

Igor Loinjak¹¹²

POWER AS THE FOUNDATION OF CULTURAL CAPITAL AND A PREREQUISITE IN CREATING THE VALUE OF AN ARTWORK

Professional Paper
<https://doi.org/10.59014/MHJV1841>

Abstract

In his studious analysis of art in the context of its status and social function, French sociologist Pierre Bourdieu analyzed the problem of the distribution of power within the area that he refers to as the “field of art”. The habitus of the protagonists active in this field plays a decisive role in it, determining the perception of the value of artwork. The interests maintaining the field dynamics are essential elements of any field, making the field a battleground in which various interests battle for domination, nevertheless presupposing a consensus between the participants in the battle and their roles. Bourdieu, like Weber, believes that any social action is based on the interests of social protagonists, because no one will engage in something that has no material or ideal value and does not include a certain motive or profit, which does not necessarily have to be economic. Furthermore, aesthetic conflicts in the field of art often have a political dimension and are merely an embellished form of the battle fought in order to impose the dominant vision of the social reality on others. The field is an imaginary space where the real social power is generated. It is superior to the concept of institution, because institutions imply consensual relations within the society, while the field also includes phenomena that are not institutionalized or defined by firm boundaries at the given moment. The objective of this study is to analyze the role of critics and other protagonists in the field of art in the process of shaping values in visual arts, and to show the importance of power in the formation of symbolic capital in a broader cultural context. For the purposes of this research, the author will use the methodology that Bourdieu applies to literature in his book *The Rules of Art*, whose main theses help us better understand the economic, symbolic and cultural relationships in the fields of visual arts, with an emphasis on the situation in Croatia after the war.

Keywords: Bourdieu, art criticism, cultural capital, power, artwork

112 Faculty of Philosophy in Osijek, iloinjak@ffos.hr

On the significance of Bourdieu's "field of arts" and Danto's "world of art"

In a series of his texts, especially in the study *The Rules of Art: Genesis and Structure of the Literary Field*, French art sociologist Pierre Bourdieu tried to explain the relationship between art and social movements using the sociological method. The methodology Bourdieu uses to analyze the literary field represents a model of scientific research practice applicable to any social field. Pierre Mounier observed that Bourdieu primarily explores and analyzes how the literary field achieved its autonomy "as a specific field" (with its capital, its agents, and its specific stakes) in his book. After achieving this, it was officially established as a literary field, because it had previously not existed in such a complete and structured form. It is obvious that this is a case study, which means that a certain number of properties, or (to use the term used by this sociologist) 'rules' of the field are valid in all fields, and especially in the field of cultural production, the category to which the literary field belongs" (Mounier, 2001, 59). Through his study and analysis of the literary field and the writers and works that shape it, Bourdieu provided a methodological pattern applicable to the analysis of any other field. It should be recognized that Bourdieu's analysis was primarily based on the structure of French literature of the 19th century and that the functioning of art and theory changed significantly in the following century, especially in the visual arts. Changed forms of artistic expression, the emergence of new media, a different approach to artistic production, the problematization of the traditional aesthetic understanding of an art object, as well as numerous other circumstances, required a redefinition of concepts.

The first significant terminological problems arose with the historical avant-gardes in which the theoretical thought of romanticism experienced its practical realization. Not long after, a new turbulent epoch appeared as part of the strengthened neo-avant-garde practices in the 1950s, especially under the influence of the New York art scene. Along with Clement Greenberg, Arthur C. Danto was among the most notable theorists who understood the importance and tried to rationally understand and explain the logic of new movements in the field of aesthetics. In his 1964 essay *The Artworld*, Danto pointed out that earlier aesthetic theories could not adequately explain the new movements within the art world. He believed

that sometimes, as observers, we do not have to be aware that what we are looking at is an art object, because we do not know the specific theoretical base that would confirm this to us (Danto, 1964, 572). In order for something to be seen as art, sometimes it is not enough just to notice an object or a gesture, because the reason for the existence of the artistic dimension does not have to be recognized by our eyes, and can lie in the “atmosphere of art theory, knowledge of art history”, that is, in what Danto calls the *art world* (Danto, 1964, 580). The artistic character of an object therefore sometimes depends exclusively on interpretation. For this reason, it is undeniable that a potential interpreter must have a broad knowledge of art history and theory. It is the theory of art and the knowledge of the historical context that can transform things from their mere ordinariness into the realm of art, and thus determine the difference between a urinal and Duchamp’s “Fountain”, or between a “Brillo box” and an art object that Warhol made from Brillo boxes (Danto, 1964; Danto, 1997).

