The ‘I’ of the Beholder

Between the ‘viewing’ and the ‘knowing’ there is a world of dialogue that exists, and it is within that gaze of the audience perpetually subject to the nature of time that the aesthetics of art comes alive.

PETER BOND

The Indian Holi festival conjures up my past as a painter mixing paint from powder colour. Inert pigment has a special quality; it coats everything and makes the mundane colourful and gets everywhere. In my own painterly learning, I mix the powder colour to achieve permanence. I write from this “the performative node of enquiry. Knowledge has no hierarchy and is unnaturally hinged upon a selfish and elite ‘mythical’ academy that is not the only sort of knowledge.”

I, the writer, come with a different knowledge, by degree, to the reader. My learning is from a working class beginning, my experiences, and from the academies I work with and teach through. It is not one thing or the other. You will cast your own knowledge over mine and it will connect in different ways. It may be discontinuous, alien, repetitive, warming. An audience is freed and this show it should be.

On ‘The Audience’ the editor asks for a way forward and in response I have ‘brushed up’ on some key thinkers who have influenced my Habitus, where I stand or ‘see fit’ in the realm of audiences of creativity. This personal re-visitation is affected by new, and worldwide, contemporaries. An audience will never be the same twice; the nature of time prevents us from receiving the ‘same thing’ in the ‘same way’. Time erodes and revitalises the ‘same thing’ if one chooses to re-visit ‘that thing’ like the Taj Mahal changing colour at different times of the day.

New political and religious enigmas grip our ‘new contemporaries’. This newness makes thinkers such as Jacques Rancière, Jacques Lacan, Hal Foster and Pierre Bourdieu unique to my re-visitation.

Rancière, in The Emancipated Spectator, states that ‘viewing’ is the opposite of knowing: the spectator is held before an appearance in a state of ignorance about the process of production of this appearance and about the reality it conceals. This fact, together with the idea of the spectator being passive and ‘separated from both the capacity to know and the power to act’ is a ‘bad thing’. Rancière describes this as an ‘illness of the gaze’, a ‘theatrical mediation’, which ‘prepare the gaze for passivity and illusion’. On a ‘media stage’ this prevails. What Rancière calls for is a type of looking that incorporates a community of ‘living attitudes’ of each of its members. My reflections on the nature of knowledge, and of the Holi festival, focus on communities of ‘living attitudes’ with individualised referents.

Rancière wants audiences to be active and fearless in challenging whatever is put before them. Rancière’s work, in this instance, draws me to the socio-philosophical works of Pierre Bourdieu and Henri Bergson. Rancière speaks of two types of knowledge. The first is established by the establishment, the second is what we assume to know, and which we are unsure about. The former, intrinsically connected to the academies of knowledge, is wrongly assumed to be the guarantor of all knowledge. Knowledge, or the thirst for knowledge, comes from all angles. Established knowledge, academia, is likely to make us feel inferior. Bergson promotes instinct above any other type of knowledge.

It is the impossible-to-measure gap between different types of knowledge that divides our knowledge. According to Bourdieu, it is the difference between academic discourse (sanctified knowledge) and other types of knowledge. For Rancière, wanting to know and not knowing is the only key to intelligence. The only entity knowledge has is ‘driven’;... What is involved is linking what one knows with what one does not know... Like researchers, artists construct the stages where the manifestation and effect of their skills are exhibited, rendered uncertain in the terms of the new idiom that conveys a new intellectual adventure.

To begin this article, I visited Tate Gallery London where my plan was to eavesdrop on conversations of people looking at artworks. I wanted a different sort of knowledge about art, one that gave me information outside of theory and history gained from the academy. However, what happened was quite different: I began to see the galleries as forged from the minds of their curators. This highlighted curators as social mediators to the public viewing art. Audiences, like research, are about cross-referencing, evaluation and being surprised.

Hal Foster, art historian, begins his book, The Return of the Real, with Minimalism as going against the grain of the art establishment. He makes two important points: firstly that Minimalism breaks away from art history because of its theatricality; and secondly that interaction between the work...
SHOW ME WHAT YOU SEE IN WHAT I SHOWED YOU
and the viewer completes the art of the Minimalist. Foster describes this as somewhere between architecture and memorial. Robert Morris’s interactive work, Bodymotionspacethings (1964), when shown at the London’s Tate Gallery was closed after a few days because it was wrecked and loved to bits by the public.

What we look at is subject to the Gaze as predetermined sets of the signified in the process of objectification. ‘Newness’, seen by an audience, nourishes a new subjectivity. These types of knowledge potentials are contained in us, and are individual as every snowflake has a unique shape. This is why, when searching for something on the World Wide Web, we look for the next thing that conforms to our sensibility as thinkers, these become micro-narratives (Jean Baudrillard).

In art galleries we are at the white and mercy of the metonymy of the curator. This is why a display at Tate London, called The Artists Studio, at first glance, looks like an exploratory, or aggressive ‘shoot’ (in Lacan’s expression) but it equally clearly also takes in objects from the physical space – just as it projects unconscious objects into the real. This power of looking results in the power to exchange individually diverse references. What springs to mind is the moment that the British artist brothers, Dinos and Jake Chapman decided to buy watercolour paintings by Adolph Hitler. They purchased those, with a viewer’s eye, to paint rainbows on them. To these artists the images warranted an image screen, a projection of a rainbow. Nevertheless, the hidden horror of those works remains ‘unscreened’.

Lacan distinguishes between looking and gazing. In a scopic regime, where we can look at anything as a subjectivity, we read the object or encounter with an unconscious pre-existence, this is similar to language as fabrication and locality. The gaze, like language and the source material for theory, is situated in ‘the world’ and not in the academy. Therefore, in Lacanian thought, the subject exists from variable, not fixed, sets of signifiers. The subject is without a predetermined signification.

According to Bourdieu, the domain of the individual, the social standing or position, is called Habitus. To me this is a place to reside thoughts that contribute to our supposed or assumed understanding of who we are. The fragile arrangement of Habitus produces a ping-pong effect between knowledge of different kinds. Too often the knowledge of the state or the academy institution habitually gains the upper ground. The view of the academic milieu as ‘fair’ and competitive and supposedly charged with ‘pushing back the frontiers of knowledge’, and selecting the ‘best minds’ for research, is at the British artist’s (Penguin’s) orthodoxy Bourdieu’s sociological research and reflections aims to dispel.”

Bourdieu sets up a thesis whereby ‘ham, egg and chips’ has a cultural value equal to ‘Hamlet’, and each should be curious about the other. Equal opportunity and social mobility arise from a notion of thing ‘establishment knowledge’ set against ‘experiential knowledge’ of, say, a lift operator or rickshaw driver.

Knowledge in terms of the latter is subject to raw sewage; it is not pickled, boxed or packaged in the way that artists and packaged in the way that artists. The spectacle of the everyday is akin to raw sewage, it is not pickled, boxed and packaged. If, in Lacan’s terms, the artist makes a spectacle of the everyday. Intelligence is a working proposition, not intelligence per se.
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