On the Spatial Turn, or Horizontal Art History[1]

Piotr Piotrowski — UNIWERSYTET IM. ADAMA MICKIEWICZA, POZNAŃ

ART SINCE 1900, a study published recently by several prominent art historians connected with the *October* quarterly, is definitely one of the best available overviews of twentieth-century art.[2] The considerable amount of artistic material covered in the book has been ordered chronologically decade by decade, with each year covered in terms of major events. These are presented not so much as separate incidents, but rather as aspects of the intellectual processes that were characteristic of a given period. On several occasions the historical narrative has been interrupted by the authors' 'round table' debates. The analyses relies on the latest methods of research, in many cases elaborated by the authors themselves. Each segment of the book, moreover, has been supplemented by an appropriate reading list and references to the other sections. This offers the reader a chance to follow specific artistic processes, series of events, and the evolution of individual artists 'above,' as it were, the subsequent narrative pieces. The book closes with a glossary of twentieth-century art, an index, and an enormous bibliography. All in all, *Art since 1900* is an excellent academic textbook, virtually indispensable for study of twentieth-century art. It is perfectly clear and written in the current idiom of art history. The question I am going to ask here pertains, however, to geography.

There is absolutely no doubt that *Art since 1900* is a textbook focusing on Western art – the art produced in the cultural and political centers of the West: Paris, Berlin, Vienna, London, New York and others. This does not mean, however, that it does not mention any examples of art created outside the West or on its periphery. Apart from Russia and the role of Moscow and St. Petersburg (or Petrograd), the reader will find in the book information on the selected problems of twentieth-century art in Brazil, Mexico and Japan, as well as in Central Europe. It is perhaps the first publication with such a wide scope, expanding the artistic geography of the last century. This is particularly important since the book is intended as an academic textbook. The problem is that it does not revise the tacit assumptions of the modernist artistic geography. It ignores the perspective of critical geography, as well as what Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann calls 'geohistory.'[3] It thereby fails to reveal the historical significance of the space and place where specific art is actually produced. In other words, *Art Since 1900* refuses to deconstruct the relations between the center and the periphery of the world history of modern art. The group of art historians to which the authors of the book once belonged has done much to revise the paradigm of art-history studies, founding their project of a critical art history on the inspirations drawn from social sciences, feminism, queer theory, etc. Still, the authors of *Art Since 1900* made no attempt to critique the modernist artistic geography, nor did they revise its premises according to their own critical methodology. Consequently, the accounts of art produced outside the centers in Western Europe and the United States have been written within the Western paradigm. In this context, an exception has been made in the case of Russia. Its influence on the development of the international (Western) avant-garde cannot be overstated and its role has been distinctly highlighted in the book. This is, however, nothing new. The history of the first great Russian avant-garde has been part of the Western canon of twentieth-century art at least since the time of Alfred Barr. Its inclusion in any historical narrative is not so much an innovation as a basic obligation. What is really significant is the presentation of the art of other regions as fragments of the global or universal art history established in the West. This reveals both the West-centric approach to art history and the premises of modernist art geography.

I call this type of art-history narrative 'vertical.' First of all, it implies a certain hierarchy. The heart of modern art is the center – a city or cities – where the paradigms of the main artistic trends come into being: Berlin, Paris, New York and other cities of the West. From those centers particular models move to the periphery, radiating all over the world. Hence, the art of the center determines the specific paradigms, while the art of the periphery is supposed to adopt the models established in the center. The center provides the canons, the hierarchy of values and the stylistic norms; it is the role of the periphery to adopt them in the process of reception. It may happen, of course, that the periphery has its own outstanding artists, but their recognition, their consecration in art history, depends on the center: on the exhibitions organized in the West and the books published in Western countries. That was what happened to the outstanding Polish constructivists Katarzyna Kobro and Władysław Strzemiński, and to Czech surrealists such as Toyen and Jindřich Štyrský. Naturally, their contemporaries recognized them as peers. For instance, in his lecture delivered in Prague on 29 March 1935, André Breton said that surrealism was developing in Paris and in Prague in two parallel ways.[4] The artists of the international avant-garde did not view the artistic scene from a vertical perspective: to the Dadaists, Bucharest and Tokyo were just as important as Berlin and Zurich. It was art history that developed the hierarchical, vertical discourse ordering artistic geography in terms of center and periphery. On the subject of Dadaism, let me mention the extensive, excellent history edited by Stephen Foster: volume four provides information on art outside the (Western) centers. The title of volume four is telling: *The Eastern Dada Orbit*. There one finds accounts of the

