

1984: ICH KANN
BEIM BESTEN WILLEN
KEIN HAKENKREUZ
ERKENNEN (1)

2009: ICH KANN
BEIM BESTEN WILLEN
ÜBERALL HAKENKREUZE
ERKENNEN (2)

(1) "Naj se še tako trudim, nikjer ne vidim kljukastega križa!"

S temi besedami je leta 1984 M. Kippenberger naslovil svojo abstraktno sliko, ki je zaradi pravokotnih oblik spominjala na simbol svastike.

(2) "Naj se še tako trudim, povsod vidim same kljukaste križe!"

Ta stavek je leta 2009 izjavil I. Jurica v svojem performansu, ki je bil izvorno zasnovan za predverje Akademije za likovno umetnost na Dunaju, ki ga še danes krasi svastika.

(1) "By My Best Will I Can't See Any Swastika!"

In 1984, M. Kippenberger produced an abstract painting evoking, through its rectangular forms, the swastika symbol, and titled the painting with this sentence.

(2) "By My Best Will I Can See Swastikas Everywhere!"

In 2009, I. Jurica uttered this sentence as part of his performance that was originally conceived for the main hall of the Academy of Fine Arts in Vienna which still bears the swastika ornament engraved there.

REARTIKULACIJA je umetniško-politična-teoretična-diskurzivna platforma/REARTIKULACIJA is an artistic-political-theoretical-discursive platform

REARTIKULACIJA je umetniški projekt skupine Reartikulacija/ REARTIKULACIJA is an art project by the group Reartikulacija: Marina Gržinić, Staš Kleindienst, Sebastjan Leban in/and Tanja Passoni.

Urednika/Editors: Marina Gržinić in/and Sebastjan Leban
Prevod v angleščino in slovenščino/Translation into English and Slovene: Tanja Passoni
Strokovni pregled besedil in prevodov/Texts and translations reviewed by Marina Gržinić
Lektoriranje/Proof-reading: Andreja Vetrh Humar, Eric Dean Scott in/and Brina Stinehelfer
Koordinacija prevodov/Translation coordinator: Tanja Passoni
Oblikovanje logotipa/Logo design: Trie
Oblikovanje časopisa in priloge/Journal and supplement design: Luminus d.o.o.
Oblikovanje naslovnice/Cover design: Leban-Kleindienst
Postavitev/Page layout: Luminus d.o.o.
Oblikovanje in postavitev internetne strani/Design and layout of the website: Staš Kleindienst
Programer/Software support: Oskar Koščak
Tisk/Print: Čukgraf
Naklada/Print run: 2000

Sodelujoči avtorji v pričujoči številki/Contributing authors in this issue: Marta Popivoda, Beograd/Belgrade, Srbija/Serbia; Šefik Šeki Tatlić, Sarajevo, BiH in/and Zagreb, Hrvaška/Croatia; Staš Kleindienst, Ljubljana, Slovenija/Slovenia; Ivan Jurica, Dunaj/Vienna, Avstrija/Austria in/and Bratislava, Slovaška/Slovakia; Virginia Villaplana, Valencija/Valencia, Španija/Spain; Jonathan Beller, New York, ZDA/USA; Marina Gržinić, Ljubljana, Slovenija/Slovenia; Subhabrata Bobby Banerjee, Newtown, Avstralija/Australia; Oliver Ressler, Dunaj/Vienna, Avstrija/Austria

Izdajo časopisa so omogočili podporniki projekta ter vsi sodelujoči pisci, umetniki in umetniške skupine v pričujoči številki/The publication of the journal has been made possible by the generous contribution of the supporters of the project and all the contributors (authors of texts, artists and art groups) in this issue.

Reartikulacija št.7 je izšla v okviru mednarodnega raziskovalnega projekta *Zakon kapitala: zgodovine zatiranja*, ki sta ga konceptualno zasnovala, organizirala in kurirala/Reartikulacija no.7 was published within the context of the International research project *The Law of Capital: Histories of Oppression*, conceptualized, organized and curated by Marina Gržinić in/and Sebastjan Leban. Projekt so podprli/The project was supported by Mestni muzej/City Museum, Ljubljana, ZRC SAZU/ The Scientific Research Center of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Ljubljana, Mednarodna ustanova Forum slovanskih kultur/International Foundation Forum of Slavic Cultures, podjetje Luminus/company Luminus, Univerza v Novi Gorici/University Nova Gorica, Slovenia, FI ZRC SAZU, Ljubljana in/and skupina Irwin/group Irwin.

Izdajo priloge *Razveza od kapitala in kolonialne matrice moči* so omogočili/The publishing of the supplement *De-linking from Capital and the Colonial Matrix of Power* was made possible by: Ministrstvo za kulturo Republike Slovenije/the Ministry of Culture of Republic of Slovenia, skupina/group Irwin, Fotem, podjetje/company Luminus, ZRC SAZU/ The Scientific Research Center of the Slovenian Academy of Sciences and Arts in/and Smart & Escargo.

Izdajatelj/Publisher: Društvo za sodobno kreativnost HCHO/Society for Contemporary Creativity HCHO.



Časopis je brezplačen/The journal is free of charge.
Časopis Reartikulacija je vpisan v razvid medijev na Ministrstvu za kulturo RS/The journal Reartikulacija is registered in the mass media register at the Ministry of Culture of the Republic of Slovenia.
Bančni račun/Bank account: SI56020100256719681; SWIFT: LJBASIX
www.reartikulacija.org
reartikulacija@gmail.com

Reartikulacija št./no. 9, Ljubljana, 2009.

Projekt podpira Fundacija ERSTE/
This project has been supported by ERSTE Foundation:



ERSTE Stiftung

KAZALO/CONTENTS

[3] **RADICAL CRITICAL PRACTICE** Marta Popivoda: AMAZON WOMAN OR LIFE! – A FORCED DECISION / DISCUSSION OF GENDER ARTIVIST TACTICS

[3-4] **NEW FASCISMS** Šefik Šeki Tatlić: DIABOLICAL FRIVOLITY OF NEO-LIBERAL FUNDAMENTALISM

[4] **REARTIKULACIJA** Staš Kleindienst: ON EUROPEAN CONSCIENCE AND TOTALITARIANISM

priloga / supplement:
RAZVEZA OD KAPITALA IN KOLONIALNE MATRICE MOČI / DE-LINKING FROM CAPITAL AND THE COLONIAL MATRIX OF POWER

[1] **ZAKON KAPITALA: ZGODOVINE ZATIRANJA / THE LAW OF CAPITAL: HISTORIES OF OPPRESSION** Ivan Jurica: NAJ SE ŠE TAKO TRUDIM, POVSOD VIDIM SAME KLJUKASTE KRIŽE! / BY MY BEST WILL I CAN SEE SWASTIKAS EVERYWHERE!

[5] **ZAKON KAPITALA: ZGODOVINE ZATIRANJA / THE LAW OF CAPITAL: HISTORIES OF OPPRESSION** Ivan Jurica: BESEDNI PODALJŠEK KOT POMEN SLIKE / THE VERBAL EXTENSION AS THE MEANING OF AN IMAGE

[5-6] **ZAKON KAPITALA: ZGODOVINE ZATIRANJA / THE LAW OF CAPITAL: HISTORIES OF OPPRESSION** Virginia Villaplana: AMAZONIJA Izgubljeni raj na zemlji / AMAZONIA World paradise lost

[6-9] **HARD (CORE)** Jonathan Beller in / and Marina Gržinić: POGOVOR O SODOBNEM KAPITALIZMU IN KINEMATIČNEM NAČINU PRODUKCIJE / DISCUSSING CONTEMPORARY CAPITALISM AND THE CINEMATIC MODE OF PRODUCTION

[9-11] **DEKOLONIALNOST / DE-COLONIALITY** Subhabrata Bobby Banerjee: ZGODOVINE ZATIRANJA IN GLASOVI ODPORA: K TEORIJ O TRANSLOKALNEM / HISTORIES OF OPPRESSION AND VOICES OF RESISTANCE: TOWARDS A THEORY OF THE TRANSLOCAL

[12] **ZAKON KAPITALA: ZGODOVINE ZATIRANJA / THE LAW OF CAPITAL: HISTORIES OF OPPRESSION** Oliver Ressler: KAJ JE DEMOKRACIJA? / WHAT IS DEMOCRACY?

ZAKON KAPITALA: ZGODOVINE ZATIRANJA

Tokratne tri številke *Reartikulacije* (7., 8. in 9. številka) raziskujejo današnjo in historično vlogo kapitala pri (de)regulaciji vseh družbenopolitičnih, delovnih, epistemoloških in življenjskih procesov. Cilj vzpostavitve trajnega izrednega stanja je preoblikovati družbo tako, da ta postane sterilna, nezmožna alternativnega mišljenja in s tem politično mrtva. Strah pred izgubo zaposlitve in domov, strah pred priseljenci, drugačnostjo, krizo itd. je postal temeljni regulator življenja. Zato je namen 7., 8. in 9. številke *Reartikulacije* pokazati, da je treba kapital in njegove strategije posodabljanja nenehno in ostro obsojati, kritizirati in preprečevati.

Reartikulacija št. 7., 8. in 9. prinaša novo strukturo produkcije interdisciplinarnih radikalno-kritičnih diskurzov. Čeprav vsaka številka posebej deluje kot samostojna enota, so vse tri med seboj povezane prek projekta *Zakon kapitala: Zgodovine zatiranja*. Gre za mednarodni raziskovalni projekt, ki vključuje razstavo in simpozij ter publikacijo treh števil *Reartikulacije*. Konceptualna osnova projekta vzpostavlja sodelovanje med omenjenimi radikalno-kritičnimi diskurzi vsake številke, s čimer pa ne izpostavlja le problematične plati kapitalističnega izkoriščanja, pač pa tudi vse strategije in načine produkcije, na podlagi katerih si kapital podreja ljudi, ozemlja, diskurze itd.

Projekt *Zakon kapitala: Zgodovine zatiranja* je kritična intervencija v strukturo sodobnih kapitalističnih družb z namenom, da osvetlimo probleme družbene neenakosti, sodobnih oblik kolonizacij, komodifikacij, marginalizacij različnih seksualnih in etničnih skupin, skratka probleme izkoriščanja s strani kapitala, s katerimi se že stoletja sooča večina svetovnega prebivalstva. Projekt razvija diskurzivno/intervencijsko platformo, ki vključuje umetnost, teorijo, filozofijo in aktivizem z namenom, da se zoperstavi rasizmu, homofobični normalnosti, izkoriščanju, razlaščanju in kolonialnosti. Ključni moment znotraj projekta predstavlja *Razveza od kapitala in kolonialne matrice moči*, ki s svojo dvojno obliko (kot priloga in kot simpozij) še dodatno poudarja intervencijsko vlogo pričujočih treh števil *Reartikulacije*, ki jo določa večplastna intermedialnost.

V tokratni številki so v slovenščino prevedena samo besedila iz priloge *Razveza od kapitala in kolonialne matrice moči*, saj smo še vedno potisnjeni v prekerno situacijo, ki nam ne omogoča zagotoviti dodatnih sredstev za izplačilo osnovnih honorarjev (neznanih, simboličnih, a vendar pomembnih) za naše zveste prevajalce in lektorje. Kljub temu bo *Reartikulacija* še naprej izhajala, saj smo trdno prepričani, da bomo samo z nenehno produkcijo radikalno-kritičnega diskurza lahko razkrili ne le starih, pač pa tudi nove oblike zatiranja, in ponudili možno alternativo trenutni situaciji.

Navsezadnje gre prav za to in morda je prav zdaj pravi čas, da se spremembe zgodijo, saj nas je vse več takih, ki želijo videti konec nekropolitičnega upravljanja, ki se je polastilo našega dela, izobraževanja, delovanja in življenja nasploh. To lahko dosežemo le s skupnimi močmi, kar potrjujejo tudi tokratne tri številke *Reartikulacije*.

Marina Gržinić in Sebastjan Leban,
urednika Reartikulacije

THE LAW OF CAPITAL: HISTORIES OF OPPRESSION

The starting point of *Reartikulacija* no. 7, no. 8, and no. 9 is the analysis of the present state of things in relation to the historical role of capital in (de)regulating all social political, labour, epistemological, and life processes. A permanent state of exception is being developed to re-shape society; making it sterile, incapable of thinking alternatively, i.e. transforming it into a politically dead society. Fear of losing jobs and houses, fear of migrants, of diversity, of the crisis, etc., has started to function as the basic regulator of life. Therefore, *Reartikulacija* no. 7, no. 8, and no. 9 want to show that capital's upgrading strategies call for its firm and consequent denigration, criticism and degradation.

Reartikulacija no. 7, no. 8, and no. 9 present a new structure of producing interdisciplinary radical-critical discourses. Although every number is meant to function independently, they are in fact all connected through the international project *The Law of Capital: Histories of Oppression*. We define the latter as an International Research Project with Exhibition and Symposium that comprises the publishing of the 3 issues of *Reartikulacija*. It is through the conceptual base of the project that the collaboration of the exposed radical-critical discourse of each issue starts to take place, thus unveiling not just the problematic side of capitalist exploitation, but also exposing all the strategies and modes of production by way of which capital has been subjugating people, territories, discourses, etc.

The project *The Law of Capital: Histories of Oppression* is a critical intervention in the structure of contemporary capitalist societies, aiming to shed light on social inequalities, contemporary forms of colonization, commodification, marginalization of various sexual and ethnic groups, and general exploitation by capital, which has been faced by the major part of the worlds population for centuries. The project puts focus on the development of a discursive/intervention platform between art, theory, philosophy and activism, in order to fight racism, homophobic normalities, exploitation, expropriation and coloniality. A crucial point is being presented in the framework of the project, namely the *De-linking from Capital and the Colonial Matrix of Power*, that through its double role (as a supplement and a symposium), further connects the issues no. 7, no. 8, and no. 9 together into an intervention marked by its uniformed multilayered intermediality.

In this issue, only the texts included in the supplement *De-linking from Capital and the Colonial Matrix of Power* are translated into Slovene, since the precarious situation by which we are restricted persists, and does not allow us to provide additional funds for the basic fees (small, almost symbolic, but still important) for our faithful translators and language editors. Nevertheless, we will continue to publish *Reartikulacija*, regardless of the precarious situation, since we are clearly convinced that only through the constant production of radical-critical discourse are we able to detect new as well as old forms of oppression, and most importantly, that we can propose some changes in the end.

Certainly, this is what it is all about, and maybe the general time is favorable to such ideas, as there are more and more of those who have enough regarding all the these necro-governmentality procedures imposed on our studies, actions and lives. We can unite our forces. This is our power, and the three issues of *Reartikulacija* testify this clearly.

Marina Gržinić and Sebastjan Leban
Editors of the journal Reartikulacija

Podporniki projekta/Supporters of the project:



FOTEM

FMR



kiberpipa



RADICAL CRITICAL PRACTICE

**Marta Popivoda
AMAZON WOMAN OR LIFE! – A FORCED
DECISION / DISCUSSION OF GENDER
ARTIVIST TACTICS**

Within the framework of “aRtivism” I am interested in a discussion of myth-building mechanisms pertaining to the figure of an Amazon woman and her gender role in contemporary culture. I took as a concrete example of my analysis the exhibition *Amazons: Re-construction of the Myth* displayed in Belgrade in 2005. The exhibition included eight female artists and I took part in it as well with a work entitled: *Amazon Woman without a Body: Image and Consequences*. In my opinion, the construction of the Amazon myth nowadays implies a logically consequent, but nevertheless problematic, order of its *transfiguration*. First, it re-activates the myth in terms of emancipation of women in contemporary society, in accordance with the feminist and gender theories and their respective activist practices. The figure of the Amazon woman was initially introduced in the contemporary social discourse to pursue emancipation of the woman as an independent subject that is *independent* from the male subject. Second, it re-produces the myth through popular culture. *She*, as a figure of emancipation, gratifies female desires for a possible transformation or at least a well-performed simulation. However, at the same time, *her* powerfully and perfectly mediated and produced female body gratifies men, the body being designed precisely for this purpose.

I am therefore interested in when and how the figure of the Amazon woman became a market commodity? The answer I find to be both the most accurate as well as critical is that the appearance of the Amazon woman figure in contemporary culture implies a logical rather than a chronological sequence: emancipation à transformation into a sex object. The Amazon woman became an irritating threat to the overwhelming patriarchal social order, which ultimately transformed her into a consumer-friendly mass-media product. It was consequently followed by the process of emancipation and the introduction of the powerful and independent “business woman” as a culturally acceptable gender role. In broader terms, what I want to underline here is the social operation of aRtivist practices accomplished through an institutional system – the system of an always-already established social order and its respective prescribed protocols of realization. Therefore, I call for a critical view on the (media) materiality of aRtivist procedures and actions.

I. The organizers/curators of the exhibition was the Cultural Centre Deve from Belgrade. The position of the organizers/curators was emancipatory, stemming from feminist and pro-feminist support and advocacy of the feminine subject, primarily the creative subject that addresses the field of art. Precisely such a position represents, in my opinion, the critical point of aRtivism in the local art context, as it raises the question: Is this still aRtivism, or its denial? The myth of the Amazon warrior woman as an activist art practice is a symptom of the mechanisms of integration of women into the art world, especially if she remains in the frameworks of these tactics without questioning the position of a female subject of art in order to perceive its limitations. “The myth, forged in the dim past, when strife was dire and inevitable, had played its part. As outward pressure relaxed, and men became more enlightened, the story lost much of its grimness, but had not spent its power: the poet and artist made it their own, drawing from its grim details new meanings, refining its lessons to suit them for a happier stage of civilization. And so they softened the story of Amazonian cruelty to serve their own ends, promoting the cult of the beautiful by holding up the splendid human figures, at once strong and graceful, to the emulation of maid and matron, and by calling for masculine admiration and pity.”¹ This quote from the book *The Amazons* written in 1910 – addressing the myth of warrior women and attempting its objective historical reconstruction – will be used here as a starting point for discussion of similar myth-building mechanisms at work in contemporary culture. For this purpose, I will disclose two tactics: two starting points and two lines of production of the Amazon myth. Moreover, I see a

1 G.C. Rothery, *The Amazons*, originally written in 1910, republished Senate Classics, London, 1995, p. 22.

NEW FASCISMS

**Šefik Šeki Tatlić
DIABOLICAL FRIVOLITY OF NEO-LIBERAL
FUNDAMENTALISM**

Horkheimer and Adorno rightfully claimed that the victory of culture industry is “twofold, what it destroys as truth outside its sphere can be reproduced indefinitely within it as lies.”¹ Meaning that the more forcefully state repression mechanisms are allowed to work (read: repress) on the so-called outside (that is, in the social reality), the more humane the police are on the inside (in the so-called media representation of reality); the more the Government allows the market to colonize the public sphere, the more socially sensible its representation is in movies, and so on.

Today, we cannot talk just about plain control, but we must talk about the nature of the interaction of the one who is being controlled and the one who controls, an interaction where the one that is “controlled” is asking for more control over himself/herself while expecting to be compensated by a surplus of freedom to satisfy trivial needs and wishes. Such a liberty for the fulfillment of trivial needs is being declared as freedom. But this implies as well the freedom to choose not to be engaged in any kind of socially sensible or politically articulated struggle. This presents the double structure of the biopolitical. Today, in the “late stages” of post-Fordist capitalist

1 Max Horkheimer / Theodor Adorno, *Dialectic of Enlightenment – Philosophical Fragments*, Stanford University Press, Stanford, California, 2002, p. 107.

logically consequent but somehow threatening transfiguration of the myth, to be addressed and warned against in this discussion.

The first position and line concern the re-activation and utilization of the Amazon myth in terms of emancipation of women in contemporary society, within the frameworks of feminist and gender theories and activist practices. The second position and line imply the re-production and instrumentalization of the myth or, more precisely, its appropriation by the popular culture. The figure of the Amazon woman, it could be argued, was initially re-activated and introduced into the contemporary social discourse to pursue emancipation of the woman as a unique, self-contained subject, relieved from its relationships to the male subject. On the one hand, I find this occurrence relevant for the local culture, where many issues of gender and sex relations remain unsolved, or are not even seriously perceived: misogyny in the public discourse (mass media, pop culture, academia included) and daily conversation (catchphrases, curses, bywords), only few women authors/artists being featured on the art scene, almost only men occupying high positions in politics (almost the entire leadership of the Serbian government, parliamentary election lists, etc.). However, I am contentious with the way the Cultural Centre Deve dealt with this problem, because merely one step after this emancipatory admittance of the Amazon figure, many (often previously ignored) problems ensue.

Therefore, my work in this exhibition (done in collaboration with the art theorist Ana Vujanović) had contentious aims. The video installation *Amazon Woman without a Body: Image and Consequences* was situated in the context of the emancipatory exhibition, conceiving the contention on two levels (two images and two screens):

1. Simulation of a typical movie trailer advertising the figure of an Amazon warrior (powerful woman who “takes control”) constructed as a media prosthesis awaiting/seeking/projecting her (real, material) body – the trailer is screened, featuring the distinct sound which accompanies the entire exhibition, on a large wall in front of the gallery. This image is what the audiences encounter first while entering the exhibition space.

2. Portraiture of different women shot at the marketplace, on the street, at home, at the workplace, etc. – a black & white silent documentary featured on a TV screen; in the video installation, the TV is set directly opposite the video beam projection: documentary portraits of women are confronted with the attractively constructed mass-media content (trailer) addressing them.

This “cold” confrontation of a mass-media feature on one side and ordinary female bodies on the other provoked disturbing meanings questioning the myth as a mechanism of historical and cultural reconstruction. The portraits of women, as recipients of the trailer’s content, individually and collectively take part in the imposed media myth. Identification with the media-produced, screened figure of the Amazon warrior creates the illusion that the change is possible through/by way of the gaze.² And precisely through the illusion that for HER, individually, change is attainable and within grasp, SHE loses what she never had in the first place³ – a possibility of her own respective change. This mechanism renders the struggle for change lost already in advance, because the Amazon woman can not embrace the critical, subversive or defying tactics of the contemporary female subject, as she is already assimilated into the mass-media culture as a market commodity. The title “Amazon Woman without a Body” paraphrases Žižek’s title *Organs without Bodies*,⁴ and relates

2 Laura Mulvey, “Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema,” originally published in *Screen* 16.3, Autumn 1975, pp. 6–18. <https://wiki.brown.edu/confluence/display/MarkTribe/Visual+Pleasure+and+Narrative+Cinema>

In this article Laura Mulvey employs Lacan’s concept of the mirror phase to elaborate a system of identification pertaining to a screen/mirror gaze: “The mirror phase occurs at a time when the child’s physical ambitions outstrip his motor capacity, with the result that his recognition of himself is joyous in that he imagines his mirror image to be more complete, more perfect than he experiences his own body.” Precisely this moment is crucial for the constitution of the ego when recognition is burdened with misrecognition, the recognized image is perceived as the (superior) reflection of one’s own body, generating future identifications with others. This very (joyous) moment of recognition of a woman in the mediated body of the Amazon warrior renders her rebellion impossible and futile for it is just a moment capturing her gaze into the screen, a moment prepared/arranged for HER.

