

UDK BROJEVI: 7.038.53(497.11)"2025"
061,3-057.87(497.11)"2025"
ID BROJ: 181270281
DOI: https://doi.org/10.18485/f_zsmu.2026.22.5

KATEGORIJA ČLANKA: NAUČNI ČLANAK

ORIGINALAN NAUČNI RAD



Milica Pekić
Kiosk Platform for Contemporary Art, Belgrade
<https://orcid.org/0009-0002-5171-4110>

REVISITING *APRIL ENCOUNTERS*: ENACTING ALTERNATIVES

Abstract:

Inspired by the student-led program developed during the recent five-month occupation of the Student Cultural Centre in Belgrade, an integral part of the wider student protests in Serbia, this paper revisits the *April Encounters* as a key manifestation that marked a formative and conceptually significant phase in the history of the Centre. Through an analysis of its programs, ideas, discussions, and art practices, the text seeks to explore the potential resonance of *April Encounters* within contemporary student struggles. The programs, with their numerous international and Yugoslavian participants, explored the new logic of artistic production that inherently aimed at transforming the institutional framework. Today, the question of institutional forms and their possible alternatives emerges as a central concern for a new generation of students, pointing to the continued relevance of examples and knowledge created within our neo-avant-garde tradition.

Keywords:

April Encounters, Student Cultural Centre, institutional change, neo-avant-garde, students' protests, engagement

Introduction

The five months long occupation of Students Cultural Centre (SKC) in Belgrade in 2025, organised by students, within the wider student and social movement in Serbia, revived questions related to the nature of cultural institutions, their role and function within society. Within the struggle marked with dominant social demand for greater participation, transparency and democratisation of institutions, the implications of such a demand for the art system became an urgent issue. Critique of the existing, still-dominant institutional structure is being articulated, while new possible designs for alternatives are yet to be defined. Summarizing the study *The Imaginary Institution of Society* by Cornelius Castoriadis (Castoriadis 1987), Simon Sheikh points out the imaginary character of the institutions and adds: “Institutions are part of symbolic network, and as such not fixed or stable, but constantly articulated through projection and practice” (Sheikh 2005, 19). This imaginary potential to reinvent an art institution through practice has been revealed in the activities of students in the occupied Student Cultural Center.

Five months of active production of space, knowledge, program, community and public manifested the constitutive process of shaping an alternative through collective action. This process also confronted us with the image of an institution which, after decades of poor management, had been effectively erased from the map of youth cultural spaces. The students’ occupation, or to use their more precise term – liberation of the space, demonstrated the capacity to transform the institution with numerous events, productions, concerts, exhibitions, experiments, conversations, plenums, encounters, exchanges and communal living. The analysis of this experience, including the analysis of implemented programs, established relations, organisational logic, work ethics, communal living practices, and other aspects of the process that shaped the occupation, will hopefully become the subject of future research. Here we will just briefly outline a few visible characteristics. The inner logic of governing the space reflected the organizational logic of the wider students’ movement, decisions were made within the plenum of *SKC in Blockade* (SKC u blokadi), and tasks were distributed within working groups. The center’s program was fully created by students and numerous concerts, film projections, performances, workshops, open dialogs and exchange sessions, exhibitions and festivals were organized. Students launched the *SKC in Blockade* internet radio station, and published 11 issues of the SKC paper.¹ Under the slogan *Students’ Space to Students* (Studentski prostor studentima) (image 01) SKC, once again, became a platform for learning, practicing skills, exploring ideas, doing, organizing, producing, negotiating, planning, and intensive exchange between young people themselves and with numerous audiences, visitors, and direct or indirect participants of the programs.

1 More on activities of *SKC in Blockade* with all issues of SKC paper available online on: <https://skc.news/>. Last accessed August 23, 2025.

Inspired by the students' attempt to constitute a new form of institution through practice, this paper examines the history of the Student Cultural Center's most notable manifestation, the *April Encounters*, as a platform that initiated wide debate on the role and function of the art institution, shortly after the students' protests of 1968.