On Bourdieu’s concept of the field

The foundation for Bourdieu’s analysis of the concept of the field starts from the questioning of the efforts of the main character Frédéric in Flaubert’s novel *Sentimental Education*. Frédéric is an example of a character in whom the ambivalent idea of the incompatibility between two worlds – the world of art and the world of money – breaks down. One is represented by the experience of artistic activity out of pure love, and the other is based on profit (Bourdieu, 1995). Frédéric embodies this first segment of love for art that cannot be reduced to money or any other interest. It is, therefore, about the larporartistic ideology (Bourdieu, 1995). In the book *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgment of Taste*, taking into account Panofsky, he concludes that nothing happens when encountering a work of art that could be explained by the concept of love at first sight. The act of knowing someone’s work is a much more complex operation of “unraveling, decoding, which includes the application of cognitive heritage, cultural competence” (Bourdieu, 2011, 6). In addition, Bourdieu pays a lot of attention to the relationship of power factors between different fields and the way it is distributed in society.

In the article *Cultural Capital and Symbolic Power – Three Aspects of Bourdieu's Theory of Ideology*, Nenad Fanuko shows how the basic concepts of his theory derive from three sources. These are the sociological systems of Max Weber, Karl Marx, and Emile Durkheim (Fanuko, 2008, 10). Bourdieu explains the concept of field relationally since, according to him, the basis of the social world is made up of objective relations that are independent of the consciousness and will of individuals. The field is not a lifeless space consisting of a set of empty positions but represents a game area that can only function if there are players “who believe in the stake and actively strive to achieve it” (Fanuko, 2008, 10). In addition, he defines the field as a social stage on which habitus operates (Fanuko, 2008). The concept of habitus helps to understand the relationship with the perception of values, because “the ‘eye’ is a product of history that is reproduced through upbringing” (Bourdieu, 2011, 7). Upbringing is closely related to education, that is, the school system and its capital. Bourdieu devotes a large part of his analysis of *Sentimental Education* to the field of literature founded around 1880 in France, in whose shaping Gustave Flaubert and Charles Baudelaire played a substantial role (Bourdieu, 1995). Certain interests that maintain its dynamics are an integral part of every field, so every field is a “stage where interests battle for dominion, and all fields assume the consensus of the participants of the battle about the roles in it” (Fanuko, 2008, 15). At the base of this understanding is Weber’s thought that every social action is based on the interests of certain social actors, since no one will commit to something that has neither material nor ideal value and does not include a specific motive and profit. Bourdieu emphasizes that he is not referring exclusively to economic interest and monetary gain, so he extends his economic calculation to symbolic goods in which symbolic capital is registered. Protagonists in each field have a certain interest that is not exclusively of an economic nature. Aesthetic conflicts in the field of literature often have a political dimension, and are only an embellished form of the battle that is fought to impose a dominant vision of social reality. For this reason, Bourdieu rejects economism as the basis of the dynamics of the field, setting the basis for the elaboration of the distinction between the artistic and economic fields, viewing them as two opposites. In the artistic field, economic interests are completely reversed, because it emphasizes the disinterestedness of action. However, disinterestedness in the artistic field only implies the absence of economic interests,

while they are very much present symbolically. “In a game where it is necessary”, Fanuko points out, “to be ‘disinterested’ in order to succeed (as in the artistic field, where ‘authenticity’ is opposed to ‘commercialization’), the protagonists will spontaneously act disinterestedly in accordance with their interests” (Fanuko, 2008, 16). As an example, Bourdieu cites two professors in the scientific field who will fight for their own theory, perhaps even at the cost of death, regardless of monetary or other profits.