Dada movement in Eastern and Central Europe, as well as in Japan.[5] It is also rather striking that whatever is outside the center is 'Eastern,' with the East stretching from Prague to Tokyo. Apparently then, vertical art history implies an 'orientalization' of the culture of Others in the sense proposed by Edward Said.[6]

Still, to launch a critique of the 'vertical' program of art history is not that easy. Of course, there are many publications devoted to art produced outside the Western artistic centers – in Central Europe, South America or Asia – and many of them in one way or another deal with the methodological problems concerning the relations between East and West, or North and South. The real problem, however, persists on a much deeper level: is there non-Western modern art, and if so, what is its mode of existence? Modernism and its 'mutations' – antimodernism and postmodernism – were by definition Western. This means, in the modernist sense,that they carried so-called 'universal' meaning: Igor Zabel claims that the modern forms and values of art are Western and as such pretend to be universal.[7] Nevertheless, these forms and values functioned not only in the West and North, but also in the East and South. Thus, when we ask about 'world art history', we must repeat a question posed quite recently by Suzana Milevska: can such art history exist at all outside the aforementioned geographical dichotomies?[8] It certainly cannot. Cultural asymmetry is not just an oversimplification, but an instrument of domination by cultural centers. (In his article 'The Marco Polo Syndrome,' Gerardo Mosquera critiqued the concept of cultural asymmetry, which is founded on a belief that the West provides models that the rest of the world either adopts or consigns to ethnographic museums as 'traditional' or 'exotic'.[9]). It is obvious that in the colonized regions art developed by drawing on the models of the metropolis. To the scholars who research the subject, however, it is equally obvious that that art goes beyond mere adoption and imitation, as well as beyond mere 'completion' of the art defined by the centers of modernism.

One of the most successful attempts to address this problem looking at a large non-Western area rather than a single case study is John Clark's *Modern Asian Art*.[10] Clark has drawn a detailed picture of modern art in Asia in relation to the culture of the West, which he calls 'Euramerica,' highlighting the ignorance of his subject matter in the West. The variety that we see in his book stems not only from the different cultural policies of different countries, but also from the much more profound cultural processes going on in various locations. In fact, Clark claims, the 'Euramerican' influence is only one element that a historian of the region must take into consideration. Another element is the inner dynamic of a given culture and its selective need to adopt specific models, and the role played by cultural 'transfers' in particular countries. In other words, Clark is interested not so much in the reflection of Western modern art in Asia, but rather in the function of that art and its institutions in a given Asian context. His is thus a much more dynamic interpretation of the reception of modern art in Asia than the ones we usually encounter in Western art-history textbooks: the artist, the work and the culture of a given country are, according to Clark, 'actors' rather than 'fields' on which Western influences appear.[11] In addition, a Western artistic style is paradoxically often used as an instrument of resistance against the cultural colonialism and imperial domination of the West in different forms of neo-traditionalist art. This makes the picture of the local situation even more complicated. This is also true of the differentiation of art and the rise of local schools in the 'Western style.'

The problems faced by Clark haunt all authors of art histories in the marginalized regions of the world. I experienced this myself while writing a history of art in East-Central Europe after World War II.[12] That particular region remained a part of Europe, although it was dominated by the Soviet Union. Its art remained European, although it had limited contact with Western art. Its artists remained European, although they were not free to travel, in particular to countries on the other side of the 'iron curtain.' Consequently, if I had relied on the 'vertical' perspective, I would have been unable to reveal the meaning of artistic culture in East-Central Europe, which developed differently in the various countries, although, for instance, geographically East Berlin was located just steps away from the West. When writing a history of the region's art, I had to focus on the political context of the reception of Western artistic models, the original meaning of which was often radically transformed: the *informel* meant something different in Poland and in France. The happening meant something different in Czechoslovakia and the U.S.A. Conceptual art in Hungary was not the same as conceptual art in the United Kingdom. Context-building, a kind of 'framing,' in the sense given to this term by Norman Bryson,[13] was an indispensable analytical tool of the art historian in this part of Europe. In fact, the historical differences and the strong influence of politics on art have given rise to the thesis, to quote Hans Belting, of the 'two voices of the history of European art.'[14] (Paradoxically, political pressure often resulted in the radical depoliticization of art.) Still, if this idea is taken too literally, it can lead to errors in the interpretation of historical processes.[15] Art in East-Central Europe had a different meaning than it did in the West, but it continued to develop in the orbit of Western culture. What is more, this aspiration acted as a political remedy against the official cultural policies of the communist regimes. Therefore, the task is not to present the 'other voice of art history,' but to establish another paradigm for the writing of art history.

