

## ZHOOZHED, ZHUZH, TSZUJED CAPS LoCKY CRITICISM!

The exhibition review above doesn't succeed in establishing whether 'tightly packed sculptures on cardboard plinths' and 'chunky brown wool tapestries hung from ceilings' constitutes a 'house style', 'risky', 'serious', 'ambitious' 'avant garde art' or 'an ambition to map a European scene'. But it does, in mentioning that the exhibition contains references to Schopenhauer, without wondering why, reproduce the likely intention of the artist that all this is somehow, in some way or other clever like philosophy. It appears that projects so cosmetically and heavily branded in theoretical discharge such as the one reviewed immediately undermine any criticism, the critic scared that they may lack the cognitive ability to comprehend such profundities.

Beyond the flaccidly descriptive the text barely even manages to register a more or less sophisticated grunt of approval or disapproval. It is not informed by anything like a position, nor is it in anyway informative; it does function as a demonstration of the fact that if your generalisations are big enough and the area from which you take your view is wide enough and diverse enough criticism is almost entirely replaced by descriptive dross. The lame device of the pay off of the last paragraph having been set up by an unsubstantiated erroneous first paragraph is not good enough. Arguably, the twelve words 'the project felt... as unwieldy and frustrating as the notion of Europe' might have sufficed for the review but word count to the reviewer is like the rowing machine in the bedroom for the adulterer; the lips, cheeks, eyelids and anuses for the sausage maker; and froth to the brewer. (collaterally generated by-product.) Equivalent meaningless sentences such as 'this object feels as complex as other unrelated complex things in the world', 'these words appear as deep and profound as is the idea of deep and profound in fishing' and 'A Paycheck Lyncher Jeers Offer = A Perchance Lechery Jerky Offs' might be offered as stand-ins.

The production of arthood is based on a plurality of styles and ever greater internal complexity that manifests itself as differences in style or appearance. Changes of style do not indicate differences that can be qualified beyond statements of preference. Difficulty or lack of clarity doesn't constitute good. Every work of arthood may strive to be good but there is no possibility of being better, only superficially different. Style in this sense is an endless infinitely conceivable quantity, that allows only the work of art to operate avantgardistically, which means nothing other than reproducing more of the same, in the absence of an avant garde.

Starting from a twofold point of view that there are no unique artistic values that transcend the art system's boundaries, no transcendental quality no matter how heavily it implies meaning while refraining from committing the substance of what is meant; and that criticality in art engages at no significant point with any substantive wider social content: from this position how does one go about maintaining an art practice that wants to function critically in such conditions?

Criticism, in the established sense of critique as external fault-finding or judgements made looking from outside in, offering something resembling objectivity or more or less judgement validated by further statements, can only operate as mere subjective affirmation of assured statements in the form of artworks when artistic production itself constitutes a problem. The fallacy of 'projecting' the effect and making it a quality of its cause tends to recur. So-called expert or specialised intervention (the conspicuous distinction between initiate and ignorant in art) only diminishes the potential of criticism. Criticism in the entirely honorific sense of what is hubristically termed 'critical art practice' regularly operates as being part of the problem of art and not part of a provisional solution to the problem of how to go about maintaining an art practice within the context of late-capitalism; this form of criticism currently only contributes to the understanding that no such problem

Criticism has ended up as nothing more substantial than a handful of individuals commenting and sanctioning each other's output, it has been subsumed into the practices' of arthood as a public relations exercise or insider-job of self-aggrandisement, a necessity in any significant institutional enterprise. Criticism as it now exists as a thickening agent for arthood engages with no substantive social context. As a form of discourse it is almost entirely self-validating and self-producing. Critical art practices have not functioned as such operationally, because they have been active in reproducing the dominant conditions of artistic production, which is far from critical. If artists themselves consider criticism in terms of a distinct specialism, then consequently a lack of potential to carry out a critical practice is normalised and accepted, as it is in texts such as this.

Therefore, we shall make a clean distinction and state that this review is as functionally feckless as it is operationally hubristic. The text fails to contribute to the formulation of a criteria for what constitutes art, or what constitutes good or better or worse or poor art, and any justification as to why. Not even a 'tentative resolution' is attempted. Why can't texts such as this declare a judgement and attempt to substantiate the judgement with statements of explanation or clarification? What exactly is at risk? If we take it that for the text to be operationally critical it must distinguish itself from its object; this can only be done by being critical, which can only be done by being distinct. In the apathetic state of arthood an attempt, at the very least, may have been productive. Because an attempt at a tentative resolution would itself constitute a criterion for a judgement of quality, even if the question of defining a notion of art is ignored beyond the assumption that something is art.

Jeffrey Charles Henry Peacock November 2018