Analyzing the relationship between the artistic and economic fields, Bourdieu comes up with another important concept of “political economy of the symbolic” – cultural capital. Cultural capital means language competence, general cultural awareness, aesthetic preferences, information about the school system, educational certificates, and the like. In addition to cultural capital, Bourdieu mentions economic and social capital. Economic capital can be directly converted into money and become institutionalized as a form of property rights. In the case of cultural capital, the process of conversion into economic capital is limited by certain conditions, and it can be institutionalized in the form of educational competencies and qualifications. The last capital, the social one, consists of social obligations and can also under certain conditions be converted into economic capital and institutionalized in the form of noble titles. Finally, to these three types of capital, Bourdieu adds the form of symbolic capital, whose characteristics take on the three previously mentioned when they are perceived and recognized as legitimate. Capital becomes symbolic “only when it is unrecognized in its arbitrary truth as capital and recognized as legitimate. On the other hand, this act of (false) knowledge and recognition is actually an act of practical knowledge, which in no way means that the known and recognized object is set as an object” (Fanuko, 2008, 17). Although its foundations are derived from Marx’s theses, Bourdieu’s concept of capital is not based on the Marxist idea of exploitation of surplus value. Economic capital is at the base of all capital, since any other capital can be converted into it, which ultimately made it difficult for Bourdieu to distance his theory from Marxist economics. Conversions from one form of capital to another are not always of the same character, and Fanuko observes that individual capitals do not even function at the same level of sociality (Fanuko, 2008).

The French sociologist believes that there are no objective economic conditions that must be met in order to wage a battle for the acquisition of

profit in the field of art or literature, because economic profit is not the primary motive for engaging in art or literature. Financial support does not contribute to better status in the field, nor to faster acquisition of symbolic capital. Nevertheless, even within these fields, there are artists and writers who, in their pursuit of economic capital, adjust their production to the requirements of institutions that seek to legalize them at all costs in order to get capital themselves. It is rare for an artist and writer to gain symbolic capital in this way, because only the recognition of competent professional colleagues can provide it. In his capital study *The Western Canon*, literary historian Harold Bloom highlights only those writers who have already secured symbolic capital with their works or are likely to secure it in the near future. When he mentions previous writers and current writers who deliberately read them in a distorted way, he means powerful writers belonging to tradition whose works already have a confirmed symbolic value, and their strong successors who give them recognition and are competent. Picon very clearly describes this relationship using the example of Mallarmé and Joyce, calling them Promethean writers who write for an audience “to whose creation it will contribute” (Picon, 1965, 24). Art for the sake of art, therefore, can now also be characterized as art for the sake of the artist/successor, because inventive and original writers do not necessarily have to be original, but only need to know what they can borrow and how to skillfully revise it (Slabinac, 2006, 178). From this comes Bloom’s thesis that the canonization, i.e., the legalization of artistic/literary values, belongs exclusively to the field of art or literature, and not to something outside that field, as the members of the *school of resentment* thought. Bloom will therefore defend the interests of the text, which is exclusively an aesthetic fact which does not have value in itself but acquires its value status through constant conflict with other aesthetic facts (Slabinac, 2006).

Symbolic capital and its endangerment

The relationship between symbolic and economic capital is quite complex. Symbolic capital is just as important as economic capital because every activity, especially of economic nature, must be presented as legitimate. A group of individuals-specialists whose task is to monitor, develop and transmit the status culture contribute to the autonomy of the field. In the

field of visual arts, they include curators, critics, gallerists, editors of cultural magazines, and cultural columns in various media, collectors, and others. Outside that segment are the artists themselves. Bourdieu most often speaks of them as producers rather than artists because “the value of the work of art is not produced by the artist but by the field of production as a world of belief that produces the value of the work of art as a *fetish*, creating belief in the creative power of the artist” (Birešev, 2007, 191). Producers are specialists, but there is also a rivalry between them. The constant conflict between established actors and newcomers contributes to the vitality of the field. At the same time, those with greater status power try to completely appropriate the specific capital of the field, using the strategy of conservation and defending their dogmas. In contrast, new actors, who possess less capital, are more inclined to practice subversive strategies. The aesthetic outlawry of the newcomers forces the dominant class to act and shape the defense mechanism of orthodoxy, because it is in their interest to maintain and defend the integrity of the *doxa*, while the newcomers try to push the boundaries of this established *doxa* through direct rebellion or deliberately distorted reading. In mid-19th century, French society looked with approval at the bold transgressions that French writers committed in their works. Even if this approval could not be immediately measured in terms of adequate monetary profit, the market still provided a certain form of social recognition to individuals and groups that exceeded the demands of the bourgeois market by their actions. According to Bourdieu, the cultural revolution that occurred in the field of art and literature in the 1830s was possible because the great heretics could count, if not on full support for their activities, at least on the attention of all those who entered the field of art and literature and through their own formation in that field accepted that all options are possible within it. “Therefore, it is clear”, according to the author, “that the literary and artistic fields were constituted as such in opposition and because of opposition to the *bourgeois world*, which has never before so cold-bloodedly imposed its values and its tendencies to control the instruments of legislation in the fields of art and literature, and which now wants to impose a degraded definition of artistic production through the press and their tricks” (Bourdieu, 1995, 58).

