

Original scientific paper
Submitted: 15/08/2025
Accepted: 11/10/2025

ABSTRACT

The article argues that contemporary theater must reinvent its spatial and perceptual foundations in order to address complex phenomena like climate change, whose scales and temporalities exceed traditional modes of representation. The author proposes the composite gaze, a mode of perception emerging from within the material and sensory conditions of performance, which generates a public-intimate space: an immersive but wounded interior where spectators are entangled with the scene rather than positioned at a distance.

To enable such a gaze, theater must create a new kind of performative environment: an anarchitectural space without horizon, shaped not by stable design but by voids, ruptures, and disorganization. Drawing on ruined monuments, partisan ecologies, and Gordon Matta-Clark's work, the text describes this space as a gestural, fissured container in which distinctions between gesture, meaning, and material expression collapse. This immersive image-space becomes a laboratory for perceiving a world whose horizons are dissolving, allowing theater to explore new forms of collective imagination under conditions of instability.

KEYWORDS

dramaturgy, composite gaze, intimate public space, image-space (Bildraum), anarchitecture, horizon, gestural space, climate change and performance, partisan ecologies

ET AL.

Composite Gaze
or The Climate
Change Resists
Postdramatic Theater

ET AL.

Izvorni znanstveni rad
Primljen: 15/08/2025.
Prihvaćen: 11/10/2025.

SAŽETAK

Članak tvrdi da suvremeno kazalište mora iznova osmisлити svoje prostorne i perceptivne temelje kako bi se suočilo sa složenim fenomenima poput klimatskih promjena, razmjera i temporalnosti kojih nadilaze tradicionalne načine reprezentacije. Autor predlaže kompozitni pogled (composite gaze), način percepcije koji proizlazi iz materijalnih i osjetilnih uvjeta izvedbe, a koji stvara javno-intimni prostor – imerzivni, ali „ranjeni“ interijer – u kojem su gledatelji isprepleteni sa scenom, umjesto da su od nje distancirani.

Kako bi se omogućio takav pogled, kazalište mora stvoriti novu vrstu izvedbenog okruženja: anarhitekturni prostor bez obzora, oblikovan ne stabilnim dizajnom, već prazninama, lomovima i dezorganizacijom. Oslanjajući se na ruševne spomenike, partizanske ekologije i rad Gordona Matta-Clarka, tekst opisuje taj prostor kao gestualni, raspuknuti spremnik, u kojem se urušavaju razlike između geste, značenja i materijalnog izraza. Ovaj imerzivni slika-prostor (image-space) postaje laboratorij za opažanje svijeta kojem obzori nestaju, dopuštajući kazalištu da istražuje nove oblike kolektivne imaginacije u uvjetima nestabilnosti.

KLJUČNE RIJEČI

dramaturgija, kompozitni pogled, intimni javni prostor, slika-prostor (Bildraum), anarhitektura, obzor, gestualni prostor, klimatske promjene i izvedba, partizanske ekologije

Kompozitni pogled ili
klimatske
promjene odolijevaju
postdramskom teatru

Introduction

The non-disciplinary field and the study of dramaturgy are always implicitly oriented toward what lies ahead –not merely because they speculate about possible futures, but because their very method requires engaging with the unknown, the incomplete, and the contingent. Dramaturgy engages with particular kinds of speculation about the future and, in its more radical practices, attempts to understand theater as a place for rehearsing new or different worlds; it also interrogates possible worlds by pressing them into material composed of the present. At the same time, dramaturgy continually questions all aspects of its own existence, for every logic of the unfolding of situations and events presupposes the possibility that it might be overtaken by some other, contingent logic of sense.

As someone who has known better times, I find it almost impossible - when teaching dramaturgy students whose own future feels so uncertain - to arrive together at images of better futures, or even of a world as it once was for my generation. This difficulty has become one of my central pedagogical concerns. The questioning of the instability of the link between practicing the present through studying past or already rehearsed presents, and existing in the future within different regimes of subjectivation (economic, social, biological, ethical, etc.), is always also a kind of perceptual training - we might understand the study of dramaturgy as a training of the imagination that precedes a change in perception. The very act of imagining a return to something better already implies that the time we are in demands repair, correction - but a return to a repaired what? To a time in which the best revolutionary or progressive ideas were born precisely out of dissatisfaction with the state of things then, with the scenarios or futures that were already then predictable?

Thus, any speech directed toward the future yet expressed through the linguistic logic by which the past spoke, is of a regulatory discourse - a discourse that corrects the settled course of events and their predictability. In reflecting on the creation of the future, Maurice Blanchot, distinguishing the prediction of the future from its prophecy, observed that “prophetic speech announces an impossible future, or makes the future it announces, because it announces it, something impossible, a future one would not know how to live and that must upset all the sure givens of existence. When speech becomes prophetic, it is not the future that is given, it is the present that is taken away, and with it any possibility of a firm, stable, lasting presence.” (Blanchot, 2003, p. 1).

This Blanchotian *coup* of prophetic perception - a perception that does not imagine new futures but produces them by interrupting the present, by emptying it of what endures - always also has its pedagogical connotation. But it is tied to a pedagogy that cannot teach a “better future,” a pedagogy that perhaps teaches nothing at all, yet through which we learn the experience of evading “a firm, stable, lasting presence.” Such a gestural pedagogy - a pedagogy whose sole aim is neither the development of a practice nor its fulfilment only in the production of works - is a pedagogy framed by interruptions, a pedagogy whose aim is not the illusion of completion of knowledge and skills but a state of constant incompleteness that produces images of time in various directions, because the interrupted gestures are not stopped but deprived of their spontaneous expressivity. If dramaturgy is a form of practice that interrogates the conditions of both knowledge and imagination, then theater becomes its most exposed laboratory, a field in which thinking about time, perception, and the possible is materialized in gestures, bodies,

Uvod

Nedisciplinarno polje i studij dramaturgije uvijek su implicitno usmjereni prema onome što je pred nama – ne samo zato što spekuliraju o mogućim budućnostima, već zato što sama njihova metoda zahtijeva bavljenje nepoznatim, nedovršenim i kontingentnim. Dramaturgija se bavi posebnim vrstama spekulacija o budućnosti i u svojim radikalnijim praksama pokušava shvatiti kazalište kao mjesto za uvježbavanje novih ili drugačijih svjetova; ona također preispituje moguće svjetove, utiskujući ih u materijal sačinjen od sadašnjosti. Istovremeno, dramaturgija neprestano preispituje sve aspekte vlastitog postojanja jer svaka logika odvijanja situacija i događaja pretpostavlja mogućnost da ju neka druga, kontingentna logika smisla može preuzeti.