3 Ana Vujanović, “Halo, Amazonko... pa... halo Amazonko...,” exhibition catalogue *Amazonke*, Deve, Belgrade, 2005.

4 Slavoj Žižek, *Organs without Bodies – Deleuze and Consequences*, Routledge, New York, 2004.

production, subjectivity is no longer external to the system; neither is cultural industry a mere propagator of capitalist ideology. In that sense, as well as in the case of the double structure of the biopolitical (lack of social responsibility on the one side, surplus of imbecile forms of freedom on the other), the cultural industry functions as the inhibitor of possibilities of thinking about some other social orders, *but it also* functions as an incubator of rationalization of precisely this social order that sustains the neo-liberal market and, consequently, its regime.

Therefore, the subjectivity, through a mere act of watching, paying attention to (media-generated) images, produces a value of the product/image and produces its own value as emancipated subjectivity. Also, in the sense in which cultural industry does not produce a mere aseptic image, but also produces a purpose for a banal individual need, it makes its collective fantasies a form of social reality. Meaning that media-represented reality now spills back into social reality.

According to Virno, “In the culture industry, it was therefore necessary to maintain a certain space that was informal, not programmed, one which was open to the unforeseen spark, to communicative and creative improvisation: not in order to favor human creativity, naturally, but in order to achieve satisfactory levels of corporate productivity.”² As he says further, “...in general, everything which it would have been dysfunctional to rigidify and regulate beyond a

2 Paolo Virno, *A Grammar of the Multitude: For an Analysis of Contemporary Forms of Life*, Semiotext[e], New York, 2004, p. 59.

directly to the basic concept of the video installation. The Amazon woman is a symbolic power structure relieved from real bodies in real life, a social prosthesis awaiting flesh. In this way, the Amazon woman, though presenting an emancipatory figure in the context of feminist readings, is in the wider social context over-articulated, used in a twofold manner. As a figure of emancipation she gratifies the woman’s desire for a possible, or at least plausibly simulated, change. But, at the same time, as a figure featuring a powerful, perfect, mediated female body, she indulges man’s gaze – being designed to please him and to become yet another desirable consumer product in the marketplace.

My primary concern with this double mechanism is therefore to answer the question: When did the Amazon woman become a consumer product? The structure of this mechanism of the Amazons’ presence in contemporary culture displays a logical, rather than chronological sequence. It says that: Emancipation presents a transformation into a sex object. Although, we should differentiate between the Western European context, where emancipation of the female subject is at least partially at work, and the local Serbian context, where the process of women’s emancipation is in its infancy. However, I consider this kind of assessment of the Amazon figure relevant for the local context, as we have to ask: What is awaiting the Amazon woman when she establishes herself as a prominent and relevant figure in the artistic, cultural, and political local scenes? My answer: She will be disarmed! Her potential subversiveness will be diluted; she will become just another commodity, just another pornographic feature.

II. Therefore, I would like to conclude this text with an alternative, a different mode of aRtivist engagement of a female subject (in art). It is not emancipatory and perhaps it will escape these traps of the mass-media society. In other words, it will not represent such a predictable element of the existing social structure with roles a priori cast, and will not so conveniently enter the marketplace of the (man-dominated) art world. We can start from the assumption that every collective identity (even the emancipatory identity of the woman-artist perceived as an Amazon warrior) eventually becomes oppressive to the individual (“In reality, the Amazon woman is nothing more than a ‘bait of interpellation;’ especially in the first person singular.”⁵). Namely, the main problem with this figure is the absence of the singular; there is no woman-artist in the singular, she always implies the rest of the tribe of women-artists in existence merely as a collective social subject “WE.” And this WE implies a pre-conceived role, requiring the body of an “independent, successful, emancipated woman” or a “woman-artist,” and reducing it to that role. That is precisely why the figure of the Amazon warrior is not effective for the individual subject, it does not communicate anything about him/her – it arms him/her with nothing but an already rehearsed role pertaining to a collective identity, as part of the existing social structure. In response to this, I suggest a kind of “post-identity” tactics, tactics of disintegration of each subject whose identity reduces and petrifies the individual, particular, incidental, unstable, ambiguous, queer... That would be a tactics of establishing female subjects of art which embrace and exert identity theories and practices – remaining open for the singularity of an individual which cannot be reduced to a single (collective) social role.⁶ In the last instance, that would be a tactics of assuming all competencies from the (male) subject of the art world, among the key ones being problematization of the very notion of identity. In those terms, I also suggest an identity switch of a “woman-artist” (implying actions within the frameworks of the pre-conceived, and competencies of that fairly narrow sector of the art world termed “female writing”) with an “identity-free” (neutral) subject of art projecting the scope of its actions and competencies across the entire realm of art.

Marta Popivoda is a video artist and freelance cultural worker mostly engaged within *Walking Theory* (TkH) platform from Belgrade (www.tkh-generator.net).

5 Ana Vujanović, *ibid*.

6 Erving Goffman, *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*, The Overlook Press, New York, 1959, p. 15. According to Goffman, ‘A ‘performance’ may be defined as all the activity of a given participant on a given occasion which serves to influence in any way any of the other participants.’ It is important to note here that the roles are conceived before they are performed by individuals: in other words, attempts at a change are assimilated in advance.

certain threshold...”³ If we understand Virno’s “unforeseen spark” as some kind of common knowledge, some kind of thinking “outside the box,” some expertise that could be subversive to capital in the sense of a refusal to oblige some work ethics, we can understand that this kind of knowledge has been incorporated into the work process by way of transcendence of its Fordist, “serialized,” uniform nature. But, that “unforeseen spark” has also become formalized/ made rigid *as* the incubator of rationalization of the effects of capital. Hence, the “unforeseen spark” does not appear in the form of some radical demand or politics, but is being represented in communication as the construction of an “importance” around completely ephemeral social events.

Love the Regime as You Love Yourself

Therefore, it is not only the mainstream media industry that has been mobilized in order to “familiarize” the famous “crisis” or “recession” to its subjects – the whole culture, communication matrixes, verbal patterns are also those which have been mobilized in a *las-sez-faire* manner in order to rationalize the hierarchy of exploitation that created the “crisis” in the first place.

At first, we have the mere verbalization of the “crisis” as a problem, *as* something bad, and this first step has been properly made by neo-liberal subjects. Part of this process of rationalization, of familiarization with the regime, are worried faces of the news anchors, dramatic speeches of governmental representatives, TV shows that host recommendations of how to cope with the recession. In the

3 *Ibid*.

early days of the crisis, neo-liberal media cults, such as Oprah and her show, hosted “economic experts” like Suze Orman who presented her “Recession Action Plan 2009,” where she was explaining how to deal with finances, etc. But recently, the way of coping with the crisis took another shift. In an episode called “Recession-Proof Your Marriage with Gary Neuman,” psychotherapist Neuman advised a young couple on the verge of divorce because of their money problems that their primary problem lies in the *communication* between the two of them, and not in the lack of money. Therefore, they were advised to work together while being grateful for having each other and that the financial loss could not have damaged the family as much as their splitting up would. One interpretation of this message is in the trace of a return to “family values” which, in Europe, has already resulted in a sharp rise of right and far-right political options, as the elections for the European parliament have shown. However, the other interpretation is the one which sees the very concept of *communication* in such a utilitarian manner as a means for the rationalization of the effects of capital. Meaning that as a stable family they will produce/consume more than an individual. The very concept of *love* is here a subject of neo-liberal ideology. The Italian Prime Minister Silvio Berlusconi, one of the European proto-fascists, some time ago got caught by paparazzi hosting a decadent house party. The far-right prime minister who built his political agenda on the “return to family values” and/or on generally neo-conservative rhetoric was now caught in a very non-family-like activity. However, he is not perceived by the majority of his voters as a hypocrite, but as a potent politician who gets rewarded with votes not because he is a genuinely conservative politician, but because he is not – because he is a proper neo-liberal. Sarkozy, the other European proto-fascist, was elected not because of his xenophobic “work, order and discipline” politics, but because it was known he would fail to do it completely. Of course, we are not saying that Sarkozy’s “order and discipline” would be a good thing! Therefore we have a situation in which proto-fascist politics is being made on one side a symptom of a non-existent socially sensible politics, and on the other this same proto-fascist politics is realised as a bunch of imbecile actions that only fit yellow press appetites.

The result of these two examples are that a proper democratic man learns how to be at once a proto-fascist on one side, and an obedient, freedom-living citizen on the other. Class antagonism is being changed for imbecile antagonisms. What we are witnessing is an operation of *cognitive cleansing* (or maybe more precisely *cognitive pollution*). It is not brainwashing, but it is an operation that makes the proper subjectivity familiarized with the regime. It is a culture that suggests love for the system as love for one’s self *as an* apolitical idiot and market fundamentalist. As we have said, what is being inhibited on the one side (the political demand to overthrow the whole capitalist system), is on the other side an incubation of a system of rationalizations for the ways in which the fascistic system works.

Another example is the movie *Independence Day*. This Huntingtonian epic of cognitive cleansing produced in the mid 1990s built its story around evil aliens invading Earth (i.e., the USA). *Independence Day* is a fascist epic not only because of its radical representation of otherness, but because, in a veiled manner, it attacks the minimums of social sensibility and sanity within common knowledge by attacking some of the epitomes of such sentiments in the form of urban legends. *Independence Day* features a scene in which protagonists (who represent common people) have been taken to a hidden army base in the so-called Area 51, where they have been allowed to see a captured alien which the army has been experimenting on. Area 51,

by the way, has a cult status in conspiracy theories as a place where allegedly secret experiments have been conducted not upon aliens, but upon citizens, and therefore it epitomizes the hidden government agenda that works only for capitalist interests and not for the people.

Independence Day, in the scene mentioned, turned the story upside down, presenting the government as indeed conducting illegal experiments, *but* only to protect its citizens. It was a kind of pop-cultural preventive means of rationalization that helped to rationalize later concentration camps in Bagram, Abu Ghraib, and Guantanamo Bay.

What is the U.S. government’s excuse for torture? They have been torturing people, *but* only to protect its own citizens. What is the excuse for building minorities’ ghettos or transforming minorities into ghettos around Europe, especially Roma people? They are being imprisoned into camps, but only for their own protection. What is the rationalization of the transfer of state money into private hands as a solution to the crisis? It is all for the sake of the people, and so on. What is happening with the subjectivity between the media representation of reality and social reality? What has been inside now dictates what is outside. As Levinas said, it is “*Being* before the existent, ontology before metaphysics, is freedom (be it theoretical freedom) before justice. It is a movement within the same before obligation to the other.”⁴ But, it does not only mean intrinsic *before* extrinsic, it means we witness intrinsic *without* extrinsic, the inner *without* the outer. As a result, the historical and political context of social struggles, the anticipation and predicament of it, as well as the sense for some universal potential of social change have now successfully been exiled from the cognitive structure of the subject. The only proper frame of reference subjectivity can have is the internal one, the intrinsic one – the one that under the influence of the market gets to be only the frivolous one.

Internal ideation of the external travestied the *outer* into the *inner*. What is reproduced as a lie (this lie should be understood as a lie about capital having any purpose but the garbled, distorted one) now becomes the outside truth. Social reality realized itself in neo-liberal capitalism as a true sick man’s dream. To say it in the spirit of the text: *Entertainment* as the maximum reach of the social potential of the democratic man has transcended and become *ontological entertainment*, *ontotainment*. Intimate ethical and moral inclinations of subjectivity are not being organized according to some acknowledgment of social antagonisms in the social reality, let’s say about the hierarchies of exploitation, but they are being organized around the egocentric core whose maximum range of reflection is itself. The happiness of such subjectivity does not come from some *other*, outside acknowledgment, but it comes from the happiness of the system, which pronounces such subjectivity a free and realized person. The epistemological frame of references of the subjectivity acquires the same frame as that of the regime, or maybe an even more garbled, distorted one.

The Ominous Face of a Slave’s Happiness

The regime produces the spectacle, the spectacle produces the regime, and the “social” reality does not produce antagonism, but a surplus of spectacle as the surplus of rationalization of the regime. This contributes only to a particular struggle for certain consumer needs or certain “human rights,” without questioning the totality of production relations inside which the injustices were created in the

4 Emmanuel Levinas, *Totality and Infinity – An Essay on Exteriority*, Duquesne University Press, Pittsburgh, 1969, p. 47.

a state of emergency throughout the country by criminalizing Romanian workers, or in the recent outbursts of violence towards immigrants in Belfast; these being just two examples. The fact is that this leads to generalized images of people from the east as barbaric nomads, which need to be civilized and domesticated as they bear the burden of a traumatic totalitarian past.

And here we come to the second major point of the resolution, the traumatic past of eastern post-socialist countries. The process of expanding the European Union to post-socialist countries brought also the “new traumatic past” to the EU, *the communist totalitarianism*. Even though the Resolution deals with totalitarianism in general, the focus is on communist regimes of Eastern Europe, not on fascism or Nazism, as if they had already reached the point of sobering and reflection. We can’t deny the fact that the Resolution was adopted in a time when the world is experiencing the deepest financial crisis since the breakdown of 1929 and the concern about rising anti-capitalist leftist ideas (the London conference on the idea of communism in March 2009, with lecturers such as Judith Balso, Alain Badiou, Bruno Boostels, Terry Eagleton, Peter Hallward, Michael Hardt, Jean-Luc Nancy, Jacques Ranciere, Alessandro Russo, Alberto Toscano, Gianni Vattimo, Wang Hui and Slavoj Žižek, being just one clear example of this concern) has also knocked on the doors of European leaders. We can thus see the Resolution as an answer to the rising idea of new communism brought upon by respectable intellectuals in a time of economic crisis, but more importantly, the Resolution puts blame on the nations of Eastern Europe and gives them a mission to accept responsibility, ask for forgiveness, and encourage moral renovation. So the main objective of the Resolution is to subdue new members and to reinforce internal division in their domestic political discourse.

And here we come to the third main point of the Resolution: if on one hand communist regimes are criminalised, on the other hand, the dualist logic of the document completely by-passes the imperial-colonial perspective of violence and subjugation. As opposed to any form of totalitarianism, colonialism can not be put into the perspective of a traumatic past in the same way. Firstly, it didn’t happen on European soil and secondly, the consent through which colonialism was naturalized was made by supranational institutions such as Christianity and humanist thought, because both could provide the non-ideological universalist, eurocentric, white male perspective of a civilizing mission as an excuse for subjugation and exploitation.

first place. Paraphrasing Jacques Rancière, *ressentiment* turns the logic of cause and effect upside down. Subjectivity for one’s misfortune, for one’s exploitation, does not blame the totality of capitalist production relations, but transforms the lack of that totality into a commodity. This is reflected as a need for police security, and not as an overall existential insecurity; it presents a rejection of fundamental mechanisms of social protection in favor of mechanisms for protection of individual security and it is an apology for the defence of a freedom that is ultimately only the freedom to be an apolitical imbecile who will be even enthusiastic when forced to pay for the managerial elites to come out of the “crisis.”

Virno mentioned dysfunctional formalization (making something rigid), but we are talking here about functional deformation or formalization of the dysfunction. Hence, subjectivity forms itself not under the exclusive influence of media-represented reality or under the “influence” of social reality, but forms itself in a short-circuit between these two – in a space where it is not known where one begins and the other ends. In the manner similar as today, where the borders of private and public interests oscillate, the borders in between the public sphere and the market are blurred in neo-liberal capitalism.

Let’s go one step further. If cultural industry has played an important role in the transition from Fordism to post-Fordism (and it did), then it is legitimate to claim that a bulk of language-cognitive abilities are non-separable from labor, i.e., that the means of production consist of communication techniques and procedures. These techniques and procedures are those that produce life, everyday communication, the most ordinary gibberish, the trash that can be seen in various tele-votings, in social networks like Facebook and Twitter, and also in public communication. As it is known, it looks like the liberal West is more concerned when some country forbids access to Facebook than when the same country has a couple of million of hungry people. Value criteria that are being affirmed in frivolous communication are nothing more than tropism that later, in the democratic process of voting, result not in the legitimization of some political option of higher social interest – what gets legitimated is exactly the frivolous tropism *as* politics; the right to gibber gets to be declared as an ideal of freedom. The culture of communication is, in this case, resentment dislocated into a sphere of gibberish where, instead of gaining the form of social rebellion, revolution, or at least a form of communication where the nature of production would be questioned, it deals with symptoms of that production, i.e., only with the life style.

What is something *higher*, what is that *unheimlich* that motivates a need for such a communication, is a mere need for the exposition of someone’s life style as a token of being a political animal. As an example, the mere speed with which someone answers a phone call is directly proportional to someone’s integration into the exploitation matrix, that is, someone’s “emancipation.” That is freedom, i.e., the freedom to join the spectacle as production process; it is life, which is nothing more than the sharing of experiences that are generated in the spectacle, as a spectacle. Hence, it is not a sharing of experiences acquired through acknowledgment of some social antagonism, of acknowledgment about the organization of exploitation, but presents the sharing of the experience of exploitation as “happiness” because exploitation functions.

Šefik Šeki Tatlić is a theoretician from Sarajevo. He is enrolled in a PhD program at the Faculty of Sociology, University of Zagreb, Croatia.

We can also see the period of 20th century de-colonization as an event which, on symbolic level, prepared a purifying moment for the colonizer, only to de-link historical colonization with its successor, who today colonizes third world countries through ownership and capital, and hides behind a promise of spreading peace and democracy.

It is this ability of apolitical neoliberal discourse to break and reshape the connection between language and its context, and therefore to organize a new use for names and terms whose symbol meanings are based on their historic origins, which can hide the real strategies of neoliberal exploitation. We can see this in today’s use of symbol institutions, such as human rights or sovereignty (sovereignty being a popular tool for empowering USA-led puppet governments in Iraq or Afghanistan with power only to pass new privatisation laws), but also in the use of institutions set up after World War II to look over stable international relations (UN, World Bank, IMF) which are being used nowadays for creating conditions for the colonization of the second and third world. In practice, this can be seen in the crediting of third world countries (ex-colonies) in return for their natural resources or industry. The symbolic power of institutions thus becomes a priceless tool for the legitimization of the neoliberal logic of expansion and the naturalisation of colonial discourses in today’s society.

And this is the precise point through which we can link back historical colonization with contemporary forms of subjugation through capital that today’s West is leading. The non-ideological framework makes colonization an economic paradigm, rather than a political one, and through this, internalizes its political discourse so that no external reflection on its violent processes can be made. It is this elimination of externality (through the production of apolitical subjects and control of the interpretation of its processes of violence) that can make the imperial-colonial regime spread around the globe and work endlessly. So the question we should pose in relation to the alternatives of capitalism is not where the idea of communism failed or how we could make it work properly, but rather where the imperial-colonial regime of exploitation triumphed in reshaping itself into an acceptable and preferred form of governing.

Stas Kleindienst is an artist and a theoretician based in Ljubljana.

REARTIKULACIJA

Staš Kleindienst ON EUROPEAN CONSCIENCE AND TOTALITARIANISM

On April 2nd, 2009, members of the European parliament adopted the *European Parliament resolution on European conscience and totalitarianism*. The Resolution is an official document which deals with the issues of the totalitarian past (especially) of former socialist countries of Eastern Europe and with the contrast between the violent past and peace-loving social order of the contemporary European Union. It is basically an ideological document, adopted in order to reproduce and reinforce the imperialist-colonialist roots on which the idea of Europe was founded. We can point out three crucial points where this tendency can be detected.

Firstly, the document promotes European values by producing a diametrical difference where ideology becomes an issue of the past and is absent in the new global world order, which started in 1990, and stands on universalist ideas of human dignity and individual freedom. This difference, of course, produces the post-ideological state of today’s EU and makes neoliberal ideology impalpable, blurred between economic speculations and the apolitical state of its population. In short, the idea of the document is to produce a dualist perspective on past and present, where, in opposition to the violent past, the present is presented as a peaceful era, ready to build on the idea of harmony among all nations that constitute the European Union.

In practice, the situation is different. The idea of a united Europe stands on closed outer borders, where the agency Frontex (a specialised independent body tasked to coordinate the operational cooperation between Member States in the field of border security) conducts its patrols and intelligence-driven operations on both sides of the border to keep the migrants out, while on the other side, the promised disappearance of inner borders is mainly due to the access of cheaper labour from eastern countries of the EU and free flow of capital. This also leads to the perception of migrations of Eastern European workers as a threat to the domestic work force. This threat is constantly being used by right wing politicians to produce fascist, nationalist or racist discourses for their own political benefit. This can be seen in the case of Italy, which introduced

RAZVEZA OD KAPITALA IN KOLONIALNE MATRICE MOČI / DE-LINKING FROM CAPITAL AND THE COLONIAL MATRIX OF POWER

ZAKON KAPITALA: ZGODOVINE ZATIRANJA/ THE LAW OF CAPITAL: HISTORIES OF OPPRESSION

Ivan Jurica BESEDNI PODALJŠEK KOT POMEN SLIKE

V tem umetniškem delu bom predstavil dva primera.

PRVI PRIMER

1984: MARTIN KIPPENBERGER: *Ich kann beim besten Willen kein Hakenkreuz erkennen!*

Naj se še tako trudim, nikjer ne vidim kljukastega križa!

