

Sezgin Boynik

One of the most revealing slogans of the Situationist International and one that the group used the most during the May '68 demonstrations read: "Our ideas are in everybody's minds." This was not meant to advocate, as many comments claim, the elitism and exclusiveness of the Situationists' idea. On the contrary, it represented a continuity of the utopian idea of art, the idea that real emancipation must be (and is) anonymous and collective.

On the other hand, that which also to a considerable extent makes this slogan famous is its manipulated aspect. Besides advocating anonymity and collectivity as the only politically possible ways of practicing art, the slogan also brings the strictly controlled ideas of the Situationists closer to the people. In other words, it makes them acceptable. "Our ideas are in everybody's minds" is thus a popularization of the Situationists' ultimate tool, which they called *détournement*. But by opening up the possibility of popularization, one creates a new form of manipulation, instantly closing up every emancipatory possibility. The Situationists, like Lenin, called this phenomenon recuperation and used it frequently. The process through which the above mentioned slogan was recuperated ranks among the most imaginative inventions of bourgeois art history. In 1989, three large world-class contemporary art museums exhibited retrospectives of the Situationist International, which is in itself an oxymoron. In order to account for this painstaking and impossible mission (besides the fact that every art is anti-Situationist, conversely, every Situationist exhibit must follow the strict definitions of the group which conceived it), one of the curators found an explanation in the statement that "Situationist ideas are in everybody's minds", therefore also in the minds of artists and, what's more, in the minds of pseudo-critical and decorative-conceptual artists like Daniel Buren, Cindy Sherman, etc. This is how Elisabeth D. Susmann explains it in the catalogue of the Situationist International exhibition at the Boston ICA in 1989.<sup>1</sup>

Therefore, discrediting any political emancipation and anonymity plus rehabilitating radical negation – this is the formula for the manipulation that Susmann performed very skillfully. Her skill lies actually in *détournement*. The well-known definition of *détournement* runs: "Short for 'détournement of preexisting aesthetic elements.' The integration of present or past artistic productions into a superior construction of a milieu. In this sense there can be no situationist painting or music, but only a situationist use of those means. In a more elementary sense, *détournement* within the old cultural spheres is a method of propaganda, a method which reveals the wearing out and loss of importance of those spheres."<sup>2</sup> Susmann does not contradict this definition; but the compari-

son is only possible if we accept that the Situationist ideas in everybody's heads are capitalist! This is where the mistake of all the art historians and culturalogists lies. Since they are essentially a product of bourgeois formalism and its class-based justification, it is very hard for them to accept the most obvious ideas of the critique of capitalism. For intellectuals and artists, anonymity, collectivity, and class struggle are not self-evident, as for the proletariat, where these things are almost instinctively accepted. Bringing contemporary art closer to the people is not difficult because of its complexity; the reason is the bourgeois-individualist concept of art as an esthetic creation of a genius artist. Unfortunately, these tendencies, which have still not lost their currency, find it hard to accept any anonymous or collective affirmation of art. Emancipation is still achieved as an individualist act, even in the case of some sort of political art taking place in contemporary art institutions. One of the reasons for this conservatism is the elimination of any kind of class consciousness and struggle from the sphere of contemporary art and the reduction of political contemporary art to a careless critique of the by-products of capitalism, from ecology to feminism and from nationalism to urbanism. Anonymity and class struggle are the two important constituents of proletarian emancipation that are most rarely noticed precisely in contemporary political art. Recuperation takes place constantly, remaining unnoticed; so much so that this schizophrenic situation has led to a large number of art theoreticians and curators excluding this terminology from their critical repertoires.