Student Cultural Centre (SKC)

The generation of '68 was granted the Student Cultural Center as a result of students' protests, but also as a way to silence their struggle against the "red bourgeoisie", the term students used to address the party elites.² They were given the fully renovated building, originally the *Officers' Club* (Dom oficira) and later the seat of *State Security Administration* (Uprava državne bezbednosti), in which the government had invested significant resources to adapt it for its new purpose (V.Š. 1971). In 2025, the situation is somewhat different. Students had to occupy the building, bring in their own equipment and realize all their programs with the only support being modest donations from citizens, only to be evicted by police five months later. Public institution, intended for the development and practice of youth and students' culture, returned to its state of hibernation, emptied of any relevant content, program and, most importantly, students.

Although the Centre and the programs it housed may have lost relevance for students over the past few decades, its rich history remains alive, as a living, active legacy that continues to shape new generations. This is reflected in the numerous events organized in the SKC within the five months of students' liberation, most specifically the *April Encounters* festival, a clear reference to the avant-garde movements that defined the institution during the seventies.



Students Space to Students, Student Cultural Centre, Belgrade, april 2025, photo Milica Pečić

2 More on the implications for the potential of political organizing and the work of student organizations after the protests of '68 in: Imširović Pavluško, „U susret studentskim nemirima, omladinski pokret u Jugoslaviji i Srbiji, juče i danas”, *Novi Plamen*, 20. oktobar 2012. Dunja Blažević, the first editor of the visual arts program at the Student Cultural Center, also speaks about the abolition of student organizations. The interview is available at: <https://vimeo.com/149264527>, Last accessed August 23, 2025.

April Encounters (Aprilski susreti)

In her introduction to the *Journal of Modern Art History Department*, dedicated to the art legacy of '68, Jasmina Čubrilo refers to the global event of the '68 protests as an unfinished event: "since all the questions which were raised, the confrontations and questioning of the existing order, remain just as relevant today as they were at the moment they erupted. In the case of '68, these were questions of democracy, representation, civil and minority rights, the distribution of power and capital, ecological awareness, and a fascination with leftist ideas."³ (Čubrilo 2018, 7) This statement can be extended to issues regarding the nature and the function of art, as well as the nature of an institution of art. This is why it is important in the current moment to revisit the legacy of *April Encounters* as the manifestation through which we can follow different ideas, challenges, experiments, and their effects regarding the topics discussed and shared among students, artists and curators from Yugoslavia and different parts of the world in the seventies.

April Encounters was first established and organized in 1972, as a manifestation celebrating Students' Day with a program oriented toward, as stated in the introduction of the *Bulletin* (Bilten) of the first issue of *April Encounters*, critical practices, creating a working environment for experiments and research.⁴ Encounters were organized six years in a row, from 1972 to 1977, within the broadly defined thematic framework of expanded media. They served as a platform for exchange, intensive dialogues and theoretical reflection on the role and position of art in society, as well as for experiments, production, and realization of a large number of works by both local and international artists. It was an international, interdisciplinary manifestation which merged film, theatre, performance, visual arts, dance, and music in an intensive and vibrant program. Modest in production, with limited means available but lots of enthusiasm and connections with international artists and curators built by program editors, *April Encounters* represented a unique manifestation. At the time when British/German film director and artist Lutz Becker could not present his documentaries on the soviet avant-garde "*Malevich Suprematism*" and "*Art and Revolution*", neither in the East nor the West, as stated by program editor of SKC gallery at the time Dunja Blažević, on the third *April Encounters* it was projected five days in a row.⁵ The number of participants throughout the years is impressive and here, as an

3 Author's translation.

4 As a part of manifestation, each year, a Bulletin was issued following the events, announcing programs, participants, publishing comments, some of the transcripts of the discussions which took place within the program and essays on the topics in question. These Bulletins represent one of the major prime sources offering insight in the nature of the manifestation.

5 Interview with Dunja Blažević by Milica Pekić and Stevan Vuković within the project "Conversations about New Artistic Practices of the 70s in Serbia" available online: <https://vimeo.com/149264527>, 19:29–21:00. Last accessed: August 25, 2025

