



PHILOSOPHY

---

EDITED BY ELISA BRICCO AND LUCA MALAVASI

# THE FUTURE OF THE POST

NEW INSIGHTS IN THE POSTMODERN DEBATE

---

MIMESIS  
INTERNATIONAL



**MIMESIS**  
INTERNATIONAL

**PHILOSOPHY**

n. 50






# THE FUTURE OF THE POST

New Insights in the Postmodern Debate

Edited by Elisa Bricco and Luca Malavasi

**MIMESIS**  
INTERNATIONAL






This volume collects the proceedings of the International conference *The Postmodern Condition: Forty Years Later*, University of Genoa, December 5th – 7th 2019 (organized by Elisa Bricco and Luca Malavasi), and is published thanks to funding from the departments DIRAAS (Dipartimento di Italianistica, Romanistica, Antichistica, Arti e Spettacolo) and DLCM (Dipartimento di Lingue e Culture Moderne) of the University of Genoa.



© 2022 – MIMESIS INTERNATIONAL  
www.mimesisinternational.com  
e-mail: info@mimesisinternational.com

Isbn: 9788869773761  
Book series: *Philosophy*, n. 50

© MIM Edizioni Srl  
P.I. C.F. 02419370305



# CONTENTS

|                                      |   |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| <i>Luca Malavasi</i><br>INTRODUCTION | 7 |
|--------------------------------------|---|

## POSTMODERNITY AND PHILOSOPHY

|   |    |
|---|----|
| <i>Roberto Mordacci</i><br>FROM POSTMODERNISM TO NEOMODERNITY | 23 |
|---|----|

|  |    |
|--|----|
| <i>Raffaele Ariano</i><br>RECONCILING SELF-REFLEXIVENESS WITH COMMONALITY. MODERNISM,<br>POSTMODERNIS, AND PERFECTIONISM IN STANLEY CAVELL | 35 |
|--|----|

|   |    |
|---|----|
| <i>Nancy Murzilli</i><br>POSTMODERNE, OÙ EST LA SORTIE ? VERS UNE RÉINSTITUTION<br>DES FORMES DE CRITIQUE SOCIALE PAR L'ART | 51 |
|---|----|

|  |    |
|--|----|
| <i>Alexandru Matei</i><br>JEAN-FRANÇOIS LYOTARD EN ROUMANIE À LA FIN DES ANNÉES 1980 :<br>MORALES FRANCOPHONES AN ROUMANIE | 65 |
|--|----|

## POSTMODERNISM AS STYLISTIC PARADIGM

|   |    |
|---|----|
| <i>Josh Toth</i><br>METAFICTION AND PLASTICITY, OR,<br>THE DEHISCING WOUND OF POSTMODERNISM | 87 |
|---|----|

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| <i>Marina Ortrud M. Hertrampf</i><br>LE VIEILLISSEMENT DE L'ESTHÉTIQUE POSTMODERNE OU L'HÉRITAGE<br>POSTMODERNE CHEZ SOPHIE CALLE ET PATRICK DEVILLE | 107 |
|--|-----|

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| <i>Steven Saulnier-Sinan</i><br>LA DISTRACTION COMME SIGNE D'UNE MODERNITÉ DÉPASSÉE.<br>TENTATIVE DE REPRÉSENTATION DE L'URBAIN À L'HEURE DU SMARTPHONE | 121 |
|---|-----|

ANNALISA PELLINO

MODERNISM RE-ENACTED  
Decolonial Forms of Moving Image and Curatorial  
Practice in *Documenta11* (2002)

This essay proposes a reading of *Documenta11* (2002) as a “paradigm-shifting exhibition”<sup>1</sup> that, within the frame of a globalised art system in the aftermath of September 11, 2001, inaugurated a new discursive approach that overcame the North-Atlantic protocols of curatorial practice. The proposal takes into consideration a theoretical frame that considers postmodernism not as an overcoming of the modernism, but as an internal formation to its plot from a cultural, aesthetic and media perspective.<sup>2</sup> I intend to show how in the wake of the post-colonial and de-colonial critique, the great European exhibition – stemmed within the modernist epistemological framework of 20th Century – dismissed the Western affordances of both modernist and postmodernist approaches. I will also focus on Okwui Enwezor’s curatorial choice to restructure the exhibition into a totally new configuration around the *black box* – in place of the *white cube* as the epitome of Western modernism – in order to re-enact<sup>3</sup> modernism and affirm new forms of art and curatorial practices oriented by the idea of *multiple modernities* and temporalities.<sup>4</sup>

- 
- 1 T.J. Demos, *The Migrant Image. The Art and Politics of Documentary during Global Crisis* (New York: Duke University Press, 2013), p. 35.
  - 2 Stuart Hall, ‘Modernism and Cultural Studies. First Encounters’, in *Stuart Hall, Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies*, ed. by David Morley, Kuan-Hsing Chen (London-New York: Routledge, 1996), pp. 131–221; Elio Franzini, *Moderno e Postmoderno. Un bilancio* (Milano: Raffaello Cortina, 2018); Ruggero Eugeni, *Posts. How media defined, un-defined and re-defined Modernity*, in International Conference, University of Genoa, December 5th–6th 2019. For a general overview on postmodern in western museology and art theory and practice see Hal Foster (ed.), *The Anti-Aesthetic. Essays on Postmodern Culture* (Washington: Bay Press, 1983).
  - 3 Cf. Cristina Baldacci, ‘Reenactment: Errant Images in Contemporary Art’, in *Re-: An Errant Glossary*, ed. by Christoph F. E. Holzhey and Arnd Wedemeyer, *Cultural Inquiry*, 15, 2019, pp. 57–67 <[https://doi.org/10.25620/ci-15\\_07](https://doi.org/10.25620/ci-15_07)>.
  - 4 Cf. Okwui Enwezor, Nancy Condee, Terry Smith (eds.), *Antinomies of Art and Culture. Modernity, Postmodernity, Contemporaneity* (London: Duke University

*Documenta and the roots of contemporary art*

During the Nineties the contemporary art system was characterised by a double turning point: the *discursive turn*<sup>5</sup> of artistic and curatorial practices, in which it is possible to recognise a path that adopts the postcolonial and decolonial approach<sup>6</sup> to question the institutional legitimacy; and the *cinematic turn*, which usually indicates the relocation of cinema from the movie theater to the exhibition space (museums and galleries).<sup>7</sup>

Conceived as a material and symbolic *dispositif*, *Documenta11* is a watershed in the process of institutional recognition of postcolonial and decolonial thought that – along with feminist and queer studies – had long been shaking the structure of Western knowledge and its systems of legitimisation and representation.<sup>8</sup> Intended as a *locus of discursivity*, *Documenta11* destabilised the former apparatus and its protocols, namely the exhibition as a *locus of identity* of the modernist discourse. Indeed, *documenta* was founded in 1955 with the aim of bringing again European art of the Twentieth century within the great narrative of international modernism, in order to resume the artistic discourse interrupted by the Second World War.

