sad in 1966. He graduated in 1991 and got his MA in 1995 from the Academy of Arts in Novi Sad. He started artistic research in the context of painting and new sculpture⁶⁶⁴ (*Marriage*, 1992; *Tongue*, 1992; *Secret*, 1993) in the late 80s and 90s. His production was in the context of exploring the material in objectivity of paintings and sculptures. Pantelić's move towards the new media and neo-conceptual artistic strategies and tactics happened after the *Prelom* exhibition (Center for the Visual Culture 'Golden Eye', Novi Sad, 1996).

He went to school for media education at the Faculty of Social Sciences in Ljubljana in 2001. He is the founder and member of the artistic association ABSOLUTELY (APSOLUTNO) that started its work in 1993. The works of the association have been signed by ABSOLUTELY (APSOLUTNO) without any personal names, since 1995. The development of 'ABSOLUTE aesthetics' from traditional painting to contemporary media was done in the area of media activism, characterised by an interdisciplinary approach to exploring art, culture and society.

The collective (Pantelić, Dragan Rakić, Bojana Petrić, Dragan Miletić) worked in the field of interdisciplinary artistic projects and media pluralism during the 90s.⁶⁶⁵ The work of the association was developed and internationally presented at the artistic festivals and galleries all around the world, in Berlin, Paris, Budapest, Wrocław, Hiroshima, San Francisco, Vienna (*Azbuka Absolut in Wien*, 1995), Frankfurt, New York, Sombor (*La Quattro Stagioni*, 1996-97-2002), Novi Sad, but also on the web-pages of the internet (*The Absolute Sale*, 1997).

Zoran Pantelić founded *The Center for New Media – kuda.org*⁶⁶⁶, which develops creative possibilities in the field of new communication technologies and art in 2000. The center is an organization that gathers artists, theoreticians, media activists, explorers and a broad audience in the field of information and communication technologies. The activity of work of *kuda.org* is dedicated to questions of the influence of electronic media on the society, the creative use of new communication technologies in the contemporary culture. Some of the main themes are the interpretation and analysis of history and the importance of the information society, the potential of the information itself and its influence on the political, economic and cultural relations in contemporary society. Zoran Pantelić, today, works as an artist, custodian, educator and media activist. Pantelić's work is transferred into the model of an activist-artist, or artist-custodian, i.e. artist-producer, and enters the area of post-production systems of art. Pantelić is involved in the work of several boards and advisory groups, international publishing houses that deal with media and contemporary artistic practice. He worked as one of the selectors of the *October Salon* in Belgrade 2001. As the editor-custodian he produced the international exhibition *World of Information – World-Information.org*⁶⁶⁷ that was held in Novi Sad and Belgrade in 2003. Outside the *Center kuda.org* he organised a *Trans-European Picnic* in co-production with *V2 Institute* from Rotterdam in 2004. He is a member of the initiative for reconstruction of cultural and social life in the city – DIZALICA (CRANE).⁶⁶⁸

The groups *Apsolutno* and *Kuda.org* and Zoran Pantelić⁶⁶⁹ have set up an artistic practice in the social and cultural field, inverting 'the creative artistic act' into the *cultural strategic and tactical practice* of reacting and *intervening* in concrete

663 This installation brought about a court trial, but the charges of insult were withdrawn (Municipal court, Novi Sad, case number 6208/06). See, e.g. the document that the artist published on the back of the invitation for opening his exhibition at the 'Center for Cultural Decontamination – Veljkovic pavilion', Belgrade, 24th September 2007

664 *Catalogue Apsolutno Zoran Pantelić*, Contemporary Visual Arts Gallery, Novi Sad, 1993; and *Apsolutno Zoran Pantelić, PRElom*, Apsolutno Association, Novi Sad, 1995

665 See www.apsolutno.org as well as 'Apsolutno' from: Jasmina Cubrilo, Svetlana Mladenov, Irina Subotic, Dušan Todorović, Suzana Vuksanovic (eds.), *MAD E + IN NOV I + SAD – Modern Artistic Scene*, Tableau Gallery, Novi Sad, 2006, pp.26-29

666 See: www.kuda.org

667 See: www.world-information.org March-May 2003

668 See: www.dizalica.org

669 Miško Šuvaković, "Umetnost postsocijalizma – Epoha entropije i brisani sablasni tragovi", from: Dragomir Ugren (ed.), *Centralnoevropski aspekti vojvođanskih avantardi 1920–2000. ... Granični fenomeni, fenomeni granica*, Museum of Contemporary Visual Arts, Novi Sad, 2002, pp. 180–193.

conditions of realization of the transitional life.⁶⁷⁰ In other words, there was a metamorphosis of the 'poetry of the artist' into 'cultural politics' as artistic post-production practice.

