



UDK 7.037

DOI 10.51937/Amfiteater-2025-1/350-366

Abstract

The article starts from the understanding of the concepts of the centre and the periphery as a symbiosis, touching on the schizoid understanding of autonomy in the *field* of art and highlighting its involvement in globalist colonisation operations. It deals with the ideological difference between the affirmation of the past (which is asserted by consolidating the conceptual emptiness of the "historical avant-garde") and the declaration in the present – a creative presence in a community context. With the awareness of this difference, the recognition of the avant-garde narrative as an embellishment of the hegemonism of the *field* begins. The presence affirmed in an artistic act defines avant-gardeness as an attitude that cannot be assimilated. The author defines avant-gardeness and substantiates the following axiom: Avant-gardeness is not a matter of exoticism nor an excess in the real. It is the *real-poetic* in the excess state of the biopolitical simulacrum. He aims to show that avant-gardeness implies an achieved and affirmed Infinity that is impossible to be exhibited within the finiteness of presentation formats. The article concludes with the thesis that the essence of the aesthetics of avant-gardeness lies in the constant invention of a *poetic definition of its own meaning*, always related to the structuralities of the situations in which this meaning arises.

Keywords: situation, displacement, outer, field, inversion, Impossible, poetry, factual

Multimedia artist **Nenad Jelesijević** is a researcher of performance art, stage arts and film, a writer, an architect/designer, the artistic director of the Kitch Institute based in Ljubljana and the coordinator of its long-term programme Performance Theory and Practice. His artistic work and writings often intertwine the phenomena of spectacle and pop. He regularly publishes on *Performans.si*, which also provides an extensive collection of his texts on performativity, film and related topical phenomena. More than 250 of his contributions have been published in books, journals, dailies, theatre playbills, various web and project publications, as well as broadcast on radio.

nenad.jelesijevic@guest.arnes.si

Nenad Jelesijević

This essay opens by introducing an understanding of the concepts of the centre and the periphery as symbiotic, which is different from the usual dichotomous perspective of their relationship. Whilst touching on the schizoid understanding of autonomy in the *field* of art, we highlight the involvement of the *field* in imperial colonisation operations. Here we are actually dealing with the ideological difference between the affirmation of the past and the declaration of oneself in the present. With the awareness of this difference, the recognition of the avant-garde narrative as an embellishment of the hegemonism of the *field* begins. Precisely presence – a creative presence in a community context – that could be affirmed in an artistic act defines avant-gardeness as an attitude that cannot be assimilated.

The definition of avant-gardeness that follows is substantiated in the axiom: Avant-gardeness is not a matter of exoticism nor an excess in the real. It is the *real-poetic* in the excess state of the biopolitical simulacrum.

This axiom is derived from these four postulates:

1) The “acceptance of otherness” is conceived as a model of business that is intended to cover up and justify the inequality on which the *field* is based. In it, all exoticism – understood as authenticity, particularity, originality, inimitability, as an exemption of ποιήσις from simulacra – is transferred from the level of the sensual to the level of the self-sufficient performative; is therefore processed, tamed, removed from interactions, so to speak, from life, and sent to the “culture of acceptance”. Avant-gardeness is not a part of the “culture of acceptance” because it is situated in itself and the common, which arises from the intelligence of the tribe in motion – as the constant mutual coordination of spirits, as creativity at the intersection of the horizontal and the vertical.

2) Presence is what makes the difference between production in the field and creation in the Beyond. The characteristic of the Beyond is immeasurability, the non-countableness. Its aesthetics are embodied and also disembodied in ways that cannot be commodified. The presence, realised in artistic creation with awareness of the core of a concrete situation, determines avant-gardeness as a specific attitude that cannot be assimilated.

3) Scholastic treatments of the avant-garde do not take into account the paradigms of presence and situation, so they are stuck in the permissible – non-factual – history. They are irrelevant from the point of view of situating life, just like the past itself. Avant-gardeness cannot be dealt with, it can only really be contemplated when we are involved in it experientially – with our tactile, motoric and vocal senses – when, therefore, our cognitive perception is sensorially embedded in the generic place of its emergence.

4) Unlike the canonised “contemporary art”, avant-gardeness is not a matter of self-sufficient pranking, a bare distraction, but a matter of a structural paradigm, a generic place. It is a poetic structure that creates an original and inimitable attraction.

We will see that avant-gardeness implies an achieved and affirmed Infinity that is impossible to be exhibited within the finiteness of presentation formats. The essay concludes with the thesis that the essence of the aesthetics of avant-gardeness lies in the constant invention of a *poetic definition of its own meaning*, always related to the structuralities of the situations in which this meaning arises.

In light of the developed axiom, the essay opens the view to the Impossible. Namely, we can speak of the avant-garde as something definite only as long as we refer in some way to the simulacrum of finiteness. However, when we abandon this reference, the notion of definiteness becomes superfluous, which also means that we are not engaged in any interpretation. However, through active observation, we are merely consolidating our presence. This decision and the act itself are aligned with the position:

Avant-garde is not possible in the *field*, but the Impossible is its axiom, which determines it as embedded in the factual – explicit, consciously exempt from the seemingly real – as something permanent, epic, something immanent to an unregulated creation, to the realisation of the Law.