**Wanted: An Aura**

The paradox of an open-ended art institution and the need for a definition

Ruth Direktor

My claim: don't change the ICOM definition of a museum. For the sake of Art. Let it remain as it is, perhaps not inclusive enough, but with enough definitions to be confronted / provoked / challenged by artists.

Let us, art professionals, give up the urge to update our definitions, so that the artists will be left with room to maneuver.

Here is the paradox of the 21st century art museum: the more it opens its doors and offers the broadest umbrella any cultural institution offers today, the more, surprisingly enough, it needs to be defined. The more open-ended Art is, and the more it spans along acts that reject traditional artifacts, the more a framework is needed: a collection, procedures of registration and conservation, categorization, division to departments, methods of presentation, Trustees and Friends, acquisition committees etc. That entire bureaucratic practice that comes along with good old heritage that comes along with an **aura.**

Once the Museum's aura is lost, due to over elasticity of its very definition, wouldn't a great part of the most innovative manifestations of art of recent years lose its sting? Performances, physical and metaphorical acts of breaking the White Cube, participatory events and, in general, art without artifacts derive their meaning from the context of the Museum as an entity with history, heritage, definition (even though changing) and hence - with an aura. Works by Tino Sehgal, Martin Creed, Alexandra Pirici & Manuel Pulmus and Public Movement will be the test cases of my discussion: the definition is needed so it can be defied, shaken and challenged.