Goran Despotovski – the case of neo-conceptual identification of erased traces of existence (Serbian edition, p.334)

Goran Despotovski (1972, Vršac) has set up a specific model of neo-conceptual⁶⁷¹ research between the poor art, performative feasibility of an event, new media and analytics of everydayness⁶⁷². Neo-conceptual art in his case is not a name for an artistic movement, but an uncertain and open terminological marking for naming different post-conceptual, plural, nomadic tactics of media and conceptual relativization of the relations between elite and popular (*high and low*) low.

Goran Despotovski started his work in the late 90s in the domain of locating the paradoxical border between figurative and primary painting⁶⁷³ and in the area of complex objective and representational installations.⁶⁷⁴ What Despotovski focuses on is the relationship of haptic and visual in suggesting the presence or absence of human body in the painting (*Scene – dejectedness*, 1999), on the photograph (*Coat repair*, 2007) or in space, among objects (*Repeat* 2002; *Showroom*, 2003).⁶⁷⁵ Despotovski works with the concept of *material trace* in the existential space (*Ejaculate*, 2002; *Sperm*, 2002). Instead of aesthetically-artistic, i.e. cultural or political values in his work there are only spent worn notions, or in the sense of Jacques Derride: *erased traces*⁶⁷⁶ in the moment of seduction or satisfaction to the painter as the observer and the observer as the consumer of visualization, tactility, movement, and by that also bodiness. Installations with 'empty clothes' (*Coat*, 2002; *Showroom* 2004) are complex audio-visual-and-objective scene arrangements of consumption, discharge and absence.

Despotovski belongs to that generation of 'nomadic artists' that simultaneously use and perform their work with different

materials, objects, media, etc. with the goal of achieving their expression and concept in a world of absurd, contradictory and alienated possibilities.⁶⁷⁷

A case of digital identities or simulatory production: explorations of Nataša Teofilović (Serbian edition, p.336)

Nataša Teofilović (1968) works as an architect and visual artist in Pančevo, Belgrade and Novi Sad. She works in the area of installations, performances, video works, video installations, digital animations and digital installations/ambients. Her work started by cooperating with artists Mima Orlović and Tanja Ristovski in the Student Cultural Center in Belgrade in the mid 90s. She has been exhibiting on her own since 1995. Her first research was dedicated to the exploration of micro-narratives inside female mythologies and mythologization, and presentability of micro-phenomenology of space, body in articulation of touch and view.

Nataša Teofilović⁶⁷⁸ has included architectonic experiences in her artistic researches. She dedicated herself to situations and events with space in relation with new media performances and sensual potentiality of intensity and the interaction of bodies in space. Her approaches are characterized by conceptualizations and primary theorizations of manifestation and demonstration of space and architecture (*Islands*, 1995; *Void*, 1997). She worked with platforms of individuum ritualizations in local and micro-conditions (*Through the eye*, 1995; *In my soul*, 1998), as well as relations between individual and collective identification (*Field of Happiness*, 1996; *Personal Seal*, (1996). Her first period is characterized by anti-formalistic conflict confrontation of private and public, open and closed, inner and outer in comparison with the demonstrated human life, the life of a woman in the space of contemporariness.⁶⁷⁹

Later interests of Nataša Teofilović lead, at the beginning of the 21st century, towards new media practices. Her research points towards the complex interrelations of physical and screen-virtual space, as well as the questions of the conditions of presenting and performing the visible and the invisible, and demonstrating individual and collective identity/identifications in video art (*LLL001/Perfect Choice 2001*) and digital practice (*o.n.a.* 2007).

The installation *o.n.a.* was exhibited at the 'Goodbye Privacy' festival – *Festival Ars Electronica 2007* in Linz in Austria. It is her most complex and developed work and was

670 See books: kuda.org (ed.), *Tektonik – Nova društvena ontologija u vreme totalne komunikacije*, Futura Publication, Novi Sad, 2004; kuda.org (ed.), *Bitomatik – Umetnička praksa u vreme informacijske/medijske dominacije*, Futura Publication, Novi Sad, 2004; kuda.org (ed.), *Divanik – Razgovori o medijskoj umetnosti, kulturi i društvu*, Daniel print, Novi Sad, 2004; kuda.org (ed.), *Izostavljena istorija*, Revolver, Frankfurt am Main and Center for New Media_kuda.org, Novi Sad, 2006. etc.

671 Germano Celant, *Un-Expressionism - Art Beyond the Contemporary*, Rizzoli, New York, 1988; Ann Goldstein, M.J. Jacob, C. Gudis (eds), *A Forest of Signs - Art in the Crisis of Representation*, The MIT Press, Cambridge MA, London, 1989

672 "Goran Despotovski", iz Jasmina Čubrilo, Svetlana Mladenov, Irina Subotić, Dušan Todorović, Suzana Vuksanović (eds.), *MAD E + IN NOVI + SAD – Savremena umetnička scena*, Tableau Gallery, Novi Sad, 2006, pp.50-53.