---

Press, 2008); Arjun Appadurai, *Modernity at Large. Cultural Dimensions of Globalization* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996). Cf. also the recent Okwui Enwezor: ‘The Art of Curating’, *NKA Journal. Contemporary African Art*, 48, 2021 <[https://read.dukeupress.edu/nka/issue/2021/48?utm\\_source=newsletter&utm\\_medium=email&utm\\_content=This%20special%20issue&utm\\_campaign=j-NKA\\_48\\_Jun2021](https://read.dukeupress.edu/nka/issue/2021/48?utm_source=newsletter&utm_medium=email&utm_content=This%20special%20issue&utm_campaign=j-NKA_48_Jun2021)>.

- 5 Mick Wilson, ‘Curatorial Moments and Discursive Turns’, in *Curating Subjects*, ed. by Paul O’Neill (London-Amsterdam: Open Editions & De Appel, 2007); cf. Simon Sheikh, ‘Curating and Research. An Uneasy Alliance’, in *Curatorial Challenges. Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Contemporary Curating*, ed. by Malene Vest Hansen, Anne Folke Henningsen, Anne Gregersen (London-New York: Routledge, 2019); Marie Laurberg, Margriet Schavemaker, *Between the Discursive and the Immersive: Curating Research in the 21st Century Art Museum* <<https://bit.ly/2OsZRES>>.
- 6 Cf. Walter Dignolo, *The Darker Side of Western Modernity. Global Futures, Decolonial Options* (New York: Duke University Press, 2012), pp. 149–180.
- 7 Cf. Raymond Bellour, *L’Entre-images: photos, cinéma, vidéo* (Paris: Éditions de la Différence, 1990); Philippe Dubois (ed.), ‘Cinéma et art contemporain / Cinema and Contemporary Visual Arts’, *Cinéma&Cie, International Film Studies Journal*, 8, 2006; Francesco Casetti, *The Lumière Galaxy. Seven Key Words for the Cinema to Come* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2015); François Bovier, Adeena Mey (eds.), *Exhibiting the Moving Image: History Revisited* (Berlin: Sternberg Press, 2015); Id., *Cinema in the Expanded Field*, (Berlin: Sternberg Press, 2015).
- 8 Iain Chambers, Lidia Curti, Michela Quadraro (eds.), *Ritorni Critici, La sfida degli studi culturali e postcoloniali* (Milano: Meltemi, 2018).



According to its creator, Arnold Bode, the exhibition would have to “re-engage in conversation” the modernist discourse, to celebrate the victory of humanist culture over despotism and to reveal the “roots of contemporary art”. From this point on Documenta took on the role of the most important exhibition of European artistic scenario and, at the end of the century, of the international one within the so-called “biennialisation” phenomenon.<sup>9</sup>

*Discursive (curatorial) turn: from forms to practices*

The *biennialisation* takes on a specific function in the general reconfiguration of the contemporary art system, inasmuch as, if the exhibitions (along with the permanent collections of museums and archives) have been the main medium for the art reception within the modernist framework, the biennials have the same role for contemporary culture.<sup>10</sup> Several scholars consider biennialisation at the same time as cause and effect of globalisation: Paul O’Neill notes for example how this has often been the main theme of the biennials during the nineties.<sup>11</sup> While Simon Sheikh, paraphrasing Fredric Jameson, states that their proliferation corresponds to the “cultural logic of globalisation” as it tends to homogenise exhibition formats, artists and works.<sup>12</sup> If globalisation encouraged the geographic expansion of *audiences* and spaces, and the becoming visible of instances until then “peripheral”, on the other hand, the contemporary art system also fostered some aspects

- 
- 9 Paul O’Neill, Simon Sheikh, Lucy Steeds, Mick Wilson (eds.), *Curating After the Global. Roadmaps for the Present* (Cambridge-London: The MIT Press, 2017). Cf. Panos Kompatsiaris, *The Politics of Contemporary Art Biennials. Spectacles of Critique, Theory and Art* (London-New York: Routledge, 2017). Cf. Anna Cestelli Guidi, *La ‘documenta’ di Kassel. Percorsi dell’arte contemporanea* (Milano: Costa&Nolan, 1997).
- 10 This expression points at the rapid proliferation of the great exhibitions, that take place on an international scale every two years but also three, four, five or seven years. Cf. Bruce Altshuler, (ed.) *Salon to Biennial: Exhibitions that made Art History. Volume 1: 1863-1959; Volume 2: 1962-2002* (London: Phaidon Press 2008-2013). Cf. also Stefania Zuliani, *Esposizioni. Emergenze della critica d’arte contemporanea* (Milano: Bruno Mondadori, 2012); Vittoria Martini, Federica Martini, *Just another exhibition: storie e politiche delle Biennali* (Milano: Postmedia, 2011).
- 11 Paul O’Neill, *The Culture of Curating and the Curating of Culture(s)* (Cambridge-London: The MIT Press, 2012), p. 81.
- 12 Simon Sheikh, ‘Morbid Symptoms: Curating in Times of Uncertainty and De-Globalization. An Introduction’, in Paul O’Neill, Simon Sheikh, Lucy Steeds and Mick Wilson (eds.), pp. 26 and 72.

of globalisation, generating new forms of cultural colonialism. It nurtured special areas of culture-oriented economic development by stimulating gentrification processes, and intensified the cultural tourism flows by transforming the exhibition into a spectacular social ritual. However, it has also been pointed out that, within the biennials, there is a number of spaces of protest and resistance where it is possible to build counter-visions, alternative to the institutional inertia.<sup>13</sup> Therefore, biennials may be, quoting Oliver Marchart, “big hegemonic machines”<sup>14</sup> for the production of cultural hegemony<sup>15</sup> and, at the same time, they are also programmatically experimental and unstable spaces that allow a wider and faster circulation of discourses thanks to the coming on stage of new actors.<sup>16</sup>

The curators’ role reflects this transformation. At the beginning of the twentieth century their figure is closely linked to the modernism, to the birth of museums and to the history of exhibitions – they are the caretakers and the mediators of the collection and its exhibition methods. Whilst from the Sixties onwards they have increasingly become nomadic and independent: Ralph Rugoff call them “jet-set flaneurs”,<sup>17</sup> Brad Buckley and John Conomos a sort of “flying curator [...] as much a mediator of artists and their public as of static objects”.<sup>18</sup> Then, in moving toward a global dimension, they emancipate themselves from the exclusive relationship with the collections, in order to address artists, audiences and events. Within this scenario it took place a sort of polarisation between the curatorship intended as an “exhibition-making practice” focused on the forms of the display,<sup>19</sup> and the curatorship intended as an expanded and “discours-oriented practice”.<sup>20</sup> In particular, Buckley and Conomos

13 Oliver Marchant, ‘Hegemonic Shifts and the Politics of Biennialization: the Case of Documenta (2008)’, *The Biennial Reader. An Anthology on Large-Scale Perennial Exhibitions of Contemporary Art*, ed. by Elene Filipovic, Marieke Van Hal, Solveig Øvstebø (Berlin: Hatje Cantz 2010), pp. 466–490.