The gradual revolution of symbolic capital led artists towards liberation from bourgeois demand, giving neither the buyer nor the market

legitimacy when deciding on the artistic value of a work. Artists could not defeat the bourgeois system in the battle over the control of the meaning and function of the work of art without eliminating the bourgeoisie itself from that struggle, i.e. the market system in which the bourgeoisie determines the price and demand without taking sufficient care of the supply. However, not all members of the bourgeois class can be viewed in the same way. Among the talented bourgeoisie, as well as the traditional nobility, there are also those who preferred and continued to cultivate aristocratic predispositions, alienating themselves from the demagogic declarations of the proclaimers of the so-called social art. Being “equally blessed with economic and cultural capital, writers from a central position in the very heart of the field of power, as sons of doctors or members of the intellectual and liberal professions (...), it seems that they were destined to occupy a corresponding position in the literary field” (Bourdieu, 1995, 86). The ruling social structures have never initiated major revolutionary movements since they have no problem with the existing order and are “usually condemned by their living conditions and destined for routine literary practice, and unable to provide troops equal to the heretics or those who are the guardians of the symbolic order” (Bourdieu, 1995, 111). Revolutions were initiated by members of unclassified milieu who, thanks to their aristocratic predispositions – and often privileged social origin – were the owners of great symbolic capital (like Baudelaire and Flaubert) and as such supported a deep intolerance of borders, whether social or aesthetic. In the period studied by Bourdieu, the hitherto unique literary field (and the same applies to the artistic field) begins to be organized in opposition between two independent principles. On the one hand, there are opposition writers who deal with “pure” production intended for producers – other writers and those whose aesthetic taste has been more refined, while on the other hand there are those who meet the demands of a wider audience.

Members of the oppositional, decadent artistic movement often came from the working class or belonged to the petty bourgeoisie and were not blessed to a large extent with cultural capital like, for example, members of the much bigger bourgeoisie, which was greatly influenced by the possibility of receiving an education (Bourdieu, 2011). Avant-garde writers and artists who had not yet acquired a privileged status, especially those of a biologically older age, had even more motivation to achieve the success

and recognition that younger avant-garde artists could obtain based on a long-term oppositional position towards the bourgeois order. Furthermore, Bourdieu claims, “I can rely on the fact that, although bourgeois commitment and economic profit or the momentary honors that mark them (*Academie*, prizes, etc) go primarily to writers who produce for the bourgeois and consumer markets, they also affect the conformist segment of the most dedicated avant-garde” (Bourdieu, 1995, 123). The growth of the market was also a key factor, since it determines the vitality of the artistic and literary fields. The increase in the number of cultural producers who could earn a living with their pen by doing the jobs offered by numerous cultural companies was linked to the increase in the number of potential readers who were ready to accept novelties and originalities in the field they were interested in. With painters, the situation was somewhat different. Having crossed paths with the ideals of the academy and the demands of the bourgeois class, they had to search for a different conception of the termination and acquisition of autonomy that was prepared in the field of literature with romanticism. The idea of art for art’s sake, which introduced new laws into the economy of the symbolic values of goods, i.e. works of art, helped transformed painters in their work on ethical and aesthetic transformation (Bourdieu, 1995, 136). Thus, the painters’ long-lived desire for liberation from even the most neutral and eclectic patronage revealed the possibility and showed the necessity of shaping a cultural production that carries within itself the principle of its own existence, freed from external influences and prohibitions.

