

The 90s and the year 2000 show an increasing proliferation - a boom of museums: world architects compete for a dream amount of money, capital that is reserved by city councils, state associations and funds in Western Europe and America for the third millennium deal-of-a-lifetime in culture, from Texas to Boston, from Helsinki to Berlin: the building of new museums for art and the renovation of old ones. In the heart of the city of Berlin, in the so-called Berlin inner city island, from 2000 on, five museums will be rebuilt; the cost of such a project is estimated at DM 2 billion. According to various reports, never has such a quantity of museums and galleries, at such a rate of financial support, been constructed. The triumph of the museum is real, and thus it is perhaps more appropriate to ask, reversing the introductory question: does, in fact, the Western museum of modern art need art anymore?

Further, how does this affect or undermine the set of parameters of the museum in itself? Museums are among those structures that institutionalized the processes of art and culture in a way that allows us to think about art as an institution. It is a public sphere of need, production and consumption in art that is regulated and institutionalized by museums. Museums are institutions that in the modern world have codified and structured art. We must recognize the redistributed relations of power and the new inner agents and forces in the very institution of Art. The audience in art is currently, today, turned from *res nullius*, from something which belonged to no one, into *res publica*, a public affair, which must be accounted for in every serious analysis of modern art. Not only because of the new tourist logic of the museums, but because of new art production in the changing (local) map of Europe, Asia, Africa and so on; museums, and the institution of Art, have to reflect the establishment of new relations of power between the urban periphery, the center and the institutions.

The question "does contemporary art need

museums anymore" perhaps would suggest that it is time to bridge the gap between art and life, transcending Art as the institution of power, bringing it down to earth, direct and real. But as you already know, out there, outside the corrupted "institution of art", there is no authentic, unspoiled reality of life! Even the community itself is an institution of relations, of stratified power and dynamics. The institution of modern art, including the whole spectrum of power and hierarchic relations embodied and comprised in it, shows something more: that our historical ideas on how we construct the museum are clearly vanishing in the face of this new situation.

Does this imply the death of the museum, as has been proposed in post-structural theory?

No! On the contrary, it is, as Peter Weibel has stated on the subject, the end of the historical definition of the museum! This conclusion of definition (that has nothing to do with the end of the museum, as it seems, in fact, that it will live eternally) should be viewed in the context of a complex set of complementary oppositions: between reality and its fantasmatic support, between law and its inherent transgression.

I have stated that this conclusion of the definition of the museum today has to be viewed also in the context between reality and its fantasmatic support – and, as this reference to fantasy and fantasmatic support will be used extensively throughout the text, clarification follows herewith. Fantasmatic support, or scenario, is a construction of fantasies or, more simply put, of thoughts on different situations, relations, etc., that help him, her or the thing, the object, the topic under discussion to resist, to survive unchanged in so-called everyday reality. S/he fantasizes about the object, relations, etc., not in order to escape from it or them, but to sustain them. To sustain them in reality unchanged, as these fantasmatic scenarios or thoughts simply prevent the passage to real action and change.

Herein lies the power of fantasy, or of the fantasmatic scenario or construction. Fantasy

and the fantasmatic scenario have nothing to do with something fantastic or unreal, but are, despite being constructions and scenarios, almost material. The fantasmatic scenario, a fantasy, has the power to prevent an action and to sustain, to support, the situation as it is in reality: unchanged, much better and more effectively than with the so-called hard-boiled material facts, present and active in this very reality.

Returning to the statement that we are witnessing today the end of the historical definition of the museum, we see, and I refer to Weibel, a shift from author- and object-centered work to observer- and machine-operations-centered work. The question is not the machine, but the logic of the machine that is transposed in the work of art. Here, we can find a change in the historical definition of the museum. A new moment that seems crucial is also an artificiality of perception and positioning that is connected with the fictionalization of history. The museum was perceived as a "natural" site, and preserved in a locality of surroundings and continuity, but with the new projects and media-orientated artworks that integrate the public as a fundamental element of the work, we can experience and recognize the artificial social construction of the site of art. The museum is an extension of art, but an artificial one!