Clearly, there is a world of difference between the history of art in Asia and in East-Central Europe, particularly when we approach the problem in terms of the Other. I must disregard here the internal differentiation of Asia. The history of the culture of India, including its assimilation of Western modernist influences, is quite different from the history of modern art in Japan. In terms of the 'exoticization' of the Other and its art history, the positioning of Asia differs a great deal from that of Central or Eastern Europe. The Asian 'Other' is a real 'Other,' while the Central or Eastern European Other is 'not-quite-Other' or a 'close Other.'[16] Of course, this has not always been the case, which is clear from Larry Wolff's study suggesting that to the people of the Enlightenment someone from Eastern

Europe (a Lithuanian, a Pole or a Russian) was a 'real Other' indeed.[17] In modern culture, however, the place of the 'close Other' is on the periphery of European culture, outside the center but still within the same cultural frame of reference. The place of the 'real Other,' by contrast, is determined not by the strategy of marginalization, but of colonization. The identity of the 'real Other' develops in the tension between its own, local tradition and the metropolis that colonizes the area. This difference has consequences for how the respective Others regard one another. The Eastern European shares with the Western European an 'orientalizing' approach to the 'real Other,' taking into consideration, however, a range of 'difference.' The Asian, by contrast, no matter from which part of Asia he or she comes, regards Europe as a fairly small and homogeneous continent. To the Asian, the culture of Germany, France, Hungary and Poland is all European culture, with a different degree of potential for expansion. What is more, the Hungarian and the Pole want to perceive themselves as Europeans and their art as European. They wanted it particularly badly under the communist rule; their longing was a psychological instrument of resistance against the attempts of the Soviet Union to impose its model of culture on Hungary and Poland. Asian cultures show no common desire to refer to a single Asian core. In a sense it is even the reverse: they all have a sense of far-reaching local differences, including differences in the reception of 'Euramerican' modernity.[18]

The problem of art history in South America is slightly different. First of all, this geographical area is linguistically quite uniform, to such an extent that it is much easier to regard it as a more or less unified region, in contrast to the countries of Asia or Eastern Europe. Even a popular study of South American art such as Dawn Ades's *Art in Latin America*[19] only recognizes national differences in some chapters. The linguistic uniformity is matched by the relatively uniform ethnic composition of the region. This does not mean, however, that its culture, including its visual culture, is uniform as well. Nonetheless, the external geohistorical circumstances created a frame of reference for the art of the continent that is different from those operating in Asia or in Eastern Europe. First of all, however, there is a view that in South America modern art has been much more involved in revolutionary politics than it has in Europe or Asia, while its modernity has been strongly connected with attempts to develop local identities with reference to local, ethnic cultural traditions.[20] Of course, just like other areas outside Western centers of modern art, South America has experienced a mixture of artistic styles violating the 'natural,' that is, Western, order of art-history chronology. These mutations and the local differences in reception of Western art gave rise to original artistic developments, such as South American surrealism. (The early phase of this movement was particularly interesting in Mexico.) In fact, despite private contacts with Breton, this was not really surrealism, but rather an original, local kind of art. No doubt such phenomena provoke art historians to revise the traditional Western frame of reference as well as to recognize the uniqueness of South American artistic culture, not only with reference to the West, but also the rest of the world.

If global art history is to be written according to the standards of 'geohistory,'[21] that is, taking into consideration the specific meaning of art of the peripheral regions, it must be critical of the hierarchical art-history narratives of 'vertical' art history. This means that it ought to be developed within a different, 'horizontal' paradigm.[22] Such a global art history should definitely take advantage of the method of 'relational geography' proposed by Irit Rogoff, who defines geography in terms of cultural differences.[23] The geography of culture conceived in this manner is an attempt to analyze the relations between the subject and the place where it functions; in this case both the former and the latter, art and the region where it is produced, are neither stable nor fully shaped. On the contrary, both are created in a dynamic process and in relation to other regions and subjects, to the local tradition and external influences. 'Relational geography' is a critical geography that rejects the essentialist basis of the traditional *Kunstgeographie*.

