

and literature, statues in public spaces, cinema as entertainment or propaganda, and so on. However, what makes art exceptional and, therefore, capable of producing singular “breakthroughs”, are not only all these generally accepted forms of arts’ undoubtedly very important contributions to our daily life under any kind of political system. What I am thinking about here, are the phenomena such as different interventions in the symbolic order, which consist of some novel gesture, an invention of an articulation or form, or a specific subversion of a meaning or of an ideological structure, and so forth. They are in most instances marked by some relation to politics, which can be described or theoretically elaborated.

It is understood that artists in different periods use specific means to achieve some decentring or destabilising, for example, of a cognitive scheme or some naturalised ideological meaning of a notion or a concept. But, in the “age of reproduction”, which is simultaneously an age of the expanding communication and public performances, an attitude within the mechanism – or rather a set of manifold mechanisms – of identification process, stands out as a specific artistic effect. I am talking about *counter-identification* – obviously a term from psychoanalysis – which is strongly related to any construction of a subject. The positioning of a subject or “creation” of an imaginary and/or fictional subjectivity, which relates in various ways to the personality of an artist or identity of an artistic group, is always playing a role in no matter what kind of enactment of an artistic act. The term’s meaning is related to a problem in the clinical practice of psychoanalysis and as such, it is noticeably synonymous with the notion of counter-transference. Mijolla’s Dictionary of Psychoanalysis in this sense mentions Robert Fliess’ definition of counter-identification as “an irregularity in the counter-transference that must become a topic of the analyst’s self-analysis if it is to be overcome. Such a distortion of empathy results in a part of the analyst’s ego identifying with a part of the patient’s ego, causing the analyst to no longer observe the patient with the necessary analytic attitude.” (de Mijolla, 2005: p. 348). However, the usage of the term broadened and diversified the meaning. Hence, the same dictionary, which lists two different meanings, refers to “French authors” as responsible for what I described as a broader meaning: “For certain French authors, it designates the subject’s adoption of character traits, drive tendencies, or of defensive modes that are opposite to those of an object that the subject fears or with which he refuses to identify” (Ibid.). Especially at the time, when psychoanalysis had a strong impact in the theoretical debate in the framework of