Previously, there was already talk about the dominant and subordinate participants of the field and the way in which their antagonism affects the vitality of the field, because these are places of antagonistic coexistence of two modes of production and circulation in which the universal logic of relations is respected. At one end of the artistic and literary field stands the anti-economic economy of pure art, based on the recognition of the value of disinterestedness, which lacks commercial and economic profit that can be obtained in the short term. This cultural production, which cannot recognize any demand other than the one it can create, is nevertheless aimed at the accumulation of symbolic capital in the long term, which under certain conditions ensures economic profit in the future. Against this production stands the economic logic of the art and literary industry, which prioritizes distribution and temporary success and is content with

adapting to the existing demand of the clientele. The first described model shapes and creates the market for the future by anticipating its symbolic capital, while the second model serves the existing market (Bourdieu, 1995, 142). The first model needs not only artists, but also critics who will appropriately introduce new art into the area of demand and ultimately strengthen its symbolic capital. Avant-garde critics (but also gallerists and curators) are dedicated to the function of discovery, which often makes them spokespersons for artists and art, and, in accordance with their status, they are opposed to institutions such as the academy and museums. The task of such actors in the field is to skillfully highlight the connection between tradition and the moderate innovation of contemporaries and to justify the deliberate misreading of predecessors so that the work does not cease to be the subject of educational institutions *in principio*, given that the educational system recognizes a monopoly only for works from the past and for producers and intermediaries who have a degree, while new practices are often approved post mortem and after a long process that ends only in the most fortunate cases with canonization and inclusion of works in curricula. Economic capital cannot guarantee other specific capitals as well as subsequent economic profit, which often comes only with time, unless it is transformed into symbolic capital whose goal is not economic profit. It is a legitimate accumulation of capital, both for the author and critic as well as for the curator, publisher or director. The work on shaping a recognizable name is the basis of dedication in the field, and the dedication of a name implies the power to consecrate objects or people through a sign or signature, which ultimately contributes to making a profit.

In this context, Bourdieu also addresses the issue of the institutionalization of art, which was exhaustively dealt with by estheticians of the analytical line such as Arthur Danto and George Dickie. Dedicated authors strive to impose their dominance in the field in which they operate because their tendency is to enter the market. The solutions they provide are becoming more and more common and acceptable because constant encounter with them replaces the process of long-term familiarization through an institutional framework. This is hindered by respectable consumers of recognizable products, because the appearance of new and different producers often means the shaping and perhaps the imposition of new tastes, as a result of which a number of producers, works of art

and systems of taste are relegated to the past on the market, and there are changes in the hierarchization of their degree of legitimacy. It should not be ignored that in addition to artists, there are other actors within the artistic field who help discover and consecrate the artist or preserve the status of existing valorizations, namely critics, writers of forewords and introductions, publishers, dealers, curators. So, for example, curators, critics, directors or gallerists are people who are inseparable from the field. They take advantage of the artist's work, but they also raise its symbolic value by placing it on the market through exhibitions, publication or installation and ensure its possible sanctification. And according to Bourdieu, "the commitment will be greater, the more committed the trader himself is" (Bourdieu, 1995, 167-168). Bourdieu argues that the dedicated artist who discovers something does not discover anything that at least some other artists have not already discovered.

Attempts to shape the symbolic capital in Croatian visual art – example of the Venice Biennale

In Croatia, the problem of market formation is very long-standing, and the roots of this problem go back to the time of communist Yugoslavia. After the 1950s, there was no organized market system because the understanding of private property was based on the Marxist model. The state was the most common buyer of works of art, as confirmed by exhibitions of annual art purchases, which were managed by eminent, but mostly regime-friendly, art historians such as Vladimir Maleković or Grga Gamulin. The power of cultural policy was in their hands, and they decided what would represent valuable and high-quality Croatian art both at home and at international fine art fairs. More contemporary – and in a certain sense more problematic new artistic practice, based on the poetics of neo-avant-garde currents – remained mostly on the margins of the field of visual art. With the independence of the Republic of Croatia, things began to change because the state's attitude towards market relations changed, but even in the 1990s there was no stronger development of the art market. With the appearance of a few collectors whose affinity was more directed towards modern painting, there were no significant changes in the market domain, and the institutions, their directors and curators continued to strongly influence the distribution of power within the field.