Now I will try to sketch out the program of a 'horizontal' art history, or rather 'horizontal' art histories, since as far as I am concerned it is impossible to talk about one art history opposed to the 'vertical' paradigm. Instead, one must think in terms of pluralistic art-history narratives.

Perhaps the starting point for the development of horizontal art histories should be the deconstruction of the vertical art history, that is, the history of Western art. A critical analysis should reveal the speaking subject: the one who speaks, on whose behalf and for whom. This is not to cancel Western art history, but to call this type of narrative by its proper name, specifically 'Western'. In other words, I mean to separate two concepts, which traditionally have been associated with one another: Western modern art and universal art. The former should be relativized and placed – according to the rules of the horizontal paradigm – next to other art-history narratives. Consequently, what is, or rather what should come out of such a move is a reversal of the traditional view of the relationship between the history of the art of the Other and the history of 'our' (read: Western) art. While it seems obvious that the modern art of Others developed under the influence of the West, it appears much less obvious to ask how developments in non-Western art affect the history of art in the West or, more precisely, the latter's perception. Here a question arises: how does peripheral art change the perception of the art of the center? Going one step further, we may also inquire what kind of picture of the center can be seen not from the center itself – the place usually occupied by the historian of modern art – but from a position that is marginal, according to the principle that one can see much more from the margins.

First of all, the marginal observer sees that the center is cracked. While the center perceives itself as homogeneous, the margins, in the process of receiving and transforming it for their own use, can see the inner tensions that belongto their essence. It seems that there are two categories that homogenize art history written from the point of view of the center: the canon and style, in the sense of a given artistic trend such as cubism, futurism, etc. The history of the art of the

periphery, defined in terms of artistic events and the description and analysis of these events, has developed in the context of the Western canon and stylistics. First artists and then art historians refer their creative and analytical experiences to those categories. The Western canon of a given trend becomes the point of reference for its reception and transformation in specific locations outside the center. This is, however, not so much a judgmental measure, but rather a historical frame, a context for the more or less autonomous operations that, under the pressure of diverse local circumstances, generate their own hierarchies and canons. Such local artistic canons cannot be agreed upon, since there is not a single history of the art of the periphery; there are as many histories as there are peripheries. Still, such histories can be negotiated, particularly from the critical perspective of opposition to the center. If, however, the canon seen from the periphery becomes relative, the conclusion is that perhaps it should be relativized also in the center. Art historians should realize that it is always an effect of analytical construction and as such has a historical character that refers more to the historian than to the art in question.

This process is even more distinct in terms of stylistics. In principle, the art of the periphery and its histories never accepted Western 'purity' of style. There are enough examples and analysis of them leads to an obvious conclusion. Let me just mention Russian cubofuturism (its very name is heterogeneous), Hungarian activism, Polish formism, South American indigenism, vibrationism, invented by the Uruguayan artist Rafael Barradas, surrealism, which took many different forms all over the world, Japanese dada, Latin American concrete art and local varieties of conceptualism that most often differed from the Western (Anglo-American) linguistic model. When we return to the center with the experience of the periphery, in the case of conceptual art we realize that in the West it was not so orthodox or homogeneous either. The linguistic model as an analytical category derived from the activity of the Art and Language group does not cover a number of manifestations. I want to say that the history of the art of the center, and the global history of modern art that developed out of it, has a chance to revise its self-perception in light of the studies focused on the periphery –horizontal art history or art histories.

The relativization of the history of Western art as a result of the deconstruction of its analytical and geographical categories, as well as the 'localization' of the center, must bring about analogical processes in the 'other' art histories. The Other must also take a fresh look at itself, define its position and the place from which it speaks. In fact, its position is much more privileged in this respect than that of the narrator placed at the center. The latter, quite often unconsciously, due to the ideology of the universalization of modern art, ignores the significance of place, thus turning into an instrument of colonization. In his or her opinion, if art is universal the place from which it speaks does not matter. The Other, much more sensitive to context and the importance of 'relational geography,' may make us aware that we do not write our statements in the middle of nowhere, but rather in specific locations. After all, the center is also just a place with specific local, legal, ethnic and cultural parameters. The subject occupying the center forgets that it is there, in a place quite precisely located on the map of the world. The Other, which cannot forget its own location, may provide it with self-consciousness. A historian of modern Argentinean, Czech, or Indian art knows very well where he or she is, while a historian of modern art in France or the United States often ignores that knowledge for the sake of universalizing the local.