We can argue that today the power of the Western museum of modern art is real, but we can not move further if we establish the analysis exclusively in such a way. I would like simply to say that the universe of the museum cannot be grasped only as a means of direct social criticism – ...as the repetitive phraseology about the museum as an institution of art, co-responsible for the distribution and reproduction of the power of capital, is a fact confirmed even by those who run these museums.... I propose that we traverse the fantasmatic universe of the museum not only by way of direct criticism, but strictly theoretically (relying upon philosophy, psychoanalysis, and art theory and history), reviewing fantasies of the

# DOES CONTEMPORARY ART NEED MUSEUMS ANYMORE?

Marina Grzinic Mauhler

current position of the museum, about its historical power or non-power relations, in order to reach a possible conclusion. We have to slightly change the terms of looking at things.

Therefore, we can say that instead of the spectral power that was attributed to the museum in the 70s, when the idea of the revolution of the museum arose and the museum had to face a symbolical destruction that imprinted onto the museum a kind of spectral power –indestructible also in the case of its potential destruction – the museum of 2000 is, in its constant assertion of its real power, definitely vulgar, cold, manipulative and almost deprived of any aura. The museum today is well aware of its own financial, economical and symbolic power, at least the museums of (modern) art in the Western world (North America, Japan, etc.), if we think only of the millions that are invested in the developed Western world towards reorganizing the museums, building and rebuilding them.

In the 70s, the museum was perceived as a threat to the art community, with its historical and chronological time classifications and with the developing of the idea of constant progress in art and culture with styles and trends. The museum was seen as a place of restriction and power, which dominated the field and provoked violently the conceptual and neo-avantgarde art world to undermine it. The new situation in the 90s, when the museum asserted visibly, transparently its power and connection to capital, money, architecture, is a process that can be described as bringing to light, to act out the underlying fantasy of the 70s! This situation is much more effective and threatening for the social and symbolical sphere of art perceived as Institution than the spectral power of the museum of the 70s.

We should not forget that this new museum structure threatens art precisely by way of directly and brutally acting out in the reality of the art and social Institution. In a certain way, this directness is also a cynical gesture: it is as if the

museum, as an institution, is giving directly to the art world what this world has hallucinated over for decades, and it seems today that this is the most effective way to distort the art world. Constructive diversion or a sabotage of the museum as an institution of power is simply not possible, because a coordinated international action, based on solidarity against Art seen as an Institution, is not possible either.

It is commonly known that as a consequence of the ready-made, the system of galleries and museums changed the modalities of the artistic function in the beginning of the past century. Before the ready-made, all the elements of artwork were inherent/internal to the material with which the work was realized. Although the artists could have some ideas about norms and values, these external elements were not part of the work of art. This is why an artwork that was designed as an artwork could be recognized as such out of the art context, as well. On the contrary, the content of a ready-made is not the concrete object, but its context – i.e., the art gallery or museum. It is possible to say that the context is the content of a ready-made, and therefore, the object of the ready-made is the gallery system in itself (Goran Djordevic in Grzanic, see references). What is much more important is that the appearance, the birth of a ready-made allowed galleries and museums to take the monopoly of evaluating the work of art in society. In fact, that a ready-made was accepted as a work of art openly demonstrates the arbitrariness of the definition of the work of art by the gallery system and museums. We can say that the fact that the ready-made was accepted as a work of art is the purest sign of the real power of the system of galleries and museums in society. From that moment on, this relation is unchanged.