Leta 1984 je »norčavi« Martin Kippenberger naslikal abstraktno sliko: prostorsko konstrukcijo iz rdečih, belih, rumenih in črnih črt, ki tvorijo oglate like. Na prvi pogled ni opaziti nič posebnega – le sliko, ki spominja na kubistične like in preizprašuje oblikovne rešitve take prostorske kompozicije. Naslov, ki je nekakšen besedni podaljšek te slike, predstavlja ključno spremembo v njenem razumevanju: »*Ich kann beim besten Willen kein Hakenkreuz erkennen*« (»**Naj se še tako trudim, nikjer ne vidim kljukastega križa!**«). Kljub uporabi osebnega zaimka »jaz« v tem naslovu, stavek jasno nagovarja neznanega gledalca, ki stoji pred sliko, in ga spodbuja k iskanju kljukastega križa, čeprav se ni bati, da bi ga našli. Pa vendar besedna zveza »kljukasti križ« v naslovu nedolžno abstraktno sliko spreminja v politično provokacijo. Med (zahodnimi) umetnostnimi zgodovinarji je to delo sprožilo resno vprašanje o procesu zatajitve dejstev polpretekle nemške (umetnostne) zgodovine, ki kljukastih križev kljub temu, da »se še tako trudi«, ne rada vidi in jih zato prikriva. Obenem so umetnostni kritiki Kippenbergerja obtožili, da ni želel izraziti resnega političnega stališča in da se nalašč ni jasno opredelil. Kaj pravzaprav njegova »retorika, ki podira tabuje«, sploh pomeni? Z njo je slika, za katero se je zaradi slikarskega sloga, v katerem je naslikana, zdelo, da nima nobene zveze z družbenopolitičnimi vprašanji, dobila politični pomen. S formalnega stališča je slika običajno delo, ki pa mu je cinična gesta – ki je medij zaradi naslova obrnila proti samemu sebi – pripela nov pomen. Abstraktna slika je tako dobila svoj podaljšek v besedi in prek nje.

2009: Če razmišljam o kapitalističnih procesih znotraj sodobne umetnosti, o umetniškem trgu, ki usmerja potenciale umetnosti, o zahodnih umetniških institucijah, ki brišejo radikalne pozicije iz umetnostne zgodovine, in o vse večjem izključevanju zgodovin umetnosti, ki ne prihajajo iz prvega kapitalističnega sveta, iz t. i. zgodovine sodobne umetnosti, lahko zatrdim:

2009: IVAN JURICA: *Ich kann beim besten Willen Hakenkreuze erkennen!*

Naj se še tako trudim, vidim kljukaste križe!

DRUGI PRIMER

1997: SANJA IVEKOVIČ: GEN XX: DRAGICA KONČAR

»Obtožena protifašističnega delovanja. Mučena in usmrčena v Zagrebu leta 1942. Umrla stara 27 let.«

Leta 1997 je feministična umetnica Sanja Iveković sklenila, da se bo zoperstavila kolektivni amneziji in brisanju zgodovine. V svojem projektu GEN XX, ki ga je objavila v hrvaških revijah, je prikazala modne fotografije ženskih fotomodelk, ki jih je poimenovala po dejanskih zgodovinskih protifašističnih narodnih junakinjah. V pripisu k vsakemu delu iz serije GEN XX lahko preberemo:

»Obtožena protifašističnega delovanja. Mučena in usmrčena v Zagrebu leta 1942. Umrla stara 27 let« ali

»Ljubica Gerovac. Obtožena protifašističnega delovanja. Storila samomor v zaporu. Umrla stara 22 let.«

Te junakinje so umrle zaradi protifašističnega prepričanja in delovanja. Zaprli, mučili in usmrtili so jih hrvaški fašistični ustaši med drugo svetovno vojno. Pozornejšega gledalca bi vznemirila razlika med glamurozno, erotično fotografijo in dokumentarnim pripi-

som k njej. Nekateri bi se počutili celo prizadete zaradi oživljanja spomina na borke protifašističnega gibanja iz druge svetovne vojne. Ivekovićeva je bila pripravljena na vse mogoče odzive, tudi na odziv modne družbe Chanel, ki je to umetniško intervencijo označila za krajo oblikovalskih pravic, ker naj bi oglaševala izdelke družbe Končar.

Umetnica se je opredelila proti kolektivni amneziji. Zoperstavila se je molčečnosti, na katero so obsojene ženske, in zamoščanju vzhodnoevropske protifašistične zgodovine. Strah pred pozabo je glavni vzgib njenih del. V tem smislu njeno delo GEN XX ne obravnava samo problemov žensk, pač pa ti »mrliški listi« (kakor jih je poimenovala Ana Peraica) pričajo tudi o izbrisu protifašističnih borcev in bork iz polpretekle hegemonistične zgodovine kakor tudi umetnostne zgodovine. Uporaba modne fotografije skupaj s temi imeni utegne za trenutek obuditi spomin na te junakinje in na vlogo, ki so jo imele v danes izbrisani socialistični preteklosti. Združitev podobe anonimne osebe z nekim imenom brez preteklosti pa spreminja oglas v mrliški list, ki beleži izbrisana in zamoščana dejstva.

2009: Zaradi procesov brisanja in izključevanja, ki so prisotni v vseh sferah, in zaradi radikalnih kritičnih pozicij in konceptov, ki so spregledani tako v splošni in umetnostni zgodovini kakor tudi v proizvodnji znanja in izobraževanju, lahko izrečem naslednjo trditev, ki je hkrati moje umetniško delo:

2009: IVAN JURICA: *Ich kann beim besten Willen überall Hakenkreuze erkennen!*

Naj se še tako trudim, povsod vidim same kljukaste križe!

Ivan Jurica je umetnik, ki živi in dela na Dunaju in v Bratislavi. Ukvarja se z analizo vzhodnoevropske umetnosti.

Ivan Jurica THE VERBAL EXTENSION AS THE MEANING OF AN IMAGE

In my present work, I will present two cases.

THE FIRST CASE

1984: MARTIN KIPPENBERGER: *Ich kann beim besten Willen kein Hakenkreuz erkennen!*

By my best Will, I can’t see any Swastika!

In 1984, the “Hetzerboy” Martin Kippenberger painted an abstract painting: a spatial structure of red-white-yellow-and-black bars with angular forms. At first glance, nothing special occurs in the perception – a painting alluding to cubist forms, questioning the formal solution of its spatial construction. Indeed, the title, the small verbal extension of the painting, produces a crucial modification in its perception: “*Ich kann beim besten Willen kein Hakenkreuz erkennen*” (“**By my best Will, I can’t see any Swastika!**”). Despite the use of the “I” in the title, the phrase is obviously attributed to a fictitious viewer standing in front of the painting, encouraging the actual viewers to search for the swastikas (though as the title says, there is no fear that the viewer will find one) in the picture. Nevertheless, the word “Swastika” in the title turns a harmless abstract painting into a political provocation. Art historians – the western art historians – interpreted the work as a serious debate on the process of repression within recent German (art) history, where, “by the best will”, swastikas are not desired to be seen and are therefore made invisible. At the same time, art critics accused Kippenberger of refusing to adopt a serious political position, remaining appositely vague. But what did his “a taboo breaking rhetoric” actually do? It gave a political meaning to the painting which, in the way it was painted, appeared fully divorced from any socio-political questions. In the medium

Izgubljeni raj na zemlji, ki se uvršča v polje eksperimentalne etnografije, raziskuje povezave med kulturo in staroselstvom v globaliziranem svetu. Posnetki potovanja po gozdovih Mata Grossa, ki jih je zapustila Elena Rodríguez-Bauzá, ponujajo razmislek o konceptu kolonialnega spomina. Temeljijo na sekvencah podob, ki so se do danes ohranile prav zaradi pečata, ki so ga za seboj pustili ti portreti. Gre za utopistični projekt portretiranja kultur, ki na Zahodu veljajo za »eksotične«.

To območje srednje in zahodne Brazilije (ki se nahaja v bližini mesta Cuiabá, danes samostojne države) je bila destinacija nekaj najpomembnejših ekspedicij v 18. stoletju, ki so odrinile iz São Paula, da bi poselile deželo, ustvarile trgovske enklave in naše najdišča zlata in draguljev. Med 19. in 20. stoletjem so to ozemlje obiskovali pisatelji, pustolovci in znanstveniki, kot so Hercule Florence, baron iz Langsdorffa in pozneje Claude Levi-Strauss, ki je v zapisu Sad Tropics/Žalostni tropi (1955) podal svoj subjektivni etnografski pogled. Pred drugo svetovno vojno so bili etnografi, ki so snemali filme, popotniki; medtem ko je Osa Johnson posnel dokumentarec z naslovom *Cannibals of the South Seas/Kanibali Južnega morja* (1912) in *Wonders of the Congo/Čudesna Konga* (1931), so pustolovci in znanstveniki dokumentirali poslednje sledi kulture, ki je izginjala. Filmski žanr in etnografija sta si kulturno sorodna; pripovedni žanri, ki ločujejo med fikcijo in dokumentarcem in so s portretiranjem in registri drugih kultur tvorili dokumentarni stil še pred obstojem dokumentarne pripovedi (kakor je pokazal Robert Flaherty v *Nanuku s severa*, 1912 – 1922), nas vodijo k razmisleku na podlagi sugestij iz eseja Jayja Rubyja z naslovom *Exposing yourself: reflexivity, anthropology and film/Razkazovanje samega sebe:*

of painting in its formal sense, it was a mediocre painting that, through a cynical gesture – turning the medium, through its title, against itself – received a meaning. The abstract painting experienced its extension only in the language and through the language.

2009: When I think about the processes that are carried on by capitalism within contemporary art, about the art market regulating the potentiality of art, the western art institutions erasing radical positions from art history and more and more expelling histories of art which are not coming from the first capitalist world from the so-called history of contemporary art, I can state:

2009: IVAN JURICA: *Ich kann beim besten Willen Hakenkreuze erkennen!*
By my best Will, I can see Swastikas!

THE SECOND CASE

1997: SANJA IVEKOVIČ: GEN XX: DRAGICA KONČAR

“Charged with anti-fascist activities. Tortured and executed in Zagreb in 1942. Died at the age of 27.”

In 1997, the feminist artist Sanja Iveković decided to challenge the collective amnesia and erasure of history. In her project “GEN XX,” which she published in Croatian magazines, fashion photographs of female models branded with names and surnames of actual historical anti-fascist national heroines were displayed. In the added text near each work from “GEN XX,” we read:

“Dragica Končar. Charged with anti-fascist activities. Tortured and executed in Zagreb in 1942. Died at the age of 27” or “Ljubica Gerovac. Charged with anti-fascist activities. Committed suicide while being arrested. Died at the age of 22.”

These heroines died because of their anti-fascist positions and activities. They were arrested, tortured and murdered by the Croat Fascist Ustasha regime during WWII. The more watchful eye of the viewer will be irritated by the discrepancy between the glamorous, eroticised photograph and the dry, documentary text surrounding it. Some will even feel indignation in terms of the sense of the “revival” of characters from the anti-fascist movement of WWII. Iveković counted on a wide range of reactions, including the one by the fashion company Chanel, which interpreted this artistic intervention as designer pilfering in terms of advertising products of the company “Končar.” Iveković positioned herself against collective amnesia. She didn’t want to accept the silencing of the female and Eastern European anti-fascist history. The fear of oblivion is one of the most powerful instigators of her work. In these terms, the work “GEN XX” is not only connected to the problems of women, but these “death certificates” (as named by Ana Peraica) also testify to the erasure of anti-fascist heroes and heroines from the present Hegemonic history and art history. The use of the fashionable image together with the name might for a moment recall the heroines and their role within the erased socialist past. But the junction between the anonymous consumable image and the name without a past turns the advertisement into a death certificate. A certificate of erasures and suppressions.

2009: Because of these processes of erasure and exclusion in all spheres, because of the radical critical positions and concepts that are missing in the history and the art history, in the knowledge production and education, I can state – and this uttering is my artwork:

2009: IVAN JURICA: *Ich kann beim besten Willen überall Hakenkreuze erkennen!*

By my best Will, I can see Swastikas everywhere!

Ivan Jurica is an artist based in Vienna and Bratislava. His work is specifically connected with analysis of Eastern European Art.

Izgubljeni raj na zemlji, ki se uvršča v polje eksperimentalne etnografije, raziskuje povezave med kulturo in staroselstvom v globaliziranem svetu. Posnetki potovanja po gozdovih Mata Grossa, ki jih je zapustila Elena Rodríguez-Bauzá, ponujajo razmislek o konceptu kolonialnega spomina. Temeljijo na sekvencah podob, ki so se do danes ohranile prav zaradi pečata, ki so ga za seboj pustili ti portreti. Gre za utopistični projekt portretiranja kultur, ki na Zahodu veljajo za »eksotične«.

Izgubljeni raj na zemlji, ki se uvršča v polje eksperimentalne etnografije, raziskuje povezave med kulturo in staroselstvom v globaliziranem svetu. Posnetki potovanja po gozdovih Mata Grossa, ki jih je zapustila Elena Rodríguez-Bauzá, ponujajo razmislek o konceptu kolonialnega spomina. Temeljijo na sekvencah podob, ki so se do danes ohranile prav zaradi pečata, ki so ga za seboj pustili ti portreti. Gre za utopistični projekt portretiranja kultur, ki na Zahodu veljajo za »eksotične«.

Prvi posnetki staroselskih kultur, živečih v Matu Grossu v Braziliji, so nastali kot rezultat približnega popisa kultur kartografa Cândida Mariana da Silva Rondona, ki ga hrani Narodni muzej v Riu de Janeiru; Da Silva Rondona je z Luizom Thomazom Reisom podpisal pogodbo, ta pa je naročil izdelavo sistematičnega etnografskega registra na filmskem posnetku. Leta 1913 in 1914 je skupaj s plemeni Pareci in Nambikwara posnel film *Os Sertões de Mato Grosso*, ki se je izgubil, leta 1916 s plemenom Bororo pa *Rituais e festas de Bororo*. To sta bila prva etnografska filma, posneta med amazonskimi staroselci.

Film *Izgubljeni raj na zemlji*, ki je posnet v obliki eksperimentalne etnografije, se odvija na območju tromeje v Amazoniji, ki meji s Kolumbijo, Brazilijo in Perujem. Vsak posamezen dokument vsebuje zgodbo različnih staroselskih skupnosti, kot sta plemeni Tikuna ali Santa Sofia, in enklave različnih etničnih skupin, kot so Muinane Bora, Marubo, Cocama ali Yagua. Kozmovizija etnične skupine Marubo, ki pravi, da se nov človek rodi iz združitve ali preobrazbe delov mrtvih, pohabljenih bitij, je rezultat reorganizacije zdesetkanih in razdrobljenih staroselskih skupnosti, ki je posledica povečanja izkoriščanja virov kavčuka, ki v celotni amazonski regiji traja že več desetletij.

Izgubljeni raj na zemlji je vizualni antropološki dokument filmske amaterke. Pripoveduje o izvoru starih ljudstev, ki so naseljevala ta ozemlja, in prek njihovih portretov razkriva poglede, ki so bili

pahnjeni v pozabo preteklosti. Gre za refleksijo o spreminjajoči se dinamiki proizvajanja podob o staroselskem načinu življenja, občutku za skupnost in življenjske eksistence.

Virginia Villaplana je pisateljica in umetnica. Doktorirala je iz likovne umetnosti in komunikacijskih ved. Od leta 2006 je asistentka na Oddelku za teorijo jezika in komunikacijskih ved Univerze v Valenciji, Španija.

Virginia Villaplana

AMAZONIA World paradise lost

2009
Film installation
4 projections
60 min
www.virginiavillaplana.com

World paradise lost was developed in the form of a film installation; it uses narrative film-essay as a device, and takes place in the areas of the current Amazon borders. The narrations contained in this work are based on images shot by Elena Rodríguez-Bauzá between 1932 and 1935 in the Amazon rainforest in Mato Gross, Brazil – in particular the banks of the São Lourenço river. These documents, captured on six rolls of nitrate film, along with the tales of the travels of this amateur entomologist were the foundations of the cinematographic tone which would offer the opportunity to create an index of indigenous culture there. Elena Rodríguez-Bauzá’s records are not, in this sense, a complete documentary work, but can be interpreted as a symbolic cultural unveiling of this vanished human geography. They include partial notes, field studies and document images – falling short of documentary status – which have been hidden away for almost a century. The collection is the result of a disseminated documentation process of an exotic journey which compiles different sequences of shots of the Mato Grosso do Sul, including falsified portraits and records of ancient indigenous populations, such as images of men enacting the war dance and women exposing their naked bodies before the camera.

A part of the experimental ethnography field, *World paradise lost* is a work which explores the links between culture and indigenism in a globalised world. The journey of the records of the Mato Grosso forest left behind by Elena Rodríguez-Bauzá is intended to be a reflection on the notion of colonial memory, based on the sequences of images brought into the present day by the marks left by this portrayal. A uto-

HARD (CORE)

Jonathan Beller in Marina Gržinić

POGOVOR O SODOBNEM KAPITALIZMU IN KINEMATIČNEM NAČINU PRODUKCIJE

Jonathan Beller je eden izmed svetovno najprovokativnejših teoretikov o filmu in digitalni medijski proizvodnji današnjega časa. Njegove bistrournne analize so pomembne, saj pokažejo, da so nove filmske/digitalne imaginarije močno preoblikovali procesi financiranja globalnega kapitalizma. Financiranje ni le »spodrsrljaj« ali »napaka« globalnega kapitalizma, pač pa način kapitalizacije, ki prežema celotno sodobno družbo, od ekonomije do estetike, in si ne nazadnje lasti tudi sredstva, s katerimi se ustvarja in reproducira teorija. Reprodukcijska globalnega kapitalizma temelji na njegovem financiranju, kar je njegov nov pogoj ne/zmožnosti delovanja. Bellerjev kinematični način produkcije ponazarja, kako finančni kapitalizem reproducira samega sebe znotraj in s pomočjo digitalne/filmske industrije in razkriva, da logika izkoriščanja in razlaščanja s strani kapitala, ki je danes prisotna v umetnosti in kulturi, ni omejena le na ti dve področji. Odgovora na vprašanji, kaj to pomeni in kako naj razumemo kinematični način produkcije, pa nista samoumevna. Nasprotno. Če nam ne uspe izpostaviti tega (nenasitno grabežljivega) delovanja, ki smo mu priča v sodobni holivudski filmski industriji in drugod, bodo ostali procesi financiranja, ki so ključni za vzpostavitev novih načinov izkoriščanja v digitalni dobi kakor tudi za ohranjanje tradicionalnih oblik nasilja in razlaščanja, podedovanih iz preteklih obdobj, mojstrsko prikriti. Pogovor med nama je le začetek dialoga o tematiki, ki jo nameravava v prihodnje še poglobiti.

Marina Gržinić: *Da bi razvili drugačno razumevanje filma, ste vpeljali termin »kinematični način produkcije«. Za kaj pravzaprav gre? V kakšni povezavi je ta s kapitalističnim načinom produkcije? Kako ta dva načina produkcije delujeta vzajemno v skupno korist? V čem se razlikujeta?*

Jonathan Beller: Formulacija »kinematični način produkcije« (KNP) je mišljena kot oznaka, ki predpostavlja vizualno in čutno sfero kot točki, v katerih se proizvaja kapital. Z izjavo, da je »film omogočil industrijsko revolucijo na področju vidnega«, sem želel povedati, da so se s pojavom filma strategije proizvodnje tržnega blaga za tekočim trakom preusmerile v polje vidnega z namenom proizvajanja podob. S taylorizmom (ki je tehnika delovne discipline in organizacije dela, ki naj bi temeljila na znanstvenih študijah o človekovi učinkovitosti in sistemih spodbud in je bila ustanovljena okoli leta 1911) je postal film očitno sredstvo za reorganizacijo predhodnih proizvodnih praks. Mogoče je reči, da je (tovarniški) način montaže blaga za tekočim trakom prevzela filmska montaža, ki so jo nato vsilili kot delovni proces. Taylor je posnel več delavcev, ki so opravljali isto delo ob različnem času in na različnih mestih, ga nato razstavil na posamezne delovne sklope, različne delovne postopke pa sestavil skupaj tako, da je dobil »najboljši način« opravljanja določenega dela. Ta »najboljši način« je podjetniški razred, ki je prevzel nadzor nad proizvodnjo, vsilil delavcem. Organizacija dela na osnovi kinematičnih procesov pa ima daljnosežnejše učinke, kot le vplivati na to, kar počnemo, kar poznamo kot delo; še več, perceptivna izkušnja in proces sta spremenjena v delo. Tako postane film sredstvo za reorganizacijo delavstva in vseh ravneh njegovega izkustva in hkrati se ta proces reorganizacije spreminja v stroj za proizvodnjo



Fotografije iz filmskega izseka, posnetega v skupnosti Bora v Kolumbijski džungli. / Photographs of a clip taken in the Bora community, in the Colombian jungle.

pian portrait project of cultures classified under Western understanding as "exotic."

This area in central-western Brazil (close to the town of Cuiaabá, which today forms a state in itself) was the destination of some of the most significant expeditions starting out from São Paulo during the 18th century in order to populate the country, create trade enclaves, and find sources of gold and gemstones. During the 19th and 20th century, this territory was visited by writers, adventurers and scientists such as Hercule Florence, the Baron of Langsdorff and later Claude Levi-Strauss, who would create a subjective ethnographer’s perspective in *Sad Tropics* (1955). Before the Second World War, film ethnographers were travellers; just as Osa Johnson carried out his documentary work in *Cannibals of the South Seas* (1912) and *Wonders of the Congo* (1931), adventurers and scientists tried to document the last traces of a culture which was fading away. The film genre and ethnography are culturally related; the narrative genres which separate fiction and documentary, blended in the portrayal and register of other cultures in documentary style, prior to the existence of a documentary narrative (just as Robert Flaherty showed in *Nanook of the North*, 1912-1922), lead us to consider, following the suggestions of Jay Ruby in his essay *Exposing yourself: reflexivity, anthropology and film*, that film genres emerge from a western middle class need to explore, document and explain the world, and thus symbolically dominate it.