At this point we have reached the key problem of horizontal art history, which is the problem of localization. When we take a look at the books on the history of modern art, we see that on the one hand we have the 'history of modern art' with no local specification, while on the other we have all kinds of adjectives specifying the regional (e.g., the art of Latin America or Eastern Europe) or, more often, the ethnic locality (e.g., the history of Polish, Korean or Mexican art). The problem of national or ethnic art-history narratives seems very characteristic of art outside the center, although, as DaCosta Kaufmann argues, their origin lies elsewhere and is much older than the history of modern art.[24] On the one hand, we have national art histories of particular countries, while on the other hand we have international art history. In fact, the latter type of art-history narrative reveals the dynamic of modern art history:again, on the one hand we have artists with an international status, although all of them actually come from specific countries and their art bears the mark of their national cultures (e.g., Pablo Picasso who came from Spain). On the other hand there are artists who remain specifically national, although some of them were also renowned abroad (e.g., Władysław Strzemiński as a Polish constructivist). This contrast reveals tensions of a geographical kind: on the one hand we have Paris and later New York as international centers of culture; on the other hand we have regional capitals placed in national frames, such as Prague, Tokyo and Buenos Aires. Obviously, in the hierarchy of art-history narratives, the former are highly appreciated, while the latter are often underrated or ignored.

Of course, that type of locality is related to the structure of nation states and the modernist form of nationalism.[25] This is now changing on account of the processes of globalization that are connected in general to a postmodern view of reality and the transformation of nation states into more cosmopolitan organizations.[26] It seems that the concept of 'locality' is no longer bound to a specific place and, according to Arjun Appadurai,[27] it transcends frontiers and borders. No matter how accurate this observation may be, place as an identity label has not disappeared. What is more, it has acquired a new meaning. The lifting of frontiers and the globalization of art institutions (e. g., the Biennale) on the one hand weakened artists' ties to place, while on the other hand it made them paradoxically even stronger, creating a kind of 'local identities for sale.' The globalized world needs such strategies; it creates them for commercial and political purposes. This is the role of cultural brokers, described with reference to South American art by Mari Carmen Ramirez; they are curators rather than art historians.[28]

It is worth while developing this problem a little bit, and asking about the relationship between the

postmodern and the post-colonial understanding of the 'nation,' i.e. international and national art history. To avoid going into details that have been treated extensively by many scholars, let us note that one of the main issues here is the question of the subject. Generally speaking, postmodernism stands for a critique of the subject, a deconstruction and dispersal of the subject; post-colonial studies operate with the defense and integrity of the subject.[29] The 'nation' seen from a postmodern perspective is deprived of its essential features. Post-colonial scholarly practice, however, relies on the essence of the nation to define its critical strategy and resistance to the center. On the one hand, in international horizontal art history, operating with the notion of the 'nation,' there must be a defense of the (national) subject. It is thus closer to the post-colonial interpretation than it is to the postmodern. On the other hand, however, shifting the topic of discussion from the international to the national level, one should have a critical approach to the question of the essential understanding of the subject. Art produced in a nation-state is never 'national,' either in the ethnic or the political sense of the word. It would be repressive to the other groups working within the nation-state, dominated by the main (ethnic, political) 'nation', to adopt the 'national' perspective. Therefore in this situation it is important to adopt a critical strategy towards the national (essential) subject in order to gain equality of rights for all the subjects – *nomen omen* – working on the scene. Consequently, horizontal art history written from a macro-perspective cannot ignore national subjects and indeed it has to make a critique of the center in order to defend them. Horizontal art history written from a micro-perspective, by contrast, has to make a critique of the essence of the national subject, has to deconstruct it, in order to defend the culture of the 'Other' against the national mainstream.

In order to address this issue in detail, I want to ask another question: what material (in addition to ideological) premises supported the national constructions of the history of modern art? I think that what mattered most was the lack of direct communication between cultures. If they communicated at all, it was via the center; this could be observed on the micro and the macro scale. The cultures of particular regions (Asia, South America and Eastern Europe) looked up to the West, rather than looking up to one another. They drew predominantly from the West, rather than from other peripheries. The same is true with reference to the individual national art-history narratives in specific regions, even a region as small as Eastern Europe. Poles have almost no idea about the history of Romanian art; they ignore it, considering their own culture, which they prefer to compare directly to the West, to be far superior. Likewise Czechs know little if anything about the history of Ukrainian art. The Other looks up to the Master rather than looking up to 'An-Other,' thereby accepting, often quite unconsciously, the hierarchy of the center of which it is a victim. If there is any transfer of values, experience or knowledge, it only occurs through the Master, that is, the West. In this way the Master legitimizes one specific Other in the eyes of 'An-Other.'