The next point to grasp is that in this displacement from reality to a fantasized universe, the status of the obstacle changes: in the 70s, the obstacle, the failure is/was inherent (the relation between the museum and the neo-avantgardist movement in art simply does/did not

work). In the second half of the 90s, this inherent impossibility is externalized into the positive obstacle which from the outside prevents its actualization: history, progress, chronological time are now seen through anti-historical views. And this move, from inherent impossibility to external obstacle, is the very definition of fantasy, of the fantasmatic objective position in which the inherent deadlock acquires positive existence! A-historical exhibitions, ruptures with styles, trends, classifications, etc. all work with the implication that with these obstacles cancelled, the relationship will run smoothly. The museum is presented as an institution, a self-reflecting historical phenomenon which uses its own means to examine its functions and possibilities in the context of today's multimedia society. When all the chronology and history concepts come down to earth, then the re-ordering of the museum and gallery space is based on the curator's geniality and taste; they are seen as a possibility for objective random collective memory (which collective? what memory?) in images and space. This museum structure is no less hallucinatory and no less a spectralization of the fantasmatic scenario of the power of the art institution from the past.

In contrast with the traditional actions of the museum in masking its power structure, when in the 70s it was sustained only as the fantasmatic spectral entity, the museum today does exactly the opposite: it destroys not itself, but its fantasmatic image/support. As opposed to the 70s, when the museum was segregated and survived as spectral entity, it seems that in the 80s and 90s the museum survives in reality by sacrificing, destroying its fantasmatic support. – Or not? The museum openly assumes the role of what is possible to call the devil of transparency, but the paradox of self-exposure, self-transparency tells us that this transparency makes it even more enigmatic. The art community thinks – not wanting to accept this – that behind the cold manipulative surface, there must be something else! – Or not?

Let us take the first example and move softly to the EAST. Again, an important clarification: East here is Eastern Europe, perceived as a mental, historical, cultural and productive paradigm, and as a spectral and fantasmatic counterpoint, or the hidden side of the New United Europe.

Our first example will be, since I have to make reference as a theoretician to a proper context of life and work, an analysis of the exhibition *2000 + ARTEAST COLLECTION*, displayed at the newly acquired, but not yet renewed space of the Museum of Modern Art (i.e., Moderna Galerija) in Ljubljana (the collection was on view from 25 June to 30 August 2000). The collection was parallel to another event: *Manifesta 2000*, simultaneously on view in Ljubljana, at different locations (from 24 June to 24 September 2000). Although both projects were displayed in the same location, it seems that they have nothing in common; besides modern art and a strong rivalry, that it is implicitly acknowledged, in the pre-supposed question, which exhibition is better and more important, not to mention less expensive for the international and national art community: I have to answer to this question, as Slavoj Žižek would say, in a Stalinist manner, both are worse! (but more about *Manifesta 2000* later!)

Luckily I was invited to write a paper for this conference, and at the same time, these two important projects were carried out in Ljubljana, in my native space, two projects that are important for the whole structure of the space of modern art of new Europe and its institutions. So, it is a conceptual, theoretical decision, almost political to make such an analysis.

The process of composing the *2000 + ARTEAST COLLECTION* is based on the idea of the dialogue between Eastern and Western EUROPE, with artworks from the 60s to the present day, and with a focus on works from Eastern Europe and from the so-called conceptual period.

The first point with regard to this re-collection of excellent works of art from the EAST of Europe in one space concerns the method by which some of the works became part of the collection; we might say that the price that was offered for some of the works was so small, almost ridiculous for an artwork with a historical past or present, or to put it more concisely: the whole situation of including some of the works in the collection was blurred, in terms of payment and regulations of displaying the work. The act was legitimized afterwards with this phrase found in the leaflet printed for the exhibition and interpreted in the following way: the artists and their works will be reimbursed over the coming years, if they will really become part of the collection (and if not, they will be returned following the exhibition). The Moderna Galerija knows perfectly well what is doing, as far as it re-collects artworks from Eastern European artists and not from the so-called Diaspora: to put it bluntly: who can afford a lawyer! The gesture – the concept of the collection, therefore, does not quite fit the description of a truly ethical act. In the end, the museum will still remain in the fantasy of the art community, with a wish to encounter a truly ethical curatorial act. Why it is so important to speak about this? Speaking not as a lawyer nor a policewoman, I am simply attempting here to identify the model that is invisibly staged in the background of the collection, and which could establish a dangerous pattern of constitution for the institution of art and the method of composing collections of contemporary and modern art in 2000 in Eastern Europe.