The first recordings of the indigenous cultures of Mato Grosso, Brazil appear as a result of a cultural approximation exercise by the cartographer Cândido Mariano da Silva Rondon, from the National Museum in Rio de Janeiro; he contracted Luiz Thomaz Reis, who commenced the

vrednosti. Kakor sem zapisal pri KNP, nas sodobni kapitalizem pri valorizaciji (v ekonomskem smislu) medijskega napredka nenehno sili, da posodabljam o lasten instrumentarij. Taka posodobitev najprej določa in nato zahteva spremembo vrednostne oblike ter hkrati vzpostavlja temelje za to, kar italijanski teoretiki imenujejo »prava subsumpcija«, prilastitev s strani kapitalistične produkcije predhodno delno avtonomnih procesov, ki so bili nekoč formalno zunaj nje. Taka prilastitev sega onkraj delovnega mesta v samo psihosocialno življenje do točke, kjer smo priča razlastitvi tistega, kar Virno imenuje spoznavno-jezikovne sposobnosti človeštva. V tem orwellovskem obratu, ki sem ga poskušal artikulirati v svojem delu in ki se mi še vedno zdi pomemben, danes prevladuje mnenje, da so naša izrekanja zgolj podrutine kapitala, ki jih upravlja splošni intelekt, ki predstavlja hkrati sredstvo in temelj naše subjektivizacije.

Taka kolonizacija vizualnega (in zdaj tudi čutnega) s strani kapitala, ki jo velja premisliti tudi v smislu naraščanja pomena vizualnega, je po mojem mnenju ena od paradigmatičnih dosežkov dolgo trajajočega 20. stoletja. Kakor tržno blago spreminja naše čutno izkustvo (Marx je v rokopisu iz leta 1844 zapisal, da je razvoj petih čutov produkt zgodovine sveta, od njegovega začetka pa vse do danes, in da je industrija odprta knjiga človeške psihologije), tako to počno tudi podobe. Simmel je pokazal, kako je organizacija moderne metropole vplivala na zavest in kako je množična proizvodnja predmetov spremenila naravo našega zaznavanja in čutnosti. Andre Bazin (*What is Cinema?/Kaj je film?* (1. knjiga), uredil in prevedel Hugh Gray, University of California Press, Berkeley, 1971) je zapisal, da »je avtomatizacija proizvodnje korenito vplivala na človekovo duševnost [...]« (str. 13), in dodal, da nadrealisti »vsako podobo razumejo kot predmet in vsak predmet kot podobo« (str. 15–16). Gre torej za spoj med predmetom-funkcijo in podobo-funkcijo, ki je že vključen v proizvodnjo tržnega blaga. Šele film, ki pomeni vrhunec razvoja industrijskih tehnologij, eksplicitno izrab i polje vizualnega za reorganizacijo čutnozaznavnih sporočil v korist države in trga. V nominalno protikapitalistični Sovjetski zvezi je Vertov govoril o »komunističnem dekodiranju vidnega sveta« in »kodiranju vidnega sveta«, medtem ko nam je Eisenstein povedal, da je film »plug, ki orje po psihi občinstva« in da je delo režiserja, da »organizira občinstvo z urejenim gradivom«. Znana je tudi Stalinova trditev, da je režiser inženir duš. Sovpliv med podobami in objekti, vpliv tako skonstruiranega okolja kot vizualnih tehnologij na organizacijo čutnega aparata je bil jasno prepoznan in uporabljen kot sredstvo za spremembo države. Sredstvo tega sredstva pa je bilo, lahko rečem, film. Zgodba o holivudskih mogilih, studijskem sistemu, vzponu oglaševanja na Zahodu in enormna vloga vizualne kulture v razvoju današnjih tržnih sil je zgodba, ki je v evropsko-ameriškem (in zdaj globalnem) kontekstu dobro poznana (če že ne vsaj dobro razumljena).

Eden glavnih razlogov za razvijanje ideje o kinematičnem načinu produkcije je bil dokazati, da se je zgodil prevzem vizualnega s strani industrije, ekonomije in politike in da kapital določa (in danes tudi pogojuje) vizualno kot mesto za proizvodnjo vrednosti, posledično pa tudi kot mesto boja. Revolucionarni filmski ustvarjalci niso ustvarjali v polju vizualnega, ker bi bili filmski ustvarjalci, pač pa ker so bili revolucionarji. Saj so se novi boji bili prav v polju vizualnega. Tega polja niso izbrali iz preprostega razloga, ker je bil film ideološko vpliven medij, ampak ker je bil in je še danes kakor tovarna, sredstvo produkcije.



Fotografije iz filmskega izseka, posnetega v skupnosti Bora v Kolumbijski džungli. / Photographs of a clip taken in the Bora community, in the Colombian jungle.

systematic task of an ethnographical register on film. In 1913 and 1914 he filmed, with the pareci and the nambikwara people, a film which has since been lost, *Os Sertões de Mato Grosso*, and in 1916, with the bororo people, *Rituais e festas de Bororo*, thus creating the first ethnographical film set among the indigenous cultures of the Amazon.

The filming of *World paradise lost*, in experimental ethnographic form, is set in the Tri-border Amazon region, between the borders of Colombia, Brazil and Peru. Each of the files generated has the backdrop of different indigenous communities, such as the Tikuna or the Santa Sofia tribes, and enclave of different ethnic groups such as the Muinane Bora, Marubo, Cocama or Yagua. The Marubo cosmovision, which relates that new beings are formed by the union or transformation of parts of dead, mutilated beings, seems to be the result of a reorganisation of decimated and fragmented indigenous societies, which was caused by the increase in rubber extraction going back decades up until today in the entire Amazon region.

World paradise lost is a visual anthropology document by an amateur cinematographer which tells of the origins of the ancient peoples inhabiting these lands, tracing their portraits and reflecting the view which has been pushed into the past. It is a reflection on the transforming dynamics of image production on the shape of indigenous life, the sense of community and vital subsistence.

Virginia Villaplana is writer and artist. She holds a PhD in Fine Arts and Communication. Since 2006 she has been assistant lecturer at the Department of Language Theory and Communication Sciences, University of Valencia, Spain.

Če povzamemo, povezanost med KNP in kapitalističnim načinom produkcije se kaže v dejstvu, da so polje vizualnega in vizualne tehnologije postala sredstva kapitalistične proizvodnje vrednosti in razlaščanja dela. Medtem ko obstajajo različni načini prilastitve in prenosa vrednosti (ki gredo vse od gledanja televizije do oglaševanja in legitimizacije vojne), ni težko uvideti, da svet, v katerem živimo danes, ne bi mogel obstajati brez vseprežemajoče prisotnosti zaslona. Celotno družbeno dejavnost posredno pogojujejo zasloni ali pa ti neposredno vplivajo nanjo: od načina oblačenja do načina izražanja in prehranjevanja. Z drugimi besedami, še vedno smo priča grozodejstvom kapitalistične družbe, ki vključujejo masovno obubožanje kot posledico masovne akumulacije kapitala, kolonialistično in imperialistično vojno, nasilni rasizem, patriarhalno dominacijo in organizacijo gulagov in koncentracijskih taborišč kot posledico liberalne demokracije; spremenila so se le produkcijska sredstva, ki jih spremljajo vse večje težave organizacije in upravljanja. Če se vnovič oprem na Orwellovo formulacijo, smo bili prisiljeni razviti sposobnost dvojnega mišljenja, saj vsakdanje življenje od nas zahteva, da o stvareh hkrati nekaj (ne) vemo, da imamo hkrati dvoje kontradiktornih stališč, za kateri menimo, da sta pravilni. Vizualna kultura s svojo hitrostjo in zmožnostjo, da prevlada nad funkcijo jezika – in s tem logično prispeva k protislovju kot takemu –, je izpolnila temeljno zahtevo, totalitarnih družb, kakor je to izrazil Orwell, ko je zapisal: »Topoumnost je bila prav toliko potrebna kakor bistrornost in nič manj težko dosegljiva.« Medtem pa je družba nadzora poleg tega, da je iz stvarnega življenja odpravila logiko in marginalizirala jezikovni pogon, s katerim se realno premika, razvila sposobnost reguliranja vsega, od mišljenja do DNK pa vse tja do atomskih in celo kvantnih ravni materije. Zato gre kinematični način produkcije razumeti kot okrepitev buržoazne oblike kapitalističnega načina produkcije, kot širjenje virusne logike forme tržnega blaga navznoter in navzven – kar predstavlja takšno nesimetrično menjava, da smo prisiljeni govoriti ne le o posthumanizmu, pač pa o posthumanem. To pa seveda pomeni podrobneje premisliti film in njegova presečišča z drugimi vektorji, kot so kibernetika, psihoanaliza, rasizem in imperializem, kar pa predstavlja drugo vrsto pogovora.

M. G.: *Pri formuliranju kinematičnega načina produkcije ste predstavili kritiko dveh Deleuzovih knjig o filmu, Podoba-gibanje in Podoba-čas. Bi lahko sintetizirali vašo kritiko Deleuza in izpostavili glavne razlike med vašim in njegovim pojmovanjem filma?*

J. B.: Lahko rečem, da je odnos med mano in Deleuzom nepopoln – povedano drugače, pri svojem delu ne izhajam v celoti iz Deleuza, kakor ga v celoti tudi ne upoštevam. Na primer: ne oprimem se vsakega pojma, ki ga je Deleuze ustvaril v svojih knjigah o filmu. Čeprav takšna analiza nekega dela in uporaba tistega, kar nekdo potrebuje, ni v neskladju z Deleuzovim etosom, pa je vsekakor neskladna z zahtevami stroke. Kakorkoli že, knjige o filmih, ki jih prištevam med najpomembnejša dela o tem mediju, sem uporabil, da bi preoblikoval Deleuzov pristop k filmu in, če sem iskren, njegova dognanja nadgradil s svojimi. Bil sem epistemološko vezan na to zahtevo, ker si je po mojem mnenju kapital podredil film (ali pa si je ta podredil kapital – morda je to še prerano in prenevarno reči). Razen nekaterih zgodnjih filmskih poskusov in polju vizualnega, ki so bili odkrito (če ne dejansko) protikapitalistično nastrojeni (kot v primeru Vertova in še bolj neposredno v primeru Eisensteina, ki sem ga že omenil zgoraj), je bila celotna filmska industrija v času

Deleuzovega pisanja že ujeta v primež kapitalistične produkcije. Še več, ta premik, ki ga lahko preprosto opišem kot prehod iz izrazito materialnega sveta v vizualne in virtualne svetove kot produkcijska mesta, je zahteval nove paradigme za razumevanje politične ekonomije. Tako ni bil po mojem mnenju prelom med podobogibanjem in podobo-časom, ki se je, kakor trdi Deleuze, nemara pod vplivom Benjaminovega eseja *The Storyteller/Pripovedovalec*, zgodil po drugi svetovni vojni in je sovpadel s pojemanjem zapisovanja izkušnje v obliki pripovedi, le rezultat umetnikov ali filmskih »mislecev«, ki so iskali nove forme (dejal bi celo, da niso le oni prispevali k temu), primerne takratnemu času (novim izkustvom, ki jih je ta prinašal, in svojevrstnosti časa kot takega), forme torej, za katere lahko filozof potem ustvari koncepte. Nasprotno, novi filmi nastajajo na podlagi družbenih odnosov, ki sami prispevajo k preoblikovanju spremenjenih odnosov med družbenimi in psiholingvističnimi sposobnostmi občinstva. Zame ta preobrat v prvi vrsti ne pomeni le velikanske spremembe v zavesti, ki so jo zaznali na področju filozofije, pač pa dogodek izrednega pomena v zgodovini politične ekonomije in družbenih bojov. Odločitev, da se »ustvarjalca« odstrani iz filma (kar predstavlja povičevanje, ki ga Deleuze upošteva, jaz pa ga v svojem poglavju o Deleuzovem delu povsem opustim), vodi v sistemski pristop in k zasledovanju sprememb v mediju filma in njemu pripadajočih družbenih praksah. Filmsko delo potemtakem pripada kolektivnosti in ne več »mislecem«, kot kanonične filmske ustvarjalce poimenuje Deleuze. Kot navaja Comolli, lahko rečemo, da je gneča, ki se vije pred kinom, pravzaprav tista, ki ustvari film. Mene pa je zanimalo, kaj so ti ljudje ustvarili.

Prav ta ideja o medsebojnem delovanju filmske forme in občinstva je bila pravzaprav povod za mojo raziskavo, kaj je najpomembnejši korak v relaciji do deleuzovskega pristopa k filmu. To pa pomeni, če se oprem na Metza, priznanje, da je film družbeni stroj, ki je skupaj z občinstvom ujet v povratno zanko finančništva. Če ta relacija prav na osnovi delovanja, ki povezuje zavest, psiho, ekonomijo in podobo, lahko proizvede novo miselnost na področju filozofije, potem je jasno, da filozofija ni več privilegirano področje, pač pa zgolj praksa kot vsaka druga, pokazatelj dinamičnosti, ki kot celota konstituira širši kibernetični proces.

V tej točki se mi zdi Deleuzovo delo omejeno in omejujoče. Ne le, ker se omejuje na analizo na stotine filmskih genijev, pač pa zaradi njegove dvojne libidinozne investicije v filme in miselnost. Moj očitek pa ni le ta, da je ta težnja estetizirajoča in filozofsko motivirana, pač pa tudi dejstvo, da je morala, da bi se konstituirala kot taka, popolnoma spregledati zgodovinsko vlogo filma. Noben fetišist ne pozna prave narave svojega predmeta čaščenja. Z drugimi besedami, Deleuzov argument se omejuje na zelo ozko definicijo filma, saj celostne vloge filma ne raziskuje kot nastajajočo operativni sistem za koordiniranje raznoterih proizvodnih spremenljivk. To pa bi kajpak pomenilo zgodoviniti film tako, da bi njegovo inovativnost na ravni forme prvenstveno povezali z družbenimi razmerami. Tako bi zadel v samo osrčje estetike in filozofije in ju uvrstili med podrutine širše delujočega sistema. Tako bi se tudi vprašali o družbenem in zgodovinskem pomenu industrializacije vizualnega, ki zahteva dialektično analizo. Deleuze se temu imanentnemu pritisku – pritisku, ki ga sam zaznava tako, da se omeji v svojem lastnem razmišljanju o podobi –, izogne tako, da nam da vedeti, da v svojih knjigah o filmih počne prav to, kar počnejo filozofi: proizvaja pojme. Na tej točki se Marxova kritika vloge filozofa izkaže za še kako aktualno: »Doslej so filozofi samo interpretirali svet, bistveno pa je, da ga spremenimo.«

Ne nazadnje pa se razlika med menoj in Deleuzom pokaže v najinem različnem pojmovanju pojasnjevalne moči dialektike. Deleuzovo delo, ki je postalo prevladujoč model postdialektičnega mišljenja, je hkrati raj za bele dečke, ki vendarle morajo nekaj proizvesti v stroki, ki živi, paradoksalno, na račun svoje naravnosti proti establišmentu. Kljub temu da lahko zvenim cinično, ostro ali zaničljivo – ali ni do sedaj zadostovalo, da si na konferenci karkoli deteritorializiral (Ali nas ni prav Žižek poučil, da se resnica psihoanalize skriva v njenih pretiravanjih?), in so tvoje delo šteli za enako pomembno in nemara celo bistrournejše od dela temnopoltih žensk, protimperalistov, queera, protirasistov in postkolonialistov? Ali če se z drugimi besedami strokovno izrazim z Deleuzom: »Zavest *bisi lahko* laskala s tem, da je bila dejansko nekaj drugega od zavesti obstoječe prakse.« A vendarle se je nelagodje, ki ga je proizvedla deleuzovska kritika, nanašalo predvsem na načine njene elaboracije, njenega lastnega besednjaka, in ne na ustvarjene pojme, ki naj bi temeljili na zgodovini, hegemonistični seksualnosti, performativnosti družbenega spola, nastanku ras itd. Ne gre za to, da bi podcenjeval Deleuzovo delo, pač pa, kot bi dejal Adorno, za to, da bi to delo obvarovali pred njegovimi lastnimi pristaši. Moje delo o Deleuzu, ki predstavlja odgovor tako deleuzijcem kot Deleuzu samemu, je nastalo kot odgovor na strategijo, ki se je želela znebiti dialektike, opraviti z zgodbami o zgodovinskih bojih proti izkoriščanju, kakor tudi zbrisati dejstvo, da je ne glede na zelo raznoliko arhitekturo želja in/ali kulturnih formacij, vendarle obstajala tudi funkcija poenotenja s strani vrednostne forme, ki je bila zmožna vsem razlikam navkljub le-te zvesti na menjalno vrednost. Poleg tega sem želel, da bi analitični prostor upošteval estetsko in kulturno vlogo vse večje akumulacije kapitala, količino sedimentiranega mrtvega dela, ki je historično gledano brez primere in ki živi na račun živega dela. Strinjam se, da je potrebno poiskati nove strategije postajanja, ki bodo upoštevale razlike, a ne sprejemam, da bi prezrli sile praktičnega abstrahiranja in homogenizacije – zlasti kadar sedanost preganjajo tako žrtve daljne zgodovine kakor tudi zamolčane in morda nepredstavljive žrtve polpretekle zgodovine.

Temeljna lastnost filma zame ni ta, da zahteva izpopolnitev filozofskih kategorij, pač pa da je pomenila točko preloma, ki je vpeljala nov režim v politični ekonomiji. Obstaja način, da priznamo, da tako fizika kot metafizika tvorita temelj naših izrekanj, ne da bi pri tem povičevali fizike ali metafizike. To pa pomeni, da moj pristop k filmu ni zaobsegel samo različnega pojmovanja v zgodovinski vlogi vizualnega; šlo je za politično odločitev. Deleuze ima popolnoma prav, ko postavlja množične filmske deteritorializacije v samo središče filmskega delovanja, kar naj bi potemtakem predstavljalo temeljni problem miselnosti o filmu – a je pri tem spregledal pomen te deteritorializacije za razumevanje vrednosti forme in prav tako za oblike družbenosti. Skratka, zatrj je možno razumevanja, da so pripadale spremembe, ki jih je sam v okviru filozofije ustrezno zabeležil, pravzaprav sferi politične ekonomije, čeprav ga je prav

film, vsaj v primeru njegovih knjig o filmu, spodbudil k pisanju. Če se prav spomnim, sem v svojem prispevku *Capital/Cinema/Kapital/Film* zapisal: »Če vsaka posamezna relacija ne bi predstavljala potencialno ustvarjene vrednosti, kako bi lahko Deleuze sploh obstajal?«

M. G.: *Koliko vaš kinematični način produkcije temelji na tehnologiji novih medijev, ki jih v času nastanka omenjenih Deleuzovih knjig še nismo poznali? V kolikšni meri tehnologije medijev in digitalizacija pogojujejo vaš kinematični način produkcije in znotraj tega vaše pojmovanje in razumevanje časa in prostora v filmu danes?*

J. B.: Kinematični način produkcije je bil idejno zasnovan, preden so ljudje, ki niso bili del Pentagona, ali peščica računalniških frikov, množično slišali za internet. Delo o Vertovu se je začelo v letih 1989–90, o Eisensteinu pa leta 1991, ko je majhna skupina akademikov začela uporabljati elektronsko pošto. Intuitivna spoznanja, da lahko film v prenosu prispeva vrednost, so prihajala zlasti iz tistega, za kar si je po mojem mnenju prizadeval radikalni in revolucionarni film – za nekaj podobnega komunističnemu hkratnemu dekodiranju in kodiranju vidnega sveta. To ne pomeni, da so name vplivali zgolj komunisti – veliko sem se naučil tudi od Hitchcocka, Altmana, Antonionija, Yvonne Rainer, Marlene Gorris, Warhola, Mikea de Leona in veliko drugih. Kakorkoli že, Solanasov in Gettinov *Toward a Third Cinema/K tretjemu filmu* z idejo, da bi moral biti film katalizator misli, družbenih sprememb in stvaritve tistega, kar sta poimenovala »novi človek«, ter sovjetski in senegalski film, zlasti Sembène in Mambéty, latinsko-ameriški film, zlasti Patricio Guzman, filipinski film, zlasti Lino Brocka in Ishmael Bernal, ter francoski in italijanski filmski ustvarjalci, kot so Pasolini, Goddard in Pontecorvo, so mi pomagali uvideti, kaj je manjkalo ali je bilo izpuščeno v dominantni filmski produkciji, in da so tudi filmi želeli nekaj od nas. Sprva, predvidevam, in to sem (kmalu) spoznal, je šlo za denaturalizacijo z mediji posredovanega sveta, pozneje pa sem postal pozoren, da so bile moje zaznavne sposobnosti vprežene v nove ali nastajajoče družbene formacije. S spodkopavanjem konvencionalnih reprezentacijskih struktur, z oživljanjem preteklih ali marginalnih družbenih oblik in z ustvarjanjem novih izraznih modalnosti za sodobnost, ki nima mesta znotraj globalnega gospodovalnega sistema, je bilo mogoče občutiti lastno pripadnost revolucionarnemu programu na afektivni, estetski, ideološki, narativni in politični ravni. V mnogih od teh del je bila prisotna otipljiva reorganizacija želje, prostora, časa in zaznavanja realnosti. Filmi so generirali načine spoznanja, ki so omogočali analizo družbenih vidikov, ki je dobesečno presegala okvirje filma, a so se hkrati oklepali forme, ki jo je podoba prevzela. Z drugimi besedami, medtem ko so ti filmi ustvarjali nove prostore in reprezentacijske prakse, so popisovali tudi vizualne in imaginarne prostore in prakse, ki jih je Hollywood koloniziral, trg pa funkcionalno izkoristil. Pasolini, na primer, v svoji *Trilogiji življenja*, s katero je aktualiziral literarne zgodbe, kot so *Dekameron*, *Canterburyjske zgodbe* in *Tisoč in ena noč*, ni le razkril njihove daleč preveč humane vsebine, pač pa je s tem, da nam je omogočil vpogled v, tako rekoč, samo drobovje sprijene in erotične plati človeškega življenja, pokazal, da so ta literarna dela s tem, ko so postala klasika za buržoazno družbo, bila tudi učinkovito izpraznjena svoje subverzivne vsebine, popredmetena in dejansko spremenjena v pravo nasprotje literaturi. Gledano širše, so bili omenjeni filmski ustvarjalci, pa tudi veliko tistih, ki jih tukaj ne omenjam, aktivno udeleženi v boj za imaginarno, ki si ga je – vsaj tako se je takrat zdelo – polastilo simbolno kapitala ali pa revolucije.