illustration of the scope of the event, I will list just some of their names: Gina Pane, Paul Pignon, Luciano Giaccari, Goran Trbuljak, Slavko Matković, Sanja Iveković, Marina Abramović, Raša Todosijević, Era Milivojević, *The People Show* collective, theater *Pekarna*, Nuša and Srečo Dragan, Luigi Ontani, Ilija Šoškić, Vladan Radovanović, Milenko Pajić, *Bosch+Bosch* collective, Joseph Boeys, Gill Eatherley, Tim Jones, Dubravko Detoni, Vladimir Gudac, *Arte Viva* collective, Katalin Ladik, Joe McEwan, Achille Bonito Oliva, Nena Dimitrijević, Germano Celant, Barbara Reise, Vladan Radovanović, Giancarlo Politi, Endre Tôt, Walter de Maria, Natalia Lach-Lachowicz, Ulrike Rosenbach, Iole de Freitas, Natalia Lach-Lachowicz, Nicol Gravier, Hans Otte, Herve Fisher, Ida Biard, Fernando de Filippi, Zdzislaw Sosnowski, Janusz Haka, Rosetta Brooks, Diego Cortez, Nancy Kitchen, Katharina Sieverding, Irina Subotić, Wolfgang Weber, Radomir Damnjanović Damnjan, Oskar Davičo, Mladen Stilić, Ješa Denegri, Zorica Mršević, Eugene Carl, Miroslav Miša Savić, Ulay, Miško Šuvaković, Ursula Krinzinger, Hans Haacke, Neša Paripović, Slobodan Šijan, Zoran Popović, Jovan Čekić, Čedomir Vasić, and Oto Bihalji Merin. Among the members of the editorial team of the manifestation were Dunja Blažević, Biljana Tomić, Božidar Zečević, Petar Ignjatović with the occasional participation of Jasna Tijardović, Bojana Pejić, Ješa Denegri, Jadranka Vinterhalter and others. In the words of Dunja Blažević:

“...all of us, who were working with certain artists and developing a certain kind of art, we all knew each other. It was an international circle where we were all equals since we did stuff simultaneously.”⁶

Situated in Yugoslavia, as a socialist and communist country outside the Eastern Block, whose citizens could freely travel in most of the countries across the globe without visas, *April Encounters* represented a platform for exchange, a working international lab where different ideas could meet, where capitalist critique can be shared, where revolutionary potential of art could be discussed and where ideas could be presented, tested, performed, produced and practiced.

Expanded media

The general topic of all issues of the manifestation was the notion of ‘expanded media’ (prošireni mediji). As mentioned by Božidar Zečević during the final discussions on the second issue of *April Encounters*, the editorial team found inspiration for the topic in Gene Youngblood’s concept of ‘expanded cinema’, which, according to Zečević, covers the joint movement of different media toward new forms and possible synthesis. Zečević further elaborates the notion as:

6 Ibid, 22:08–22:18.

“the beginning of a new, collective understanding of art as a general necessity, in which the border between the producer and the audience disappears; in which past era’s understanding of individual and exclusive rights to artistic goods is irreversibly lost.”⁷ (Zečević 1973)

One of the key instruments for communicating the theme of the manifestation and encouraging artists to experiment with the notion of expanded media was an open call for submissions, first introduced at the inaugural *April Encounters* and maintained as an integral part of the program through to the sixth and final edition. Statements by jury members, published in *I April Encounter’s Bulletin*, give an insight into how the notion was understood. Art historian Matko Meštrović argues that the transcendence of traditional artistic media, along with the opening of an unlimited repertoire of artistic means, renders the classification of artistic techniques and procedures impossible. This, he claims, justifies the use of the umbrella term ‘expanded media’ and highlights the fact that the formulations of artistic messages could not be predicted since:

“...they may take the form of a document, a shock, an invitation to participate or play, a construction project, a staged event, or any more or less complex and open-ended process typically aimed at engaging the viewer’s, observer’s, participant’s, or fellow citizen’s entire sensory or cognitive apparatus, whether they are invited, provoked, or simply caught off guard.”⁸ (Meštrović 1972)

Ješa Denegri points out that shifts in modes of aesthetic communication also imply a transformation in the social status of art, which moves toward “a further democratization of artistic exchange, primarily driven by free and equal individual choices.” (Denegri 1972) Božidar Zečević highlights the element of play as the most vital characteristic of the new practices, one that recognizes no external limitations and without which it becomes impossible to confront “a world of fixed relations and immutable codes.” (Zečević 1972)

In the introduction of the *II April Encounter Bulletin* Dunja Blažević expands on Denegri’s view by introducing a dichotomy in the interpretation of the concept of expanded media: art as an end in itself versus art as a means. The former refers to the shifting of formal boundaries within art itself, while the latter points toward the “socialization” (podružtvljanje) of art, where expanded media serves as a tool in that process. (Blažević 1973)

On the final day of the second *April Encounters*, a discussion was held on the concept of expanded media, with the aim of examining the cultural and social