The museum is caught in a deadlock, following the perverse scenario of directly enacted fantasy; what was before all presupposed, today is direct. What was merely hinted at in the 70s, is now “rendered thematic” (Žižek) – the power of the institution, the relocation of the works of art, the displacement. In the *2000 + ARTEAST COLLECTION*, we encounter at its purest this direct transgression, this direct staging of perverse fantasies. What is the spectral fantasy of the authority of the art institution? That there is

something brutal and vulgar at the very beginning of the constitution of every museum and its collection. Similarly, as in the case of the last cannibal, the question of when you eat the last one and clean your village, can be replaced by the question of when you stole the last work of art in order to establish the collection. This is the reason that this direct act renders innocuous the subversive impact of the collection, and provides a thesis, a new confirmation of the Freudian statement that perversion is not subversive at all.

Let us take another detour, and take a look at the so-called (a)historical positioning of the museum and the narratives that reflect it. My further thesis is that the very circular form of such a narrative directly renders visible the circularity of the (a)historical process of the museum. A crucial ingredient of the metamorphic universe of the museum is a certain phrase, a signifying chain, which resonates as a Real that insists and always returns. We can identify, and I make here a reference to Žižek, that proposed a similar reading for an absolutely different topic, a kind of a basic formula that suspends and cuts across time.

In the 70s, Harald Szeemann insisted and formulated the idea of the open museum; attempts were made to make social contradictions visible in the museum, and consequently to free art from being sentenced to the museum, by connecting it once more with the world outside. The formula phrase is: Art must awaken, museums are prisons!

In the 80s, Harald Szeemann stated: The museum is a house for art! (in *Archis*, 1988, in a conversation with Rob de Graaf and Antje von Graevenitz), and moreover... art is fragile, an alternative to everything in our society that is geared to consumption and reproduction... that is why art needs to be protected, and the museum is the proper place for this. The museum is not what it seemed to be – the museum is therefore not a prison! (in Debora Meijer's paper/lecture from 1991).

In the 90s, and in the beginning of the millenium, the catchphrase is: Does modern art need museums anymore? – Rhetorically announcing the potential death of the obscene paternal figure – the museum – in art.

In short, this circularity is based on the impossibility of the museum to encounter itself, its proper position. At first the institution is troubled by some insistent message (the symptom) which bombards it from outside, but then, at the conclusion of the analysis, the museum could be able to assume this message as its own. "Does modern art need the museum anymore" can be read as the assertion of the castration: the "father" is always already dead, castrated – there is no enjoying "the" Other; the promise of the fantasy is a lure. This is why the figure of the castrated father is the figure of an excessively exuberant father, similarly to the figure of the museum of our present. Museums are so empowered on the surface, with exuberant, excessive architecture, that is almost not necessary to go inside the museum; it is enough to see it from the outside!

Let us return to the starting point from another perspective: the 80s museum was a house for art, and the 90s museum is the obscene museum, which reveals all its power, without any mask. These two poles can be seen as, first, the "protective museum", and second, the obscene, authoritarian, empowered museum. The two poles that can be reformulated as appearance versus reality, the protective institution against the Real of the over-empowered museum of today that becomes so transparent, obscene in its visibility. But nevertheless, although such polarization tells a lot about the museum spectral figure and its completely artificial character, in the end it rings false.

It is crucial to understand that we are not dealing here with the opposition between the appearance of the protective museum, and, on the other hand, the cruel reality of the 90s powerful

institution of modern art that becomes visible once we demystify its appearance. The overpowered museum, far from being the Real beneath the respectful protective appearance, is rather itself a fantasy formation, a protective shield. Both institutions, both museums from the 80s and 90s, suspend the agency of the symbolic Law/prohibition, whose function is to introduce art into the universe of social reality. The two museums are the opposition between the Imaginary and the Real; the 80s museum is the protector of an imaginary safety, and the 90s one (just refer back to Moderna Galerija) is the sign of almost lawless violence.