673 See: Živko Grozdanić, "Primarna stanja slike", from www.despotovski.Vršac.com.txt/Grozdanić2000_srp.htm

674 See: Sava Stepanov, "O umetnosti ui apsurdnosti – povodom slika i instalacija Gorana Despotovskog", from www.despotovski.Vršac.com.txt/sava2005_srp.htm

675 See: www.despotovski.Vršac.com/works.htm

676 Jacques Derrida, "Freud et la scène de l'écriture", iz *L'écriture et la différence*, Éditions du Seuil, Paris, 1967, pp. 293-340

677 Goran Despotovski (ed.), *Showroom&Folding*, Contemporary Gallery, Zrenjanin, 2005

678 Nataša Teofilović: www.cyberrex.org/NT

679 Sinisa Mitrovic, 'O vs S', see: www.cyberrex.org/NT/critic-srp.html

the result of her research studies of digital art.⁶⁸⁰ Nataša Teofilović conducted a 'character' research of a 'virtual actress' by making the 'character' in 3D animation programs (animation software *Maya*). By realizing a 3D character she came to a *virtual dynamic body* she presented via five screens. With this, the artwork was set up as a multi-register presentation of the animated character and the relation of the animated or virtual character with the spatial arrangement of presentational screens. By way of complex visual-dynamic digital-ambiental setting a new space for perception and reception of virtual-physical events was initiated. Phenomenology of the screen and phenomenology of the physical space are provocatively confronted in relations with the potential or the real body of the observer.

Studies of gender: on the feminist history of art in Vojvodina (Serbian edition, p.338)

A special case of 'art in the age of culture' is working with gender identities. There is a characteristic transformation from the artist as *the source of art*, which is one of the base determinants of the modern age, modernity and modernism, towards a female artist who, through the practice of performing art, deconstructively and decentrally questions its identity as a creator, performer, social actor, female artist, producer, entertainer, and woman. In the process of facing the dramatic fact that the artist is not necessarily male, i.e. that the creation and performance of art cannot be unambiguously put within the essentialist and universal codex or catechesis of the uninterested aesthetic of modernism, the issue of 'gender identities' was raised. Certain theorists write about the transition from the tactics of *subject* to tactics of *identity*. The transition is linked to the appearance of female artists and to their deconstructive work concerning great dogmas, canons, themes and systems of creation and reception of western modern art. The transition from the idea of subject as a source (the transcendental or existential 'place' or 'source' of origin) to the *identity* as a transient index position in the society, culture and art coincides with the transition from the tactics of creation of art to the tactics of performance. On the other hand, the issue of gender is posed as significant because, in the line from the subject towards the object of art, it enables the question of relativity of the ontological constitution of the art and artist. Gender is recognized as a social construction and that matrix of social construction is in understanding and performance applied to art. Art is not an inherently given 'phenomenon', but an element or a

structure of designing social reality. Art is not the mimesis of the world, but it is the people who see and recognize the world via the construction of the 'screen', i.e. via ideologically situated pictures that appear through the work of art as well. Art historian Griselda Pollock defined the western canon of 'male art' as following:

I do not define canon as a collection of valuable objects/texts or a list of esteemed masters, but as a discursive formation which constitutes objects/texts by choosing them as products of art mastery and, due to that, as supplements which confirm and identify the exquisiteness of the white male as a bearer of creation and culture. To realize art through the canonical discourse means to understand manhood as power and meaning, and then to identify it with truth and beauty.⁶⁸¹

The canon appears in various forms as a platform and protocol of performing the horizon of expectation, creation, reception, understanding and classifying artwork, art and artists. The canon appears in specific societies and it enables the local manifestation of every work of art to be understood and experienced as trans-historic and trans-geographic. The canon brings one 'specific feature' (of aesthetics, gender, race, class, ethnicity, politics) to the universality, which is an expression of related powers and domination in micro-social and macro-social relationships. Thus, the feminist theory and history of art, by problematizing the 'canon of universal creator' modelled on the white-male-creator, points to the role of otherness and therefore to the change of inherently understandable values and the meaning of modern art. A female painter and a female sculptor appear as an asymmetric challenge to the hegemony of the universal creator.

There were only a small number of women in the Avant-garde artistic practice in Vojvodina; for a long time art was an exclusively male job. The process of decentralizing of the 'artist' status and constituting the role of the *female artist* began quite late, in the 1960s. That process is evident in the border areas of Modernism. A few characteristic decentralized figures are prominent: Ana Bešlić in sculpture, Mira Brtko in reductive painting, Bogdanka Poznanović in informal painting, performance, mail-art, painting critique and video art, Judita Salgo in multi-genre prose and poetry, Katalin Ladik in poetry and performance, Ana Raković in conceptual art, Milica Mrđa Kuzmanov⁶⁸² in performance (*Fires*, 1988. or *Rituals of the Body and the Earth*, 1990) and video art, and Lidija Srebotnjak-Prisic in video art, digital art and installations. These female authors worked on the margins and were not interpreted as 'women' in theory and history of art. Moreover, they