Kao netko tko je poznavao bolja vremena, smatram gotovo nemogućim – kada predajem studentima dramaturgije čija se vlastita budućnost čini tako neizvjesnom – zajedno doći do slika boljih budućnosti ili čak svijeta kakav je nekoć bio za moju generaciju. Ta poteškoća postala je jedna od mojih glavnih pedagoških briga. Preispitivanje nestabilnosti veze između prakticiranja sadašnjosti kroz proučavanje prošlih ili već uvježbanih sadašnjosti, i postojanja u budućnosti unutar različitih režima subjektivacije (ekonomskih, socijalnih, bioloških, etičkih itd.), uvijek je ujedno i neka vrsta perceptualnog treninga – studij dramaturgije možemo shvatiti kao trening imaginacije koji prethodi promjeni percepcije. Sam čin imaginiranja povratka nečemu boljem već implicira da vrijeme u kojem se nalazimo zahtijeva popravak, korekciju – ali povratak popravljenom čemu? Vremenu u kojem su se najbolje revolucionarne ili progresivne ideje rodile upravo iz nezadovoljstva tadašnjim stanjem stvari, scenarijima ili budućnostima koje su već tada bile predvidive?

Stoga je svaki govor, koji je usmjeren prema budućnosti, a izražen kroz jezičnu logiku kojom je govorila prošlost, dio regulativnog diskursa – diskursa koji ispravlja ustaljeni tijek događaja i njihovu predvidivost. Razmišljajući o stvaranju budućnosti, Maurice Blanchot je, razlikujući predviđanje budućnosti od njezina proricanja, primijetio da „proročanski govor najavljuje nemoguću budućnost, ili budućnost koju najavljuje, samim time što je najavljuje, čini nečim nemogućim, budućnošću koju se ne bi znalo živjeti i koja mora poremetiti sve sigurne datosti postojanja. Kada govor postaje proročanski, ne ispostavlja se budućnost, nego se oduzima sadašnjost, a s njome i svaka mogućnost čvrste, stabilne, trajne prisutnosti“ (Blanchot, 2003, str. 1).

Ovaj Blanchotov *coup* proročanske percepcije – percepcije koja ne imaginira nove budućnosti nego ih proizvodi prekidanjem sadašnjosti, njezinim pražnjenjem od onoga što traje – uvijek ima i svoju pedagošku konotaciju. No, vezan je uz pedagogiju koja ne može poučiti „boljoj budućnosti“, pedagogiju koja možda i ne poučava ničemu, ali kroz koju učimo iskustvo izbjegavanja „čvrste, stabilne, trajne prisutnosti.“ Takva gestualna pedagogija – pedagogija kojoj jedini cilj nije ni razvoj prakse ni njeno ispunjenje samo u produkciji djela – jest pedagogija uokvirena prekidima, pedagogija kojoj cilj nije iluzija dovršenosti znanja i vještina, već stanje stalne nedovršenosti koje proizvodi slike vremena u različitim smjerovima jer prekinute geste nisu zaustavljene, nego su lišene svoje spontane izražajnosti.

Ako je dramaturgija oblik prakse koji propituje uvjete i znanja i imaginacije, onda kazalište postaje njen najizloženiji laboratorij, polje u kojem se mišljenje o vremenu, percepciji i mogućem materijalizira u gestama, tijelima i slikama. Pomak od pedagoške brige o tome kako nastaniti nesigurnost, na estetsku i političku brigu o tome kako je uprizoriti,

and images. The shift from a pedagogical concern with how to inhabit uncertainty to an aesthetic and political concern with how to stage it marks not a change of subject, but a change of medium. What is at stake is not only how we learn to imagine futures, but how we construct spaces and forms in which this imagination can be shared, sensed, and critically reworked. It is precisely here that the question of climate change enters dramaturgical thought — not as a topic to be represented, but as a condition that challenges the very possibility of representation. Climate change dislocates perspective, scale, and duration; it demands from theater and performance new perceptual and conceptual tools capable of engaging with forces and temporalities that exceed human comprehension. The question then becomes: what kind of image and what kind of theater can still make the present perceptible when its horizon is dissolving?

I.

“Oil resists five acts,” Brecht wrote in 1929 in his text “On Materials and Forms” (1977, p. 29), aiming to show that new catastrophes cannot be represented through linear performative structures. The complexity of power currents flowing in multiple directions demanded a new performative form. Analogously, we might say that climate change resist postdramatic theater, or any mode of representation in which abstractions are embodied only in human figures and relationships¹. Climate change cannot be seen - let alone represented - frontally. “Relying on multiple disparate measurements, we look for patterns and estimate probabilities. We see in parts: the melting ice caps, glaciers, and permafrost; the advancing deserts and diminishing coral reefs; the disappearing coastlines and the migrating species. (...) Once we see it - the ‘it’ of climate change encapsulated into a data point or disastrous image - it’s already too late” (Dean, 2016). This does not imply any exclusion of humans - quite the opposite. It presupposes a different relation to the question of the possible within what we understand as human, rather than simply seeking the possible in the “nature”.

To bring the problematics of climate change to light, we probably need intelligent theater - not just intelligent dramaturges. By this I do not mean any form of “smart theater” that would simply mimic the dispositifs of the digital environment or „natural theater” which would verify the catastrophic impacts on our environment by displacement or embedment of performance into endangered locations. I am thinking, above all, of a theater that will generate encounters whose configurations poetically open up opportunities for a different understanding of the moment of dwelling together in a field of possibilities. Landscape imagery or site-specificity is not necessary to shape such opportunities, but what is needed is an appropriate form of theater, a new space for the work of image that will place the conditions of production and the conditions of life in a problematic relationship with intelligence.

What have we concluded so far about the work of image in theater?²

1 In a similar way, we can speak about the ways of presenting the complexity brought by artificial intelligence.

2 For my understanding of the work of the image in performance cf. Pristaš, G. S. (2018). *Exploded Gaze*. Multimedijski institut.

ET AL.

Goran Sergej Pristaš: COMPOSITE GAZE OR THE CLIMATE CHANGE
RESISTS POSTDRAMATIC THEATRE

ET AL.

Goran Sergej Pristaš: KOMPOZITNI POGLLED ILI KLIMATSKE PROMJENE
ODOLJEVAJU POSTDRAMSKOM TEATRU

ne označava promjenu subjekta, već promjenu medija. U pitanju nije samo kako učimo zamišljati budućnosti, već kako konstruiramo prostore i oblike u kojima ta imaginacija može biti podijeljena, doživljena i kritički prerađena. Upravo ovdje pitanje klimatskih promjena ulazi u dramaturšku misao – ne kao tema koju treba predstaviti, već kao uvjet koji dovodi u pitanje samu mogućnost predstavljanja. Klimatske promjene dislociraju perspektivu, razmjere i trajanje; one zahtijevaju od teatra i izvedbe nove perceptivne i konceptualne alate pomoću kojih će biti moguće nositi se sa silama i temporalnostima koje nadilaze ljudsko poimanje. Pitanje koje se stoga nameće glasi: kakva slika i kakvo kazalište mogu i dalje učiniti sadašnjost opipljivom kada se njen horizont rastapa?