The two museum conditions, the imaginary and real, are what is left, once the paternal symbolic authority disintegrates. (What is missing is the museum as the carrier of the symbolic authority, the Name of the father!)

What we get are strangely de-realized museums, blind museum mechanisms that en/act immediately, with no delay!

Back to the 2000 + ARTEAST COLLECTION. The second point is that it is highly symptomatic that not one, not a single Slovenian artist, was included in the present collection-exhibition, not even the group OHO, that is perceived as the hardcore kernel, or the only conceptual activity in the 70s in Slovenia. This is even more problematic as the conceptual movement from the East is, as it is stated by the museum itself, at the core of the 2000 + ARTEAST COLLECTION. Paradoxically enough, as the 2000 + ARTEAST COLLECTION is not produced as a national display, the collection was prepared precisely for the international audience, counting on Manifesta 3 in Ljubljana. The 2000 + ARTEAST COLLECTION disavowed the Slovenian part entirely, de facto eliminating the production from the 60s on. We cannot take into consideration for a minute the excuse that this was because of the possible problems with the national Slovenian space, which will swallow the collection much more easily without a selection of local artists.

For the sake of the clean power of the institution, the proper internal space was completely disavowed, so that the collection displayed an abstract activity, untouched by the national space. From the viewpoint of the Moderna Galerija, this staged fantasy, constructed as a purely aseptic international presentation, protected the museum and its employees from the national space, but at the same time, we can argue, empowered the museum in the international context. In the future, this uncanny situation will have to generate a conceptual exhibition with clear formal regulations of property and reflection of the local space, surpassing the present symbolical and real lawless condition within such an abstract and depersonalized situation.

Or we can look at this from another point of view: an exhibition is a sort of structured text, a pure statement, and if somebody can achieve such an act, erasing the whole space of internal production, why then we are so worried when writing a text, an analysis of this act?

More general conclusions are that the museum of 2000 is not a situation opposed to the virtualized world of the museums in all its abstracted versions. On the contrary, the museum of 2000 displays itself as an abstract category, without any kind of problematic exaggeration, with no causality. The refusal of a productive closure (that would imply, e.g., in the case of Moderna Galerija, the selection of artists from the Slovenian space and context) means the refusal to face the mortality of the museum itself!

In this case, we are not dealing with the symbolic concealing of the traumatic Real of the context. It is exactly the opposite: the images and acts of utter catastrophe, far from giving access to the Real, function as a protective shield against the Real of the museum and of its abstract and strictly depersonalized situation.

This is why Alexander Brener's action at Manifesta 2000 can be viewed beyond just an act of barbarism. But as not everyone has been there, I will try first to give an interpretation of his action.

What was the action of Alexander Brener, supported by his partner Barbara Schurz, at Manifesta 2000 in Ljubljana? (Manifesta is proclaimed as the biennial of modern art from the New Europe.) One day before the official opening of Manifesta, the official press conference of Manifesta took place in one of the big halls of Cankarjev dom in Ljubljana; when approximately ten people from the organizational core of Manifesta: the curators of Manifesta, the director of Cankarjev dom and the president of the national board of Manifesta, etc., were seating themselves in front of the audience, introducing themselves, ready to take questions from the audience, Alexander Brener started his action. Brener started to write on a huge special projection screen, behind the table around which the Manifesta core organizers were seated before the public, such words and sentences as: Liberal servants of global capitalism fuck off, etc. Then he moved in front of the long press conference table, and helped by Barbara Schurz, who delivered their written statement, painted and partly destroyed the table. Brener then lay on it, waiting for the Cankarjev dom security guards to come to remove him, while they were already removing the screaming Barbara Schurz.

What was most striking in the action of Alexander Brener at the press conference of Manifesta 2000 in Ljubljana? He broke with the inherent transgression that is seen as an ability to compromise with the situation of the institution in itself – Brener put forward an action!