680 Nataša Teofilović, *interface//character 0.5* (digital installation), master's thesis, 2006. This paper was done at the Group for Digital Art in the Interdisciplinary post-graduate studies at the University of Arts in Belgrade

681 Griselda Pollock (1999), "What is the Canon – Structurally?", u: "About Canons and Cultural Wars", p. 9.

682 Branka Srdić-Zivanović, "Autorstvo samoće", *Projekta**t, issue 1, Novi Sad, 1993, pp. 52-53

were women of different ethnical and artistic identities. They were faced with the boundaries of their own language and the language of the culture they operated in, whether those were verbal, visual, or behavioral languages. However, from the emersion of Postmodernism in the early 1980s, through the art in the age of opaqueness in the mid 1990s towards today, the role of female artists has become increasingly important and evident, and towards the end of the 20th and the beginning of the 21st century, it has become almost dominant on the local artistic scene: Višnja Petrović (1960), Nataša Teofilović, Vesna Tokin, Biljana Bakaluca (1971), Dejana Marisan (1971), Bosiljka Zirojević (1971), Vanesy Wallet Hardi (1971), Jelena Janev, Ivana Rakidzic (1973), Željka Jović, Biljana Klarić, Karolina Mudrinski, Jelena Kovačević Juresa, Dubravka Ziramov Lazić (1974), Ksenija Kovačević, Jelena Kovačević, Aleksandra Resnjak (1975), Olga Ungar, Dejana Nešović, Zorica Čolić, Zita Majoros (1977), Mia Stojanović (1977), Marija Miljković (1978), Milica Benic (1978), Ana Vilenica (1978), Željka Pjesivac (1979), Mónika Szigeti (1979), Katarina Šević, Ljubica Cvorić (1980), Marina Tomić (1982) and others. The discussion on the role of women in the art of the second half of the 20th century now raises the issue of the role of the female artist throughout the entire 20th century; actually, in the visibility and recognition of the female artist in the epoch of the 'male modernistic canon'. Just one view over the catalogues points to a number of female artists who should once again be subjected to explanation and interpretation from the platform of cultural and above all gender studies: painter Jelena Covic, weaver Sarolta Kovalszky (????), Danica Jovanović (1886–1914), Angela Macković (1883–1951), Ilona Acsádi, (1887–????), Zuzka Medvedjova (1897–1985), Klára Geréb, Zora Petrović, Zlata Markov Baranji (1906), Slavka Petrović-Sredovic (1907–1978), Mirjana Sipos (1916), Ankica Opresnik, Radmila Graovac (1920), Majda Kurnik (1920–1967), Ksenija Ilijević (1923), Radojka Radojević-Branica (1923–1954), Ivanka Acin-Petrović (1925), Ljubica Tapavički (1925–2006), Ekatarina Ristivojev (1925), Mira Jurisic, Radmila Bobic Fijatovic (1943), Julijana Kis (1944), Ljubinka Ivezić (1944), Ilonka Vagner Tatić (1944), Rada Čupić, Mirjana Subotin Nikolić (1960), Vesna Olujić, Olivera Marić (1966) and others. Some of these figures distinguish themselves by their early contributions to the establishment of the painting, and broader artistic culture (Jelena Covic, Danica Jovanović⁶⁸³), while other female painters and sculptors stand out as great masters of Modernism (Zora Petrović⁶⁸⁴, Ana Bešlić⁶⁸⁵, Mira

Brтка⁶⁸⁶) and artistic experiment (Bogdanka Poznanović, Judita Salgo, Katalin Ladik).

Conclusion: the twentieth century – *ge-stell* (Serbian edition, p347)

What is a century? What is a *one hundred years*?⁶⁸⁷ Are those two different? When did the century begin and when did it end? What is the color, smell, taste, tactility of this century behind us? Is it an assembly of 'facts within some hundred years, more or less? Why is the twentieth century so intriguing, shocking, dramatic, bloody, pleasurably beautiful and full of unexpected leaps towards human freedoms but also towards political totalitarianisms? Why are the new discoveries both the expressions of the true human emanation and the forms of the most vulgar exploitation, i.e. the challenges for the terrifying returns to the impossible 'old', *original* or real? How is it that in the history of art next to the great cities of the twentieth century (Budapest, Belgrade, Vienna, Munich, Berlin, Paris) as the triumphs of modernists who were the obsessive focus of the modern and modernistic artist in Vojvodina, there are also the names of concentration camps⁶⁸⁸ as places of *naked life*; above all the alarming name of Auschwitz?⁶⁸⁹ How do we explain the political, social, cultural and artistic revolutions and contra-revolutions that occurred on that small area which is even today vaguely called Vojvodina? How do we explain the nations and their cultures coming and disappearing on the territory of Vojvodina during the last hundred years? Why was I unable to find artists of the German minority within the existing historiography of the cultures in Vojvodina? What was the meaning of Hungarization at the beginning of the century and the Serbization at the end of the twentieth century?