I.

„Nafta ne podnosi pet činova“, napisao je Brecht 1929. u svom tekstu „O materijalima i oblicima“ (1977, str. 29), ciljajući na to da se nove katastrofe ne mogu predstaviti kroz linearne izvedbene strukture. Složenost strujanja moći u više smjerova zahtijevala je nov izvedbeni oblik. Analogno tome, mogli bismo reći da klimatske promjene odolijevaju postdramskom kazalištu ili bilo kojem načinu predstavljanja u kojem su apstrakcije utjelovljene samo u ljudskim figurama i odnosima.¹ Klimatske se promjene ne mogu vidjeti – a kamoli predstaviti – frontalno. „Oslanjajući se na višestruka različita mjerenja, tražimo obrasce i procjenjujemo vjerojatnosti. Vidimo u dijelovima: ledene kape koje se tope, ledenjake i permafrost, pustinje koje se sve više šire i koraljne grebene koji se smanjuju, obale koje nestaju i migrirajuće vrste. (...) Onog trenutka kada to vidimo – to ‘to’ klimatskih promjena enkapsulirano u podatkovnu točku ili katastrofalnu sliku – već je prekasno.“ (Dean, 2016). To ne podrazumijeva isključenje ljudi – upravo suprotno. Ono pretpostavlja drugačiji odnos prema pitanju mogućeg unutar onoga što podrazumijevamo kao ljudsko, umjesto da se moguće traži samo u „prirodi“.

Da bismo rasvijetlili problematiku klimatskih promjena, vjerojatno nam je potreban inteligentan teatar – ne samo inteligentni dramaturzi. Pod time ne mislim ni na kakav oblik „pametnog kazališta“ koji bi jednostavno oponašao dispositive digitalnog okruženja, niti na „prirodno kazalište“ koje bi provjeravalo katastrofalne utjecaje na naš okoliš dislociranjem ili ugrađivanjem izvedbe u ugrožene lokacije. Mislim, prije svega, na teatar koji će generirati susrete čije konfiguracije poetički otvaraju prilike drukčijeg razumijevanja trenutka zajedničkog bivanja u polju mogućnosti. Slike krajolika ili *site-specific* pristup nisu nužni za oblikovanje takvih mogućnosti, ali potreban je prikladan oblik kazališta, nov prostor za rad slike koji će uvjete proizvodnje i uvjete života staviti u problemski odnos s inteligencijom.

Što smo do sada zaključili o radu slike u kazalištu?²

1 Slika nije čvrst odraz, već refrakcija, složena konfiguracija tijela, pokreta, objekata i pogleda. Kazališna slika opire se totalizaciji; nastaje iz fragmenata, prekida i nepostojećih odnosa, a ne iz koherentnih cjelina. Ne dolazi odnekud, već izranja, udvostručujući se unutar materijala. Čak i kad nastoji biti zrcalo

1 Na sličan način možemo govoriti o načinima prezentiranja kompleksnosti koju generira umjetna inteligencija.

2 Za moje razumijevanje rada slike u izvedbi vidi: Pristaš, G. S. (2018). *Exploded Gaze*. Multimedijalni institut.

1 The image is not a solid reflection but a refraction, a complex configuration of bodies, movements, objects, and gazes. The theatrical image resists totalization; it arises from fragments, interruptions, and non-existent relations rather than coherent wholes. It does not come from somewhere but emerges, doubling itself within the material. Even when it tries to be a mirror of the world, within it operates a machine for producing thought - what Diderot would call a hieroglyph (Diderot, 1972): a univocality of energies and interests that collapses the differences between gesture, meaning, and material expression.

2 The stage image is inseparable from the spectator, whose gaze is already anticipated in its construction. The “ideal model” of the spectator shapes the very form and rhythm of what is created, long before the moment of encounter. Therefore, theater always stages a duality: both the spectacle and the very act of viewing. The gaze becomes a double exposure, and perception - like the image - is mediated, situated, and historically coded.

3 Theatrical images are not merely visual compositions but temporal constructions: they hold within themselves situations, events, ruptures, and subsequent reflections. This temporality is neither linear nor abstract; it unfolds through interstices - interruptions, breaths, and spaces - where the spectator can reorient their relation to what is seen. Yet the power of the theatrical image lies in its ability to remain unfinished, to draw attention to its own constructedness, and to propose watching as a situated, relational, and potentially resistant act. What closes off an image is its relation to the horizon of viewing: the image we watch and in which we are implicated always has, as its horizon, an image of the world.

But what is the status of the image when its world - whether or not negotiated with the viewer - has no horizon? And what kind of world is one without a horizon? Here, I would like us to consider the concept of the horizon in its dual nature: as a boundary that brings the world into view and within which the world defines itself, but also as something that vanishes into the distance - into processes that exceed the human capacity for perception. In this second sense, the horizon's disappearance results from complex flows and contingencies that disregard human existence, where the span of human presence on Earth is overtaken by the totality of relations that shape the world's definition.

In 2012, as members of the performance collective BADco., we tried to approach the problem of climate change from multiple perspectives at once. In the performance *Is There Life on Stage? - exercises in terraforming*³, we sought to experiment on stage with the establishment of new living (and working) conditions, human relationships, ecosystems, life forms, communities, etc. The result was a serial performance in which each “episode” offered a different approach to the question of gaze into the environment, the stage environment, but also into the image of reality proposed by that environment. While working on that performance, we realised that the standard modes of viewing implied by theater were inadequate to the problem.

Theater implies two gazes: (1) the scenographic gaze, which is perspectival and oriented toward controlled revelations and concealments over time (the spectator sees selective scenes from a particular vantage point); (2) the ichnographic gaze (Serres,

3 BADco., *Is There Life on Stage? - exercises in terraforming* (Coproducers: BADco. and Domino, 2012).

svijeta, unutar nje djeluje stroj za proizvodnju misli – ono što bi Diderot nazvao hijeroglifom (Diderot, 1972): jednoglasnost energija i interesa koja urušava razlike između geste, značenja i materijalnog izraza.

2 Scenska slika neodvojiva je od gledatelja čiji je pogled već anticipiran u njenoj konstrukciji. „Idealan model“ gledatelja oblikuje samu formu i ritam onoga što se stvara, puno prije trenutka susreta. Stoga kazalište uvijek uprizoruje dualnost: i spektakl i sam čin gledanja. Pogled postaje dvostruka ekspozicija, a percepcija je – poput slike – posredovana, situirana i povijesno kodirana.