14 Oliver Marchant.

15 Ronald Kolb, Shwetal A. Patel, Dorothee Richter, ‘Contemporary Art Biennials – Our Hegemonic Machines in States of Emergency’, *On Curating*, 46, 2020.

16 Cf. Elene Filipovic, Marieke Van Hal, Solveig Øvstebø (eds.), cit., p. 20; Milena Hlavajova, ‘How to Biennial? The Biennial in Relation to Art Institution’, pp. 296–297.

17 Ralph Rugoff, ‘Rules of the Game’, *Frieze*, 44, 1999, pp. 47–49.

18 Brad Buckley, John Conomos (eds.), *A Companion to Curation* (Hoboken: Wiley Blackwell, 2020), pp. XLIV–XLIV.

19 Brian O’Doherty, *Inside the White Cube. The Ideology of the Gallery Space* (Santa Monica-San Francisco: The Lapis Press, 1976).

20 Cf. Eszter Lázár, <<https://bit.ly/3gd88cd>> [accessed 21 Feb. 2021]; Hal Foster, *What comes after Farce?* (London: Verso, 2020), pp. 121–130; id., *The Return of*

recognized within the curatorial turn a whole new generation of curators and scholars interested in *emerging* artistic productions<sup>21</sup> from the geographic areas not touched by the modernist narration. Trained within the decolonisation processes and inspired by postcolonial and decolonial theories, these new actors tend to adopt discursive and collaborative forms of artistic and curatorial practice. In a process that involves theory and practice, this approach takes up the model of cultural studies intended, with Stuart Hall, as “discursive formation” in the sense given by Michel Foucault,<sup>22</sup> since they take into account the plurality of discourses criticising the alleged neutrality of institutions. In question, then, is not so much the *raison d’être* of biennials, but how they are able to leave the North-Atlantic framework, to become spaces of possibilities for post-national and post-identity practices in which *pluri-versality* can emerge. Athena Athanasiou states that, in the face of the shift from utterances to speeches, from forms to practices, this kind of curatorship turns into both a theoretical and a political questioning, because it considers the system as an apparatus that regulates the relationship between power, knowledge and subjectivity – precisely in the wake of Foucauldian *dispositif/apparatus* theory.<sup>23</sup>

---

*the Real: The Avant-Garde at the End of the Century* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1996); Claire Bishop, ‘Former West: Art as Project in the Early 1990s’, Id., *Artificial Hells. Participatory Art and the Politics of Spectatorship* (London: Verso, 2012).

- 21 The adjective “emerging” refers both to new subjects and to practices that produce new meanings, values and relationships. It is taken up by Raymond Williams who distinguishes *dominant* cultural moments (tradition and the status quo), *residual* ones (placed at distance but part of the dominant system and serve to legitimise the domination relationship) and *emerging* ones (contain elements of implicit or explicit dissent). Cf. id., *Marxism and Literature* (Oxford-New York: Oxford University Press, 1977), pp. 121–127. Cf. also Rosi Braidotti, *Nomadic Subjects. Embodiment and Sexual Difference in Contemporary Feminist Theory*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 1994); Teresa De Lauretis, ‘Eccentric Subjects: Feminist Theory and Historical Consciousness’, *Feminist Studies*, 16, 1, 1990, pp. 115–150.
- 22 Stuart Hall, ‘Cultural Studies and its Theoretical Legacies’, in David Morley, Kuan-Hsing Chen (eds.), pp. 261–274. Cf. Michel Foucault, *L’ordre du discours* (Paris: Gallimard, 1971).
- 23 Athena Athanasiou, Simon Scheick, ‘Formations of Political-Aesthetic Criticality: Decolonizing the Global in Times of Humanitarian Viewership’, in Paul O’Neill, Simon Sheikh, Lucy Steeds, Mick Wilson (eds.), pp. 71–94.

Documenta 11 and the “postcolonial constellation”

Okwui Enwezor’s *documenta11* fits into this scenario as a symptom of the postmodern formalism’s end, long before the Nicolas Bourriaud’s *Altermodern Manifesto* that, according to Walter D. Mignolo is a form of “eurocentric critique of eurocentrism”, a ‘nice’ and ‘generous’ repetition of ‘imperial design’ that could only ultimately promote the forms of an increasingly polycentric, globalized capitalism itself – at best an ‘interesting provincial option’.<sup>24</sup> Taking up the well-known metaphor of Frantz Fanon, the curator conceived the exhibition as a moment of *tabula rasa* – necessary for the beginning of any “decolonisation”. Nevertheless, it should be pointed out that the most appropriate expression to describe Enwezor’s intervention is not so much *decolonisation* as *decolonialisation*.<sup>25</sup> The notion of decoloniality refers to the thought that is exercised to change the theory and the order of ideas that regulate the power relations, it is an epistemic project that goes beyond the historical experience of political emancipation of the colonies.<sup>26</sup> Decoloniality is a “syncopated and jeopardized space-time”<sup>27</sup> that consists, with Rachele Borghi, in “multiplying the places of enunciation” within uneven territories, feeding a “constellation of micro-policies”.<sup>28</sup> In this case, the gesture of Enwezor is aimed at subverting – today we would say queering – the centre-periphery model<sup>29</sup> proper of the colonial conception of the world and out of date within a global dimension,

24 Cf. David Cunningham, ‘Returns of the Modern: On Nicolas Bourriaud’s *Altermodern*’, *Journal of Visual Culture*, 9, 1, 2009, p. 7; <<https://www.tate.org.uk/whats-on/tate-britain/exhibition/altermodern/altermodern-explain-altermodern/altermodern-explained>>.

25 Cf. ‘Decolonizing Art Institutions’, *On Curating*, 35, 2017.

26 Cf. Walter D. Mignolo, *The Darker Side of Western Modernity*; Walter D. Mignolo, Catherine E. Walsh (eds.), *On Decoloniality. Concepts, Analytics, Praxis* (New York: Duke University Press, 2018). Cf. Gayatri C. Spivak, *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason. Toward a History of the Vanishing Present* (Washington: Harvard University Press, 1999).

27 Gennaro Ascione, *Science and the Decolonization of Social Theory. Unthinking Modernity* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016), p. 144.