Alexander Brener and Barbara Schurz attacked Manifesta within the institution at its core – Cankarjev dom. The space is important for Slovenian official culture, and Cankarjev dom is a symbol of a center around which the main cultural and political, as well as cultural economic

affairs turn in the city. Thus, in contrast to the elusive spectral presence of the audience, who tried with questions to undermine and to clarify the position of this international exhibition (some Belorussians asked politely about the border of this New Europe and got an answer that was almost a mockery – something to the effect of: please do not bother us, the curators – we did not have enough time to go everywhere, etc.), Brener was direct, verbal and physical. The conclusion of his action was a direct self-commodification and self-manipulation. He lay down and waited.

Alexander Brener was not functioning as a truly dangerous entity, not as a real serious figure and authority: he was hyperactive, exaggerated, almost ridiculous and melodramatic. After partially destroying the table of the organizers of the press conference, he just lay on it, as if on the beach, waiting for the security guards, and when they were pushing his partner out of the hall, he just shouted her name, as in some highly melodramatic Hollywood films.

Nevertheless, here we could also see the most exact depiction of authority that we rarely have the chance to see so transparently. The Manifesta press conference was “exploding”, but not the authority ritual. They – the Manifesta core organizers – continued the press conference immediately after Brener was removed, without a single word of reference to what happened. Here, as Žižek would say, it is possible to see how difficult is to effectively interrupt the ritual of authority that sustains the appearance. Even after the embarrassing situation, the press conference persisted as if nothing, absolutely nothing, had happened, and similarly persisted the symbolic ritual in itself. It is therefore no surprise that at the end, it was all concluded with a party and a huge amount of food; this conclusion was what the organizers pretended Manifesta to be, a common celebratory toast and festivity.

Hence, it is possible to say that due to Brener's

action and his catastrophic scenario, it was possible for the Manifesta organizers and producers to take shelter, to disavow the real concept and results of Manifesta, and therefore to avoid the actual deadlock, the antagonisms, the divisions, the abstractions...of the national/international community.

Let us take another example: the INTERPOL project of Jan Åman and Victor Misiano at the Fargfabriken in Stockholm in 1996. Is it not possible to say that the horrifying “violence” of Oleg Kulik, acting as dog in the art gallery space, is itself already a protective shield that has to be fantasized as such, protecting us from the true horror – the horror of the abstract positioning of East and West?

In conclusion: the true horror is not all these benevolent institutions and museums, such as Manifesta, Fargfabriken, etc., that protect us from the Brener and Kulik syndromes; nor Moderna Galerija, that completely disavowed Slovenian art – because it could “provoke a national war” between the Museum of Modern Art – Moderna Galerija, the national Slovenian space – and the avantgarde artists, but exactly the reversal of this situation. The truly suffocating and psychotic generating experience in itself is that this protective care (that protects in the end only and obscenely visibly the institution in itself) erases all traces of difference, (a-historical) positioning, etc.

Let us now look more closely at the second example: the analysis of the Manifesta 3 project in Ljubljana. The paradox is that Manifesta 3, proclaimed as a pure act of transnational and global art vision, was in fact commissioned (and not vice versa) by the Slovenian state, the government and the Ministry of Culture, and the main managerial art and culture institutions in the city. When the state is overly bureaucratic, then it takes the role of the gallery and of the museum system. So the state dictates (through a codified system of institutions) the art concept (Goran Djordjevic). Manifesta reinforced from the

outside, internationally legitimated the power of major national institutions of art and culture in Ljubljana (led by Cankarjev dom). In fact, the major independent (!) institutions that were crucial for the constitution of the paradigm of modern art production in Slovenia from the late 70s onward, were not included in the Manifesta project (Gallery SKUC, Metelkova, Galerija Kapelica [K4]). Manifesta was used as a perfect guise of codification and acceptance of the fake and abstract internationalism in the so-called national realm.