3 Kazališne slike nisu samo vizualne kompozicije, već temporalne konstrukcije: one u sebi sadržavaju situacije, događaje, rupture i naknadne refleksije. Ta temporalnost nije ni linearna ni apstraktna; ona se odvija kroz međuprostore – prekide, dahove i praznine – gdje gledatelj može reorijentirati svoj odnos prema viđenom. Ipak, snaga kazališne slike leži u njenoj sposobnosti da ostane nedovršena, da skrene pozornost na vlastitu konstruiranost i da predloži gledanje kao situiran, relacijski i potencijalno otporan čin. Ono što zatvara sliku jest njezin odnos prema horizontu gledanja: slika koju gledamo i u kojoj smo implicirani uvijek ima, kao svoj horizont, sliku svijeta.

Ali kakav je status slike kada njen svijet – bio on dogovoren s gledateljem ili ne – nema horizont? I kakav je svijet bez horizonta? Ovdje bih želio da razmotrimo pojam horizonta u njenoj dvojakoj prirodi: kao granice koja svijet dovodi u vidokrug i unutar koje se svijet definira, ali i kao nečega što nestaje u daljini – u procese koji nadilaze ljudsku sposobnost percepcije. U tom drugom smislu, nestanak horizonta proizlazi iz složenih tokova i kontingencija koje zanemaruju ljudsko postojanje, gdje raspon ljudske prisutnosti na Zemlji nadilazi totalitet odnosa koji oblikuju definiciju svijeta.

Kao članovi izvedbenog kolektiva BADco. pokušali smo 2012. pristupiti problemu klimatskih promjena iz više perspektiva odjednom. U predstavi *Ima li života na pozornici? – vježbe u terraformiranju*³ nastojali smo eksperimentirati na pozornici s uspostavljanjem novih uvjeta života (i rada), ljudskih odnosa, ekosustava, oblika života, zajednica itd. Rezultat je bio serijalna izvedba u kojoj je svaka „epizoda“ nudila drugačiji pristup pitanju pogleda u okoliš, scenski okoliš, ali i u sliku stvarnosti koju taj okoliš predlaže. Radeći na toj izvedbi shvatili smo da standardni načini gledanja koje kazalište implicira nisu adekvatni problemu.

Kazalište implicira dva pogleda: (1) scenografski pogled, koji je perspektivan i usmjeren prema kontroliranim otkrivanjima i skrivanjima tijekom vremena (gledatelj vidi selektivne scene s određene točke gledišta); (2) ihnografski pogled (Serres, 1995, str. 19), koji je planimetrijski i sveobuhvatan – obuhvaća sve moguće horizonte i perspektive odjednom, kao apstraktni plan ili potencijalnost cjelovitosti. Ukratko, scenografija organizira iskustvo kroz skrivanje i otkrivanje, dok ihnografija nudi potpun, konceptualan uvid u sve moguće poglede definirane horizontima. Ono što nam je nedostajalo bio je *kompozitni pogled* (*composite gaze*) – pogled iz unutrašnjosti materije, onaj koji ne dolazi s fiksne točke (scenografski) niti iz apstraktnog plana (ihnografski), već iz unutrašnjosti same situacije gledanja, iz utjelovljenog položaja promatrača uronjenog u materijalne uvjete gledanja. Ovaj pogled nastaje iz afektivnog, osjetilnog i prostornog okruženja – iz tame, iz vlastitog

3 BADco., *Is There Life on Stage? – exercises in terraforming*, u koprodukciji BADco.-a i Domina, 2012.

1995, p. 19), which is planimetric and comprehensive - it encompasses all possible horizons and perspectives at once, as an abstract plan or potentiality of a wholeness. In short, scenography organizes experience through concealment and revelation, while ichnography offers a complete, conceptual insight into all possible views defined by horizons. What we were missing was a composite gaze - a gaze from within the matter, one that does not come from a fixed point (scenographic) nor from an abstract plan (ichnographic), but from the interior of the very situation of viewing itself, from the embodied position of the observer immersed in the material conditions of viewing.

This gaze arises from the affective, sensory, and spatial environment—from darkness, from one’s own body, from the presence of other bodies, from the texture of sound, the rhythm of light, from the feeling of enclosure. Unlike the perspectival gaze that looks upon the scene, and the planimetric gaze that views or speculates from above, the composite gaze occurs from within, within the matter of space and experience, from the position of an observer who is not separate but immersed. It is a gaze that does not look at an object but rather lives through the situation. But we have to differentiate the composite gaze from that of participative theater or in immersive media. It is, in the most organic sense, coming from a place of bodily experience, affective engagement, and sensory interaction. It is more about the experience of being within the environment rather than looking at it as an external object. The composite gaze primarily focuses on the experience of being present in a sensory way. The participative gaze, however, involves active interaction - the spectator may influence or alter the course of the event, sometimes with narrative or performative consequences. It is not a detached or observing gaze but an impersonally intimate⁴ one implying paradoxical closeness that dissolves the boundaries between self and other without collapsing into personal identification. This gaze embodies the unsettling experience of being inside something rather than merely looking at it from a distance, it disrupts the spectator’s expectation of distance and control, replacing it with a relational space where the world is not a spectacle to behold but a shared, active presence in which the self is both present and dispersed.

This type of gaze is only the starting position for enabling a second transformation, a second degree of displacement: a displacement from the given image of the world, its explosion and the opening of holes, gaps where the possibility of a new gestuality emerges - a gestuality that will practice the impossible. If, according to Althusser, Brecht’s theater presupposes three types of displacement (2003, p. 142):

- 1) the displacement of ‘the theatre in respect to the ideology of the theatre that exists in the head of the spectators’ (establishing a series of distances on the stage and from the spectators)
- 2) displacing ‘the conception of the play’ (decentering the play in order to avoid ‘the form of a spontaneous representation that the audience has of life and its conflicts’)
- 3) displacing ‘the play of the actors in respect to the idea of acting that the spectators and the actors themselves have,’ then here we are talking about a fourth displacement

4 On impersonal intimacy, cf. Bersani, L. & Adam Phillips, A. (2010). *Intimacies*. (Chicago, Ill., Bristol: University of Chicago Press ; University Presses Marketing, 2010)

tijela, iz prisutnosti drugih tijela, iz teksture zvuka, ritma svjetlosti, iz osjećaja zatvorenosti. Za razliku od perspektivnog pogleda koji gleda scenu, i planimetrijskog pogleda koji gleda ili spekulira odozgo, kompozitni pogled događa se iznutra, unutar materijalnosti prostora i iskustva, s pozicije promatrača koji nije odvojen već uronjen. To je pogled koji ne gleda objekt, već proživljava situaciju. Ali moramo razlikovati složeni pogled od onoga u participativnom kazalištu ili u imerzivnim medijima. On, u najorganskijem smislu, dolazi iz mjesta tjelesnog iskustva, afektivne angažiranosti i osjetilne interakcije. Više je riječ o iskustvu bivanja unutar okoliša nego o gledanju na njega kao na vanjski objekt. Kompozitni pogled prvenstveno se fokusira na iskustvo osjetilne prisutnosti. Participativni pogled, međutim, uključuje aktivnu interakciju – gledatelj može utjecati ili mijenjati tijek događaja, ponekad s narativnim ili izvedbenim posljedicama. To nije odvojen ili promatrački pogled, već impersonalno intiman⁴: implicira paradoksalnu bliskost, koja rastvara granice između sebe i drugog bez urušavanja u osobnu identifikaciju. Ovaj pogled utjelovljuje uznemirujuće iskustvo bivanja unutar nečega umjesto pukog gledanja iz daljine, on narušava gledateljevo očekivanje udaljenosti i kontrole, zamjenjujući ga relacijskim prostorom u kojem svijet nije spektakl za promatranje, već zajednička, aktivna prisutnost u kojoj je sebstvo istovremeno prisutno i raspršeno.