Zvonko Maković, Tonko Maroević and Igor Zidić imposed themselves as intellectual authorities for the first half of the 20th century, striving to point out the European quality and value of Croatian modernity.¹¹³ The power of private gallerists and collectors was very limited, with the exception of the later appearance of the collections of Marinko Sudac or Tomislav Kličko, who had the help of curators with whom they worked to try to shape new valorization interpretations of the art they collected.

In addition to being forced to deal with the problem of appropriating a part of the power within the field for a long time, private gallerists did not have enough power and knowledge to appropriate a part of the monopoly over symbolic capital, so their role in the economic capital of the field depended on other factors as well. In the field of mass media and publishing, the situation was very similar. In addition to the terrible lack of media space for visual art in regular television news shows and daily newspapers, most of the texts about art could be found in specialized magazines such as *15 dana* (published since 1957), *Zarez* (published in print 1999-2016), *Vijenac* (published by Matica hrvatska), *Art Magazin Kontura* (since 1991), *Fantom slobode* (since 2003) or the recently founded magazine *Nemo*, which is published electronically. In addition to HRT's (national radio-television) very short programme *Vijesti iz kulture*, which prioritises the presentation of well-known and popular names of Croatian and international art, HRT 3 offers a large number of specialized shows on culture that are usually watched only by experts in the field. The contribution of these shows is certainly not negligible when it comes to the segment of non-economic development of art and its symbolic potential. It is understandable that the media aspect of the artistic field largely depends on the affinities of the editors because they decide which aspect will be emphasized, so their power in building symbolic capital is very great. On the other hand, the ideological orientation of certain media houses also affects the selection of what will be put in focus. One of the more pronounced examples of such editorial policy can be observed in the work of Patricija Kiš Trebovac from *Jutarnji list*, who, thanks to the readership of this daily newspaper, has a significant power in the selective presentation

113 In recent years, the Art Pavilion in Zagreb has hosted a series of exhibitions from the collections of Croatian collectors, where one could very clearly see which preferences are dominant in their selection of exhibits that they want to have in their private collections.

of current artistic movements in which quality and symbolic potential are put on the back burner.

The strength of the media in the field of visual arts in Croatia is very weak. The main lever of power in this context is held by two apparently opposing camps, which in practice are quite intertwined. On the one hand, there are directors and curators of larger museum and gallery institutions, and on the other hand there are non-governmental associations, i.e. civil society associations with a whole range of curators and experts in culture like BLOK, Kontejner, WHW etc. Although their *modus operandi* is quite different and somewhat opposite, within the framework of the Croatian cultural scene, they are strongly intertwined, and it is not uncommon for the same individuals to participate in parallel in both segments of cultural policy. The positive side of this situation is that they share the same aspiration towards certain symbolic values which, through institutionalization, are starting to get a certain economic equivalent. However, the downside of such built relationships is the generation of identical values of symbolic capital, which over time leads to the homogenization of valorization and ideological preferences and tastes. The formation of symbolic capital, therefore, is largely connected with the aesthetic ideology of individuals who have power in the field. The last editions of the Venice Biennale showed that Croatian representatives are increasingly striving to be represented by strong curatorial names from the Croatian scene or curators with international references. Artist Kata Mijatović presented herself at the 55th Venice Biennale with the project “Between Heaven and Earth”, which she designed with curator Branko Franceschi. At the next biennale, Damir Očko presented himself with the exhibition “Trembling Studies: The Third Stage”, curated by the French critic and curator Marc Bembekoff. The 57th Venice Biennale was curated by Branka Benčić (an independent curator at the time) with the project “Horizon of Expectations”, in which Tina Gverović and Marko Tadić were involved. The last two biennials are also signed by foreign curators, more precisely female curators. In 2019, “Traces of disappearance (in three acts)” by Igor Grubić was curated by Katerina Gregos, while at the 59th biennial the project “Untitled (Croatian Pavilion) 2022” by Tomo Savić – Gecan was curated by Elena Filipović, who is also the director of the Kunsthalle in Basel. The example of the Venetian presentations of Croatian artists shows how important it is that, in addition to the work of art itself, in the process of

its symbolic establishment, a number of significant participants from the field who possess the competence to shape the symbolic capital of works and artists and determine their status in a canon of visual arts should be included. The term canon is important because phrases like “canonical lists” and “objective valorization” are highly debatable and are formed due to the relationships that exist within the artistic field between actors who participate in it according to their own interests.