The artist Igor Grubić from Zagreb, 40 years old, who makes political art, is a rare example of an artist who is aware of the emancipatory value of anonymity. His anonymity has been unmasked, or recuperated, from the very beginning by the author himself. Grubić's works are well-known to everybody. Even though almost all of the works that Grubić conceives, prepares, and realizes were created in a mysterious atmosphere of anonymity, the reason for this is not a tactical attitude of his political artistic production. Anonymity is more like the emancipatory value of his art. This differs plainly from the managerial anonymity of Banksy, for instance, where anonymity and the critical attitude which this anonymity brings with it are merely the media manipulation of a completely capitalist and uninteresting production. Banksy's anonymity serves to silence a great tradition of subversive and collective (graffiti!) art, which is in itself anonymous, by authorizing and mystifying this production into a vague spectacular situation. Banksy's non-situational attitude is a front which takes more from anonymity than it gives: it takes away the most valuable aspect of anonymous art, its collectivity, by giving it over to a dubious (as it turned out, strictly capitalist) spectacular show. For these reasons, Grubić's anonymity is more productive and emancipatory

than any "subversive managerial activism"; it is an anonymity which is absolutely aware of the collective 'use value' of its act. Why is Grubic's anonymity more emancipatory and collective, considering that his acts are presented from the very beginning as part of the works of one artist? This presentation comes from the artist himself, who announces his art as the art of an "author", thereby settling the unavoidable dilemma of the bourgeois art lover, curator, and confused art critic. His authorization of [his own] anonymity is an emancipation which makes things easier from the beginning, by starting, without blurring the situation, from the point that anonymity isn't a matter of a skillful tactics of jamming (one of the most disgusting translations of détournement) capitalism or, even worse, the system. He accepts anonymity as a foundation of his production.

What kind of anonymity are we dealing with here? As opposed to the above mentioned 'labeled' or 'branded' anonymity of the 'invisible genius', here we are met with a form of anonymity which is above all collective.

It is collective in its quantity (a cluster) and its quality (easiness). That is to say that because of his clusters of works easy to perform, we interpret Igor Grubic as an artist who politicizes anonymity. This politicization results from the belief that real emancipation is anonymous.

The first point concerning this emancipation is its everyday nature. Igor Grubic's series of works, realized every day during a whole year, represents a full-blown serial production of anonymity, disabling the bourgeois definition of art as something special, authentic, original, or, even worse, as the transcendental act of individuals. Art as an anonymous and everyday production is the nightmare of the bourgeoisie; he characterizes this through a very familiar vocabulary, which varies according to need from a sophisticated anti-democratic one to a more rigid totalitarian-dictatorship or communist vocabulary. Now we can explain the logic of this thesis. As we can see from the example of the recuperation of the Situationist idea, the strongest reason for resistance to this emancipatory and democratic idea is the premise of anonymity, which the bourgeois mentality sees as a threat to its very foundation. This foundation, as is well-known, is called the individual, the most holy thing in all of bourgeois ideology.<sup>3</sup>

This resistance to anonymity, now more active than ever, can be found in all institutions, especially in cultural-artistic ones, which were unfortunately created, raised, and have matured backed by the bourgeois logic of justifying rights on the basis of the individual. This is why art works such as Grubic's are important; they render art, as the act of an abstract construction of esthetic genius, empty and worthless. They are, like all other everyday things, profane, ephemeral, simple, direct, important, necessary, and imminent ("Art has no alternative", Vlado Martek!).

The formal aspect of Grubic's approach to art is one of the most emancipatory approaches in recent artistic practice; with no pretentiousness whatsoever, it puts art back in its real place, that is to say it hands it over to the people's collective property of esthetic production.<sup>4</sup>

1 On the Passage of the Few People through a Rather Brief Moment in Time: *The Situationist International 1957-1972*, organized by Elisabeth Sussman and Mark Francis, Institute of Contemporary Art, Boston, 1989

2 Definitions, *Internationale Situationniste* #1 (June 1958)

3 Surely, this holiness is guaranteed as long as it makes profit; otherwise it can, by a very easy manipulation, transform itself into its cancer called fascism.

4 Among the recent successful attempts to politicize the people's creativity is the reader: *Stuck in transition: a collection of socially engaged works*, Center for libertarian studies, Belgrade, 2009.