Ova vrsta pogleda samo je početna pozicija za omogućavanje druge transformacije, drugog stupnja dislociranja: dislociranja od zadane slike svijeta, njene eksplozije i otvaranja rupa, praznina gdje se pojavljuje mogućnost nove gestualnosti – gestualnosti koja će prakticirati nemoguće. Ako Brechtovo kazalište, prema Althusseru, pretpostavlja tri vrste dislociranja (str. 142):

- 1) dislociranje „kazališta u odnosu na ideologiju kazališta koja postoji u glavi gledatelja“ (uspostavljanje niza distanci na pozornici i od gledatelja)
- 2) dislociranje „konceptije drame“ (decentriranje drame kako bi se izbjegao „oblik spontane reprezentacije koju publika ima o životu i njegovim sukobima“)
- 3) dislociranje „igre glumaca u odnosu na ideju glume koju imaju gledatelji i sami glumci“, onda ovdje govorimo o četvrtom dislociranju
- 4) dislociranju prostora u odnosu na svijet s kojim je u kontinuitetu (pražnjenje prostora od svijeta, stvaranje praznine koja poziva na novu imaginaciju).

U tu svrhu možemo zamisliti konstrukciju izoliranog prostora, pregnantnog prostora koji bi istovremeno služio kao unutarnji prostor slike kojom vlada zakon energija i interesa; zatim okruženje „izolirano“ unutar svijeta, rasvjetovljeno, ali i javni intimni kontejner u kojem će se razlike između geste, značenja i materijalnog izraza upravo urušiti, otvarajući „rupu, prazninu ili granicu koja konstituira želju i subjekt politike“ (Dean, 2016). Prije nego što predstavim mogućnosti takvog prostora, želim naglasiti razliku između kompozicija definiranih horizontom i kompozita uvjetovanih okruženjem.

4 O impersonalnoj intimnosti vidi: Bersani, L. i Phillips, A. (2010). *Intimacies*. University of Chicago Press; University Presses Marketing.

4) the displacement of space in relation to the world with which it is in continuity (by emptying the space of the world, creating a void that calls for a new imagination).

For this purpose, we can imagine construction of an isolated space, a pregnant space that would simultaneously serve as the inner space of an image governed by the law of energies and interests; then an environment “isolated” within the world, unworlded, but also a public intimate container in which the differences between gesture, meaning, and material expression will precisely collapse, opening “a hole, gap, or limit constitutive of desire and the subject of politics” (Dean, 2016). Before presenting the possibilities of such a space, I want to emphasize the difference between compositions defined by a horizon and composites conditioned by an environment.

II.

About a hundred kilometers from Zagreb lies the site of two monuments dedicated to the Partisan resistance in World War II, Petrova Gora. I do not wish to delve into the specific historical details of the site as that would take too much space in this essay; I only want to point out two types of relationships to the living environment.

One monument is the work of sculptor Vojin Bakić, erected in 1982 as a monumental complex - a magnificent abstract sculpture made of stainless steel and concrete. The monument’s interior was designed to house a museum, while around it an educational – recreational complex was built. The structure itself is placed on the mountain’s highest peak as an erect form whose envelope expands into space according to the internal dynamics of an amorphous, organic spiral that ascends through the museum’s purpose-built spaces to the top of the building. The approach to the monument emphasizes ecstatic verticality composed with the horizon, and upon reaching the top, the visitor’s gaze is exposed to a horizon encompassing a full 360 degrees.

The second memorial site is the Central Partisan Hospital, located in the forest not far from the first monument. From 1942 to 1945, the Partisan hospital was a complex structure of underground shelters embraced by and folded into Forest vegetation. “Such dugouts could usually accommodate 10 to 20 wounded fighters along with medical staff, medicines, water, etc. A dugout had ventilation pipes, a toilet, and so on. We can boast that several dozen such shelters were built in Kordun and that throughout all the years of the war the enemy never discovered the wounded who were hidden in them...” (Borčić, 1988, p. 14). The Partisan hospital, with its relationship to nature in which it wraps and embeds itself, is a true example of what Malm or Kirn call “maroon” or “partisan ecologies.”⁵ According to Kirn, partisan ecologies testify to the deep entanglement of humans, animals, and plants in wartime suffering and resistance, and he explores these relationships as they are translated into partisan art.

The current status of these two sites is that both are in a state of neglect. Revisionist historical policies have produced a deep sense of social and cultural unease toward the legacy of the Partisan movement, and these two monuments have become casualties of such an (anti)memorial atmosphere. Bakić’s monument was devastated in the second

5 Cf. Malm, A. (2018). In Wildness Is the Liberation of the World: On Maroon Ecology and Partisan Nature. *Historical Materialism* vol. 26, no. 3, 3–38 and Kirn, G. (2023). Partisan Ecology in Yugoslav Liberation and Antifascist Art. *Baltic Worlds*, 4, 47–53.

Goran Sergej Pristaš: COMPOSITE GAZE OR THE CLIMATE CHANGE RESISTS POSTDRAMATIC THEATRE	ET AL.
	172
Goran Sergej Pristaš: KOMPOZITNI POGLED ILI KLIMATSKE PROMJENE ODOLJEVAJU POSTDRAMSKOM TEATRU	ET AL.
	173

II.

Stotinjak kilometara od Zagreba nalazi se mjesto dvaju spomenika posvećenih partizanskom otporu u Drugom svjetskom ratu – Petrova Gora. Ne želim ulaziti u specifične povijesne detalje lokacije jer bi to oduzelo previše prostora u ovom radu, samo želim ukazati na dvije vrste odnosa prema životnom okruženju.

Jedan je spomenik rad kipara Vojina Bakića, podignut 1982. godine kao monumentalni kompleks – veličanstvena apstraktna skulptura od nehrđajućeg čelika i betona. Unutrašnjost spomenika bila je namijenjena muzeju, dok je oko njega izgrađen edukativno-rekreacijski kompleks. Sama struktura postavljena je na najviši vrh planine kao uspravan oblik kojemu se omotač širi u prostor prema unutarnjoj dinamici amorfnе, organske spirale koja se uspinje kroz namjenski izgrađene prostore muzeja do vrha zgrade. Prilaz spomeniku naglašava ekstatičnu vertikalnost komponiranu s horizontom, a po dolasku na vrh pogled posjetitelja izložen je horizontu koji obuhvaća punih 360 stupnjeva.