The dynamics of 'fluxes' and 'impulses', which incites the confrontation of cultures, societies and arts in Vojvodina, is extremely exciting, problematic and contradictory. Nevertheless, being engaged in art is seeking for 'impulses': what is it that attracts, sustains and provokes sensory and intellectual attention?

If we try to determine the 20th century in Vojvodina, we will be left in front of an almost insoluble question of the beginning and ending of the century? Is there congruence between the twentieth century and these last hundred years in the previous century? It appears that one of the endings of the 19th century and beginning of the 20th century can be found in the Hungar-

683 Jasna Jovanov (ed.), *Danica Jovanović (January 4, 1886 – September 12, 1914)*, Gallery of Matica srpska, Novi Sad, 1986

684 Olivera Janković (ed.), *Zora Petrović – Umetnost kao život*, SANU, Belgrade, 1995

685 Katarina Ambrozić (ed.), *Ana Bešlić*, City museum, Subotica, 1983

686 Mira Brтка, Contemporary Visual Arts Gallery, Novi Sad, 1971

687 Alain Badiou, *20. stoletje*, Analecta, Ljubljana, 2005

688 Giorgio Agamben, *Remnants of Auschwitz – The Witness and the Archive*, Zone Books, New York, 2002

689 Pavle Šosberger, "Imenik žrtava holokausta iz Vojvodine", from: *Jevreji u Vojvodini: kratak pregled istorije vojvođanskih Jevreja*, Prometej, Novi Sad, 1998, pp. 205-515

ian imperial-cultural project – The *Millennium* exhibition from 1896, but also in the beginning of the end of Austro-Hungarian Empire after 28 June 1914, or in the true disintegration of the empire in 1918. If we focus on the art itself, then the 20th century certainly began with the coming of the artistic atmosphere of Nagyanya (1896). The same year of 1896, when the *Millennium* exhibition was held and Nagyanya came into being, can be the beginning of the new century: yet, those two events do not tell the same story about the cultural battles and experience of ‘the nature’ of art. One story is about the modern and the other about modernism. Was the new century anticipated by the discovery of ‘mechanical picture reproduction’ – the photograph – and the moving of the picture into a new media, which was about to force its way into the world – the film? Yes, the reception of the new media-artistic technologies promised that moment of ‘new’, and the new was an important obsession of the people who were creating that century, the passion and the obsession with the new? The market of the new? The bursts of affectation of the new!

If we try to determine the end of the century, do we have to stick to that fatal and cinematically mystified 2000? The end of the century or the end of the world? Or did the end happen earlier with the completion of the block division of the world in the epoch of perestroika that marked the end of ‘the communist concept’ and the victory of ‘liberal political system’?⁶⁹⁰ Is then the symbolical ‘year’ the one when the Berlin wall came down in 1989, when the USSR fell apart, when the second Yugoslavia started to disintegrate for the second time, or when the great European and African genocides occurred in the last decade of the 20th century? In other words, is the end of the 20th century marked by the ending of the economic, social, political, cultural, and artistic internationalism and the establishment of globalism? Has perhaps the end of 20th century never happened?

Maybe one of the answers to these critical questions is that *the lesson* is a lesson on complexity and inexistence of one answer – the key to all rebuses. The lesson is that we have to search through individual singularities of the society, culture, and art, and through their immanence. Concerning art, there is a contradiction in every modernistic oriented art that ‘something’ is art only if it has won the right to its formal, phenomenological, and existential autonomy in regard to the social, religious, and political; as well as that it is the status of artistic autonomy that is the social, cultural, and political problem that leads us into the center of the human ‘story’ of the 20th century. However, every *human story* seems to be a performance of a narrative about structures and their effects, which in turn concerns the ideologies of art, culture, and society.

690 Zagorka Golubović, *Pouke i dileme minolog veka*, Filip Višnjić Publishing, Belgrade, 2006

Bibliography:

- Imre Bori, *Književnost vojvodanskih Mađara*, Matica srpska, Novi Sad, 1979.
- Dimitrije Boarov, *Politička istorija Vojvodine: u trideset i tri priloga*, Europanon consulting, Novi Sad, 2001.
- Varga Katalin, Gergely András et al, *1896: a Millenniumi Országos Kiállítás és az ünnepek krónikája*, Atlasz, Budapest, 1996.
- Pavle Šosberger, *Jevreji u Vojvodini: kratak pregled istorije vojvodanskih Jevreja*, Prometej, Novi Sad, 1998.
- Bela Duranci (ed.), *Arpad Balaž – slike, grafike, crteži 1920–1970*, Gallery of Matica srpska, Novi Sad, 1970.
- Bela Duranci (ed.), *Likovno stvaralaštvo Mađara u Vojvodini 1830–1930*, City Museum, Subotica, 1973.
- Bela Duranci, Bordás Győző (eds.), *A két Pechán – Dva Pehana*, Forum, Novi Sad, 1982.
- Bela Duranci, *A vajdasági építészeti szecesszió – Secesija u vojvodanskoj kulturi*, Forum, Novi Sad, 1983.
- Bela Duranci, *Zoltan Kalapiš – Bečkerečki svetlopišac*, Photo-cinematic association of Vojvodina, Novi Sad, 1986.
- Bela Duranci, *Umetničke kolonije*, Osvit, Subotica, 1989.
- Bela Duranci, *Slikar Stipan Kopilović 1877–1924*, NIO Subotičke novine, 1991.
- Bela Duranci, *Duga nad akademijom*, Contemporary Gallery of “Olga Petrov” Cultural Center, Pančevo, 1991.
- Bela Duranci, *Farkas Béla*, Forum, Novi Sad, 1999.
- Bela Duranci, *Vojvodina – bogatstvo razlika*, KI Association PČESA, Novi Sad, 2002.
- Bela Duranci, *Moj izbor*, Center for Visual Culture “Zlatno oko”, Novi Sad, 2004.
- Bela Duranci, *Arhitektura secesije u Vojvodini*, Grafoprodukt, Subotica, 2005.
- Đorđe Jović, *Ka umetnosti – izbor tekstova*, Center for Culture Olga Petrov, Pančevo, 1987.
- Imre Šafran, *Na tragu – Putopisi, eseji, kritike*, Osvit, Subotica, 1971.
- Tihomir Savić, *Ečka / Umetnička kolonija*, Forum, Novi Sad, 1965.
- Imre Dević, *Dvadeset godina Umetničke kolonije u Bačkoj Topoli 1953–1973*, Forum, Novi Sad, 1962.
- József Acs, *Slikarska kolonija u Senti*, Forum, Novi Sad, 1962.
- Miloš Arsić (ed.), *Likovna umetnost u Vojvodini 1944–1954*, Contemporary Visual Arts Gallery, Novi Sad, 1980.
- Miloš Arsić, Ljiljana Ivanović, Slobodan S. Sanader, Grozdana Šarčević (eds.), *Likovna umetnost u Vojvodini XX veka – Stalna izložba*, Contemporary Visual Arts Gallery, Novi Sad, 1984.
- Ljiljana Ivanović (ed.), *Razvoj skulpture u Vojvodini 1895–1980*, Contemporary Visual Arts Gallery, Novi Sad, 1984.
- Miloš Arsić (ed.), *Grafika u Vojvodini 1900–1985*, Contemporary Visual Arts Gallery, Novi Sad, 1985.
- Miloš Arsić (ed.), *Slikarstvo u Vojvodini 1955–1972*, Contemporary Visual Arts Gallery, Novi Sad, 1989.
- Miloš Arsić (ed.), *Slikarstvo u Vojvodini 1900–1944*, Contemporary Visual Arts Gallery, Novi Sad, 1991.
- Miloš Arsić (ed.), *Aktuelnosti u slikarstvu Vojvodine 1973–1993*, Contemporary Visual Arts Gallery, Novi Sad, 1994.
- Miloš Arsić (ed.), *Stabilna konvencija slike – trenutak koji traje*, Museum of Contemporary Visual Arts, Novi Sad, 2002.
- Miloš Arsić (ed.), *Tradicija tautološkog – plastičke norme ne-konačnog*, Museum of Contemporary Visual Arts, Novi Sad, 2002.
- Miloš Arsić (ed.), *Paradoksi eklektičkog – Realne vrednosti kontinuiteta obnavljanja*, Museum of Contemporary Visual Arts, Novi Sad, 2003.
- Miloš Arsić (ed.), *Između geometrije i geometrijskog – Kontekst retrostanja*, Muzej savremene likovne umetnosti, Novi Sad, 2005.
- Dragomir Ugren (ed.), *Hijatusi modernizma i postmodernizma. Jedna teorijska kontroverza*, Projekat, br. 11–15, Novi Sad, 2001.
- Dragomir Ugren (ed.), *Likovna umetnost u Vojvodini 1950–2000. – Izbor dela iz zbirki Muzeja*, Museum of Contemporary Visual Arts, Novi Sad, 2001.
- Dragomir Ugren (ed.), *Fatalne devedesete – Strategije otpora i konfrontacija – Umetnost u*

Vojvodini na kraju XX i početku XXI veka, Museum of Contemporary Visual Arts and "Zlatno oko", Novi Sad, 2001.

Dragomir Ugren (ed.), *Centralnoevropski aspekti vojvodanskih avangardi 1920–2000. ... Granični fenomeni, fenomeni granica*, Museum of Contemporary Visual Arts, Novi Sad, 2002.

Dragomir Ugren (ed.), *Neuporedivi identiteti – Kolekcija vojvodanske umetnosti za Muzej XXI veka*, Museum of Contemporary Visual Arts, Novi Sad, 2003.

Suzana Vuksanović (ed.), *Nova skulptura u Vojvodini 1980–2000*, Museum of Contemporary Visual Arts, Novi Sad, 2006.