28 Rachele Borghi, *Decolonialità e privilegio. Pratiche femministe e critica al sistema-mondo* (Milano: Meltemi, 2020), pp. 63–92.

29 Cf. Christoph Behnke, Valérie Knoll, Ulf Wuggenig (eds.), *Art in the Periphery of the Center* (Berlin: Sternberg Press, 2015). Cf. ‘Centres-Peripheries’, *On Curating* 41, 2019; Anthony Gardner, Charles Green, ‘Post-North? Documenta11 and the Challenges on the Global Exhibition’, *On Curating - The documenta Issue*, 33, 2017, pp. 109–121.

because both the economic and political institutional power manifests itself in a discontinuous and accelerated manner.

Born in Nigeria but trained within the New York cultural scene between the eighties and nineties, Enwezor went along with this discontinuity to show the antinomies of a model that no longer corresponds to the real circuits of contemporary art. With his co-curators – Carlos Basualdo, Ute Meta Bauer, Susanne Ghez, Sarat Maharaj, Mark Nash and Octavio Zaya – he organised five platforms of film screening and public programs, conferences and workshops: *Democracy Unrealized* (Wien-Berlin);<sup>30</sup> *Experiments with Truth: Transitional Justice and the Processes of Truth and Reconciliation* (New Delhi);<sup>31</sup> *Creolité and Creolization* (St. Lucia – Little Antilles);<sup>32</sup> *Under Siege: Four African Cities – Freetown, Johannesburg, Kinshasa, Lagos*.<sup>33</sup> Each platform took place in a different location and, in line with a strategy of interdisciplinary involvement of theory with practice – it was accompanied by a publication gathering essays from several intellectuals – including Stuart Hall, Chantal Mouffe, Iain Chambers, Oliver Marchart, Michael Hardt and Antonio Negri, Homi K. Bhabha, Ernesto Laclau, Derek Walcott, Jan Bernabé among others. In *Documenta11* postcolonial and decolonial cultural criticism thus becomes a critique of and within the (post-)modernism-driven institution itself, through a centrifugal movement that goes far beyond the classic hundred-days exhibition in the heart of old Europe.

Homi Bhabha – to whom Enwezor explicitly refers in his essay for the exhibition catalogue – questions the mechanism that orient the identification of the places of culture at the end of the millennium, considering them not only as physical spaces but first of all as the relationship between the subjects and the institutions.<sup>34</sup> Places of culture are outside the dialectic center-periphery, both in the former colonies and within the western metropolis, that is, in the sub-text/substratum of the Otherness that has crossed modernity as anachronism and karst movement, to be recognized in its

30 Okwui Enwezor et al. (eds.), *Democracy Unrealized: Documenta11 Platform1* (Berlin: Hatje Cantz, 2002).

31 Okwui Enwezor et al. (eds.), *Experiments with Truth: Transitional Justice and the Processes of Truth and Reconciliation: Documenta11 Platform2* (Berlin: Hatje Cantz, 2002).

32 Okwui Enwezor et al. (eds.), *Créolité and Creolization: Documenta 11 Platform3* (Berlin: Hatje Cantz, 2002).

33 Okwui Enwezor et al. (eds.) *Under Siege: Four African Cities-Freetown, Johannesburg, Kinshasa, Lagos. Documenta11 Platform4* (Berlin: Hatje Cantz, 2002).

34 Homi Bhabha, *The Location of Culture* (New York: Routledge, 1994).

significant force as an alternative and persistent idea of modernity only at the turn of the 20th century.

*Deterritorialisation and relocation: white cube and black box*

The fifth and final platform, the *Exhibition*, took place in Kassel, proposing a de-regulation of the exhibition itself as a medium, addressing another aspect of the North-Atlantic paradigm: the white cube as the epitome of Western modernism. Enwezor restructured the whole exhibition around the idea of *black box*, placing it as an explicit counterpoint of the *white cube* as the epitome of Western modernism. But the curator's interest in the black box lacks the theoretical implications it has for film studies.<sup>35</sup> What is relevant for Enwezor is that in the black box Bhabha's idea of an interstitial, differential and performative "Third Space" subverts the white cube protocols oscillating between "regulation and negotiation".<sup>36</sup> In this regard, the exchange between George Baker and Hal Foster within a round table dedicated to the moving image in contemporary art is illuminating:

Baker: [...] The most interesting artists working with film are specifically working out of a geographical relationship of peripherality to Hollywood, for example, people like Stan Douglas in Vancouver, or William Kentridge in Johannesburg, or Eija-Liisa Ahtila in Finland. And when the artist in fact comes out of L.A., such as Paul Sietsema or Sharon Lockhart, they take their camera to Paris or to Japan or to South America. This links back to the question of the most recent Documenta, Okwui Enwezor's *Documenta 11*, and its thorough investment in the projected image. There's a connection here between...

Foster: The peripheral and the projected?

Baker: Yes. One of the most interesting uses of the projected image now is to disidentify with commercial, Hollywood cinema, and to somehow reconnect to and explore legacies within film that are outside of the Hollywood or the mass-cultural.<sup>37</sup>

35 Cf. Cosetta G. Saba, 'Extended Cinema. The Performative Power of Cinema in Installation Practices', *Cinéma & Cie. International Film Studies Journal*, 20, 2013; Cosetta G. Saba, Cristiano Poian (eds.), *Unstable Cinema. Film and Contemporary Visual Arts* (Udine: Campanotto Editore, 2007).

36 Homi Bhabha, p. 304.

37 Malcom Turvey, Hal Foster, Chrissie Iles, George Baker, Matthew Buckingham, Anthony McCall, 'Round Table: The Projected Image in Contemporary Art', *October*, 104, 2003, pp. 71–96.

This idea of the meeting between “peripheral” cultural perspectives and the installation of moving images clarifies the choice of Enwezor to assume the black box as a “cultural technique” of the post-colonial critique, establishing almost a kind of mutual exclusion – more symbolic than material – between white cube and black box. From this point of view the white cube is interpreted as a functional device to the normalised assimilation of the Other on the false line of modernist primitivism,<sup>38</sup> or as the anaesthetising instrument of the abstraction of art from its context, the ideal background, white, immaculate and almost mystical, for the work you want autonomous, sheltered from the real, out of time and forgetful.<sup>39</sup>

From a completely different perspective, the white cube has assumed the function of a liberating but protected space, as well as an opportunity to reinvigorate the cinema against the background of post-cinematic development and within the framework of the so-called “convergence culture”.<sup>40</sup> Scholars such as Francesco Casetti and Thomas Elsaesser, for example, welcomed the relocation of the cinema into the exhibition space.<sup>41</sup> Film studies affirmed the seductive idea of spectator freedom within the exhibition, in contrast with the disciplinary posture imposed by the closed and dark space of the movie theater that places the viewer in a sort of “captivity”.<sup>42</sup> Conversely, from the perspective of exhibition studies, authors such as Claire Bishop and Boris Groys ascribed the same function to the black box, interpreting the mobility of the spectator within the cinematographic installation as an element of emancipation from a more contemplative classical vision, but in the wake of a general minimalist decentralisation of the point of view – that frees perception by shifting the gaze from the limits of the frame to the most open and dynamic one of the exhibition space.<sup>43</sup>

38 On the relationship between primitivism and modernism cf. James Clifford, *The Predicament of Culture. Twentieth-Century Ethnography, Literature, and Art* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1988).