Drugo memorijalno mjesto je Centralna partizanska bolnica, smještena u šumi nedaleko od prvog spomenika. Od 1942. do 1945. partizanska bolnica bila je složena struktura podzemnih skloništa obuhvaćena i uvučena u šumsku vegetaciju. „Takve zemunice su obično mogle primiti 10 do 20 ranjenih boraca s medicinskim osobljem, lijekovima, vodom itd. Zemunica je imala ventilacijske cijevi, WC i slično. Možemo se pohvaliti da je na Kordunu izgrađeno nekoliko desetaka takvih skloništa i da neprijatelj nikada tijekom svih godina rata nije otkrio ranjenike skrivene u njima...” (Borčić, 1988, str. 14). Partizanska bolnica, svojim odnosom prema prirodi u koju se omata i ugrađuje, pravi je primjer onoga što Malm ili Kirn nazivaju „maroon ecologies“ ili „partizanskim ekologijama“.⁵ Prema Kirnu, partizanske ekologije svjedoče o dubokoj isprepletenosti ljudi, životinja i biljaka u ratnim stradanjima i otporu, pri čemu on istražuje na koji su način ti odnosi prevedeni u partizansku umjetnost.

Trenutni status ovih dviju lokacija je da su obje u stanju zapuštenosti. Revizionističke povijesne politike proizvele su dubok osjećaj društvene i kulturne nelagode prema naslijeđu partizanskog pokreta, a ova dva spomenika postala su žrtve takve (anti) memorijalne atmosfere. Bakićev spomenik devastiran je u drugoj polovici 1990-ih, opljačkan je, s njega je skinut sav materijal koji se mogao preprodati. Njegova ruševina danas bi bila idealno mjesto za promatranje trenja između progresivnog modernizma i povratka divljine (*rewilding*) u doba klimatskih promjena.

Partizanska bolnica također je zanemarena, bez organiziranog upravljanja ili održavanja, a priroda je polako preuzima – zarasta i konzumira sve tragove ljudske prisutnosti. Istovremeno, deforestacija u području oko bolnice dovela je do toga da lokacija više ne prenosi osjećaj prikrivenosti koji je nekad definirao kompleks. Umjesto toga, sada se čini kao da je bolnica smještena u malom gaju, a ne u divljini.

Međutim, ove dvije lokacije vrlo jasno utjelovljuju razliku u načinima gledanja koje sam izložio. Modernistički spomenik u potpunosti je definiran horizontom – on je istovremeno scenografska simulacija intenziteta narodnog ustanka i pokušaj da se pogled podigne na razinu totaliteta, sveobuhvatne perspektive koja viziju poput otiska utiskuje u okoliš.

5 Vidi Malm, A. (2018). In Wildness Is the Liberation of the World: On Maroon Ecology and Partisan Nature. *Historical Materialism* vol. 26, no. 3, 3–38 i Kirn, G. (2023). Partisan Ecology in Yugoslav Liberation and Antifascist Art. *Baltic Worlds*, 4, 47–53.

half of the 1990s; it was looted, with all the material that could be resold stripped from it. Its ruin today would be an ideal site to observe the friction between progressive modernism and rewilding in the age of climate change.

The Partisan hospital is also neglected, with no organized management or maintenance, and nature is slowly taking over - overgrowing and consuming all traces of human presence. At the same time, deforestation in the area around the hospital has led to the site no longer conveying the sense of concealment that once defined the complex. Instead, it now feels as if the hospital were situated in a small grove rather than in the wilderness.

However, these two sites very clearly embody the difference in modes of viewing I have been describing. The modernist monument is entirely defined by the horizon - it is both a scenographic simulation of the intensity of the people’s uprising and an attempt to elevate the gaze to the level of totality, an all-encompassing perspective that presses vision like an imprint onto the environment. By contrast, the Partisan hospital is a complex without a horizon, a space in which the gaze is submerged, closed off from the world, finding its organizational model in an underground configuration, a space of interstices, tunnels, and holes - in what Deleuze and Guattari call “holey space” (1987, p. 415). Ultimately, the structure of the monument itself, after its devastation, has become shot through with fissures; its current state is closer to a work of anarchitecture as understood by Gordon Matta-Clark than to a modernist monument, and it also raises very interesting questions about how the experience of inhabiting these new openings allows insights into the present, into processes that link political materialism and physical nature. It is no longer a space of optimism; the tension toward the horizon is exhausted in the layers of ruined time, and the time that once suggested an ascent toward the absolute has turned inward.

The museum is no longer a monument “to a singular time,” but its own dialectical annihilation - the monument has been destroyed in order to become a monument to a future without a horizon, but also an observatory of a new ecology, a „()hole complex” (Negarestani, 2008, p. 48), compositions of solid and void. A space that no longer represents with its image, whose body is directed toward its own disorganization. The ruin thus becomes a dialectical image: a site where history folds into material disintegration and where the remnants of form begin to think in their own material language. What appears as decay is also a moment of awakening, the image’s own consciousness of its dissolution. In this sense, the ruin is not merely an architectural residue but an image-space in formation, a threshold at which perception and matter enter into a reciprocal movement of annihilation and articulation. This brief detour through the partisan ecology serves to ground the question of image-space in concrete material and historical conditions, to show how the relation between form, ruin, and environment already anticipates the kind of dialectical image in which political materialism and physical nature converge.

This is precisely how I try to imagine what Walter Benjamin writes about in his encounter with surrealist art, which he names *Bildraum*:

(...) in all cases where an action puts forth its own image and exists, absorbing and consuming it, where nearness looks with its own eyes, the long-sought image-space [Bildraum] is opened, the world of universal and integral actuality, where the ‘best room’ is missing – the space, in a word, in which political materialism and

ET AL.
Goran Sergej Pristaš: COMPOSITE GAZE OR THE CLIMATE CHANGE
RESISTS POSTDRAMATIC THEATRE

ET AL.
Goran Sergej Pristaš: KOMPOZITNI POGLLED ILI KLIMATSKE PROMJENE
ODOLJEVAJU POSTDRAMSKOM TEATRU

Nasuprot tome, Partizanska bolnica je kompleks bez horizonta, prostor u kojem je pogled uronjen, zatvoren od svijeta, pronalazeći svoj organizacijski model u podzemnoj konfiguraciji, prostoru međuprostora, tunela i rupa – u onome što Deleuze i Guattari nazivaju „izbušenim prostorom“ (1987, str. 415).