Mića Bašičević, *Studije i eseji. Kritike i zapisi 1952–1954*, Society of the Art Historians of Croatia, Zagreb, 1995.

Mića Bašičević, *Studije i eseji. Kritike i zapisi 1955–1963*, Society of the Art Historians of Croatia, Zagreb, 1995.

Dimitrije Bašičević Mangelos, *Ogledi*, V. Bašičević edition, Novi Sad, 1996.

Dimitrije Bašičević, *Sava Šumanović – život i umetnost* (prvo izdanje: 1960), Vojin Bašičević edition, Novi Sad, 1997.

Miodrag B. Protić (ed.), *Treća decenija – Konstruktivno slikarstvo*, Museum of Modern Art, Belgrade, 1967.

Miodrag B. Protić (ed.), *1929–1950: Nadrealizam Postnadrealizam Socijalna umetnost Umetnost NOR-a Socijalistički realizam*, Museum of Modern Art, Belgrade, 1969.

Miodrag B. Protić, *Srpsko slikarstvo XX veka I & II*, Nolit, Belgrade 1970.

Miodrag B. Protić, *Četvrta decenija – ekspresionizam boje, kolorizam, poetski realizam, intimizam, koloristički realizam*, Museum of Modern Art, Belgrade, 1971.

Miodrag B. Protić, *Jugoslovensko slikarstvo 1900–1950*, BIGZ, Belgrade 1973.

Miodrag B. Protić, *1900–1920: planerizam, secesija, simbolizam, minhenski krug, impresionizam, ekspresionizam*, Museum of Modern Art, Belgrade, 1973.

Miodrag B. Protić, *Jugoslovenska skulptura 1870–1950*, Museum of Modern Art, Belgrade, 1975.

Miodrag B. Protić (ed.), *Jugoslovenska grafika 1900–1950*, Museum of Modern Art, Belgrade, 1978.

Miodrag B. Protić (ed.), *Jugoslovensko slikarstvo šeste decenije*, Museum of Modern Art, Belgrade, 1980.

Žana Gvozdenović (ed.), *Galerija Petra Dobrovića*, Museum of Modern Art, Belgrade, 1989.

Olga Dobrović (ed.), *Dokumentacija o stvaralaštvu Petra Dobrovića III, Likovne kritike, intervjui, politički članci, pisma*, Gallery of Matica srpska, Novi Sad, 2002.

Simona Čupić, Jovana Barić-Jeremić, Maja Landratoške, *Petar Dobrović (1890–1942)*, Prosveta, Belgrade, 2003.

Lazar Trifunović (ed.), *Srpska likovna kritika – izbor*, SKZ, Belgrade, 1967.

Lazar Trifunović, *Srpsko slikarstvo 1900–1950*, Nolit, Belgrade, 1973.

Ješa Denegri, *Pedesete: teme srpske umetnosti (19PEDESET1960)*, Svetovi, Novi Sad, 1993.

Ješa Denegri, *Fragmenti / šezdesete-devedesete / umetnici iz Vojvodine*, Prometej, Novi Sad, 1994.

Ješa Denegri, *Šezdesete: teme srpske umetnosti*, Svetovi, Novi Sad, 1995.

Ješa Denegri, *Sedamdesete: teme srpske umetnosti*, Svetovi, Novi Sad, 1996.

Ješa Denegri, *Osamdesete: teme srpske umetnosti*, Svetovi, Novi Sad, 1997.

Ješa Denegri (ed.), *Šidijanke*, Vojin Bašičević Edition, Novi Sad, 1997.

Ješa Denegri, Vojin Bašičević (eds.), *Dimitrije Mića Bašičević Mangelos. Drugi o njemu*, V. Bašičević Edition, Prometej, Novi Sad, 1997.

Ješa Denegri, *Devedesete: teme srpske umetnosti (1990–1999)*, Svetovi, Novi Sad, 1999.

Miško Šuvaković (ed.), *Primeri analitičkih radova*, SKC Gallery, Belgrade and Nova Gallery, Zagreb, 1978.

Miško Šuvaković (ed.), *Scene jezika – Uloga teksta u likovnim umetnostima – Fragmentarne istorije 1929–1990 – Antologija tekstova umetnika*, knjiga 2, ULUS, Belgrade, 1989.

Miško Šuvaković (ed.), *Retrospektiva: Grupa KÓD, (B) i (B) KÓD*, Contemporary Visual Arts Gallery, Novi Sad, 1995.

Miško Šuvaković, *Asimetrični drugi. Eseji o umetnicima i konceptima*, Prometej, Novi Sad, 1996.

Miško Šuvaković, Ješa Denegri (eds.), *Prestupničke forme devedesetih. Postmoderna i avangarda na kraju XX veka*, Museum of Contemporary Visual Arts, Novi Sad, 1998.

Miško Šuvaković, Dubravka Đurić (eds.), *Impossible Histories – Historical Avant-gardes, Neo-*

Avant-Gardes, and Post-avant-gardes in Yugoslavia, 1918–1991, The MIT Press, Cambridge MA, 2003.