39 Cf. Brian O’Doherty; Erika Balsom, *Exhibiting Cinema in Contemporary Art*, (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2013), pp. 39–42; Douglas Crimp, ‘On the Museum’s Ruins’, *October*, 13, 1980, pp. 41–57.

40 Henry Jenkins, *Convergence Culture. Where Old and New Media Collide*, (New York: NY University Press 2006).

41 Thomas Elsaesser, ‘Is a Factory a Museum?’, *The Journal of Cinema and Media*, 60, 1, 2019, pp. 42–52; Francesco Casetti; Id., ‘La questione del dispositivo’, *Fata Morgana*, 20, 2013.

42 Cf. Jean-Luc Baudry (1970), trans. by Alan Williams, ‘Ideological Effects of the Basic Cinematographic Apparatus’, *Film Quarterly*, 28, 2, 1974-1975, pp. 39–47.

43 Claire Bishop, *Installation Art* (London: Tate Publishing, 2005). Boris Groys, *The Topology of Contemporary Art*, Okwui Enwezor, Nancy Condee, Terry Smith (eds.), pp. 71–80. Cf. Boris Groys, Politics of Installation, *Journal #02*, 2009

Nevertheless, trying to establish an order of precedence or causality risks to reduce the complexity of this encounter between cinema and contemporary art.<sup>44</sup> Indeed, far from functioning as a mere new setting for cinema, the white cube is also, in agreement with Erika Balsom, first and foremost a *dispositif*.<sup>45</sup> As such it has its own history and reflects an institutional framework, protocols and associated practices, as well as an ideology that can produce mystification.<sup>46</sup> Hito Steyerl for example doesn't recognise the emancipatory function of the mobility of the film experience within the exhibition space, reproaching museum the betrayal of the cinematic duration: in particular she deemed *Documenta11* to expose an excessive amount of moving images that no spectator could see in its entirety. For Steyerl, therefore, even if the exhibition space is a protected place for the relocated cinema, it remains within an exceptional condition and does not realise its political and communitarian utopia, in that the cinematographic installation addresses a fragmented multitude of spectators and prevents the formation of a social body grounded on the experience of a shared vision.<sup>47</sup> Nevertheless, if on the one hand it is possible to agree with this idea, on the other it could be objected, with Elsaesser, that it reflects a classical model of spectatorship proper to narrative cinema. The scholar asks: "Who determines the time, the location, and the kind of attention appropriate to a film once it enters the art space?"<sup>48</sup> For Elsaesser the real dilemma of

---

<<https://bit.ly/3gY17P8>>; Michael Fried, 'Art and Objecthood', *Artforum*, 1967. Cf. also Stefania Zuliani, 'Senza cornice. Spazi e tempi dell'installazione', 2015 <<https://www.arshake.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/Critical-Grounds-04-Stefania-Zuliani-Senza-Cornice.pdf>>.

- 44 On the so-called "querelle des dispositifs" cf. Philippe Dubois, Frédéric Monvoisin, Elena Biserna (eds.), *Extended Cinema. Le cinéma gagne du terrain* (Udine: Campanotto Editore, 2010); Raymond Bellour, *La Querelle des dispositifs. Cinéma – installations, expositions* (Paris: POL, 2012); Francesco Casetti.
- 45 Cf. Julian Myers-Szupinska, 'Exhibitions as Apparatus', *The Exhibitionist: Journal on Exhibition Making: The First Six Years*, ed. by Jens Hoffmann, Julian Myers-Szupinska, Liz Glass (New York: D.A.P. 2017), pp. 16–23; François Bovier, Adeena Mey (eds.); Andrew V. Uroskie, *Between the Black Box and the White Cube: Expanded Cinema and Postwar Art* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2014).
- 46 Erika Balsom, p. 51.
- 47 Hito Steyerl, 'Is a Museum a Factory?', in *Cultures of the Curatorial*, ed. by Beatrice von Bismarck, Jörn Schaffaff, Thomas Weski (Berlin: Sternberg Press, 2013), pp. 319–332.
- 48 Thomas Elsaesser, 'Is a Factory a Museum?', *The Journal of Cinema and Media*, Wayne State University Press, 60, 1 2019, pp. 42–52. Cf. Id., 'Ingmar Bergman in the Museum? Thresholds, Limits, Conditions of Possibility', *Journal of Aesthetics & Culture*, n.1, 2009 <<https://bit.ly/32jsGMF>> [accessed 21 Feb. 2021].



the problematic encounter between these two devices, the cinema and the exhibition, is the fact of creating a hybrid body that offers an experience of duration in space – of *spatialized time*.<sup>49</sup>

In fact, the cause that determines the spectator emancipation, still in agreement with Balsom, cannot be traced exclusively neither to mobility, nor to the duration. The filmic event within the exhibition space is rather the result of the convergence of different elements that make it a situated experience impossible to theorise in a definitive way. The black box enter into the white cube producing a sort of cross-pollination between the two apparatuses, an assemblage that requires continuous negotiation giving rise to a wide range of physical and expressive possibilities, to which corresponds the same amount of audience responses, themselves conditioned by the context.

Aware of the problematic nature of the widespread presence of moving images in large exhibitions, Mark Nash – Enwezor’s co-curator for the moving image section – argues that cinematic is a “key mode” in the formation of contemporary subjectivity.<sup>50</sup> In the thirty years that preceded *Documenta11*, the film and the artist’s video has established itself as one of the dominant discourses of contemporary art, re-enacting and reconfiguring the practices of experimental and avant-garde cinema, those of the Hollywood fiction and documentary, those related to the archives of the twentieth century, as well as artistic and curatorial practice *tout court*.<sup>51</sup>

49 Cf. Alessandro Bordina, Vincenzo Estremo, Francesco Federici (eds.), *Extended Temporalities. Transient Visions in the Museum and in Art* (Milano-Udine: Mimesis, 2017); Sandra Lischi, ‘Film da percorrere: l’installazione ‘cinematografata’’, *Predella. Journal of Visual Arts* <<https://bit.ly/32kFulm>> [accessed 21 Feb. 2021].