V knjigi, ki sem jo napisal o filipinski vizualnosti, ki nosi naslov *Acquiring Eyes/Odpiranje pogleda* poskušam pokazati, da vizualnost na določeni točki procesa modernizacije predstavljala hkrati tudi sfero svobode. Z drugimi besedami, da je vizualnost pripadala skupnim dobrinam in bila nekaj zunanjega kapitalistični produkciji, in da so se moderni umetniki k njej obrnili potem, ko so jih matirale kapitalistične (in v primeru Filipinov tudi imperialistične) strategije nadzora, tako v okviru registrov materialnega kot simbolnega. Pomembno je bilo ustvariti način razumevanja vizualnega kot prostora odpora, saj se s tem implicira, da je odpor do prevladujočih materialnih razmer in simbolne logike njihove produkcije, tisto kar omogoča vizualno, in še več, da je to zunanje, ta sfera svobode posledično predmet spora in kolonizacije. Ideja o moderni vizualnosti, ki izhaja iz boja, je skladna s predpostavko, da delavci ne le gradijo sveta, pač pa tudi poganjajo inovacije. To je odgovor na vaše vprašanje o KNP in digitalnih tehnologijah, saj sem imel pri vnovičnem pregledu knjige, ki je več let odloženo samevala v predalu, mnogo priložnosti za premišljevanje, kako je film odprl prostor, ki so ga novi mediji od televizije, videa pa tja do računalnika in interneta dodatno razvili in razvejali. Strategije prenosa vrednosti na presečišču med telesom in družbenim strojem, ki jih poznamo kot »podobos«, so bile prenesene na drugo razvojno raven z digitalno spremembo uporabnosti zaslona. Kakorkoli že, internet in zlom tehnološke borze Nasdaq sta v poznih devetdesetih letih prejšnjega stoletja potrdila pozornost, ki so jo namenili teoriji vrednosti, ki sem jo razvil prek filma, kakor tudi potrditev o središčnosti zaslona pri organizaciji nastajajoče družbenosti.

M. G.: *Eden vaših najpomembnejših argumentov je, da kinematični način produkcije zaobide estetski moment v smislu sublimnega in ga, nasprotno, predstavlja kot obliko najbrutalnejšega sodobnega izkoriščanja. Na kakšen način kinematični način produkcije predstavlja najpreciznejšo povezavo med filmom, tehnologijo novih medijev, postfordistično delitvijo dela in globalnim kapitalizmom? Kakšne so možne oblike odpora proti tovrstnemu prepletu, ki poteka prek kapitalističnega izkoriščanja in kinematične digitalizacije?*

J. B.: Ideja, da je sublimno v kapitalizirani reprezentaciji hkrati zastavek in sredstvo izkoriščanja, je v nekaterih pogledih razširitev pojmovanj, ki izhajajo iz časa Frankfurtske šole. Zlasti Benjaminovo pojmovanje, da smo pod fašizmom izkusili naše lastno uničenje kot prvovrstni estetski užitek, ali kakor se v nekoliko drugačnem ključu glasi Adornova in Horkheimerjeva zbadljiva besedna igra iz njunega eseja »Kulturna industrija«: »Zabava‘ je zdravilna kopel.« Moje pojmovanje sublimnega je povezano z Benjaminovo idejo o šoku v njegovem eseju »Storyteller/Pripovedovalec.« Kakorkoli že, mnenja sem, da sedanji vznik ustvarjalnosti ne poganjajo prekinitve običajnih povezav izkušnje in časa, ki jih poznamo iz preteklosti kapitalizma in katere se niso dotaknile tradicionalnih vidikov družbe, pač pa da je za ta vznik pomemben nenaden pojav sublimnega, kot egouničujočega tehnosoka ali dojemanje lepega kot fašistično-nacionalnega/moškega/eroticizma. To so natanko tisti instrumenti,

ki preoblikujejo dušo gledalca in njegov zaznavni aparat. Če sem zelo jednat, Marinettijev manifest je zdaj del našega vsakdana, le-pota in sublimnost nasilja sta hkrati estetizacija politike in niz sredstev, s katerimi se nas – množico – privaja na nasilje (proti drugim in proti nam samim) in tako uničuje solidarnost. Če zadevo zastavim nekoliko drugače od tistega, kar sem doslej razvijal v svojih zapisih, lahko rečem, da postmoderno sublimno ni prišlo do »skrajne točke«, ko gre za določanje politik sublimnega trenutka. Na eni strani sublimno prinaša uničenje in dekonstitucijo ega, na drugi pa omogoča postajanje na način mazohizma, ki ga je razvil Deleuze. V prvem primeru gre torej za proces, ki ga diktira kapitalistična družba, katere namen je omejiti človeško psiho in jo preoblikovati pod strogimi kriteriji tako, da bo uporabna v vse bolj okrepljenih novih protokolih kapitalističnega sodelovanja (in prav tu se ujema s vsesplošno brutalnostjo in ubijalsko funkcijo svetovnega medijskega sistema), v drugem primeru pa bo ta isti proces kreativnega uničenja nemara celo potreben za ponovno ovrednotenje, ki bi lahko vodilo k skupnosti, preobrazbi in družbenim spremembam. Kakor pravi Jameson, kapitalizem moramo razumeti hkrati kot najboljšo in najslabšo stvar, ki se je človeštvu kdajkoli zgodila. V tem duhu (dialektičnem kajpak, ki vztraja pri protislovju in njegovi historičnosti) menim, da se od Benjaminovega odnosa do filma lahko veliko naučimo, saj je zanj film, čeprav je deloval z namenom, da bi uničil kultne vrednote, obenem uničil tudi kategorije kulturega, ki so bile pomembne za zgodnjo fazo buržoaznega humanizma, kot so avtentičnost, genij, kreativnost in osebnosti. Benjamin v eseju »Umetniško delo v času svoje tehnične reprodukcije« povezuje ohranjanje teh vrednot s fašizmom in pravi, da njihova uporaba vodi v obdelavo podatkov v fašističnem slogu. Tako obliko obdelave lahko še danes vidimo na plakatih večine muzejskih retrospektiv. Benjamin nadaljuje, da čeprav je film zmožen producirati revolucionarno kritiko, je bil takratni film (od Hollywooda do nacističnega prevzema mesta Weimarske republike) potisnjen v službo proizvodnje ritualnih vrednot (vključno s kultom osebnosti) in da je film uporaben samo, kolikor razumevanje njegovih procesov omogoča kritiko družbene vloge umetnosti. Ne pozabimo, da je po Benjaminovem mnenju ta kritika enaka zbirki orožja. Z drugimi besedami, Benjamin kljub reakcionarnemu značaju takratnega filma ni podcenjeval moči, ki jo je ta imel pri ukinjanju tradicije – in ker je bila takratna tradicija sestavljena iz več hierarhično razporejenih družb, je imelo to ukinjanje močan potencial, ki ga je morala revolucionarna kritika resno vzeti v obzir. Dejal bi, da smo danes, ko doživljamo ukinjanje zasebnosti, priča enakemu procesu, kjer je notranjost podvržena vrtoglavemu gibanju kolektivnih sil, ki se izražajo v obliki napetosti in nadzora. Medtem ko je glavni namen tega ukinjanja ohraniti zasebne lastninske odnose, bo nujno imelo tudi druge učinke, vključno z nastankom novih oblik kolektivnosti in odnosov med njimi, ki se trenutno kažejo na različne načine, med drugim v odnosih »drug do drugega«, v množtvu, v predindividualnih odnosih, v skupnem, množicah itd. V nekaterih pogledih smo razpeti med arhivom in sublimnostjo, med vsemi nepredstavljivimi človeškimi potenciali, različnostjo in potmi, ki izginjajo in nemara vsebujejo odrešilno moč, in visceralno, politehnično, kibernetično preobrazbo naše lastne biti. Morda se zdi paradoksalno, ampak pojmovanje vsakega naštetega kot znak nečesa drugega (atavističnega in računalniškega) nam morda vendarle daje neko smernico. Ukinjanje zasebnosti lahko vodi celo v ukinitev zasebne lastnine. Na nas je, da ugotovimo, ali se bo to zgodilo in kako.

Dr. Jonathan Beller je izredni profesor na oddelkih za anglistiko in humanistiko ter za kritične in vizualne študije na Inštitutu Pratt v New Yorku.

Jonathan Beller and Marina Gržinić DISCUSSING CONTEMPORARY CAPITALISM AND THE CINEMATIC MODE OF PRODUCTION

Jonathan Beller is one of the world’s most challenging theoreticians of film and new digitalized media productions at the present moment. His astute analyses are important as they show that new film/digital imageries are deeply reconfigured by the financialization processes of global capitalism. Financialization is not just the flip side (“the error”) of global capitalism, it is the mode of capitalization functioning through the whole of contemporary society from economics to aesthetics; it also encroaches on the means by which theory is conceived and re-produced. Reproduction of global capitalism has at its core the form of financialization of global capitalism that is the new condition of its im/possibility. Jonathan Beller’s cinematic mode of production presents the way in which financial capitalism reproduces itself within and through the digital/film industry by showing that the logic of exploitation and expropriation by capital today in arts and culture is not limited only to the realms of art and culture. What this means, and how the cinematic mode of production is to be understood, is not something obvious. On the contrary. Its operations (voraciously predatory) in the contemporary Hollywood film industry and elsewhere are to be presented clearly, otherwise the processes of financialization, which are the keys to the new orders of exploitation in the digital era, as well as to the maintenance of traditional forms of violence and expropriation inherited from prior eras, will remain masterly hidden. The discussion between us is just the beginning of a dialogue on this topic that will evolve in the future.

Marina Gržinić: *In your writing, in order to develop another way of understanding cinema, you coined “the cinematic mode of production.” In what does it consist? What is its connection with the capitalist mode of production? In which way do these two modes work hand in hand with each other? On what points do they differ?*

Jonathan Beller: The formulation “the cinematic mode of production” (CMP) is meant to indicate the positing of the visual and sensual realms as production sites for capital. In saying that “cinema brings the industrial revolution to the eye,” I meant that with the origin of cinema, assembly-line strategies for the production of commodities were directed at the eye for the production of images. With Taylorism (a technique of labor discipline and workplace organization based upon supposedly scientific studies of human efficiency and incentive systems,

begun around 1911), the cinema becomes an explicit tool for reorganizing prior production practices. It is possible to say that the (factory) chain montage becomes film montage – and then this montage is imposed upon the workplace. Taylor filmed multiple workers doing the same job at different times and in different locations, broke the job down into component parts and edited their movements together to assemble from all the variations “the one best way” to do a job. That “one best way” was then imposed upon workers by a managerial class that seized control of the shop floor. However, the organization of labor by cinematic processes goes much deeper than and far beyond simply affecting what we do at what used to be called work; indeed, it transforms perceptual experiences and processes into work. The cinema becomes a tool for the reorganization of the worker at every level of his or her experience and simultaneously converts this process of reorganization into an engine of value production. As I say in the CMP, in contemporary capitalism we must constantly retool ourselves, at the same time as we valorize (in the economic sense) media pathways. This retooling first posits and then presupposes a transformation in the form of value whilst simultaneously laying the groundwork for what the Italian theoreticians call “real subsumption,” the capture by capitalist production of formerly semi-autonomous processes that previously were formally outside of capitalist production. This capture extends beyond the work place into psycho-social life to the point where we confront the expropriation of what Virno calls the cognitive-linguistic capacities of humankind. In an Orwellian turn that I tried to articulate in my own work and continue to find persuasive, current thinking has it that our very utterances are merely the subroutines of capital scored by the general intellect that is at once the means and the material of our subjectification.

This colonization of the visual (and now the sensual) by capital, also to be thought in terms of the rise of visuality, is in my view one of the paradigmatic achievements of the long 20th century. Just as commodities transform our sensual experience (Marx says in the 1844 manuscripts that the forming of the five senses is a labor of the history of the world down to the present, and also that industry is the open book of human psychology), so too with images. Simmel showed how the organization of the modern metropolis affected consciousness, as well as how mass-produced objects changed the character of one’s perception and sensibilities. Andre Bazin (*What is Cinema?* (vol. 1), ed. and trans., Hugh Gray, University of California Press, Berkeley, 1971), wrote that “production by automatic means has radically affected our psychology... (p. 13),” and noted that for the surrealists, “every image is to be seen as an object and every object as an image (pp. 15–16).” So we have a convergence of object-function and image-function already implicit in commodity production, but it is the cinema, precisely as a culmination of the development of industrial technologies, that explicitly utilizes the visual pathway to re-organize sensory input for both state and market purposes. In the nominally anti-capitalist Soviet Union, Vertov spoke of “the communist decoding of the visible world” and “the encoding of the visible world,” while Eisenstein told us that a film was “a tractor plowing over the audience’s psyche,” and that the director’s job was “the organization of the audience with organized materials.” Stalin famously remarked that the filmmaker was an engineer of the soul. The interplay between images and objects, the role of both the built environment and visual technologies on the organization of the sensorium was explicitly recognized and deployed as a medium for the transformation of the state. The medium of this medium, as it were, was cinema. The story of Hollywood moguls, the studio system, the rise of advertising in the West, and the tremendous role of visual culture in the development of current market forces is a better known (if not well understood) story in the Euro-American (and now global) context.

One of the main purposes of the idea of the cinematic mode of production is to recognize this seizure of the visual by industrial, economic and political concerns, and to recognize that in the seizure of the visual, capital posits the visual (and now presupposes it) as a site for the production of value, and necessarily then, as a site of struggle. Revolutionary filmmakers went to the visual not because they were filmmakers, but because they were revolutionaries. It was in the visual that new battles were being fought. The choice of the visual was not simply because cinema was an ideologically influential medium, but rather, like the factory itself, the cinema was and remains a means of production.

So to sum up, the continuity of the CMP with the capitalist mode of production is to be grasped in the fact that the visual and visual technologies have become means for capitalist value production and the expropriation of labor. While there are various modes of capture and streams of value transfer (that go from the act of watching TV, to advertising, to legitimizing war), it is easy to see that the world that we live in today could not exist in its present form even for one day without the ubiquitous presence of the screen. All social activity is either directly organized by screens or indirectly impacted by them, from the clothes we wear to what we know how to say to what we put into our bodies. In other words, the horrors of capitalist society that include mass immiseration as the other side of massive capital accumulation, and colonialist and imperialist war, violent racialization, patriarchal domination and the organization of gulags and camps as the other side of liberal democracy, are still with us; but the means of production have shifted with growing problems of organization and management. Again to use Orwell’s formulation, we have had to develop the capacities of doublethink, required as we are in daily life both to know and not to know, to hold two contradictory ideas in our heads simultaneously while believing them both to be true. Visual culture, with its quickness and ability to short-circuit language function – and with it the figuration of contradiction as such by logic – has realized a fundamental requirement for totalitarian society expressed by Orwell when he writes: “stupidity was as necessary as intelligence and as difficult to attain.” Meanwhile, along with the liquidation of logic and the marginalization of linguistic traction on the movement of the real, the society of control has developed the capacity to regulate everything from thought to DNA, down to the atomic and even the quantum levels of matter. Thus the cinematic mode of production is to be understood as an intensification of the bourgeois form of the capitalist mode of production, a corkscrewing inwards and an extension outwards of the viral logic of the commodity form – that is, of dissymmetrical exchange to the point where it is necessary to speak not just of post-humanism, but of the post-human. That, of course, would entail thinking in a more detailed way about cinema and its intersection with other vectors including cybernetics, psychoanalysis, racism and imperialism, which makes it another conversation.

M. G.: *In order to formulate the cinematic mode of production, you also presented the critique of Deleuze’s two major books on cinema, The Movement-Image and The Time-Image. Could you synthesize your critique of Deleuze and expose the major differences between your and his conceptualization of cinema?*

J. B.: I would say that my relation to Deleuze is incomplete – in other words, I do not feel that my own work either exhausts or even fully digests Deleuze’s work. For example, I do not have a “take” on every concept he produces in the cinema books. While such a method of entering the fabric of a work and using what one needs is not inconsistent with Deleuze’s own ethos, it remains inconsistent with the professional demands of scholarship. Be that as it may, my use of the cinema books, books that I consider to be among the most important written on the medium, was an effort to recast Deleuze’s approach to cinema and, to be frank, to subsume his efforts, in my own. In a way, I was epistemologically bound to do this because, in my own view, cinema was itself being subsumed by capital (or perhaps subsuming capital? – it is too early and too dangerous to say). While some of the earliest inroads into the visual by cinema were avowedly (if not practically) anti-capitalist (as with Vertov and, more to the point, Eisenstein, as mentioned above), the cinema as a whole had, by the time of Deleuze’s writing, been captured as a means of capitalist production. Furthermore, this shift from what we could abbreviate as the explicitly material world to visual and virtual worlds as production sites, seemed to impose the need for new paradigms for the understanding of political economy. Thus, the break between the movement-image and the time-image, which Deleuze says, following perhaps the Benjamin of “The Storyteller,” occurs after World War II and coincides with a decreasing narratability of experience, becomes in my own view, not (I should say not only) the result of artists or film “thinkers” searching for new forms that would be adequate to their time (to the new experiences and properties of time itself) – that is, of forms that the philosopher might then produce concepts for; rather, the new films are composed out of social relations that themselves re-negotiate the shifting relation between the socius and the psycholinguistic abilities of the audience. For me, this shift was not primarily a sea change in consciousness that belonged to the domain of philosophy, but rather an event of great significance in the history of political economy and of social struggle. Thus, by removing the auteur from the cinema, (a functioning conceit that Deleuze embraces, but that I eschew in my chapter on his work), one takes a systems approach, and tracks shifts in the medium and in the social practices that pertain. The film-work then belongs to the collectivity rather than to the “thinkers,” as Deleuze calls his canonical filmmakers. As Comolli put it, one could say that it is the queues around the block that invent the cinema, and I was interested in what the people were making.

It is this idea of the reciprocity between film form and audience that licenses for my own work what is actually the most important move in relation to the Deleuzian approach to cinema. This involves, building on Metz, the recognition of the cinema as a social machine, a machine that is caught in a financial feedback loop with audiences. If this relationship, which passes through consciousness, the psyche, the economy and the image can, by its very functioning, produce new thoughts in the domain of philosophy, then quite clearly philosophy is no longer a privileged domain. It is a practice among others, one indicator of a dynamic that as a whole constitutes a larger cybernetic process.

It is here that I find Deleuze’s work limited and limiting. Not only because it confines itself to the analysis of the hundred or so geniuses of cinema, but because of its dual cathexis on films and on thought. My objection is not simply that this desire is aestheticizing or philosophically motivated, but rather that in order to construct itself thusly, it misses the historical role of cinema in its entirety. No fetishist can know the true nature of his or her object. In other words, Deleuze’s encounter confines itself to a rather narrow definition of cinema, in as much as it does not explore the global role of cinema as an emergent operating system for the coordination of the multiple variables of production. To do so, would of course historicize cinema in such a way that its formal innovations were linked primarily to social conditions, and this move would impinge upon the centrality of aesthetics and philosophy, casting them as subroutines in the operation of a larger system. It would also raise questions about the social and historical significance of the industrialization of the visual and require a dialectical mode of analysis. Deleuze gets around this immanent pressure – pressure that he perceives precisely by the stemming of his own thought in the face of the image – by muttering something to the effect of what he is doing in the cinema books is what philosophers do: produce concepts. But here, Marx’s challenge to the role of the philosopher sounds as fresh as ever, “Up to now, philosophers have only interpreted the world, the point, however, is to change it.”

Ultimately, this difference with Deleuze comes down to a difference regarding the explanatory power of the dialectic. The work of Deleuze, which has become exhibit for post-dialectical thinking, has also become a haven for white boys who need to have something to say in a profession whose bread and butter, paradoxically, is its anti-establishment aspirations. At the risk of being cynical, over harsh and dismissive (hey, didn’t Žižek teach us that the truth of psychoanalysis was to be found in its exaggerations), as long as you were de-territorializing something at a conference, then the work you were doing was assumed by some to be just as important and perhaps smarter than that of women of color, anti-imperialists, queers, anti-racists and post-colonials; in other words, in the professionalized utilization of Deleuze, “Consciousness *could* flatter itself that it really was something other than consciousness of existing practice.” But the edgy discomfort that much Deleuzian criticism generated was often only with the terms of its elaboration, its own vocabulary, rather than with received notions of history, hegemonic sexuality, gender performativity, racial formation, etc. This is not to disparage Deleuze’s work, only, as Adorno might say, to defend him against his devotees. My own work on Deleuze – work that was as much an answer to Deleuzians as to Deleuze, was a response to this strategy to make the dialectic go away, to displace the narratives of the historical struggle against exploitation, as well as to efface the reality that in spite of the massively variegated architecture of desire and/or cultural formations, there was also the homogenizing function of the value-form that was increasingly able to posit all difference as exchange-value. Furthermore, I wanted analytical space to consider the aesthetic and cultural role of the increasing accumulation of capital, the historically unprecedented amount of sedimented dead labor that took its toll on the living. Finding new strategies of becoming by moving through difference, yes, ignoring the forces of practical ab-

straction and homogenization, no – especially when the present was haunted both by the victims of past history and also the unrepresented and perhaps unrepresentable contemporary victims of living history.

For me, the decisive character of cinema was not that it demanded refinements in philosophy’s categories, but rather that it was the watershed for a new regime in political economy. There is a way of recognizing that both physics and metaphysics underlie all of our utterances without coronating either the physicians or the metaphysicians. This is to say that my approach to cinema involved not only differences regarding the historical role of the visual; it was a political choice. Deleuze was right to recognize the centrality of cinema’s massive de-territorializations, that cinema presented a profound problem for thought – but he misses the significance of that de-territorialization on the value-form and on forms of sociality. In short, he represses the fact that the transformations he chronicles in the domain of philosophy properly belong to the domain of political economy, even though, at least in the case of the cinema books, it is cinema itself that puts him to work. As I think I wrote in “Capital/Cinema,” “If every relation weren’t potentially productive of value, how could there have been a Deleuze?”