Of course, the relations between the center and the localities defined in national terms have changed. Modern culture favored the tension between the national and the international, while contemporary, postmodern, globalized and multiple culture prefers a different vocabulary, favoring local identity. For the sake of universalist utopias of unity, modernism ignored individual identities: ethnic, local, sexual, racial and others. The very adjective 'international' implied a state of being 'inter-,' 'beyond' or 'above' all individual and national features (e. g., the 'international' style or stage). That rhetoric concealed the imperialism of the West, which could be perceived on the most basic level of language used by 'international' society: first French, then English. The present situation, however, calls for new strategies. As a result of global conflicts and the subsequent collapse of the universalist utopia, some sort of identity mark is generally seen as the basic starting point. Good examples of this new attitude can be seen in the artistic interpretations of Marina Abramović and Ilya Kabakov. They regard national origin as important, but unlike their predecessors they do not frame it in an 'exotic' discourse (such as Diego Rivera working in the United States), nor do they negate the role of influences. What is more, this tendency favors the reconstruction of the national origin of many avant-garde ideas, which was blurred by the paradigm of international modernism. This can be seen in analyses of the work of Marcel Duchamp in the French context, and Kazimir Malevich in the context of Russian tradition. Surely, all this is not brand new, but studies of these two artists in the 1930s, 1940s and 1950s showed little trace of the national contextualization of their achievements. This was only acknowledged much later. In this context, one comes across the idea of transnationality, which is something quite different from internationality.

The idea of transnationality ought to be used to develop a horizontal art history,art history that is polyphonic, multidimensional and free of geographical hierarchies. Of course, an open model of global art history must also include other concepts rooted in perspectives other than critical geography: those of specific genders, ethnic groups, subcultures and so on. If fact, such revisions of art history, for instance from a feminist point of view, have been proposed for many years but often they still endorse the geographico-hierarchical paradigm of the history of modern art. We now see transnational art histories, which negotiate values and concepts along lines other than the opposition between national and international; this is clear from the regional art-history narratives mentioned above. Still, the potential and the appeal of a transnational discourse offers us a chance to open art history to a much more interesting perspective; to write a history of art that would (like the negotiations of local art-history narratives in specific regions) allow its authors to negotiate local narratives on a transregional level. This does not have to lead to writing another art history in a horizontal form. On the contrary, this strategy should result in a plurality of transregional narratives, an obvious critique of the West-centered art-history narrative. This is a great challenge to our discipline, or at least to the segment focused on the study of modern art. Just as a horizontal art history, or histories, should critique the vertical, centralized model, a world art history should critique the universal one, the history of imperial art

in the literal sense of the term, which imposed on the colonies the hierarchies, the epistemological categories and the value system of the metropolis. In other words: the world art history that has been my subject matter on this occasion should be horizontal rather than vertical.

Translated by Marek Wilczyński

Notes

1. This article is the enlarged version of two separate and different papers given to the following conferences: 'Toward horizontal art history' (CIHA Congress, 'Crossing Cultures. Conflict. Migration. Converges', Melbourne 2008); proceedings will be published by Melbourne University Press 2009), and 'European avant-garde and its horizontal art history' (EAM Conference, 'Europa! Europa?', Ghent 2008). The Polish version of this text is going to publish in *Artium Quaestiones*, Vol. XX, Poznań 2009.

2. Hal Foster – Rosalind Krauss – Yves-Alain Bois – Benjamin H. D. Buchloh, *Art Since 1900. Modernism, Antimodernism, Postmodernism*, London 2004.

3. Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, *Toward a Geography of Art*, Chicago – London 2004. – Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, Time and Place: Essays in the Geohistory of Art. An Introduction, in: Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann – Elizabeth Philiod (eds), *Time and Place: Essays in the Geohistory of Art*. London 2005.