50 Mark Nash, ‘Art and Cinema. Some Critical Reflections’, in Okwui Enwezor et al. (eds.), pp. 129–136.

51 Here a list of artists and works in alphabetical order: Eija-Liisa Ahtila (*The House*, 2002); Chantal Akerman (*From the Other Side*, 2002); G. A. Ancelovici - Colectivo Cine Ojo (*Memoirs of an Everyday War*, 1986); Michael Ashkin (*Proof Range*, 1999); Kutlug Ataman (*Semiha B. Unplugged*, 1997; *Never my Soul*, 2001; *The 4 Seasons of Veronica Read*, 2002); The Atlas Group (*The Operator #17 file: I Think it Would be Better if you Could Weep*, 2000; *Hostage: The Bachar Tapes*, 2001); Black Audio Film Collective (*Handsworth Song*, 1986); Pavel Braila (*Shoes for Europe*, 2001); James Coleman (*Photograph*, 1998-99); Stan Douglas (*Win, Place our Show*, 1999; *Le Détroit*, 2000); Park Fiction (*Hamburg Dialog – That’s Gentrification*, 2001); Yang Fudong (*The Strange Heaven*, 1997); Douglas Gordon (*Left Is Right and Right Is Wrong and Left Is Wrong and Right Is Right*, 1999); Pierre Huyghe (*Les Grands Ensembles*, 1994-2001; *Atari Light*, 1999; *The Third Memory*, 2000; *No Ghost Just a Shell*, 2000; *Interludes*, 2001;

In the present case, the selection of film-installations within *Documenta11* is oriented by the questions posed in the mid-1980s by cultural theory in Great Britain,<sup>52</sup> whose merit was first of all to politicise the theory and to overcome the idea of a spectator intended as a universal subject, disembodied and out of history.<sup>53</sup>

This approach reflected in the fact that, while the critical discourse on the white cube has put the emphasis on the space within a visual regime based on the disembodied eye, the discourse on the black box questioned the situated look and the kinematic body also in its pre-cognitive and affective dimension,<sup>54</sup> interpreting the cinematic experience in its whole materiality.<sup>55</sup>

---

*Lighting Prototype*, 2001; *One Millions Kingdoms*, 2001); Igloolik Isuma Productions (*Our Land*, 1995); Sanja Ivekovic (*Personal Cuts*, 1982); Isaac Julien (*Trussed*, 1996; *Vagabondia*, 2000); William Kentridge (*Confessions*, 2001); Joan van der Keuken (*Eye Above the Well*, 1988); Svetlana & Igor Kopystiansky (*Flow*, 2002); Steve McQueen (*Exodus*, 1992-97; *Current*, 1999; *Prey*, 1999; *Girls*, *Tricky*, 2001; *Now*, 2002); Jonas Mekas (*As I Was Moving Ahead Occasionally I Saw Brief Glimpses of Beauty*, 2000); Feng Mengbo (*Q4U*, 2001-02); Trihn Mihn-Ha (*Naked Spaces: Living is Round*, 1985; *The Fourth Dimension*, 2001); Shirin Neshat (*The Shadow Under the Web*, 1997; *Soliloquy Series*, 1999; *Possessed*, 2001); Ulrike Ottinger (*Ticket of No Return*, 1979; *Freak Orlando*, 1981); Pere Portabella (*Warsaw Bridge*, 1989); Seifollah Samadian (*The White Station*, 1999); Eyal Sivan (*Itsembatsemba, Rwanda, One Genocide Later*, 1996); Jean-Marie Teno (*A Trip to the Country*, 2000).

52 Cf. Michele Cometa, *Studi Culturali* (Napoli: Guida, 2010); Stuart Hall, *Il soggetto e la differenza. Per un'archeologia degli studi culturali e postcoloniali* (Roma: Meltemi, 2016); David Morley, Kuan-Hsing Chen.

53 Mark Nash, pp. 129–136.

54 Cf. 'Performing Body, Projecting Screen', *Anglistica AION: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, Istituto Universitario Orientale, 11, 1-2, 2007. On the role of affects in the process of the "construction of cultural mind" cf. Antonio Damasio, *The Strange Order of Things. Life, Feeling, and the Making of Culture* (London: Penguin, 2019).

55 Cf. Giuliana Bruno, *Surface: Matters of Aesthetics, Materiality, and Media* (Chicago: University Press, 2014); Id. *Atlas of Emotion: Journeys in Art, Architecture, and Film* (London: Verso, 2002).

### Conclusion

(Re)thinking the institution and thinking through the institution<sup>56</sup> is one of the most debated issues of contemporary art, because it questions its legitimacy, the autonomy of art and its aesthetic canons. This phenomenon, recognized as “new institutionalism”<sup>57</sup> is often intertwined with critical theories that focus on emerging subjectivities: postcolonial/decolonial, feminist and queer. In this case, the new institutionalism proposed by *Documenta11* looks at the relationship between cultural identity, global knowledge circuits and spectatorship. Following the trajectory suggested by Catherine David<sup>58</sup> – curator of *documentaX* where she already exposed the omissions of Western art history from a post-national point of view – Enwezor does not exclude the exhibition but questions its centrality as the uniquely outcome of artistic production. The exhibition is de-structured and converted into a *locus of discursivity* where to “perform” the theory, in the public sphere of the expanded and a-centric “post-colonial constellation”: quoting Enwezor “[T]he project of *Documenta11* was conceived not as an exhibition, but as a constellation of public spheres. [...] in the domain of the discursive rather than of the museological”.<sup>59</sup>

In a historical moment of huge “political transitions and frictions” and of “global institutional consolidation” of *documenta*, Enwezor chooses to deal with the spectres of modernism and of its post-modern projections.<sup>60</sup> In this way the curator deals with the issue of the *predicament*<sup>61</sup> of contemporary art, precisely due to the problematic relationship between artistic practices and globalisation, as well as between the historicism and cultural approach.

56 Paul O’Neill, *How Institutions Think. Between Contemporary Art and Curatorial Discourse* (Cambridge-London: The MIT Press, 2017).

57 Jonas Ekeberg, *New Institutionalism* (Oslo: Office for Contemporary Art Norway, 2003). Cf. James Voorhies (ed.), *What Ever Happened to New Institutionalism?* (Berlin: Sternberg Press, 2014); Claire Bishop, *Radical Museology, or, What’s Contemporary in Museums of Contemporary Art?* (London: Koenig Books, 2013); ‘Institution as a Medium. Curating as an Institutional Critique?’, *On Curating*, 8, 2011.

58 Cf. ‘Retrospective: *documenta X*, 21 June-28 September 1997’, <<https://bit.ly/3fxFoux>>.

59 Okwui Enwezor et al. (eds.), *Documenta11, Platform 5*, p. 54. Cf. Okwui Enwezor, *The Postcolonial Constellation. Contemporary Art in a State of Permanent Transition*, in Okwui Enwezor, Nancy Condee, Terry Smith (eds.), pp.207–234.