7 Author’s translation.

8 Author’s translation.

profile of the manifestation, as well as offering a theoretical articulation of its thematic framework.⁹ In his presentation, artist Vladimir Radovanović emphasized that expanded media should not be regarded as an artistic style or movement, arguing instead that the term must also encompass an expanded attitude toward both art and the medium itself. Jovan Ćirilov noted that questions surrounding media expansion had already been raised in the fifties through the experiments of John Cage, Anna Halprin, and Allan Kaprow, practices later referred to as happenings or mixed media. Ješa Denegri points out that for contemporary practice, articulation of certain attitudes, expressible through almost any available means, is more important than the choice of means or media used for communication. He concludes that it is no longer appropriate to speak of expanded media, but rather of new media, or “simply of attitudes on the basis of which anyone can choose and use those means they consider adequate to their expressive purpose.”¹⁰ (Denegri 1973)

The discussion of the third *Encounters*, notable for Joseph Beuys’s visit and numerous international participants, was entitled *Information – Expanded Media or New Arts* (Informacija – prošireni mediji ili nove umetnosti). According to Ješa Denegri, the discussion, involving numerous Yugoslavian and international participants, was marked by intense ideological confrontations and diverse viewpoints, covering a thematic range from commercialism in art and ideological premises of art to the possibilities and forms of critical practice. (Denegri 2003, 34) Artist Vladimir Gudac, for example, views dominant artistic practice as an activity of the elite for the elite, and defines the aim of new art as making it widely accessible, not through the ‘democratization of art’ (demokratizacijom umetnosti), but through the ‘cultivation of life’ (kultivacijom života), enabling creativity as a way of living for all. (Gudac 1974)

The fourth April Encounters, as part of its discussion program, opened the topic of the position of women in art through a debate entitled ‘*Women in Art*’ (Žene u umetnosti). The debate was announced in the *Bulletin* as a conversation prompted by the statement: ‘*This artwork by a female artist is so good, as if it were made by a man*’ (Delo ove umetnice je tako dobro kao da je delo muškarca).¹¹ The discussion featured a notable group of female artists and curators from Yugoslavia, alongside participants from Germany, Brazil, France, and Poland. Among participants were Gisliind Nabakowski, Ulrike Rosenbach, Natalia Lach-Lachowicz, Iole de Freitas, Katharina Sieverding, Nicol Gravier, Dunja Blažević, Irina Subotić, Jadranka Vinterhalter, Marina Abramović, Ida Biard, Nena Baljković, Jasna Tijardović, Borka Pavićević, and Biljana Tomić.

9 Authorized transcripts of the participants’ presentations were published in: *Билтен 09, II априлски сусрет*, СКЦ, Београд, 1973.

10 Author’s translation.

11 As announced within the program of the Encounters in: *IV Априлски сусрети, Билтен 04, 09.05.1975*, 5.

The fifth *April Encounters* brought the critique of the development of new art forms and their inadequate institutional appropriation, shifting the conversation toward the revolutionary potential of art and its role in society. The Yugoslav model of self-management provided a conceptual framework for the discussion, further inspired by the exhibition *October 75*, curated by Dunja Blažević at the SKC Gallery in October 1975.¹² Aware of the risks posed by the commodification of conceptual and new art, which could easily reduce it into a mere artistic style, artists and curators on the local scene revisited Marxist ideas and the notion of self-management as a distinct feature of Yugoslav socialism. An unsigned text published in the *Bulletin*, entitled *Is the Fate of New Art an -ism?* (Da li je sudbina nove umetnosti izam), described self-managing art as follows:

“Self-managing art is, therefore, the kind of art that demonstratively envisions the future, art that already enacts, in the making, that future. It plays, reveals, performs, teaches, and lives precisely that.”¹³

While international critique was directed toward the institutional assimilation and neutralization of avant-garde and conceptual art, local critique targeted the rigidity of the art bureaucracy, the dogmatism of postwar Yugoslav modernism, and the anomalies in the implementation of the self-management ideology. The potential of art to induce change within the dominant system shaped the discussions of the sixth *April Encounters*, within the thematic framework entitled *Electronic Media in Social Change* (Elektronski mediji u društvenim promenama). Electronic media were approached as an open channel of communication which should ensure the right of working people to share information and be informed. The discussion addressed the nature of electronic media, their emerging new functions, mechanisms of information distribution as both one-way and two-way processes. Topics discussed included contact programs, communicators, concepts such as mass communication, channel, medium, message, and others.¹⁴