Konačno, i sama struktura spomenika, nakon njegove devastacije, postala je prožeta pukotinama; njegovo trenutačno stanje bliže je djelu *anarhitecture*, kako ga je shvaćao Gordon Matta-Clark, nego modernističkom spomeniku, a postavlja i vrlo zanimljiva pitanja o tome kako iskustvo nastanjivanja tih novih otvora omogućuje uvide u sadašnjost, u procese koji povezuju politički materijalizam i fizičku prirodu. Spomenik više nije prostor optimizma, napetost prema horizontu iscrpljena je u slojevima razrušenog vremena, a vrijeme koje je nekad sugeriralo uspon prema apsolutu okrenulo se prema unutra.

Muzej više nije spomenik „jednom vremenu“, već vlastito dijalektičko uništenje – spomenik je uništen da bi postao spomenik budućnosti bez horizonta, ali i opservatorij nove ekologije, „()hole kompleks“ (Negarestani, 2008, str. 48) kompozicija čvrstog i praznog. Prostor koji više ne reprezentira svojom slikom, čije je tijelo usmjereno prema vlastitoj dezorganizaciji. Ruševina tako postaje dijalektička slika: mjesto gdje se povijest preklapa s materijalnom dezintegracijom i gdje ostaci forme počinju misliti svojim vlastitim materijalnim jezikom. Ono što se čini kao propadanje, istovremeno je i trenutak buđenja, vlastita svijest slike o njezinu raspuštanju. U tom smislu, ruševina nije samo arhitektonski ostatak, već *slika-prostor* u formaciji, prag na kojem percepcija i materija ulaze u recipročno kretanje poništenja i artikulacije. Ovaj kratki obilazak kroz partizansku ekologiju služi da se pitanje slike-prostora utemelji u konkretnim materijalnim i povijesnim uvjetima, da se pokaže kako odnos između forme, ruševine i okruženja već anticipira vrstu dijalektičke slike u kojoj politički materijalizam i fizička priroda konvergiraju.

Upravo tako pokušavam zamisliti ono o čemu piše Walter Benjamin u svom susretu s nadrealističkom umjetnošću, koju imenuje *Bildraum* (prostor-slika):

(...) U svim slučajevima gdje djelovanje izlaže vlastitu sliku i postoji, upijajući je i konzumirajući, gdje blizina gleda vlastitim očima, otvara se dugo traženi prostor slika (*Bildraum*), svijet univerzalne i integralne aktualnosti, gdje nedostaje ‘najbolja soba’ – prostor, jednom riječju, u kojem politički materijalizam i fizička priroda dijele unutrašnjost ljudskoga, psihi, pojedinca, ili što god im drugo želimo baciti, s dijalektičkom pravdom, tako da nijedan ud ne ostane nepoderan. Ipak – dapače, upravo nakon takvog dijalektičkog uništenja – ovo će i dalje biti prostor-slika i, konkretnije, prostor-tijelo (*Leibraum*) (Benjamin, 1999, str. 207-218).

U ovom pregnantnom fragmentu nalazimo izražajan nacrt unutarnjeg prostora nadrealističke slike koja probavlja samu sebe, topi se, trga se iznutra – prostor koji unutar slike narušava organizaciju i otvara praznine. Ovaj slika-prostor ne može se prevesti u arhitekturu, ne može biti rezultat dizajnerskog procesa. Upravo suprotno: to je prostor formiran vlastitom dezorganizacijom, politički prostor „organizacije pesimizma“, rad „dijalektičkog uništenja“ koji ne rezultira ne-činjenjem, već aktivacijom ništavila, praznine, pukotine, trans-prostora,⁶ prostora u kojem se deaktivira energetska logika povezanosti kroz zakon energija i interesa.

6 Zahvalio bih Jacku Halberstamu za vezu između anarhitecture i geste, koju sam otkrio ne nekoliko njegovih predavanja, a koja će uskoro biti izdana u knjizi *Anarchitecture After Everything* u MIT Pressu.

physical nature share the inner human, the psyche, the individual, or whatever else we wish to throw to them, with dialectical justice, so that no limb remains untorn. Nevertheless – indeed, precisely after such dialectical annihilation – this will still be an image-space and, more concretely, a body-space [Leibraum] (Benjamin, 1999, pp. 207-218).

In this pregnant fragment we find an expressive outline of the inner space of the surrealist image that digests itself, melts, tears itself from within - a space that within the image disrupts organization and opens voids. This image-space cannot be translated into architecture, it cannot be the result of a design process. Quite the opposite: it is a space formed by its own disorganization, a political space of the “organization of pessimism,” a labor of “dialectical annihilation” that does not result in non-doing but to the activation of nothingness, the void, the fissure, the trans-space⁶, a space in which the energetic logic of connection through the law of energies and interests is deactivated.

Just as in Gordon Matta-Clark’s early drawings titled Energy Rooms, this is a space where the envelope of the “best room” becomes porous, undone. Although the forms of the drawings suggest floor plans, it is unclear whether these are walls coming into being or disappearing. But what is present are pregnant energetic assemblies, almost scores for the movement of a body, inner spaces of the image whose gestural quality transforms image-space into body-space. This gestural quality, crucial for all of Matta-Clark’s later anarchitectural work - whether in his building cuts, splittings, or conical intersections - has given Matta-Clark’s projects a metastable status, metastable to the extent that the gesture itself is. They are neither pure praxis, mere doing, nor poiesis, putting something into existence. For, as Agamben suggests:

(...) if producing is a means in view of an end and praxis is an end without means, the gesture then breaks with the false alternative between ends and means that paralyzes morality and presents instead means that, as such, evade the orbit of mediality without becoming, for this reason, ends. (2000, p. 56).

Or, as Matta-Clark himself put it: “Anarchitecture attempts to solve no problem.” (Matta-Clark, 1973, 1153).

Can we speak of such a space as a gestural space? Anarchitectural performative space is not a Bauhaus-style linear grid of planimetric and stereometric relations, not a closed cube or glass box of possibilities. As I have argued elsewhere, Benjamin connects the mimetic function of innervation with the transmission (or even transduction) of impulses from the moving image to the viewer, thereby enabling the apparatus to act more immediately and to intervene in the social space of viewing. Interestingly, however, in describing “prayer wheel” in *One-Way Street* (1979, p. 75), Benjamin emphasizes that breath has a regulatory role in innervation: it acts as a sonic formula, a sacred syllabic structure of the image, similar to breathing exercises in yoga. The image of a body that shapes matter through stretching gestures becomes yet another metaphor for Benjamin’s apparatus that produces tensions and articulations. Yet in his description of Bildraum, stretching produces the tearing of organs, in the composite body it tears apart mutual gazes, opening the potential for a gaze emerging from matter itself - a gaze in

⁶ I would like to thank Jack Halberstam for the connection between anarchitecture and gesture which I followed in several of his lectures and which will be summed up in his forthcoming book *Anarchitecture After Everything* at MIT Press.