M. G.: *How much is your Cinematic Mode of Production based on new media technologies that were not present in the time of Deleuze’s writing of his two books? How much do new media technologies and digitalization frame your Cinematic Mode of Production and, within it, your conceptualization and understanding of time and space in cinema today?*

J. B.: The *Cinematic Mode of Production* was conceived before many people outside of the Pentagon and a few computer geeks had heard of the Internet. The work on Vertov was begun in 1989–90 and on Eisenstein in 1991, when a few academics were beginning to use email. The intuitions about cinema as an intervention in value transfer came principally from what I felt radical and revolutionary cinema was trying to accomplish – something along the lines of the communist decoding of the visible world combined with the communist encoding of the visible world. Not that all my influences were communists – I learned a great deal from Hitchcock, Altman, Antonioni, Yvonne Rainer, Marlene Gorris, Warhol, Mike de Leon, and many others. However, Solanas and Getino’s “Toward a Third Cinema,” with its idea that cinema was to be a catalyst for thought, social change and the creation of what they called the New Man, along with Soviet cinema, Senegalese cinema, particularly of Sembène and Mambéty, Latin American cinema, particularly Patricio Guzmán, Philippine cinema, particularly Lino Brocka and Ishmael Bernal, along with French and Italian filmmakers like Pasolini, Godard and Pontecorvo, taught me to think about what was absent or elided in dominant cinema, and also that films wanted something from us. The first moment, I suppose, was a denaturing of the mediated world which I had become conscious of, and the second was my experience of my perceptive faculties being harnessed to new or incipient social formations. Whether by destroying conventional representational structures, reanimating past or marginal social forms, or inventing new modalities of expression for a contemporary that had no place in the global dominant, one could feel oneself being enlisted as part of a revolutionary program at affective, aesthetic, ideological, narrative and political levels. There was in so much of this work a palpable reorganization of desire, of space, time and the perception of reality. The films also were generative of modes of cognition that could then be utilized to analyze aspects of society that were in a literal sense beyond their frames but nonetheless were relevant to the form that the image took. In other words, as they carved out new spaces and representational practices, these films also inventoried visual and imaginative spaces and practices that had been simultaneously colonized by Hollywood and functionalized by markets. Pasolini, for example, in his *Trilogy of Life*, animates the *Decameron*, the *Canterbury Tales* and the *Arabian Nights* in a way that reveals not only their all too human content but also, through their ultra visceral presentation of the untoward and erotic dimensions of human life, how, by being turned into classics for bourgeois society, literary works had effectively been liquidated of their subversive contents, reified and, indeed, turned into the very opposite of literature. In a long view, the filmmakers I mention here and many others were engaged in a battle for the imaginary, which was to be won by either the symbolic of capital or of the revolution – or so it seemed at the time.

In my book on Philippine visuality, *Acquiring Eyes*, I try to show how at a certain point in the modernization process, the visual was also a realm of freedom. In other words, that the visual was part of the commons, an outside of capitalist production that modern artists turned to when they were checkmated by capitalist (and, in the case of the Philippines, imperialist) strategies of control in the material and symbolic registers. Such an understanding of the visual as a space of resistance was important to establish because it suggests that it is resistance to the dominant material conditions and their enabling symbolic logics that opens the visual, and furthermore, that this outside, this realm of freedom is subsequently contested and colonized. This idea of modern visuality emerging out of struggle is consistent with the premise that it is not only the workers who build the world, but that it is workers who drive innovation. I bring this up in response to your question about the CMP and digital technologies, because as I revised that book after it sat re- and dejected in a drawer for many years, I had many occasions to reflect upon how it was cinema that opened up the spaces that new media, from television to video, to the computer, to the Internet, further developed and ramified. The strategies of value transfer at the interface between the body and the social machinery known as “the image” was being taken to another level of development in the digital modification of the utility of the screen. For me anyway, the Internet and the speculative Nasdaq explosion of the late 1990s was proof of both the attention given to the theory of value that I had derived from the cinema as well as confirmation of the centrality of the screen in the organization of emergent sociality.

M. G.: *One of your most important points is that your cinematic mode of production leave behind the understanding of the esthetical as the sublime, presenting it, on the contrary, as the form of today’s most brutal exploitation. In what way does, the cinematic mode of production presents the connection of cinema, new media technology, the post-Fordist division of labor and global capitalism? What are the possible forms of resistance against such an entanglement between capitalistic exploitation and cinematic digitalization?*

J. B.: The idea that the sublime in capitalized representation is at once a cipher and an engine of exploitation is in some respects an extension of Frankfurt school era insights. Specifically, Benjamin’s insight

that under fascism we experience our own destruction as an aesthetic pleasure of the first order, or, in a slightly different key, Adorno and Horkheimer’s acerbic quip from “The Culture Industry” essay, “Fun” is a medicinal bath.” My understanding of the sublime is also connected to Benjamin’s idea of shock in “The Storyteller” essay. However, rather than the interruptions of the ordinary textures of experience and time that are associated with an earlier stage of capitalism that left aspects of traditional society intact, the eruption of the sublime as ego-shattering techno-shock, or, for that matter, of the beautiful as fascist-nationalism/ masculinity/eroticism, are at present among the engines of creation – precisely, instruments for the remaking of spectators’ interiorities and perceptual machinery. To speak too briefly, Marinetti’s manifesto is now a commonplace, the beauty and sublimity of violence is both the aestheticization of politics and a set of tools for injuring us, the masses, to violence (against others and against ourselves) – it destroys solidarity. However, in a slightly different key from my prior writings, I might say that with the postmodern sublime, there may well be no “last instance,” when it comes to determining the politics of the moment of sublimity. On the one hand, with the sublime, there is annihilation and the de-constitution of the ego, on the other hand, there is becoming à la Deleuzian masochism – so on that first hand, you have a process that is ordained by capitalist society in the retrenchment of the human psyche reformed in very precise ways that can be functionalized by the

DEKOLONIALNOST/ DE-COLONIALITY

Subhabrata Bobby Banerjee ZGODOVINE ZATIRANJA IN GLASOVI ODPORA: K TEORIJ O TRANSLOKALNEM

V tem prispevku bom zastavil preprosto vprašanje: Če nekatere sodobne kapitalistične prakse vodijo v razlaščanje, marginalizacijo in smrt določenega prebivalstva, kateri prostori odpora so na razpolago skupnostim, ki bijejo boj za preživetje? Odgovori (če ti sploh obstajajo), kakor je to običajno pri večini najlažjih vprašanj, so zapleteni, zahtevni, včasih paradoksalni, drugič zaskrbljujoče nasilni ali pa nemara celo nemogoči. Ampak nezmožnost predstave drugih oblik sveta predstavlja še večji neuspeh domišljije, kakor sprejeti dejstvo, da četudi trenutni sistem ni popoln, »deluje« in se ga lahko »spremenī«. V tem besedilu želim pokazati, za koga sistem pravzaprav deluje, koga spreminja in kaj se spreminja, kdo vodi te spremembe in kakšne so njihove posledice.

V enem svojih predhodnih prispevkov sem na podlagi pojmov suverenosti in biomoči Giorgia Agambena, Achilleja Mbembeja in Michela Foucaulta razvil koncept nekrokapitalizma. Upoštevaajoč obstoj različnih tipov kapitalizma v današnji politični ekonomiji definiram nekrokapitalizem kot specifično kapitalistično prakticiranje načinov organizacijske akumulacije, ki vključujejo razlaščanje, smrt, mučenje, samomorilska dejanja, suženjstvo, uničenje sredstev za preživetje ter splošno organizacijo in upravljanje nasilja. Akumulacija prek razlaščanja je David Harvey označil za »novi imperializem«, ki je značilen za sodobno neoliberalno politično ekonomijo. Ta pa je neverjetno podobna Marksovemu opisu primitive akumulacije, ki je predhodnica industrijskega kapitalizma.

Država je odigrala ključno vlogo tako pri razvoju primitivne akumulacije kakor pri njeni preobrazbi v industrijski kapitalizem. Od časa Britanskega imperija, ko je Vzhodnoindijska družba osvajala ozemlja, zasejala zemljo, zasušnjevala prebivalstvo in vzpostavila kolonialna oporišča, da bi služila kralju in državi, do nastanka moderne suverene nacionalne države in njenega organizacijskega zbiralnika, to je transnacionalne korporacije, je bila vedno vojaška moč tisti dejavnik, ki je omogočal proces akumulacije. V dobi postkolonializma ima nacionalna država kot edini legitimni povzročitelj nasilja še vedno ključno vlogo v procesu akumulacije. A vendar ločnice med državno in tržno oblastjo niso jasno začrtane: vplivni tržni akterji, kot so transnacionalne korporacije, imajo običajno svojo »policijo« ali pa se poslužujejo zasebne vojske, da bi »zaščitile« svoje premoženje v tretjem svetu. Zasebne vojaške sile je ameriška vlada uporabljala med obema invazijama na Irak. Tako tudi med trenutno okupacijo Iraka zasebni vojaški izvajalci številčno presegajo vojaške sile zavezniških sil, razen ameriških.

Stari vzorci imperializma se kažejo v dominaciji neoliberalnih politik v sedanji globalni politični ekonomiji. Transnacionalne korporacije običajno izvajajo moč nad državami tretjega sveta tako, da jim obljubljajo tuje investicije in grozijo, da bodo te investicije ukinile ali preusmerile drugam. V zameno za tuje investicije in delovna mesta so korporacije od ubužanih in pogosto skorumpiranih vlad tretjega sveta izvlekle davčne koncesije, subvencije za električno energijo in vodo, minimalno okoljsko zakonodajo, rudo in naravne vire, pohlevno delovno silo in vzpostavitev posebnih ekonomskih con (PEC), ki v temelju predstavljajo izredna stanja, kjer se zakončasno ukine, da se omogoči nadaljevanje ekonomskega izkoriščanja. Tako namesto da bi razglasili smrt nacionalne države, kot zatrjujejo nekateri teoretiki globalizacije, je globalna ekonomija osnovana prav na sistemu nacionalnih držav. Neoliberalno globalizacijo lahko razumemo kot znamenje poslednjega hegemonističnega uspeha državnega načina proizvodnje. Nacionalna država je potemtakem temeljni vogelni kamen globalizacije, vpletena je v delovanje transnacionalnih korporacij, pri vzpostavitvi globalnega finančnega sistema, uvedbi politik, ki določajo mobilnost dela, in pri ustanovitvi večdržavnih institucij, kot so ZN, Mednarodni denarni sklad (IMF), Svetovna banka, NAFTA in Svetovna trgovinska organizacija (STO). Stopnja neprecedenčne vladne intervencije v globalno finančno krizo v Evropi, Severni Ameriki, Aziji in Avstraliji je tolikšna, da so neokonservativni krogi uzrli duh socializma in izrazili bojazen pred pojavom državno vodene ekonomije. Ali je finančna kriza zares odsev krize kapitalizma, ki se lahko odraža z dolgoročnim vnovičnim poseganjem države v ekonomsko proizvodnjo, ali gre kot običajno samo za posel, se bo še pokazalo, zlasti zdaj, ko se Nemčija, Francija in Združene države očitno izvijajo iz recesije.

Da bi bolje razumeli kontekst nekrokapitalističnih načinov akumulacije, ki rezultira v razlaščanju, izgubi osnovnih virov za preživetje in

ever intensifying new protocols of capitalist cooperation (and therefore coincides with the generalized brutality and murderous function of the world media-system), but on that other hand, the very same process of creative destruction may well be necessary for transvaluation, which could also mean communion, transformation and social change. As Jameson says about capitalism, we must understand it to be both the best and the worst thing that has ever happened to humanity. In this spirit (a dialectical one that insists upon contradiction and its historicity), I think there is more to learn from Benjamin’s attitude toward the cinema, which, for him, even as it worked to destroy cult values, also destroyed cultic categories precious to an earlier moment of bourgeois humanism, including authenticity, genius, creativity and personality. In “The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction” essay, Benjamin allies the preservation of these values with fascism and says that their deployment leads to a processing of data in the fascist sense. One can still see this form of processing on the placards of most museum retrospectives. Benjamin also says that although cinema is capable of revolutionary critique, the then-current cinema (from Hollywood to Weimar) is pressed into the service of the production of ritual values (including the cult of personality) and only useful in as much as an understanding of its processes enables a critique of the social role of art. And we should not forget, that in Benjamin’s view, this critique amounts to the assemblage of an arsenal. In other words, in spite of

smrti, se bom osredotočil na presečišče tržnih in državnih interesov. Ti ustvarjajo posebne izkoriščevalske režime, ki vodijo v konflikte med staroselskimi skupnostmi, transnacionalnimi korporacijami in vladami – takšni konflikti so prisotni v nekdanjih kolonijah Azije, Severne, Srednje in Južne Amerike, Afrike in Pacifika. Ti konflikti povzročajo nasilen izgon kmečkega prebivalstva, okoljsko uničenje, družbene premike in uničenje osnovnih virov za preživetje, pojavljajo pa se v demokratičnih državah, ne v vojaških diktaturah, kar terja vprašanje: Na kakšen način demokracija služi tem skupnostim? In če država in trg jemljeta skupnostim moč v demokratičnih družbah, kaj lahko storijo civilna družba in družbena gibanja, da se zoperstavijo takim praksam? Preden raziščemo ta vprašanja, predlagam, da podrobneje analiziramo nekatere nedavne konflikte, kjer je transnacionalni kapital v obliki multikorporacij uporabil »legitimno« nasilje države za prisilno premestitev, ohromitev in uničenje staroselskih in ruralnih skupnosti, da bi si s tem prilastil njihovo zemljo in iz nje ustvaril presežno vrednost.

Imperialistične formacije v sodobni politični ekonomiji so »učinkovitejše«, saj formalne kolonije ne potrebujejo nekoga, ki bi jim vladal. Imperializem se je naučil bolje upravljati stvari, tako da je vladanje prepustil elitam nekdanjih kolonij, večino imperialističnih poslov pa strukturni moči nadnacionalnih institucij, kot so Svetovna trgovinska organizacija, Svetovna banka, Mednarodni denarni sklad in trgi. Opisal bom tri načine upravljanja, ki omogočajo akumulacijo prek razlaščanja: upravljanje prek izkoriščanja naravnih virov, upravljanje prek izključevanja in upravljanje prek izгона.

Upravljanje prek izkoriščanja naravnih virov izhaja iz prekletstva obdarjenosti z naravnimi viri. Gre za obliko izkoriščanja, ki je dobro poznana med milijoni prebivalcev tretjega sveta, ki živijo v prekletstvu naftnega in rudnega bogastva. Izkoriščanje naravnih virov, kot sta nafta in ruda, po vsem svetu skoraj vedno spremljajo nasilje, okoljsko uničenje, razlastitve in smrt. Transnacionalne naftne družbe, vlade in zasebne varnostne sile so ključni akterji v teh conah nasilja, kjer so se skupnosti, nad katerimi se izvaja največje nasilje, prisiljene odpovedati suverenosti, avtonomiji in tradiciji v zameno za modernost in gospodarski razvoj, ki pa se jim nenehno izmikata. Družbe Shell v Nigeriji, Chevron v Ekvadorju, Rio Tinto v Papui Novi Gvineji, Barrick v Peruju in Argentini, Newmont Mining v Peruju, Vedanta Resources v Indiji in zapatistična vstaja v mehiškem Chiapasu je le peščica bolj znanih primerov »prekletstva obdarjenosti z naravnimi viri«. Trg, država, mednarodne gospodarske in finančne institucije so popolnoma vpletene v upravljanje prek izkoriščanja naravnih virov. Pokrajina Chiapas v Mehiki na primer proizvede 54 odstotkov hidroenergije v Mehiki, 21 odstotkov vse nafte in 47 odstotkov zemeljskega plina, hkrati pa je to najrevnejše območje v državi, kjer je 36 odstotkov prebivalstva prikrajšanega za pitno vodo, 35 odstotkov pa za elektriko. Na vsakih 1000 turistov je na voljo 7 hotelskih sob, na vsakih 1000 lokalnih prebivalcev pa 0,3 bolnišničnih postelj. V eni od najbogatejših pokrajin z naravnimi viri v tej državi, ki predstavlja vir bogastva celotne države, 71,6 odstotkov staroselcev trpi zaradi podhranjenosti, 14.500 pa jih letno umre. Transnacionalne korporacije izkoriščajo bogastva v Chiapasu z izkopavanjem rude, sekanjem gozdov in turizmom na račun lokalnih skupnosti, ki imajo to nesrečo, da »živijo« v tej pokrajini. Leta 1994 se je na tisoče prebivalcev Chiapasa uprlo mehiški vladi z oboroženo vstajo in začasno prevzelo pokrajinsko glavno mesto San Cristobal. Mehiška vlada se je odzvala z vojaško akcijo in po nekaj spopadih upornikom ponudila »pogojno oprostitev«. Vodje zapatistov so se odzvali na ponudbo mehiške vlade s pismom, ki se glasi »Kdo bi moral prositi za oprostitev in kdo bi moral oprostitev izreči?«

Čemu bi morali biti oproščeni? Kaj nam boste odpustili? Da nismo umrli od lakote? Da ne molčimo v revščini? Da ne ponižno sprejemamo vloge prezrtih in izobčenih, ki nam jo nalaga zgodovina? Da smo celotni državi in vsemu svetu dokazali, da človekovo dostojanstvo še živi, pa četudi v enem izmed najrevnejših prebivalstev sveta?

Pismo se zaključi z izjavo zapatistov, da bi morala država prositi za odpuščanje, o čemer bi zapatisti z veseljem premislili. S situacijo, ki je nastala, trg ni bil pretirano zadovoljen. V memorandumu z naslovom »Mehika – politična posodobitev« je Chase Manhattan Bank, največja finančna ustanova mehiške vlade, sklenila, da »mora vlada zatreti zapatiste, da pokaže učinkovitost nadzora nad nacionalnim ozemljem in varnostne politike.« Skratka, mednarodne finance in infrastruktura sta glavni zahtevi, ki omogočata »razvoj« v »nerazvitih« območjih, kjer morajo vlade zagotoviti »učinkovit nadzor in varnost«, kar pomeni, da se mora določene skupnosti »izničiti«. To je nekrokapitalizem.

Upravljanje prek izključevanja izhaja iz prekletstva demokracije in je še ena izmed praks, ki se pogosto uporablja pri vladanju v politični

the reactionary character of the cinema of his time, Benjamin did not underestimate its power to liquidate tradition – and since that tradition was in fact composed of the many traditions of hierarchical societies, that liquidation had a tremendous up side that had to be taken seriously by revolutionary critique. I would say that the same is true for our current moment – we are living through the liquidation of privacy – in which interiority is subject to the vertiginous movement of collective energies in the form of intensities as well as surveillance. While the dominant function of this liquidation is to preserve private property relations, it will necessarily have other effects, including the emergence of new forms of collectivity and collective relations currently being figured in a variety of ways, including peer 2 peer, the multitudes, the pre-individual, the commons, the swarm, etc. Thus, in some respects, we are between the archive and sublimity, all of the incredible human potentials, diversity and pathways that are being lost and may yet contain some saving power, and the visceral, polytechnic, cybernetic transformation of our very being. It may sound paradoxical, but seeing each as a sign of the other (the atavistic and the computational) may well offer us some guidance. The liquidation of privacy may also lead to the liquidation of private property. It is up to us to find out if and how.

Dr. Jonathan Beller, Associate Professor in English and Humanities, Critical and Visual Studies, Pratt Institute, New York.

ekonomiji. Med pogajanji, ki so vodila h Kjotskemu protokolu, je bila eni od zadolženih skupin dodeljena naloga, da razvije globalno gozdarsko politiko, ki bo urejala upravljanje gozdov in pogozdovanje in s tem popravila škodo, ki jo povzročajo emisije toplogrednih plinov. Zavedajoč se posledic nemirov, ki so spremljali srečanja Svetovne trgovinske organizacije leta 1999 v Seattlu, in podobnih nemirov ob Svetovnem ekonomskem forumu v Davosu, Genovi in Melbourneu, so organizatorji, da se njihova politika navzen ne bi pokazala kot izključevalna, poleg korporacij, oblikovalcev politike in znanstvenikov k pogovoru povabili tudi okoljevarstvene organizacije, sindikate in skupnostne organizacije. A v prizadevanju, da bi ustvarili globalno gozdarsko politiko, so pozabili povabiti predstavnike več milijonov ljudi, ki v teh gozdovih živijo – to so predvsem staroselska plemena. Tako so ta priredila svoje lastno srečanje o klimatskih spremembah in na Mednarodnem staroselskem forumu o klimatskih spremembah (*International Indigenous Forum on Climate Change*) razglasila svojo lastno resolucijo: Ukrepi za lajšanje klimatskih sprememb, o katerih trenutno potekajo pogajanja, temeljijo na svetovnem pojmovanju ozemelj, ki gozdove, zemljišča, morja in posvečene kraje obravnava zgolj v smislu njihove zmožnosti absorpcije ogljika. Tako pojmovanje teh ukrepov in njihovo izvajanje negativno vpliva na življenje staroselskega prebivalstva in krši naše temeljne pravice in svobodčine, zlasti pravico do povrnitve, vzdrževanja, upravljanja in uporabe naših zemljišč, ki so navedena in opredeljena v aktih Združenih narodov.

Za staroselce, ki živijo v tej pokrajini, gozdovi ne predstavljajo le ponorov ogljika, pač pa jim pomenijo vir prehrane, življenja, zdravstva, dom, kulturo, družbo, obliko institucionalne ureditve in ekonomijo. Globalna trgovina in okoljske politike se pogosto izvajajo brez upoštevanja nasilja nad staroselskimi skupnostmi in njihovim razlaščanjem, čeprav je to nasilje posledica let istih politik. Nesmiselno je razpravljati o vprašanih pravice do gozdov, če gozdov več ni. Razlastitev lokalnih skupnosti pa izpostavlja tudi spodrsrljaj trga in države, saj »državljanī demokraciīnih dr̄zav nimajo pravice odločanja o svoji prihodnosti. To je nekrokapitalizem.