As presented in this brief overview, the main concerns of artists, curators, cultural workers and audiences of *April Encounters* within its six editions were fully directed toward avant-garde explorations regarding new, conceptual, expanded, and experimental art practices of the seventies and their social and political potential. But the discussions were also inspired by the productions presented, performed and tested within the program of *Encounters*. Ješa Denegri, in his presentation at the second *April Encounters*, highlights the audience’s full participation as the most

12 More on the exhibition *October 75* in: Vesić, Jelena. “SKC (Student Cultural Centre) as a Site of Performative (Self-)Production: October 75 – Institution, Self-organisation, First-person speech, Collectivization”, *Život umjetnosti*, no 91 (2012): 30-53, https://www.ipu.hr/content/zivot-umjetnosti/ZU_91-2012_030-053_Vesic.pdf. Last accessed: August 25, 2025

13 „Да ли је судбина нове уметности изам“, *Билтен 02, V априлски сусрет*, СКЦ, Београд, 1976, Author’ translation

14 More in *Билтен 06 VI априлски сусрет*, СКЦ, Београд, 1977

significant achievement, emphasizing how their active involvement both shaped the events and inspired the artists. (Denegri, 1973)

New art

Artists were active participants in all of the discussions but were also continuously, during the program of *Encounters*, producing and performing works, testing them in direct contact with other artists, curators and audiences. During the first edition in 1972, Gina Pane performed her body performance *Life Death Dream* and Era Milivojević performed *Long Live the First of May* (Živeo 1. Maj).¹⁵ These works, along with some earlier performances by Era Milivojević, inspired and announced a series of performative actions and experiments by a circle of artists linked to SKC during the seventies. The notion of the art work and its mode of production, as well as the relationship between artist and audience, were explored by many artists through various approaches. At the second edition in 1973, Goran Đorđević and Vojislav Radulović set up a piece called *The Performance* (Predstava), as an action exploring audience participation. The gallery was divided into two sections, and the audience into two groups. The first group entered and was hidden behind a curtain with soft music playing. Then the second group was seated opposite them. When the curtain was pulled back, both groups realized they were facing each other, being simultaneously audience and performers. Reactions ranged from discomfort to acceptance and mutual interaction.¹⁶

During the third edition of the *Encounters* Gergelj Urkom performed a destruction of a chair as an incidental artwork, Marina Abramović performed her piece *Rhythm 5*, laying inside a burning star, Braco Dimitrijević staged a fictional *Reception* from his *Casual Passerby* (Slučajni prolaznik) series, and Ida Biard and Goran Trbuljak conducted an interview that Trbuljak later claimed as his own artwork:

“Ida Biard: Why do you sign the interview as your own work?
Goran Trbuljak: Because an artist’s interview has a social and cultural function, the same function as an exhibition or the work itself.
This interview can also be recognized as my work because my awareness of it is such.”¹⁷ (Biard 1974)

15 For more details about first performances by Era Milivojević through his own perspective in interview by Milica Pekić and Stevan Vuković within the project “Conversations about New Artistic Practices of the 70s in Serbia” available online: https://kioskngo.net/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/Era-Milivojevic_English-subtitles_1.mp4?28960

16 Description of the work with reflection on audience reaction in: *Билтен 07, II априлски сусрет*, СКЦ, Београд, 1973.

17 Full interview is published in Encounter’s Bulletin, and here is part of it in authors’ translation: Биард, Ида. „Интервју – Горан Трбуљак и Ида Биард“, *Билтен 05 III априлски сусрет*, СКЦ, Београд, 1974

Artist Radomir Damjanović Damjan realized the action *Free Artwork* (Besplatno umetničko delo), handing out his works on office forms to the audience, questioning authorship and the nature of artistic labor. Under the slogan *Free Art* Katalin Ladik, two years later, during the fifth edition of *Encounters*, realized an action with an audience entitled *Exchange Art – Art of Exchange, Alteration, and Change* (Exchange Art – umetnost razmene, izmene i promene). She created a sort of the marketplace within the gallery space, inviting the audience to take part in the free exchange of things and ideas. (Ladik 1976)

During the fourth *Encounters* Raša Todosijević performed his work *Art and Memory* (Umetnost i memorija), in which, for several hours, with a scarf over his mouth, he recited the names of artists from art history he could remember. The artist later stated:

“The original of the piece *Art and Memory* exists only in the mind and memory of the people who were present on the occasion of its realization... For me, there’s only the art history that is registered in my memory.” (Sretenović 2002, 33)

Within the program of the same edition of *Encounters* Ilija Šoškić performed his work *Coexistence* (Koegzistencija), bringing a snake from the zoo into the SKC Gallery as a form of critique of the art institution:

“I attack art institutions, galleries, because they are outdated. I see galleries only as a form of polemic. An artist can do anything in a gallery. Tonight I’m bringing a snake, an intellectual and aggressive snake, and I’m creating a pathetically aggressive situation that no gallery can exploit.” (Šoškić 1975)

Unfortunately, it seems that exploitation remains the dominant mode of operation inherent to the art system itself, as it was in the seventies, and still is today. Galleries continue to be the most prominent exponents of this representational and deeply commercial logic of art circulation. During the third edition of *Encounters*, one of the works, selected through the open call, by Milenko Pajić and Zoran Danilović, entitled *Basketball in The Gallery* (Košarka u galeriji), involved installing a basketball hoop inside the gallery and inviting the audience to play with a ball as a method of exploring the possible transformations of the gallery space. In the same year, 1974, artists Goran Đorđević and Slavko Matković developed the idea of the *Expanded Gallery* (Proširena galerija). During the *Encounters*, they decided to open galleries in their own rooms, as a first step in building the network of room-based galleries. Interested participants were invited to leave their addresses at the Student Cultural Centre, allowing the network to expand. All members would collectively

organize a “permanent, unconventional exhibition taking place simultaneously in various towns and villages around the world.”¹⁸

It was interesting to witness one of the first events organised by students in February this year, after overtaking SKC, which opened the same polemic topic on the nature of the gallery space and consequently the nature of the institution of art. In the words of the students:

“Participatory performance 48 Hours is an event that uses the operational logic of the blockades and direct democracy, and translates it into the gallery context. The framework invites people to intervene in the gallery space over a 48-hour period. There is no specific author of the installation, instead, every visitor contributes to the collective creation and exhibition of the content. The framework itself is set by the program working-group, a fluid structure without permanent members, and thus not subject to the conventional logic of authorship.”¹⁹

Conclusion

It is evident that students today are continuing the struggle their colleagues started almost sixty years ago. The capacity of an institution of art to resist the changes that transformations in art production induce, evident in the case of the Student Cultural Centre in Belgrade, reveals the effects of institutional resilience and rigidity. In the contemporary context, the full extent of these effects is manifested in the decay of SKC as a centre for youth and students’ culture, the commercialization of its functions, and the resulting irrelevance of its programs for new generations. This, however, was not enough for the current generation of students to forget or abandon the idea of public institutions as available infrastructure that should, at least nominally, serve the needs and creative capacities of youth and students. Although brief in duration, the five month liberation of the Centre provides us with new arguments and evidence based insights for much needed reflection on the current role and function of public art institution. It also opens space for new projections and broader debate on how we envision, negotiate and redesign our institution through collective processes.

As an institutional manifestation marking the inception of the Student Cultural Centre, the *April Encounters* offered a pathway toward institutional transformation. To paraphrase the aforementioned remark on self-managing art from the *Bulletin* it “demonstratively envisioned the future”. It played, revealed,

18 As stated by artists in the: *Билтен 04 III априлски сусрет*, СКЦ Београд, 1974.

19 As stated by students in the first issue of Students paper: *SKC list*, 25. 02. 2025.

performed, taught, and lived the future, but was soon assimilated and silenced. Today, however, a new generation of students is once again bringing the future to our doorstep. Revisiting the rich tradition of student struggles, their achievements as well as their failures, can empower and inspire us all as we confront present and future challenges, and as we enact and test possible alternatives.

