

## Counter-identification and Politics of Art

---

Art is taking positions in the symbolic universe by affirming singularity, which by virtue of being always some *artefact* (i.e. artistic fact) transcends any particularity of the singular as such. This holds true for artistic products of all kinds in no matter which period of history or culture or other relevant contexts; but really remarkably, such claim has been made possible and rather clear only in recent periods due to the profiles of art and its “statements”.

### *The Ineffable*

However, for some older art, such aspects have grown to be readable through theory, which of course cannot but keep being problematic due to a special reflexivity, which is linked to the dialectics of subjectivity. This enables some positions within the field of theories, which “assign science a priori limits” (Bourdieu, 1996: p. xvi). Pierre Bourdieu mentions philosophers from Henri Bergson to Martin Heidegger and in a distinct manner Hans-Georg Gadamer as representatives of – let me just say it – fetishism of art, which denies sociology’s capacity for any relevant analysis of art. Largely this denial can be generalised for any other form of “rational” knowledge.

*Is it true that scientific analysis is doomed to destroy that which makes for the specificity of the literary work and of reading, beginning with aesthetic pleasure? And that sociologist is wedded to rel-*