It is difficult for most literary experts to accept the increasingly widespread thesis about the relativity of literary values. Kant seems to have opened this Pandora’s box quite unintentionally. The solution was sought in the works of analytical aestheticians who at least partially tried to return to the objectification of literary values. Monroe Beardsley can be considered the originator in this area. In his work *Aesthetics: Problems in the Philosophy of Criticism*, he offered a middle ground between objectivity and relativism – the instrumentalist theory. According to the proposed understanding, “aesthetic value depends on the range of experiences that the aesthetic object arouses, or more precisely, on the range of aesthetic experiences that can be aroused, from the point of view of three main criteria, namely the *uniqueness*, *complexity* and *strength* of the potential experience” (Compagnon, 2007, 288 as cited in Beardsley, 1981, 529). Beardsley believed that these three criteria are sufficient for an objective evaluation of a literary work, that is, every reader can use them to logically conclude that one work is more valuable than another. However, even with Beardsley, the problem of establishing those three models remains. Even if it is accepted that *uniqueness* and *complexity* enter the objective domain, the question of *strength* still remains largely reserved for each individual.

At one point, the concept of time imposed itself as a very good ally in the conflict between objectivity and the relativity of artistic values. It was based on the fact that time will give the final verdict on the question of the quality of artwork. If it is truly valid, it will be studied and inspiring for a hundred years, and if it succumbs to the passage of time, it will be difficult to accept the thesis of contemporaries about its extraordinary quality. Numerous works of light or trivial literature, which are extremely popular and widely read in the beginning, lose the battle with time, and very few remain as legacy for generations to come. Goodman was also aware of this fact, admitting that most of the works of art were of extremely poor quality (Compagnon, 2007, 263). Hans Robert Jauß also accepted the future

as a valid criterion for assessing literary value. However, the problem with the inclusion of the concept of time in the parameters of determining the artistic value of an individual work lies in the fact that the artistic field needs to valorize a certain object or the artist's entire opus *hic et nunc* in order to determine as soon as possible its symbolic capital, which in market circumstances could begin to produce economic capital as well.

Conclusion

In his research on art, sociologist Pierre Bourdieu developed a very stimulating methodology for the study of different artistic fields, which is applicable not only to the period that Bourdieu himself focused on, but also to later movements in the field of the art world, especially after the development of the capitalist arrangement of the market system. Bourdieu perceives works of art as goods that possess a certain capital. However, he considers the concept of commodity to be a much broader term than, for example, Marx. For this reason, the French sociologist emphasizes the difference between different types of capital – economic, cultural, social and symbolic – already in his early analyses. Although all capitals are reducible to economic ones, money is not the only driver that operates within certain fields, especially when it comes to artistic and scientific ones. In this text, emphasis was placed on Bourdieu's analysis of the field and the relationships that prevail within it. Although he himself did not strictly deal with the field of fine or visual arts, the methodology he developed analyzing the literary field can be applied to this field as well.

The objective of this paper was to reflect on the role of curators and critics in shaping the field of visual arts, as well as to analyze their role in gaining and distributing power within the field. Within the framework of the Croatian visual arts scene, power is still traditionally distributed within institutions and its diversification is decided by curators and critics who managed to obtain their privileged status within the field and acquire a monopoly over the distribution of different types of capital. Using the example of the last few editions of the Croatian pavilions at the Venice Biennale, an effort was made to show the attitude of Croatian artists towards their own position within the field. Since the segment of market relations still does not contribute to a more favorable relationship between

symbolic and economic capital for the artist, the tendency of artists is to participate in market relations outside the borders of their own country, which is much simpler in the field of visual arts than, for example, in the field of literature. Finally, in the last section of the paper, using the example of canon analysis, an attempt was made to show that the monopoly of individuals and certain ideologies often has no direct connection with the objective value of a work of art, so that symbolic capital is often left to the phenomenon of time, which only in the future crystallizes a model of potential objectification of value whose objectivity is always woven into the relations between individual actors of the field and depends on them.