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

Miško Šuvaković, *Konceptualna umetnost*, MSUV, Novi Sad, 2007.

Dragana Vranić (ed.), *Ivan Tabaković – Legat Rastislave Tabaković – Izložba slika, tempera, akvarela, crteža, kolaža 1908–1977*, Museum of Modern Art, Belgrade, 1985.

Vjekoslav Četković, *Ivan Radović*, Art Academy and Matica srpska, Novi Sad, 1989.

Vjekoslav Četković, "Umetnici Vojvodine u socijalnoj umetnosti Srbije", from: *Socijalna umetnost u Srbiji između dva rata*, Art Academy in Novi Sad, Novi Sad, 1991, pp. 225–254.

Vida Golubović, "Dada u Subotici", *Književnost*, No. 7–8, Belgrade, 1990, pp. 1383–1388.

Josip Buljovčić, Eva Toldi (eds.), *Nadbanja i Vojvodani – sto godina umetničke kolonije*, XXXIII likovni susret, Subotica, 1996.

Lóránd Hegyi (ed.), *Aspects/Positions – 50 Jahre Kunst Aus Mitteleuropa 1949–1999*, Museum moderner Kunst Stiftung Ludwig Wien, Wien, 2000.

Thimoty O. Benson (ed.), *Central European Avant-Gardes: Exchange and Transformation, 1910–1930*, LACMA, Los Angeles, 2002.

Thimoty O. Benson, Éva Forgács (eds.), *Between Worlds: A Sourcebook of Central European Avant-Gardes, 1910–1930*, LACMA, Los Angeles, 2002.

Aleš Erjavec (ed.), *Postmodernism and the Postsocialist Condition. Politicised Art under Late Socialism*, California University Press, Berkeley, 2003.

Gordana Đilas, Nedeljko Mamula (eds.), *Tribina mladih 1954–1977. – Građa za monografiju Kulturnog centra Novog Sada*, Biblioteka Polja, KCB, Novi Sad, 2004.

Živko Brković, *Sava Šumanović – epistolarni portret – pisma, dokumenta, bolest*, KIZ Center, Belgrade, 1988.

Jasna Jovanov (ed.), *Minhenska škola i srpsko slikarstvo*, Gallery of Matica srpska, Novi Sad, 1985.

Milica Orlović (ed.), *Kolekcija Pavla Beljanskog – kod nas i u svetu*, Pavle Beljanski Memorial Collection, Novi Sad, 2003.

Galerija Matice srpske, Matica srpska, Novi Sad, 2001.

Vera Jovanović (ed.), *Spomen-zbirka Pavla Beljanskog*, Pavle Beljanski Memorial Collection, Novi Sad, 1988.

Ljubica Miljković, *Sava Šumanović, Prepuštanje pasiji*, Sava Šumanović Painting Gallery, 2007.

Olga Mikić (ed.), *Novosadske umetničke radionice XVIII - XX veka*, Gallery of Matica srpska and City Museum of Novi Sad, Novi Sad, 1971.

Nenad Makuljević, *Umetnost i nacionalna ideja u XIX veku: sistem evropske i srpske vizuelne kulture kulture u službi nacije*, Zavod za udžbenike i nastavna sredstva, Belgrade, 2006.

Miroslav Timotijević, *Radanje moderne privatnosti – Privatni život Srba u Hazburškoj monarhiji od kraja 17. do početka 19. veka*, Clio, Belgrade, 2006.

Ivanka Reberski, *Realizmi dvadesetih godina – magično, klasično objektivno u Hrvatskom slikarstvu*, Institute for the History of Art, Zagreb, 1997.

Olga Kovačev Ninkov, *Život i delo Franca Ajzenhuta (1857-1903)*, City Museum, Subotica, 2007.

EUROPEAN CONTEXTS OF THE 20TH CENTURY ART IN VOJVODINA

Publisher: **The Museum of Contemporary Art Vojvodina in Novi Sad**
Jevrejska 21, 21000 Novi Sad • Tel: +381 21 6613 897, Fax: +381 21 6611 463
e-mail: info@msuv.org • website: msuv.org

Executive Publisher: **Živko Grozdanić**, Director of the Museum of Contemporary Art Vojvodina in Novi Sad

Artists' biographical data, catalogue data and documentation: **Dragomir Ugren**

Architects' biographical data: **Vladimir Mitrović**

English translation: **Jagoda Topalov**

Proofreading: **Alex Papke**

Design: **Dragomir Ugren and Mirjana Dušić-Lazić**

Book Cover: **Kapitány László**

Photos: **Pavle Jovanović, Goran Despotovski, Mikloš Hever, Augustin Juriga, Vladimir Červenka, Miško Šuvaković** and artists' photo documentation

Printed by: **Publikum, Belgrade, Serbia**

Print Run: **1000 copies**