Literature:

- Blažević, Dunja. Conversation about New Artistic Practices of the 70s in Serbia, Kiosk: <https://vimeo.com/149264527>, (Last accessed August 23, 2025.).
- Блажевић, Дуња. Билтен 01, II Априлски сусрет, Студентски културни центар, Београд, 1973
- Биард, Ида. „Интервју – Горан Трбуљак и Ида Биард“, Билтен 05 III априлски сусрет, СКЦ, Београд, 1974
- Билтен 02, V априлски сусрет, СКЦ, Београд, 1976
- Билтен 04, IV Априлски сусрети, Студентски културни центар, Београд, 1975
- Билтен 04 III априлски сусрет, СКЦ Београд, 1974
- Билтен 06, VI априлски сусрет, СКЦ, Београд, 1977
- Билтен 07, II априлски сусрет, СКЦ, Београд, 1973
- Castoriadis, Cornelius. *The Imaginary Institution of Society*, London: Polity Press, 1987.
- Čubrilo, Jasmina. „1968: nedovršeni projekat“ in *The Journal of Modern Art History Department, Faculty of Philosophy University of Belgrade* 14 (2018): 7–9.
- Denegri, Ješa. *Studentski kulturni centar kao umetnička scena*, Beograd: SKC, 2003.
- Денегри, Јеша. Билтен I Априлски сусрет, Студентски културни центар, Београд, 1972.
- Гудац, Владимир. „План концептуалног ангажмана у умјетности данас“, Билтен 03 III Априлски сусрет, Студентски културни центар, Београд, 1974
- Imširović, Pavluško. „U susret studentskim nemirima, omladinski pokret u Jugoslaviji i Srbiji, juče i danas“, *Novi Plamen*, 20. oktobar 2012
- Jelena Vesić. “SKC (Student Cultural Centre) as a Site of Performative (Self-)Production: October 75 – Institution, Self-organisation, First-person speech, Collectivization”, *Život umjetnosti*, no. 91 (2012): 30–53.
- Ладик, Каталин. „Пројекат за акцију – ИКС ЧЕНЦ АРТ– уметност, размене, измене и промене“, 7. Билтен 5. априлски сусрет, Студентски културни центар, 1976
- Мештровић, Матко. Билтен I Априлски сусрет, Студентски културни центар, Београд, 1972.
- Milivojević, Era. Conversation about New Artistic Practices of the 70s in Serbia, Kiosk: https://kioskngo.net/wp-content/uploads/2021/01/Era-Milivojevic_English-subtitles_1.mp4?28960, (Last accessed August 23, 2025.).
- Sheikh, Simon. “In the Place of the Public Sphere. An introduction” in *In the Place of the Public Sphere*, ed. Simon Sheikh, 6–19. Berlin: B_Books, 2005.

Sretenović, Dejan. (ur.) Hvala Raši Todosijeviću, Muzej savremene umetnosti, Beograd, 2002
SKC list 01, 25. 02. 2025. https://drive.google.com/file/d/1zxILWAi7bN5_X2ezSX-m3JN0gaEEAqA2/view (Last accessed August 23, 2025.)

Шошкић, Илија. Билтен 04 III априлски сусрет, СКЦ Београд, 1974.

V.Š. „Отворен Студентски културни центар“, Студент бр. 11, Београд 13. април 1971.

Зечевић, Божидар. Билтен 09, II априлски сусрет, Студентски културни центар, Београд, 1973

Зечевић, Божидар. Билтен I Априлски сусрет, Студентски културни центар, Београд, 1972

Milica Pekić
Kiosk Platforma za savremenu umetnost, Beograd

**PONOVNO PROMIŠLJANJE APRILSKIH SUSRETA:
IZVOĐENJE ALTERNATIVA**

Apstrakt:

Inspirisan programom koji su studenti osmislili tokom nedavne petomesečne okupacije Studentskog kulturnog centra u Beogradu, integralnog dela šireg studentskog protesta u Srbiji, ovaj rad razmatra *Aprilske susrete* kao ključnu manifestaciju koja je obeležila formativnu i konceptualno značajnu fazu u istoriji ovog centra. Kroz analizu programa, ideja, diskusija i umetničkih praksi, tekst nastoji da istraži potencijali odjek *Aprilskih susreta* u savremenim studentskim borbama. Programi, sa brojnim međunarodnim i jugoslovenskim učesnicima, istraživali su novu logiku umetničke produkcije koja je u svojoj suštini težila transformaciji institucionalnog okvira. Danas se pitanje institucionalnih formi i njihovih mogućih alternativa ponovo javlja kao centralna preokupacija nove generacije studenata, ukazujući na trajnu relevantnost primera i znanja stvorenih u okviru naše neoavangardne tradicije.

Ključne reči:

Aprilski susreti, Studentski kulturni centar, institucionalna promena, neoavangarda, studentski protesti, angažman