60 Okwui Enwezor et al. (eds.).

61 Cf. Hal Foster, Rosalind Krauss, Yve-Alain Bois, Benjamin Buchloh, David Joselit, ‘The Predicament of Contemporary Art’, in *Art Since 1900. Modernism, Antimodernism, Postmodernism* (New York: Thames & Hudson, 2004), pp. 671–679.

### Bibliography

- AA.VV., 'Okwui Enwezor: The Art of Curating', *NKa Journal. Contemporary African Art*, Vol. 2021, Issue 48 (New York: Duke University Press, 2021).
- AA.VV., *Centres-Peripheries, On Curating*, n. 41, 2019 (Zürich: Institute for Cultural Studies in the Arts (ICS), Zurich University of the Arts (ZHdK)).
- AA.VV., *On Curating - The documenta Issue*, n. 33 - 2017 (Zürich: Institute for Cultural Studies in the Arts (ICS), Zurich University of the Arts (ZHdK)).
- AA.VV., *Decolonizing Art Institutions, On Curating* n. 35, 2017 (Zürich: Institute for Cultural Studies in the Arts (ICS), Zurich University of the Arts (ZHdK)).
- AA.VV., *On Curating* n. 13, 2012 (Zürich: Institute for Cultural Studies in the Arts (ICS), Zurich University of the Arts (ZHdK)).
- AA.VV., *On Curating* n. 8, 2011 (Zürich: Institute for Cultural Studies in the Arts (ICS), Zurich University of the Arts (ZHdK)).
- AA.VV., 'Performing Body, Projecting Screen', in *Anglistica AION: An Interdisciplinary Journal*, n. 11. 1-2, 2007 (Napoli : Istituto Universitario Orientale).
- Altshuler B., (ed.) *Salon to Biennial: Exhibitions that made Art History. Volume 1: 1863 -1959; Volume 2: 1962 - 2002*, (London: Phaidon Press 2008-2013).
- Appadurai A., *Modernity at Large. Cultural Dimensions of Globalization* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996).
- Ascione G., *Science and the Decolonization of Social Theory. Unthinking Modernity* (London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2016).
- Baldacci C., 'Reenactment: Errant Images in Contemporary Art', in *Re-: An Errant Glossary*, ed. by Christoph F. E. Holzhey and Arnd Wedemeyer, *Cultural Inquiry*, 15 (Berlin: ICI Berlin, 2019), pp. 57-67.
- Baudry J.-L. (1970), trans. by Williams A., 'Ideological Effects of the Basic Cinematographic Apparatus', in *Film Quarterly*, Vol. 28, n. 2, 1974-1975 (University of California Press).
- Balsom E., *Exhibiting Cinema in Contemporary Art* (Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press, 2013).
- Behnke C., Knoll V., Wuggenig U. (eds.), *Art in the Periphery of the Center* (Berlin: Sternberg Press, 2015).
- Bellour R., *La Querelle des dispositifs. Cinéma - installations, expositions*, (Paris: POL, 2012).

- Bellour R., *L'Entre-images: photos, cinéma, vidéo*, (Paris: Éditions de la Différence, 1990)
- Bhabha H., *The Location of Culture*, (New York: Routledge, 1994).
- Bishop C., *Radical Museology, or, What's Contemporary in Museums of Contemporary Art?* (London: Koenig Books, 2013).
- Bishop C., *Artificial Hells. Participatory Art and the Politics of Spectatorship* (London: Verso, 2012).
- Bishop C., *Installation Art* (London: Tate Publishing, 2005).
- Bordina A., Estremo V., Federici F. (eds.), *Extended Temporalities. Transient Visions in the Museum and in Art* (Milano-Udine: Mimesis, 2017)
- Borghi R., *Decolonialità e privilegio. Pratiche femministe e critica al sistema-mondo* (Milano: Meltemi, 2020).
- Bovier F., Mey A. (eds.), *Exhibiting the Moving Image: History Revisited* (Berlin: Sternberg Press, 2015).
- Bovier F., Mey A. (eds.), *Cinema in the Expanded Field* (Berlin: Sternberg Press, 2015).
- Braidotti R., *Nomadic Subjects. Embodiment and Sexual Difference in Contemporary Feminist Theory* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1994).
- Bruno G., *Surface: Matters of Aesthetics, Materiality, and Media* (Chicago: University Press, 2014).
- Bruno G., *Atlas of Emotion: Journeys in Art, Architecture, and Film* (London: Verso, 2002).
- Buckley B., Conomos J., (eds.), *A Companion to Curation* (Hoboken: Wiley Blackwell, 2020).
- Casetti F., *The Lumière Galaxy. Seven Key Words for the Cinema to Come* (New York: Columbia University Press, 2015).
- Casetti F., "La questione del dispositivo", in *Fata Morgana*, n. 20, 2013.
- Cestelli Guidi A., *La "documenta" di Kassel. Percorsi dell'arte contemporanea* (Milano: Costa&Nolan, 1997).
- Chambers I., Curti L., Quadraro M. (eds.), *Ritorni Critici, La sfida degli studi culturali e postcoloniali* (Milano: Meltemi, 2018).
- Clifford J., *The Predicament of Culture. Twentieth-Century Ethnography, Literature, and Art* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1988).
- Cometa M., *Studi Culturali* (Napoli: Guida, 2010).
- Crimp D., 'On the Museum's Ruins', *October*, n. 13, 1980 (Cambridge: The MIT Press).