Upravljanje prek izгона izhaja iz prekletstva razvoja, ki obsega prisilen izgon staroselskega prebivalstva z namenom, da se ustvari prostor za infrastrukturne in energetske projekte. Po nekaterih ocenah je v Indiji od leta 1947 med 30 in 50 milijoni ljudi zaradi zaježitvenih projektov ostalo brez zemlje. Zaježitveni projekt Sardar Sarovar bo, ko bo enkrat zaključen, povzročil izselitev 400.000 staroselcev. Gospodarske »reforme« in politika prestrukturiranja, ki jih diktirajo nadnacionalne institucije, kot so Svetovna trgovinska organizacija, Svetovna banka in Mednarodni denarni sklad, se pogosto končajo z izgonom lokalnih skupnosti in njihovo razlastitvijo. Tako so na primer kmetijske »reforme« in liberalizacija trgovine (kmetijski trgi se v tretjem svetu »liberalizirajo«, v prvem pa ščitijo) neposredno povezane z 260-odstotnim porastom samomorov kmetovalcev v Indiji. Leta 2005 je bilo zabeleženih 520 takih primerov v Vidharbhi, največji pokrajini pridelovanja bombaža v Indiji. Več samomorov je bilo v tistih območjih, kjer se prideluje izdelke za trg, kakor pa v tistih, kjer se prideluje hrana. Medtem ko je februarja 2006 le šest novinarjev poročalo o »samomorih kmetovalcev«, se je v istem obdobju 512 novinarjev prerivalo v Mumbaju ob tednu mode Lakme Fashion Week, kjer so se manekenke sprehajale v najnovejših elegantnih oblačilih, narejenih iz bombaža, ki ga pridelujejo kmetje, ki manj kot 500 kilometrov stran delajo samomore. Zaskrbljena zaradi povečanja samomorov med revnimi kmetovalci je indijska vlada na ta območja poslala ekipe psihiatrov, ki so kmetovalcem in njihovih družinam svetovali, kako »obvladovati stres«. Neki mlajši kmetovalec, čigar oče je naredil samomor zaradi vse večjih dolgov, je psihiatrom povedal takole: »Prišli ste sem in nas obsuli z vprašanji in odgovori. Svetovali ste, naj ne pijemo, naj ne pretepamo svojih žena, naj izvajamo jogo, da bomo obvladovali stres. A nikoli nas niste vprašali, kako je mogoče, da kmetovalci, ki državo oskrbujejo s hrano, trpijo takšno lakoto.«

Joseph Stiglitz, nekdanji podpredsednik Svetovne banke in nekdanji favorit neoliberalnega establišmenta, danes pa njihov nasprotnik, je izjavil, da je Svetovna banka s svojo politiko gospodarskega razvoja »na račun zategovanja pasov med revnimi uspela odpeti pasove med bogatimi«. To je nekrokapitalizem.

Kako se skupnosti upirajo tem dolgim in nasilnim zgodovinom zatiranja? Staroselske skupnosti v Avstraliji, Afriki, Severni, Srednji in Južni Ameriki in v azijskem Pacifku se s transnacionalnimi korporacijami in svojimi vladami borijo za naravne vire. Če analiziramo te konflikte, pridemo do nekaterih skupnih zaključkov. Prvič, skupnosti, ki so vpletene v boj za preživetje, izkazujejo veliko željo po tem, da bi preprečile vmešavanje trga in države v staroselsko politično

ekonomijo. Drugič, večina teh skupnosti se skoraj vselej »bori do smrti«. Tretjič, ta odporniška gibanja se ne uvrščajo med mednarodna, transnacionalna ali globalna, pač pa so povsem translokalna: to so lokalne skupnosti, živeče v demokratičnih družbah in vpletene v konflikte tako z državo kot s trgom, občasno pa tudi s »civilno družbo«, medtem ko se hkrati povezujejo z drugimi odporniškiimi gibanji po vsem svetu.

Participatorna demokracija in prevzem odgovornosti sta ključna pri razvoju translokalne politike. Ne nazadnje je usklajevanje gospodarskih, okoljskih in socialnih interesov naloga politike, saj so v to vpletene strukture in procesi moči. Glavno vprašanje, s katerim se sooča translokalna demokratična politika, je, kako ustvariti oblike moči, ki bodo bolj usklajene z načeli ekonomske demokracije. V sodobni politični ekonomiji je na milijone ljudi, ki živijo »demokracijo brez izbire«, kjer kot državljani suverenih držav sicer lahko volijo, da bi zamenjali vladajoče politične stranke, imajo pa bolj malo ali nič vpliva na ekonomsko politiko, ki omejuje ali ukinja njihove zmogljivosti in pravice. Potemtakem ima vladanje na translokalni ravni manj opraviti s tem, kako korporacije prodirajo v civilno družbo ali vzpostavljajo dialog z njenimi akterji, in bolj s tem, kako marginalizirane in ubožane skupnosti, ki se ne uvrščajo med korporacijske, državne ali tržne akterje, lahko zagotovijo, da bodo njihove pravice zaščitene znotraj neke demokratične ureditve. A kljub temu da ima civilna družba ključno vlogo v tem procesu, pa nimajo vse pokrajine v svetu vzpostavljene civilne družbe in ustreznih institucij, ki bi se bile zmožne pogajati z državnimi in tržnimi akterji.

Partha Chatterjee trdi, da gre pri pojmu civilne družbe pravzaprav za sterilen koncept zahodnjaškega srednjega razreda. Po njegovem mnenju v primeru današnje demokracije ne moremo govoriti o vladavini, ki jo vodijo in sestavljajo ljudje ali ki bi delovala v korist ljudi, pač pa prej o politiki vladanih. V mnogih predelih sveta civilna družba izključuje politično družbo, ki jo tvorijo prebivalci, ki naj ne bi bili njeni »ustrezni« člani ali »pravi« državljani demokratične nacionalne države – to so nelegalni migranti, neregistrirani tujci, nelegalni skvoterji, nelegalni uporabniki vode, elektrike in javnega prevoza. K slednjim bi dodal tudi staroselske skupnosti iz različnih predelov sveta, katerih pokrajine so danes pravzaprav konfliktne cone, imperialistična in kolonialna izredna stanja, kjer je dovoljena akumulacija presežne vrednosti na račun smrti in razlaščanja. V bližnji prihodnosti se bo politična družba še bolj razširila, saj bomo imeli po nekaterih ocenah od 20 do 40 milijonov novih klimatskih beguncev, to pomeni, da bomo imeli novo kategorijo politične družbe, ki ji bo treba »vladati«. Translokalno torej vznikne na presečišču politične in civilne družbe, kjer skupine ljudi, ki predstavljajo politično družbo v različnih predelih sveta, bijejo podoben boj za naravne vire proti tržnim in državnim akterjem.

Če so tržni in državni akterji odgovorni za konflikte zaradi naravnih virov, potem si morajo skupnosti izboriti pravice nad temi viri – v primeru staroselskih skupnosti ne gre za lastninske pravice posameznikov, pač pa za pravice skupnosti. Največji izziv teorije translokalnega odpora je uresničiti nemogoče, to je ustvariti demokratičnost, ki bo presegala suverenost nacionalne države in morda celo državljanstvo samo. Translokalni subalterni odpor potrebuje nekakšno obliko translokalne suverenosti, koncept, ki ga bo treba podrobno razdelati tako s teoretičnega kot političnega stališča. Kljub vsemu institucije danes vsaj deloma priznavajo težek položaj, v katerem živijo staroselske skupnosti po vsem svetu. Generalna skupščina Združenih narodov je priznala obstoj zgodovine kolonizacije in razlaščanja staroselskih skupnosti po vsem svetu in leta 2007 sprejela Deklaracijo o pravicah staroselcev. Deklaraciji so se ostro uprle Avstralija, Kanada, Nova Zelandija in ZDA, države, ki so odgovorne za genocid staroselcev (Avstralija je Deklaracijo podpisala leta 2009). Petinštirideset od šestinštiridesetih členov Deklaracije ZN podeljuje staroselcem pravico do samoodločanja na področju »razvoja in uporabe njihovih zemljišč ali ozemelj in drugih virov«, a od držav hkrati zahtevajo, da pridobijo »njihovo proustvoljno in obveščeno soglasje, preden se lotijo kateregakoli projekta, ki zadeva zemljišča, ozemlja in druge vire, še zlasti, če gre za razvoj, uporabo rudnin, vodnih ali drugih virov in njihovo izkoriščanje«, ter da zagotovijo ustrezne ukrepe za »zmanjšanje škodljivih okoljskih, gospodarskih, družbenih, kulturnih ali duševnih posledic«. V posmeh tem veličastnim vizijam o pravicah staroselcev pa je sklepni člen Deklaracije, kjer je zapisano, da se »noben člen te Deklaracije ne razlaga tako, kot da namiguje, odobrava ali spodbuja katerokoli dejanje, ki bi delno ali v celoti spodkopalo ali oškodovalo ozemeljsko celovitost ali politično enotnost suverenih in neodvisnih držav«.

Težko je pričakovati, da bodo pravice staroselskih skupnosti do samoodločanja in razvoja zagotovljene, ne da bi razrešili problem državne suverenosti. Translokalne politične režime sestavljajo državni, tržni in civilnodružbeni akterji, ki razpolagajo z večstopenjsko strukturo moči in privilegiranimi državljanskimi pravicami. Politične družbe lahko vplivajo na legitimnost in moč transnacionalne civilne družbe, da bi zaščitile svoje pravice, če državi ali trgu spodleti. Novejša odporniška gibanja so poskusila doseči prav to, a so bila različno uspešna. V indijski zvezni državi Orissa trenutno poteka odmevnejši konflikt, kjer je moč države in trga, ki se izraža v multinacionalni rudarski korporaciji Vedanta Resources, usmerjena proti plemenskim skupnostim Dongria Kondh, ki naseljujejo tamkajšnje hribovje Niyamgiri. Korporacija, ki tam gradi rudnik boksita, se sooča z ognjevitim odporom staroselskih skupnosti. Te se pritožujejo, da rudnik zaradi onesnaževanja kmetovalcem onemogoča obdelovanje polj, uničuje njihov pridelek, pobija živino in pospešuje širjenje novih bolezni. Naravnost perverzno ironično je, da je družba Vedanta v začetku tega leta prejela Zlatega pava za okoljsko upravljanje – 2009, ker naj bi prispevala k varovanju okolja. Konflikt, kakor v večini primerov, kjer so vpleteni naravni viri, se je sprevrgel v krvav spopad, saj se je država v imenu trga poslužila svojega »legitimnega« nasilja z uporabo oboroženih policijskih sil. »Obveščeno soglasje« in »pravice do razvoja« se razblinljajo pod težo državne suverenosti in korporativne moči ter izpostavljajo temeljno neskladnost med staroselskimi in državnimi/tržnimi interesi.

Anil Agarwal, predsednik družbe Vedanta Resources, je o svoji korporativni strategiji povedal naslednje: »Verjamemo, da bodo naša strategija in poslovni cilji izkoristili indijska visoko kakovostna rudna bogastva z nizkimi razvojnimi stroški, kar bo Indijo uvrstilo med vodilne predevalce kovin in rud v svetu.«

Jitu Jakaka, plemenski starešina, ki se bori proti rudarski korporaciji, je svoj boj opisal takole: »Lahko nam prerežete vratove, lahko nas obglavite, a družbi Vedanta tega ne bomo dovolili za nobeno ceno. Borili se bomo z orožjem in odgnali vsakogar, ki bo stopil na našo zemljo. Brez Niyamgirija si življenja sploh ne predstavljamo. Če nam vzamete goro, bo z nami konec. Izgubili bomo dušo. Gora Niyamgiri je naša duša. Če izgubimo goro, bo naša duša umrla.«

To neskladje pogledov o pomenu zemlje odražata temeljni protislovji Deklaracije ZN o pravicah staroselcev: edini način, da bi staroselci iz Orisse zaščitili svoje pravice, je ta, da država preda suverenost pokrajini, staroselske skupnosti pa si zagotovijo lastniške pravice nad zemljo in naravnimi viri. Enačenje prispodobе gore Niyamgiri kot »duše« staroselcev ni najbolj učinkovita uporaba »sredstev«, ki omogočajo izkoriščanje presežne vrednosti za potrebe trga. Na ta način postane uničevanje duš in teles skupnosti, ki se borijo proti prekletstvu obdarjenosti z naravnimi viri, nujni pogoj za ustvarjanje »bogastva«. Kakor je pred več kot sto leti povedal stari mislec: »V dvoboju vedno zmaga močnejši.«

Podoben boj se odvija tudi na drugi hemisferi, na drugem kontinentu – globoko v amazonski džungli Peruja in Ekvadorja. Odločitev perujske države, da bo 72 odstotkov državnega pragozda in naravnih virov v perujski Amazoniji namenila črpanju nafte, sekanju gozdov in kopanju rud brez posvetovanja s staroselskimi prebivalci, je le-tos sprožila nasilne in krvave proteste, ki so se končali z masakrom neoboroženih staroselskih protestnikov s strani perujske vojske. Gospodarska rast Peruja v zadnjih letih je komaj kaj prispevala k blagostanju staroselskih prebivalcev (ti štejejo skoraj polovico prebivalcev celotne države), saj 40 odstotkov staroselcev živi v strašanski bedi. Da bi upravičil napade na staroselsko prebivalstvo Amazonije, je perujski predsednik Alan Garcia povedal naslednje: »40.000 domorodcev nima pravice, da 28 milijonom Perujcem prepove dostop do svoje zemlje. Gre za zaroto, ki želi državi onemogočiti uporabo lastnih naravnih virov, ki jo skrbi za dobrobit, razvoj in kakovost življenja svojih ljudi. A vprašajte se: Kdo bo imel koristi, če Peru ne bo mogel izkoriščati zemeljskega plina? Kdo bo imel koristi, če Peru ne najde novih najdišč nafte? Odgovor je znan. Najpomembneje je lokalizirati mednarodne mreže, ki so nastale z namenom, da netijo nemire«.

Te nove vojne cone po svetu ponazarjajo translokalne boje za naravne vire, kjer se je politična družba, soočena s krizo razvoja, znašla v boju proti tržnim in državnim silam. Ravno prek analize »mednarodnih mrež, ki so nastale z namenom, da netijo nemire«, se lahko razvije teorija in politika translokalnega. Daleč od tega, da smo demokratični državljani, ki jih štiti država, ki jim služi trg in ki jih zagovarja civilna družba – soočeni smo s političnimi družbami, ki ne samovoljno pristajajo na te pogoje, marveč so vanje prisiljene za ceno izkoriščanja bogastva v korist »obče javnosti«, »države« ali »družbe«. Ti konflikti predstavljajo nov ekonomski in kulturni »imperializem brez kolonij«, kjer imperialistično politiko v pretežni meri vodijo tržne institucije. Državlani lahko postanejo državljani s pravico do državne zaščite, samo če proizvajajo menjalno vrednost. V nasprotnem primeru jih je treba ubiti zavoljo napredka in razvoja. Politična suverenost je tako podrejena korporativni suverenosti, namesto politike pa o prihodnjih vojnih conah odloča ekonomija izkoriščanja, izgona in izključevanja.

Če naj presežemo neuspeh kolektivne domišljije, moramo ponovno premisliti prostore, ki so »nastali z namenom, da netijo nemire«. Le tako bomo morda ponudili vizije, ki bodo omogočile predstavo o prihodnosti, kjer trajnostni razvoj ne bo pomenil trajnostnega razvoja korporacije, kjer strukturna prilagajanja ne bodo pomenila zategovanje pasu med revnimi in odpenjanje pasu med bogatimi, kjer biotehnologija ne bo iz raznolikosti življenja reproducirala uniformnosti, kjer izvoz hrane ne bo vodil v večanje bruto domačega proizvoda, medtem ko bodo otroci stradali, kjer se ne bo porabilo milijarde dolarjev za razvijanje zdravila za plešavost in impotenco, medtem ko bo na milijone ljudi umiralo zaradi malarije in tuberkuloze. A to je že druga zgodba.

Subhabrata Bobby Banerjee je profesor poslovnega upravljanja in prodekan za raziskovanje na Poslovni šoli, Univerza Zahodni Sydney, Avstralija.

Viri:
Achille Mbembe, "Necropolitics," v: *Public Culture* 15/1, 2003, str. 11–40.
Ann L. Stoler, "On degrees of imperial sovereignty," v: *Public Culture*, 18 /1, 2006, str. 125–145.
David Harvey, *A brief history of neoliberalism*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2005.
Giorgio Agamben, *Homo Sacer: Sovereign power and bare Life*, Stanford University Press, Stanford, 1998.
Giorgio Agamben, *State of exception*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 2005.
Michel Foucault, *The history of sexuality*, 1. zvezek, Random House, New York, 1978.
Michel Foucault, *Power/knowledge: selected interviews and other writings*, Pantheon, New York, 1980.
Partha Chatterjee, "Empire and nation revisited: 50 years after Bandung," v: *Inter-Asia Cultural Studies*, 6/4, 2005, str. 487–496.
Subcomandante Marcos and the Zapatista Army of National Liberation, *Shadows of tender fury: The letters and communiqués of Subcomandante Marcos and the Zapatista Army of National Liberation*, Monthly Review Press, New York, 1995.
Subhabrata B. Banerjee, "Who sustains whose development? Sustainable development and the reinvention of nature," v: *Organization Studies*, 24/1, 2003, str. 143–180.



Subhabrata Bobby Banerjee HISTORIES OF OPPRESSION AND VOICES OF RESISTANCE: TOWARDS A THEORY OF THE TRANSLOCAL

In this article I want to ask a simple question: if some contemporary capitalist practices lead to dispossession, marginalization and death of certain populations, then what venues of resistance are available to communities engaged in livelihood struggles? The answers (if indeed there are any), as tend to be the case for most simple questions, are complex, challenging, sometimes paradoxical, at other times troublingly violent, perhaps even impossible. But not attempting to imagine other worlds is a greater failure of the imagination than accepting the fact that while the current system is not perfect, it "works" and can be "fixed." What I want to do in this article is to show for whom the sys-

tem works, who and what is being fixed, who does the fixing and the consequences of this fixing.

In one of my earlier papers I developed the concept of necrocapitalism drawing on the works of Giorgio Agamben, Achille Mbembe and Michel Foucault's notions of sovereignty and biopower. While acknowledging the existence of different types of capitalisms in today's political economy, I define necrocapitalism as specific capitalist practices of modes of organizational accumulation that involve dispossession, death, torture, suicide, slavery, destruction of livelihoods and the general organization and management of violence. Accumulation by dispossession has been described by David Harvey as the "New Imperialism" that characterizes the contemporary neoliberal political economy, which bears a striking resemblance to Marx's description of primitive accumulation that preceded industrial capitalism.

The state played a crucial role both in the development of primitive accumulation and its transformation to industrial capitalism. From the days of the British Empire, where the East India Company conquered territories, pillaged lands, enslaved populations and set up colonial outposts to serve king and country, to the emergence of the modern sovereign nation-state and its organizational accumulator, the transnational corporation, military strength was always an enabling factor of the accumulation process. In the postcolonial era, the nation-state as the only legitimate purveyor of violence continues to play a key role in the accumulation process. However, the lines between state authority and market authority are not clearly defined: powerful market actors like transnational corporations often have their own "police" or use private militias to "protect" their assets in the Third World. Private military forces were used by the United States government during both invasions of Iraq, and in the current occupation of Iraq private military contractors outnumber military forces of all allied forces with the exception of the United States.

Old patterns of imperialism can be seen in the dominance of neoliberal policies in today's global political economy. Transnational corporations often wield power over Third World countries through their enticements of foreign investment and their threats to withhold or relocate their investments. In return for foreign investments and jobs, corporations are able to extract from impoverished and often corrupt Third World governments tax concessions, energy and water subsidies, minimal environmental legislation, minerals and natural resources, a compliant labor force and the creation of Special Economic Zones (SEZ) which are essentially states of exception where the law is suspended in order for the business of economic extraction to continue. Thus, rather than marking the death of the nation-state as some theorists of globalization like to argue, the global economy is premised precisely on a system of nation-states. Neoliberal globalization can be seen as a marker for the final hegemonic triumph of the state mode of production. The nation-state then is a fundamental building block of globalization, in the working of transnational corporations, in the setting-up of a global financial system, in the institution of policies that determine the mobility of labor, and in the creation of the multi-state institutions such as the UN, IMF, World Bank, NAFTA and WTO. The unprecedented scale of government intervention in response to the global financial crisis in Europe, North America, Asia and Australia has been such that neoconservative circles have invoked the specter of socialism and the fears of the emergence of a state-run economy. Whether the financial crisis is indeed a reflection of the crisis in capitalism that could result in long-term re-engagement of the state in economic production or whether it will be business as usual remains to be seen, especially now that Germany, France and the United States appear to be coming out of recession.

In order to better understand the context of necrocapitalist modes of accumulation that result in dispossession, loss of livelihood and death, I want to focus on the intersection of market and state interests that create particular extractive regimes leading to violent conflicts between Indigenous communities, transnational corporations and governments – conflicts that are occurring in the former colonies in Asia, the Americas, Africa and the Pacific. These conflicts involve forceful expulsion of peasant populations, environmental destruction, social dislocation and loss of livelihood and are all occurring in democratic countries, not in a military dictatorship, which begs the question: in what way is democracy serving these communities? And if the state and market produce disempowering outcomes for communities in democratic societies, what can civil society and social movements do to resist such practices? Before we explore these questions, let us take a look at some recent conflicts where transnational capital in the form of multinational corporations deploy the "legitimate" violence of the state to forcibly relocate, maim or kill Indigenous and rural communities in order to extract surplus from their land.

Imperial formations in the contemporary political economy are more "efficient" in the sense that formal colonies no longer need to be governed. Imperialism has learned to manage things better by using the elites of the former colonies to do the governing, and the structural power of supranational institutions like the World Trade Organization, World Bank and International Monetary Fund and markets to do much of the imperial work. I will describe three modes of management that enable accumulation by dispossession: management by extraction, management by exclusion and management by expulsion.

Management by extraction arises from the endowment curse and is an all too familiar discourse for millions of people in the Third World living under the oil curse and the minerals curse. Extraction of oil and minerals in many parts of the world is almost always accompanied by violence, environmental destruction, dispossession and death. Transnational oil companies, governments, private security forces are all key actors in these zones of violence and the communities most affected by this violence are forced to give up their sovereignty, autonomy and tradition in exchange for modernity and economic development which continues to elude them. Shell in Nigeria, Chevron in Ecuador, Rio Tinto in Papua, Barrick in Peru and Argentina, Newmont Mining in Peru, Vedanta Resources in India and the Zapatista uprising in Chiapas, Mexico are but a few of the more well-publicized cases of the "endowment curse." The market, state and international economic and financial institutions are inextricably involved in management by extraction. The Chiapas region of Mexico, for example, produces 54% of Mexico's hydroelectric energy, 21% of its oil and 47% of its natural gas, and also contains the country's most impoverished people, where 36% of the population do not have running water and 35% do not have electric-

ity. There are seven hotel beds for every 1,000 tourists and 0.3 hospital beds for every 1,000 locals. In one of the country's richest regions in terms of natural resources and a source of wealth for the rest of the country, 71.6% of the Indigenous population in the region suffers from malnutrition and 14,500 people die every year. Transnational corporations extract wealth from Chiapas by mining their land, felling their forests, and selling a tourist experience at the expense of local communities who have the misfortune of "inhabiting" the region. In 1994, thousands of Chiapians rose up against the Mexican government in an armed insurrection and temporarily took over the regional capital of San Cristobal. The Mexican government responded with military action and after several conflicts offered a "conditional pardon" to the rebels. Zapatista leaders responded to the Mexican government's offer of conditional pardon with the following letter, entitled "Who must ask for pardon and who can grant it?"