Manifesta was an approval for the international community, insisting on the Schengen agreement in art and culture; demonstrating, furthermore, that Slovenia can fully respect and operate the agreed-upon terms of the game. A clarification: the Schengen agreement that was first signed as an economic act of regulation in Western Europe in the mid-80s, became in the 90s a European Community act of a severe regulation focusing on how to stop immigration, how to stop movements of "aliens", how to regulate the visa application process, crossing borders, seeking political asylum, etc.

(See: <http://spjelkavik.priv.no/henning/ifi/schengen/body1.html> for an accurate insight into the Schengen agreement.)

Slovenia, as one of the states which is in the process of joining the European Community (in the first wave), is obliged to fully respect this agreement. Slovenia is thus in 2000 in the position of being a *cordon sanitaire*, a zone to protect Western Europe from an epidemic of refugees and immigrants (or, as was publicly stated, in mid-September, by representatives of the Roman Catholic Church, who complained that if it is a process of immigration in Western Europe, then it must be controlled and selected, i.e., cleansed of Muslim immigrants).

Multiculturalism is the cultural logic of global capitalism, as new spiritualism is its ideology; multiculturalism is not about nivelization (as I believed in the past), but about multiplication (as was now thought by Manifesta); this is why global capitalism needs particular identities. In this triangle of global-multicultural-spiritual, the post-political must be seen not as the conflict between global/national ideological visions that are represented by competitive parties, but as abstract collaboration. As Jacques Rancière developed in his theory of the post-political, it is about the collaboration of enlightened technocrats (economists, lawyers, public opinion experts) and liberal multiculturalists. Manifesta 3 is, in its absolutely abstracted version, the international legitimization of the internal

enlightened technocrats of post-socialism (Cankarjev dom, etc.) by international multiculturalists. It also shows a radical discord between the effects of resistance and the institutions and mechanisms of power that provoke them, and the complicity of power, private capital and thought with mastery.

Both the old and new museum – and the "new" museum in the post-socialist context – are caught in an ideological trap. The museum defense against the true threat is actually to stage a bloody, aggressive, destructive threat in order to protect the abstract, sanitized situation. This is the sign demonstrating the absolute inconsistency of the museum fantasmatic support, as well. Instead of the multiple-reality talk, as who else but Žižek would say, one should thus insist on a different aspect – on the fact that the fantasmatic support of the reality of the museum is in itself multiple and inconsistent!

The introduced Real perpetuates the Modernist dichotomy of art versus reality. We have not to recreate the natural situation, but rather to articulate the artificial interventions and nevertheless to make a path, to transpose the museum from an instrument of repression to an instrument of criticism, to traverse the universe of the museum from conservation to confrontation.

This essay was delivered as a key note presentation at CIMAM Conference - The International Committee of ICOM – The International Council of Museums of Modern Art conference, held at Ludwig Museum Budapest, 22-25 September 2000.

I would like to thank the following persons: dr. David Elliott, president of CIMAM, Mr. Zelimir Koscevic, member of the board of CIMAM and Ms. Adele Eisenstein/C3 for the accurate editing of this essay.

#### REFERENCES:

Marina Grznic, *Fiction reconstructed: Eastern Europe, Post-socialism and the Retro-avant-garde*, Vienna: Edition selene, 2000.

Debora Meijers, "The Museum and The A-Historical Exhibition: the latest gimmick by the arbiters of taste, or an important cultural phenomenon?" in *Place, Position, Presentation, Public*, ed. Ine Gevers (Maastricht and Amsterdam: Jan van Eyck Akademie and De Balie, 1993).

Peter Weibel, "Ways of Contextualisation," in *Place, Position, Presentation, Public*, ed. Ine Gevers (Maastricht and Amsterdam: Jan van Eyck Akademie and De Balie, 1993).

Slavoj Žižek, *The Plague of Fantasies*, London: Verso, 1997.

Slavoj Žižek, *The Art of the Ridiculous Sublime: On David Lynch's Lost Highway*, Seattle: The Walter Chapin Simpson Center for the Humanities, 2000.