- Cunningham D., 'Returns of the Modern: On Nicolas Bourriaud's Altermodern', *Journal of Visual Culture* 9(1) (Los Angeles, London, New Delhi, Singapore and Washington DC: SAGE Publications, 2009).
- Damasio A., *The Strange Order of Things. Life, Feeling, and the Making of Culture* (London: Penguin, 2019).
- De Lauretis T., 'Eccentric Subjects: Feminist Theory and Historical Consciousness', *Feminist Studies*, vol. 16, no. 1, 1990, pp. 115–150.
- Demos T.J., *The Migrant Image. The Art and Politics of Documentary during Global Crisis* (New York: Duke University Press, 2013).
- Dubois P. (ed.), 'Cinéma et art contemporain / Cinema and Contemporary Visual Arts', *Cinéma&Cie*, International Film Studies Journal, n. 8 (Milano: Il Castoro, 2006)
- Dubois P., Monvoisin F., Biserna E. (eds.), *Extended Cinema. Le cinéma gagne du terrain* (Udine: Campanotto Editore, 2010).
- Ekeberg J., *New Institutionalism* (Oslo: Office for Contemporary Art Norway, 2003).
- Elsaesser T., 'Is a Factory a Museum?', *The Journal of Cinema and Media*, Vol. 60, n. 1, 2019 (Detroit: Wayne State University Press).
- Elsaesser T., "Ingmar Bergman in the Museum? Thresholds, Limits, Conditions of Possibility", in *Journal of Aesthetics & Culture*, n.1, 2009.
- Enwezor O., Condee N., Smith T. (eds.), *Antinomies of Art and Culture. Modernity, Postmodernity, Contemporaneity*, (London: Duke University Press, 2008).
- Enwezor O. et al. (eds.), *Democracy Unrealized: Documenta11 Platform1* (Berlin: Hatje Cantz, 2002).
- Enwezor O. et al. (eds.), *Experiments with Truth: Transitional Justice and the Processes of Truth and Reconciliation: Documenta11 Platform2* (Berlin: Hatje Cantz, 2002).
- Enwezor O. et al. (eds.), *Créolité and Creolization: Documenta 11 Platform 3* (Berlin: Hatje Cantz, 2002).
- Enwezor O. et al. (eds.) *Under Siege: Four African Cities-Freetown, Johannesburg, Kinshasa, Lagos. Documenta11 Platform4* (Berlin: Hatje Cantz, 2002).
- Eugeni R., *Posts. How media defined, un-defined and re-defined Modernity*, in International Conference, University of Genoa, December 5th-6th 2019.
- Filipovic E., Van Hal M., Øvstebø S., *The Biennial Reader. An Anthology on Large-Scale Perennial Exhibitions of Contemporary Art* (Berlin: Hatje Cantz 2010).
- Foster H., *What comes after Farce?* (London: Verso, 2020).

- Foster H., *The Return of the Real: The Avant-Garde at the End of the Century* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1996).
- Foster H. (ed.), *The Anti-Aesthetic. Essays on Postmodern Culture* (Washington: Bay Press 1983).
- Foster H., Krauss R., Bois Y.-A., Buchloh B., Joselit D., ‘The Predicament of Contemporary Art’, in *Art Since 1900. Modernism, Antimodernism, Postmodernism* (New York: Thames & Hudson, 2004).
- Foucault M., *L’ordre du discours* (Paris: Gallimard, 1971).
- Franzini E., *Moderno e Postmoderno. Un bilancio* (Milano: Raffaello Cortina, 2018).
- Fried M., ‘Art and Objecthood’, *Artforum*, Summer 1967.
- Groys B., *Politics of Installation*, Journal #02, 2009.
- Hall S., *Il soggetto e la differenza. Per un’archeologia degli studi culturali e postcoloniali*, a cura di Mellino M., (Roma: Meltemi, 2016).
- Hoffmann J., Myers-Szupinska J., Glass L., *The Exhibitionist: Journal on Exhibition Making: The First Six Years* (New York: D.A.P. 2017).
- Jenkins H., *Convergence Culture. Where Old and New Media Collide* (New York: NY University Press 2006).
- Kolb R., Patel S., Richter D., ‘Contemporary Art Biennials – Our Hegemonic Machines in States of Emergency’, *On Curating* n. 46, 2020.
- Kompatsiaris P., *The Politics of Contemporary Art Biennials. Spectacles of Critique, Theory and Art* (London-New York: Routledge, 2017).
- Laurberg M., Schavemaker M., *Between the Discursive and the Immersive: Curating Research in the 21st Century Art Museum*.
- Lázár E., ‘Discursivity’, in *Curatorial Dictionary*, <<https://bit.ly/3gd88cd>>.
- Lischi S., “Film da percorrere: l’installazione ‘cinematografata’”, in *Predella. Journal of Visual Arts* <<https://bit.ly/32kFulm>>.
- Martini V., Martini F., *Just another exhibition: storie e politiche delle Biennali* (Milano: Postmedia, 2011).
- Mignolo W., Walsh C. E. (eds.), *On Decoloniality. Concepts, Analytics, Praxis* (New York: Duke University Press, 2018).
- Mignolo W., *The Darker Side of Western Modernity. Global Futures, Decolonial Options* (New York: Duke University Press, 2012).
- Morley D., Chen K.-H. *Stuart Hall, Critical Dialogues in Cultural Studies* (London-New York: Routledge, 1996).
- O’Doherty B., *Inside the White Cube. The Ideology of the Gallery Space* (Santa Monica-San Francisco: The Lapis Press, 1976).
- O’Neill P., Sheikh S., Steeds L., Wilson M. (eds.), *Curating After the Global. Roadmaps for the Present* (Cambridge-London: The MIT Press, 2017).

- O'Neill P., *How Institutions Think. Between Contemporary Art and Curatorial Discourse* (Cambridge-London: The MIT Press, 2017).
- O'Neill P., *The Culture of Curating and the Curating of Culture(s)* (Cambridge-London: The MIT Press, 2012).
- O'Neill P., *Curating Subjects* (London-Amsterdam: Open Editions & De Appel, 2007).
- Rugoff R., 'Rules of the Game', *Frieze*, n. 44 - 1999.
- Williams R., *Marxism and Literature* (Oxford-New York: Oxford University Press, 1977).
- Saba C. G., 'Extended Cinema. The Performative Power of Cinema in Installation Practices', *Cinéma & Cie, International Film Studies Journal*, n. 20, 2013.
- Saba C. G., Poian C. (eds.), *Unstable Cinema. Film and Contemporary Visual Arts* (Udine: Campanotto Editore, 2007).
- Spivak G. C., *A Critique of Postcolonial Reason. Toward a History of the Vanishing Present* (Washington: Harvard University Press, 1999).
- Turvey M., Foster H., Iles C., Baker G., Buckingham M., McCall A., 'Round Table: The Projected Image in Contemporary Art', *October*, Vol. 104 (Cambridge: The MIT Press, 2003).
- Uroskie A. V., *Between the Black Box and the White Cube: Expanded Cinema and Postwar Art* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2014).
- Vest Hansen M., Folke Henningsen A., Gregersen A., *Curatorial Challenges. Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Contemporary Curating* (London-New York: Routledge, 2019)
- Von Bismarck B., Schafaff J., Weski T., *Cultures of the Curatorial* (Berlin: Sternberg Press, 2013).
- Voorhies J. (ed.), *What Ever Happened to New Institutionalism?* (Berlin: Sternberg Press, 2014).
- Zuliani S., *Senza cornice. Spazi e tempi dell'installazione*, 2015 <<https://www.arshake.com/wp-content/uploads/2015/07/Critical-Grounds-04-Stefania-Zuliani-Senza-Cornice.pdf>>.
- Zuliani S., *Esposizioni. Emergenze della critica d'arte contemporanea* (Milano: Bruno Mondadori, 2012).