References

- Beardsley, M. (1981). *Aesthetics: Problems in the Philosophy of Criticism*. Indianapolis: Hackett.
- Birešev, A (2007). Polje književne proizvodnje: *Sociološki imperijalizam ili estetizacija sociologije?*. *Filozofija i društvo*, 32, 177-211.
- Bourdieu, P. (2011). *Distinkcija – društvena kritika suđenja*. Zagreb: Antibarabus.
- Bourdieu, P. (1998). *Practical Reason: On the Theory of Action*. Stanford – California: Stanford University Press.
- Bourdieu, P. (1995). *The Rules of Art: Genesis and Structure of the Literary Field*. Stanford – California: Stanford University Press.
- Compagnon, A. (2007). *Demon teorije*. Zagreb: AGM.
- Danto, A. C. (1997). *Preobražaj svakidašnjeg: Filozofija umjetnosti*. Zagreb: KruZak.
- Danto, A. C. (1964). The Artworld. *The Journal of Philosophy*, 61 (19), 571-584.
- Fanuko, N. (2008). Kulturni kapital i simbolička moć – tri aspekta Bourdieuove teorije
- ideologije. *Školski vjesnik*, 57 (1/2), 7-41.
- Mounier, P. (2001). *Pierre Bourdieu, une introduction*. Paris: Pocket – La Découverte.
- Picon, G. (1965). *Uvod u jednu estetiku književnosti. Pisac i njegova senka*. Beograd: Kultura.
- Slabinac, G. (2006). *Sugovor s literarnim davlom. Eseji o čitateljskoj nesanici*. Zagreb: Naklada Ljevak.

MOĆ KAO BAZA ZA KULTURNI KAPITAL I PREDUVJET U STVARANJU VRIJEDNOSTI UMJETNIČKOG DJELA

Sažetak

Pri studijoznim analizama umjetnosti u kontekstu njezinoga statusa i društvene uloge, francuski sociolog Pierre Bourdieu osvrtao se na problematiku raspodjele moći unutar područja koje naziva "umjetničkim poljem". U polju presudnu ulogu ima habitus aktera koji u njemu djeluju te određuje percepciju vrijednosti umjetničkog predmeta. Esencijalni su dio svakog polja interesi koji održavaju njegovu dinamiku pa je ono pozornica borbe različitih interesa koji unatoč svemu pretpostavljaju konsenzus između sudionika borbe i njihovih uloga. Tu se Bourdieu oslanja na Weberovu misao kako je svaka društvena akcija zasnovana na interesima nekih društvenih aktera jer se nitko neće angažirati za nešto što nema bilo materijalnu bilo idealnu vrijednost te u sebi ne uključuje određeni motiv i profit koji nužno ne mora biti ekonomske prirode. Nadalje, estetski konflikti u polju umjetnosti nerijetko imaju političku dimenziju te su samo uljepšani oblik borbe za nametanje dominantne vizije društvene realnosti. Polje je imaginarni prostor u kojem se generira stvarna društvena moć. Ono je superiornije od pojma institucije jer institucije podrazumijevaju konsenzusne odnose u društvu, dok polje obuhvaća i pojave koje u tom trenutku nisu institucionalizirane te određene čvrstim granicama. Cilj je istraživanja analizirati ulogu kritičara, ali i drugih aktera umjetničkoga polja u procesu oblikovanja vrijednosti vizualne umjetnosti te prikazati u kolikoj je mjeri moć važna pri formiranja simboličnoga kapitala u širem kulturnom kontekstu. U ovoj analizi autor će se poslužiti metodologijom koju Bourdieu u djelu *The Rules of Art* primjenjuje na područje književnosti, a čije osnovne teze pružaju mogućnost za bolje razumijevanje ekonomskih, simboličkih i kulturnih odnosa u područja likovnih i vizualnih umjetnosti pri čemu će naglasak biti na stanju u poslijeratnoj hrvatskoj umjetnosti.

Ključne riječi: Bourdieu, kritika, kulturni kapital, moć, umjetnički predmet