

BETWEEN THE BLACK BOX AND THE WHITE CUBE

Based on Andrew V. Uroskie's book "Between the Black Box and the White Cube", 2014

RODRIGO GHATTAS
2017

Introduction – From Medium to Site

The expanded cinema is an outlet, a vertex of infinite possibilities that allowed the artist to shed the unilateral relationship between what was shown on the screen and the passive experience of the audience. Shedding cinema's barriers was not an easy task, however, it managed to quickly create spaces where human senses are potentiated with the aim that the audience experience collectively more and more realistic situations.

A cinema that was characterized by a well-defined and traditional parameter. As in every epoch in the history of art, the artist seeks to extend the artistic experience. This mutation and transformation of the experience allowed him to bring afloat new strategies, tools, spaces and ways to engage with his audiences, full of emotions. The task of providing more social spaces became a priority for the artist in the 60s, generating increasingly participatory roles for the viewer.

At that moment they decided to leave behind the cinemas and theaters, to position their work into previously unimaginable spaces such as galleries, warehouses, open spaces, etc. Leaving part of what they knew until that moment as their comfort zone, to now be engaged in spaces that could, in contrast, generate unexpected, awkward or fragile situations. This shift began to transport the viewer out of their present space and time, to show a different dynamic and sensory perspective, which led him to meet and experience new levels of fiction in motion.

The right question when talking about the Expanded Cinema might be asking not what is cinema, but where?

It is true that somehow the expanded cinema stopped to belong exclusively to the screen but either meant that deliberately fell into the gallery arms. Its scope was not limited to these two contexts. Personally, I think this is one of the first and perhaps most important expressions that demonstrate the need and concern of the artist about the Other, the other as a spectator, the other as a human, the other as receiver of the message; *how* becoming an essential question. That Other who for years had been underestimated, the one that never had the opportunity to participate, only observe.

As I see it, these are the foundations of what would later be called "social art", "community-based art", "engagement art", etc. Even though the foundation for these new encounters between art and viewer, now called participant, were not fully established. Later on, these were fully developed to allow the activation of different social spaces through art, although they are constantly changing. Spaces, meetings, places, emotions, realities, time, and, interactions were part of an endless list of new concepts or to be more precise, concepts that were redefined to achieve a better understanding of each context according to its own characteristics and

peculiarities, being the work of art only one element among many to be analyzed within a whole, a specific situation.

This new kind of interaction generated a role play between the artist, the curator, the viewer, the participant, a new environment when the rules of the game changed completely and made us rethink what these institutional parameters really meant in the way the art of that time was exhibited. This creation of attention and awareness, in my opinion, is the most significant contribution that this movement brought. We need a greater understanding of what these intimate spaces mean, to try to understand the radical changes that the artist must face every day. I believe we could now talk about the Expanded Artist, as a sequence of actions of the artist in the public space, which allows him to constantly transform the way he connects with different audiences even within the context of a unique and specific situation.