4. André Breton, *Position politique du surréalisme*, Paris 1972, quoted from František Šmejkal, From Lyrical Metaphors to Symbols of Fate: Czech Surrealism in the 1930s, in: Jaroslav Anděl (ed.), *Czech Modernism, 1900–1945* (exh. cat.), Houston, The Museum of Fine Arts 1989, p. 65.

5. Stephen C. Foster (ed.), *Crisis and the Arts. The History of Dada* IV. – Gerald Janecek – Toshiharu Omuka (eds), *The Eastern Dada Orbit: Russia, Georgia, Ukraine, Central Europe, and Japan*, New York 1998. Of course, there are other studies focusing on Eastern Europe in particular as a place of origin of the Dada movement: Tom Sandqvist, *Dada East. The Romanians of Cabaret Voltaire*, Cambridge, Mass. 2006.

6. Edward Said, *Orientalism*, New York 1979.

7. Igor Zabel,'We' and 'The Others,' in: Eda Čufer – Viktor Misiano (eds), *Interpol. The Art Show Which Divided East and West*, Ljubljana – Moscow 2000, p. 132.

8. Suzana Milevska, Is Balkan Art History Global?, in: James Elkins (ed.), *Is Art History Global?* New York – London 2007, p. 216.

9. Gerardo Mosquera, The Marco Polo Syndrome. Some Problems around Art and Eurocentrism, in: Zoya Kocur – Simon Leung (eds), *Theory in Contemporary Art Since 1985*, London 2005, pp. 218–225.

10. John Clark, *Modern Asian Art*, Honolulu 1998.

11. Ibidem, p. 22.

12. Piotr Piotrowski, *Awangarda w cieniu Jalty. Sztuka w Europie Środkowo-Wschodniej w latach 1945–1989*, Poznań 2005 (English edition: London: Reaktion, forthcoming 2009).

13. Norman Bryson, Art in Context, in: Ralph Cohen (ed.), *Studies in Historical Change*, Charlottesville 2003, p. 21.

14. Hans Belting, *Art History after Modernism*, Chicago – London 2003, p. 61.

15. See Mária Orišková, *Dvojhlasné dejiny umenia*, Bratislava 2002.

16. The term'close Other' was used by Bojana Pejić in her essay The Dialectics of Normality, in: Bojana Pejić – David Eliott (eds), *Art and Culture in Post-Communist Europe* (exh.cat.), Stockholm, Moderna Museet 1999, p. 120. She mentions Boris Groys (*fremde Nahe*), but makes no bibliographic reference.

17. Larry Wolff, *Inventing Eastern Europe*, Stanford, Ca. 1994.

18. Clark (see note 10), p. **???**

19. Dawn Ades, *Art in Latin America. The Modern Era, 1920–1980*, New Haven – London 1989.

20. Ibidem, pp. 125–126, 195–213.

21. DaCosta Kaufmann (see note 3).

22. Piotr Piotrowski, On Two Voices of Art History, in: Kaja Bernhardt – Piotr Piotrowski (eds), *Grenzen überwindend. Festschrift für Adam S. Labuda zum 60. Geburtstag*, Berlin: 2006, p. 53.

23. Irit Rogoff, Engendering Terror, in: Ursula Biemann (ed.), *Geography and the Politics of Mobility*, Wien – Köln 2003, p. 53.

24. Thomas DaCosta Kaufmann, National Stereotypes, Prejudice, and Aesthetic Judgments, in: Michael Ann Holly – Keith Moxey (eds), *Art History, Aesthetics, Visual Studies*, Williamstown, Mass. 2002, pp. 71–84.

25. See Anthony D. Smith, *Nationalism and Modernism. A Critical Survey of Recent Theories of Nations and Nationalism*, London – New York 1998.

26. Ulrich Beck, *Macht und Gegenmacht im globalne Zeitalter. Neue Weltpolitische Ökonomie*, Frankfurt am Main 2002.

27. Arjun Appadurai, *Modernity at Large. Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*, Minneapolis 1996.

28. Mari Carmen Ramirez, Brokering Identities: Art Curators and the Politics of Cultural Representation, in: Reesa Greenberg – Bruce W. Ferguson – Sandy Nairne (eds), *Thinking about Exhibitions*, London – New York 1996, pp. 21–38.

29. See Dariusz Skórczewski, Wobec eurocentryzmu, dekolonizacji i postmodernizmu. O niektórych problemach teorii postkolonialnej i jej polskich perspektywach, *Teksty Drugie*, 2008, Nos 1–2, pp. 33–35.