ET AL.	
Goran Sergej Pristaš: COMPOSITE GAZE OR THE CLIMATE CHANGE RESISTS POSTDRAMATIC THEATRE	ET AL.
176	

ET AL.	
Goran Sergej Pristaš: KOMPOZITNI POGLLED ILI KLIMATSKE PROMJENE ODOLJEVAJU POSTDRAMSKOM TEATRU	ET AL.
177	

Baš kao u ranim crtežima Gordona Matta-Clarka pod nazivom *Energy Rooms*, ovo je prostor gdje omotač „najbolje sobe“ postaje porozan, razoren. Iako oblici crteža sugeriraju tlocrte, nejasno je jesu li to zidovi koji nastaju ili nestaju. Ali ono što je prisutno jesu pregnantni energetske sklopovi, gotovo partiture za kretanje tijela, unutarnji prostori slike čija gestualna kvaliteta transformira sliku-prostor u tijela-prostor. Ta gestualna kvaliteta, ključna za sav kasniji anarhitektonski rad Matta-Clarka – bilo u njegovim rezovima zgrada, cijepanjima ili stožastim presjecima – dala je Matta-Clarkovim projektima metastabilan status, metastabilan u mjeri u kojoj je to i sama gesta. Oni nisu ni čista *praxis*, puko činjenje, ni *poiesis*, stavljanje nečega u postojanje. Jer, kako Agamben sugerira:

(...) ako je proizvodnja sredstvo s obzirom na kraj, a *praxis* je svrha bez sredstava, gesta tada raskida s lažnom alternativom između ciljeva i sredstava koja paralizira moralnost i umjesto toga predstavlja sredstva koja, kao takva, izbjegavaju orbitu medijalnosti bez da, zbog toga, postanu ciljevi. (2000, str. 56).

Ili, kako je sam Matta-Clark rekao: „Anarhitektura ne pokušava riješiti nijedan problem.“ (Matta-Clark, 1973, 1153).

Možemo li takav prostor nazvati gestualnim prostorom? Anarhitektonski izvedbeni prostor nije bauhausovski linearni raster planimetrijskih i stereometrijskih odnosa, nije zatvorena kocka ili staklena kutija mogućnosti. Kao što sam drugdje argumentirao, Benjamin povezuje mimetičku funkciju inervacije s transmisijom (ili čak transdukcijom) impulsa s pokretne slike na gledatelja, čime se aparatu omogućuje da djeluje neposrednije i intervenira u društveni prostor gledanja. Zanimljivo je, međutim, da Benjamin, opisujući „molitveni kotač“ u *Jednosmjernoj ulici* (1979, str. 75) naglašava da dah ima regulativnu ulogu u inervaciji: djeluje kao zvučna formula, sveta slogovna struktura slike, slično vježbama disanja u jogi. Slika tijela koje oblikuje materiju kroz geste istezanja postaje još jedna metafora za Benjaminov aparat koji proizvodi napetosti i artikulacije. Ipak, u njegovu opisu *Bildraum*, istezanje proizvodi trganje organa, u složenom tijelu trga međusobne poglede, otvarajući potencijal za pogled koji izranja iz same materije – pogled u kojem „bliskost gleda vlastitim očima“. Prostor u kojem su slika, aktualnost i tijelo neraskidivo spojeni kod Benjamina je prostor inervacije, a ovaj opis onoga što naziva *Bildraum* možda je najvjerniji prikaz inervacije koji imamo. Dakle, gestualna intervencija u prostoru bez horizonta oblik je tekuće intervencije koja otvara pukotine, praznine koje ne nastoje riješiti probleme ostajući unutar horizonta zadanog svjetonazora. Takve intervencije su načini organiziranja pesimizma (Benjamin, 1999), prakticiranja nemogućeg, „gesta, ali gesta koja je nedovršena, poziva druge da je podnesu, podrže, nastave joj davati smisao kroz svoju praksu“ (Pristaš, 2023, str. 85-92). Takve geste otvaraju mnoge nove prostore unutar gustoće slike-prostora „tako da nijedan ud ne ostane nepoderan“.

which “nearness looks with its own eyes.” The space in which image, actuality, and body are inseparably joined in Benjamin is a space of innervation, and this description of what he calls Bildraum is perhaps the most faithful rendering we have of it. Thus, gestural intervention in a space without horizon is a form of ongoing intervention that opens fissures, voids that do not seek to solve problems remaining within the horizon of a given worldview. Such interventions are modes of organizing pessimism (Benjamin, 1999), of practicing the impossible, “a gesture but the gesture is incomplete, it calls for others to endure it, to support it, continue giving meaning to it through their practice”

REFERENCES / BIBLIOGRAFIJA

Althusser, L. (2003). On Brecht and Marx. In W. Montag (Ed.), *Louis Althusser*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Agamben, G. (2000). *Means without End: Notes on Politics*. University of Minnesota Press.

Benjamin, W. (1979). *One-Way Street and Other Writings*. New Left Books.

Benjamin, W. (1999). Surrealism: The Last Snapshot of the European Intelligentsia. In *Selected Writings*. Belknap Press of Harvard University Press.

Bersani, L. & Adam Phillips, A. (2010). *Intimacies*. University of Chicago Press, University Presses Marketing.

Blanchot, M. (2003). *The Book to Come*. Stanford University Press.

Borčić, M. (1988). Razvoj zdravlja u kotarevima Slunj i Veljun u vrijeme NOR-a. In *Kotar Slunj i kotar Veljun u NOR-u i socijalističkoj izgradnji, knjiga 2*. Historijski arhiv Karlovac.

Brecht, B. (1977). *Brecht on Theatre*. Hill and Wang.

Dean, J. (2016, January). The Anamorphic Politics of Climate Change. *e-flux, vol. 69*, www.e-flux.com/journal/the-anamorphic-politics-of-climate-change/.

Deleuze, G. & Guattari, F. (1987). *A Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. University of Minnesota Press.

Diderot, D. (1972). *Premières Oeuvres*. Editions Sociales.

Kirn, G. (2023). Partisan Ecology in Yugoslav Liberation and Antifascist Art. *Baltic Worlds, 4*, 47–53.

Malm, A. (2018). In Wildness Is the Liberation of the World: On Maroon Ecology and Partisan Nature. *Historical Materialism vol. 26*, no. 3, 3–38.

Matta-Clark, G. (1973). *Note card no. 1153*. Estate of Gordon Matta-Clark, on deposit at the CCA, Montreal. <https://www.cca.qc.ca/en/archives/370196/gordon-matta-clark-collection>

Negarestani, R. (2008). *Cyclonopedia. Complicity with Anonymous Materials*. Re-Press.

Pristaš, G. S. (2018). *Exploded Gaze*. Multimedijalni institut.

Pristaš, N. (2023). Continuity through Interruption. In B. Tanurovska-Kjulavkowska & I. Dragšić (eds.), *From Praxis to Policy: Environmental Shift through Art and Culture*. Lokomotiva – Centar za nove inicijative u umjetnosti i kulturi.

Serres, M. (1995). *Genesis*. The University of Michigan Press.