Why do we have to be pardoned? What are we going to be pardoned for? Of not dying of hunger? Of not being silent in our misery? Of not humbly accepting our historic role of being the despised and the out-cast? Of having demonstrated to the rest of the country and to the entire world that human dignity still lives, even among some of the world's poorest peoples?

The letter ended with the Zapatistas stating that perhaps it was the government that should ask the Zapatistas for pardon, which they would be happy to consider. The market was not particularly sympathetic to the plight of the Zapatistas either. In a memo entitled "Mexico – Political Update," the Chase Manhattan Bank, a major financier of the Mexican government concluded that the "government will need to eliminate the Zapatistas to demonstrate their effective control of the national territory and security policy." Thus, international finance and infrastructure is a key requirement for "development" to occur in "underdeveloped" areas, of which governments must demonstrate "effective control and security," which means certain communities need to be "eliminated." This is necrocapitalism.

Management by exclusion arises from the democracy curse and is another practice that is commonly used to govern the political economy. During the negotiations leading up to the Kyoto protocol, one of the tasks allocated to a policy group was to develop a global forest policy that would develop forestry management and reforestation policies to offset greenhouse gas emissions. Conscious of the fall out from the riots that accompanied the 1999 World Trade Organization meetings in Seattle and similar riots at the World Economic Forum in Davos, Genoa and Melbourne, the organizers were careful to be seen to be inclusive and invited green groups, unions, community organizations, apart from corporations, policy makers and scientists. Unfortunately, in their quest to come up with a global forest policy, they omitted to invite representatives of millions of people who actually live in forests, mainly Indigenous tribes. The forest tribes held their own climate change summit and proclaimed their own resolution at the International Indigenous Forum on Climate Change: The measures to mitigate climate change currently being negotiated are based on a worldview of territory that reduces forests, lands, seas and sacred sites to only their carbon absorption capacity. This worldview and its practices adversely affect the lives of Indigenous Peoples and violate our fundamental rights and liberties, particularly, our right to recuperate, maintain, control and administer our territories which are consecrated and established in instruments of the United Nations.

For Indigenous people who inhabit the region, forests are not just carbon sinks – forests are their food, livelihood, source of medicine, housing, culture, society, polity and economy. Global trade and environmental policies are often made without taking into account the violence and dispossession of Indigenous communities that result from these policies. It becomes meaningless to debate issues of forest rights when there are no forests left. Dispossession of local communities also highlights the failure of both the market and the state where "citizens" of democratic states do not have the right to determine their future. This is necrocapitalism.

Management by expulsion arises from the development curse involving forceful expulsion of Indigenous populations to make way for infrastructure and energy projects. In India, it is estimated that between 30 and 50 million people have lost their traditional lands as a result of dam projects since 1947. A single mega dam project, the Sardar Sarovar dam project will displace 400,000 tribal peoples once it is completed. Economic "reforms" and structural adjustment policies dictated by supranational institutions like the World Trade Organization, World Bank and International Monetary Fund often result in dispossession of local communities through expulsion. For instance, agricultural "reforms" and trade liberalization (agriculture is "liberalized" in the Third World and protected in the First World) have been directly linked to a 260% increase in the suicide rates of farmers in India. In 2005, there were 520 suicides by farmers in Vidharbha, the largest cotton-growing region in India. There were more suicides in cash crop-growing regions than in food-growing regions. Six journalists covered the "farmer suicides" stories in February 2006. That same week, 512 journalists were jostling for space in Mumbai for the Lakme Fashion Week, where models were exhibiting the new chic cotton dresses made from cotton grown by farmers who were killing themselves less than 500 kilometers away. Alarmed by the increase in suicides among poor farmers, the Indian government sent teams of psychiatrists to the region to advise farmers and their families on "managing stress." One young farmer whose father committed suicide after facing mounting debts had this to say to the visiting psychiatrists: "You came here and asked us many questions and gave us many answers. Don't drink you said. Don't beat your wife. Do yoga to handle stress. You never asked this one question: Why are farmers of this country who place food on the nation's table starving?"

Joseph Stiglitz, former Vice President of the World Bank, once the blue-eyed boy of the neoliberal establishment and now a traitor to their cause, commented that the bank's economic development policies "did manage to tighten the belts of the poor as we loosened those on the rich." This is necrocapitalism.

So how have communities resisted these long and violent histories of oppression? Indigenous communities in Australia, Africa, the Americas and the Asia-Pacific have been fighting transnational corporations and their own governments over access to resources. If we analyze these conflicts, a few common themes emerge. First, communities engaged in livelihood struggles demonstrate a strong will to fight these incur-

sions of the market and state into the Indigenous political economy. Second, for these communities the struggle is almost always a "fight to the death." And finally, these resistance movements cannot be described as international, transnational or global, but are truly translocal: local communities living in democratic societies that are engaged in conflicts with both the state and the market, and sometimes even with "civil society," while also making connections with other resistance movements in different parts of the world.

Participatory democracy and accountability are central to developing a politics of the translocal. Ultimately, any reconciliation between economic, environmental and social interests is a political task because it involves structures and processes of power. The main question for a translocal democratic politics is how to create forms of power that are more compatible with the principles of economic democracy. In the contemporary political economy there are millions of people who experience "democracy without choices" where, as citizens of sovereign states, they can vote to change ruling political parties, but have little or no say in influencing economic policies that diminish or destroy their capabilities and rights. Thus, the governance of translocality has less to do with how corporations can penetrate civil society or enter into dialogue with civil society actors, but more to do with how marginalized and impoverished communities who are non-corporate, non-state and often non-market actors can ensure their rights are protected in a democracy. And while civil society has a key role to play in the process, not all regions of the world have an established civil society with accompanying institutions that can negotiate with state and market actors.

Partha Chatterjee argues that the notion of civil society itself is predominantly a Western, middle class sanitized concept. He argues that democracy today is not about government by, of and for the people but rather better understood as a politics of the governed. Civil society excludes in many parts of the world a political society that consists of populations who are not "proper" members of civil society or "true" citizens in a democratic nation-state – illegal migrants, undocumented aliens, illegal squatters, illegal users of water, electricity, transport. To this population, I would add Indigenous communities in different parts of the world whose regions are now essentially conflict zones, imperial and colonial spaces of exception where the accumulation of surplus value can take place through death and dispossession. And in the very near future we will see the political society expand even more as an estimated 20 to 40 million people become climate change refugees, a new category of political society that has to be "governed." So the translocal emerges at the intersection of political society and civil society where groups of people comprising the political society in different parts of the globe are fighting similar battles over resources against market and state actors.

If state and market actors have to be held accountable over resource conflicts, communities need to establish rights over resources – in the case of Indigenous communities these are not individual property rights but communal rights. The ultimate challenge of a theory of translocal resistance is to conceive the inconceivable: an extension of the democratic that transcends nation-state sovereignty, perhaps even transcends citizenship. Translocal subaltern resistance needs some form of translocal sovereignty, a concept that is yet to be developed fully both theoretically and politically. At least there is now some level of institutional recognition of the plight of Indigenous communities all over the world. Acknowledging the histories of colonialism and dispossession suffered by Indigenous communities all over the world, the United Nations General Assembly adopted the United Nations Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People in 2007. The Declaration was vigorously opposed by Australia, Canada, New Zealand and the United States, all of which were responsible for the genocide of Indigenous people (Australia finally signed the Declaration in 2009). Forty-five of the 46 articles in the UN Declaration appear to give Indigenous peoples the right to self-determination in terms of "development or use of their lands or territories and other resources," while requiring states to obtain "their free and informed consent prior to the approval of any project affecting their lands or territories and other resources, particularly in connection with the development, utilization or exploitation of mineral, water or other resources" and providing appropriate measures to "mitigate adverse environmental, economic, social, cultural or spiritual impact." However, the final article in the declaration makes a mockery of these noble visions for Indigenous rights when asserting "nothing in this Declaration may be interpreted as implying or authorizing or encouraging any action which would dismember or impair, totally or in part, the territorial integrity or political unity of sovereign and independent States."

It is difficult to see how Indigenous communities' rights to self-determination and development can be secured unless we unpack notions of state sovereignty. Translocal political regimes consist of state, market and civil society actors with multilevel power and multilayered citizenship. Political societies can leverage legitimacy and authority of transnational civil society to protect their rights when there is state or market failure. Recent resistance movements have attempted to do just that with differing degrees of success. There is currently a major conflict underway in the state of Orissa in India where the might of the state and the market in the form of a multinational mining corporation Vedanta Resources is pitted against the Dongria Kondh tribal communities that inhabit the Niyamgiri hills in the region. The corporation, which is constructing a bauxite mine, is facing spirited resistance from the Indigenous communities who have complained about pollution from the mine that is preventing farmers from farming their field, destroying their crops, killing their cattle and promoting the spread of new diseases. In an act of perverse irony, earlier this year Vedanta won the "Golden Peacock Environment Management Award – 2009" for their contributions to environmental protection. The conflict, as is the case with nearly all resource conflicts, took a bloody turn as the state deployed its "legitimate" violence in the name of the market using armed police forces. "Informed consent" and "rights to development" vanish under the weight of state sovereignty and corporate power and highlights the fundamental incommensurability between Indigenous and state/market interests.

Anil Agarwal, Chairman of Vedanta Resources had this to say about his corporate strategy: "We believe our strategy and business objectives will harness India's high-quality wealth of mineral resources at low costs of development, positioning it as a leader on the global metals and mining map."

Jitu Jakaka, a tribal elder fighting the mining corporation described their struggle: "We are not going to allow Vedanta at any cost. Even if you cut out throats, even if you behead us we are not going to allow this. We will fight with weapons and drive away whoever comes. Without Niyamgiri we cannot think of life. If we lose the mountain we will end up in great trouble. We'll lose our soul. Niyamgiri is our soul. If Niyamgiri goes our soul will die."

These two incompatible views of the meaning of land reflect the fundamental contradictions in the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous People: the only way for tribal communities to protect their rights in Orissa is for the state to cede sovereignty over the region or for the tribal communities to establish secure property rights over land and resources. Framing the Niyamgiri hills as their "soul" is not a particularly efficient use of the "resource" that permits the extraction of surplus for the market. Thus destruction of souls and bodies of communities fighting the endowment curse becomes a necessary condition for generating "wealth." As a wise old man said more than two hundred years ago "between two rights, force decides."

An almost identical battle is being waged in another hemisphere and on another continent – this time deep in the Amazonian jungles of Peru and Ecuador. The state's decision to open up 72% of communal rainforest lands and resources in the Peruvian Amazon to oil drilling, logging and mining without consultation with Indigenous inhabitants have led to violent and bloody protests this year culminating in a massacre of unarmed Indigenous protestors by the Peruvian military. Peru's economic growth in recent years has had little effect on its Indigenous population (comprising nearly half the country's population) where 40% of the Indigenous population live in dire poverty. Justifying the attacks on the Indigenous inhabitants of the Amazon, the Peruvian President Alan Garcia had this to say: "40,000 natives do not have the right to tell 28 million Peruvians not to come to their lands. There is a conspiracy aimed at stopping us from using our natural resources for the good, growth and quality of life of our people. You have to ask yourself: Who stands to benefit from Peru not being able to use its gas? Who stands to benefit from Peru not finding any more oil? We know who. The important thing is to establish the ties in these international networks which have emerged to foment unrest."

These new war zones across the globe illustrate the translocality of struggles over resources where the political society facing the brunt of development find themselves fighting against the forces of the market and the state. It is precisely by investigating the "international networks which have emerged to foment unrest" that a theory and politics of the translocal can emerge. Far from being democratic citizens protected by the state, served by the market and advocated for by civil society, we now have political societies who do not slip through the cracks but rather are forced through them for the extraction of wealth for the "general public," the "nation" or "society." These conflicts represent a new economic and cultural "imperialism without colonies" where much of the imperialism is managed by market institutions. Citizens can become citizens deserving state protection only if they produce exchange value, if not they will have to be killed in the name of progress and development. Political sovereignty becomes subservient to corporate sovereignty and it is the economics of extraction, expulsion and exclusion, not politics, that determine future war zones.

To overcome a collective failure of the imagination there is a need to revisit places that have "emerged to foment unrest." Perhaps inhabiting these spaces may provide alternate visions that enable us to envision a future where sustainable development does not mean sustainable corporations, where the poor are not structurally adjusted by tightening their belts while loosening the belts of the rich, where biotechnology does not reduce the diversity of life into a replication of uniformity, where food exports do not lead to an increase in a nation's GNP while their children starve, where billions of dollars are not spent developing drugs to cure balding and impotence while millions die elsewhere of malaria and tuberculosis. But that is another story.

Subhabrata Bobby Banerjee is Professor of Management and Associate Dean of Research at the College of Business, University of Western Sydney, Australia.

References:
Achille Mbembe, "Necropolitics," in *Public Culture* 15/1, 2003, pp. 11–40.
Ann L. Stoler, "On degrees of imperial sovereignty," in *Public Culture*, 18 /1, 2006, pp. 125–145.
David Harvey, *A brief history of neoliberalism*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 2005.
Giorgio Agamben, *Homo Sacer: Sovereign power and bare Life*, Stanford University Press, Stanford 1998.
Giorgio Agamben, *State of exception*, University of Chicago Press, Chicago 2005.
Michel Foucault, *The history of sexuality*, Vol. 1, Random House, New York 1978.
Michel Foucault, *Power/knowledge: selected interviews and other writings*, Pantheon, New York 1980.
Partha Chatterjee, "Empire and nation revisited: 50 years after Bandung," in *Inter-Asia Cultural Studies*, 6/4, 2005, pp. 487–496.
Subcomandante Marcos and the Zapatista Army of National Liberation, *Shadows of tender fury: The letters and communiqués of Subcomandante Marcos and the Zapatista Army of National Liberation*, Monthly Review Press, New York 1995.
Subhabrata B. Banerjee, "Who sustains whose development? Sustainable development and the reinvention of nature," in *Organization Studies*, 24/1, 2003, pp. 143–180.

**ZAKON KAPITALA: ZGODOVINE ZATIRANJA/
THE LAW OF CAPITAL: HISTORIES OF OPPRESSION**

KAJ JE DEMOKRACIJA?

Film Oliverja Resslerja
118 min, 2009

»Kaj je demokracija?« pravzaprav ni eno vprašanje, pač pa dve. Na eni strani je vprašanje vezano na razmere trenutnih parlamentarnih predstavnikov demokracij, ki so v tem projektu pod kritičnim drob-nogledom, na drugi strani pa vprašanje zasleduje različne poglede na to, kakšen naj bi bil bolj demokratičen sistem in kako naj bi bil organiziran.

V projektu številni aktivisti in politični analitiki iz petnajstih držav z vsega sveta – iz Amsterdama, Berkeleyja, Berlina, Berna, Budimpešte, Kopenhagna, Moskve, New Yorka, Rostocka, San Francisca, Syd-neyja, Tajpeja, Tel Aviva, Thessalonikov in Varšave – odgovarjajo na vprašanje, kaj je demokracija. Intervjuji so se snemali na filmski trak od januarja 2007. Čeprav so vsi vprašani odgovarjali na isto vprašanje, je rezultat množica različnih pogledov in stališč ljudi iz držav, ki veljajo za demokratične.

Intervjuji sestavljajo film, ki je razdeljen na osem delov. Vsak od njih predstavlja nekakšno globalno analizo globoke politične krize zahodnega modela demokracije in nosi svoj naslov: Vnovič premisliti reprezentacijo, Politika izključevanja, Skrivnost namesto demokratične transparentnosti, Nove demokracije?, Ali je represen-tativna demokracija sploh demokracija?, Neposredna demokracija, Ponovno izbojevanje staroselske politike in Ali model zahodne de-mokracije ne sodi v smetnjak zgodovine?

V enem od videoposnetkov Adam Ostolski (Varšava) pojasni, da je bila »moderna ideja o demokraciji [prvotno] povezana s pojmom napredka«, parlamentarne države pa »so se vse bolj nagibale k temu, da bi postale demokratične, s tem ko so vključevale nove tipe političnih akterjev, kot so delavci in ženske. [...] A od 1980 dalje, ko je politiko in ekonomijo zajel neoliberalni val, smo priča nazadovanju demokracije«. Lize Mogel (New York) poudarja, da se je stanje tako spremenilo, da ko danes govorimo o reprezentativni demokraciji, »ne mislimo nujno na zastopanje posameznikov, ampak prej na zastopanje kapitala«. Nikos Panagos (Thessaloniki) trdi celo, da sta »reprezentacija in demokracija povsem nezdružljiva pojma. Zato današnjega sistema nikakor ne moremo označiti za demokratičnega – prej gre za sofisticirano obliko oligarhije«. Medtem ko nekateri v videu podajajo različna mnenja o demokraciji ali procesih odločanja glede staroselskih skupnosti, se David McNeill (Sydney) sprašuje, ali se je smiselno »še naprej boriti za pravico do demokracije in za definicijo besede demokracija« in ali je »niso konservativci, ki so si demokracijo lastili, tako skorumpirali in onečastili, da jo je bolje za-pustiti«.

Film obravnava sporni pojem demokracije, ki jo tisti na oblasti zlorabljajo za vzdrževanje reda, medtem ko za več sto milijonov ljudi z južne poloble demokracija še vedno predstavlja ideal, ki ga je tre-ba po vsej sili doseči. Danes se zdi skoraj nemogoče biti proti de-mokraciji, čeprav je ta vse bolj izpraznjena. Potencialna strategija bi lahko bila, da demokracijo napolnimo z novim pomenom. V tem smislu film predstavlja večplasten diskurz o demokraciji; predstavlja širok izbor mnenj, ki presegajo meje nacionalnih držav in kontinen-tov.

Idejna zasnova, intervjuji, snemanje in zvok: Oliver Ressler
Intervjuvanci: Kuan-Hsing Chen, Noortje Marres, Lin Chalozin Dovrat, Thanasis Triaridis, Tone Olaf Nielsen, Jo van der Spek, Cheikh Papa Sakho, Wolf Dieter Narr, Tiny ali Lisa Gray-Garcia, Joanna Erbel, Yvonne Riano, Trevor Paglen, Tadeusz Kowalik, Adam Ostolski, Boris Kagarlitsky, Michal Kozłowski, Lize Mogel, Rick Ayers, Nikos Panagos, Macha Kurzina, Gabor Csillag, Zachary Running Wolf, Jenny Munroe, David McNeill
Videoredakcija in videoprodukcija: Oliver Ressler
Mojster slike in podnapisov: David Grohe
Animacija: Zanny Begg
Kompozicija in mojster zvoka: Rudi Gottsberger



Oliver Ressler, *Kaj je demokracija?*, 2009, prizori iz filma / Oliver Ressler, *What is Democracy?*, 2009, stills from the film

Posnetki: Sierpien 80 (Ó Telewizja Polska S. A.)
Posebna zahvala: Louisa Avgita, Kai Bauer, Zanny Begg, Karen Ben-nett, Christini Boehler, Paul Chatterton, Amy Cheng, Eyal Danon, Hil-la Dayan, Miklos Erhardt, Takis Fotopoulos, Frédérique Gautier, Peter Grabher, Hou Hanru, Laila Huber, Manray Hsu, Jens Kastner, Caroline Lensing-Hebben, Geert Lovink, Margarethe Makovec, Davor Mis-kovic, Nikos Panagos, Ted Purves, Gerald Raunig, Natalia Romik, Wal-ter Seidl, Katharina Schlieben, Gregory Sholette, Kuba Szreder, Nora Theiss, Dmitry Vilensky, Tom Waibel
Prevod angleških podnapisov: Harold Otto
Prevod nemških podnapisov: Otmar Lichtenwörther
Prevod francoskih podnapisov: Lucile Gourraud-Beyron

Projekt so podprli: ERSTE Foundation, Kulturstadt der Steiermark, Lan-desregierung, Kulturstadt Graz, Otto-Mauer-Fonds, Bien-nale de Lyon, 2009

www.ressler.at

Oliver Ressler je umetnik, ki v svoji praksi združuje umetnost in aktivizem. Živi in dela na Dunaju.

WHAT IS DEMOCRACY?

A film by Oliver Ressler
118 min., 2009

“What is democracy?” is not one question, but is actually two questions. On the one hand, the question relates to conditions of the current pa-riamentary representative democracies that are scrutinized critically in this project. On the other hand, the question traces different approach-es to what a more democratic system might look like and which orga-nizational forms it could take.

The project asked “What is democracy?” to numerous activists and po-litical analysts in 15 cities around the world: in Amsterdam, Berkeley, Berlin, Bern, Budapest, Copenhagen, Moscow, New York, Rostock, San Francisco, Sydney, Taipei, Tel Aviv, Thessaloniki and Warsaw. The inter-views have been recorded on video since January 2007. Even though all interviewees were asked the same question, the result was a mul-tiplicity of different perspectives and viewpoints from people living in states that are usually labeled “democracies.”

This pool of interviews builds the basis for a film in eight parts, which (re)presents a kind of global analysis about the deep political crises of the Western democratic model. The film’s eight parts have the follow-ing titles: “Rethinking representation,” “Politics of exclusions,” “Secrecy instead of democratic transparency,” “New democracies?,” “Is represen-tative democracy a democracy?,” “Direct democracy,” “Reclaiming Indigen-ous politics” and “Should we consign the Western democracy model to the ash heap of history?”

In one video, Adam Ostolski (Warsaw) explains that originally “the mod-ern idea of democracy was connected to the notion of progress” and parliamentary states “had some tendency to become more and more democratic by including new types of political actors, such as work-



ers and women. [...] But since the 1980s, since the neoliberal trend in politics and economy, we have a regression of democracy.” Lize Mogel (New York) notes that the situation changed in such a way, that when you think about representative democracy today “you are not neces-sarily talking about individuals being represented, but more capital be-ing represented.” Nikos Panagos (Thessaloniki) even argues that “repre-sentation and democracy are incompatible terms. Therefore, under no circumstances could the present system be called a democracy. It is just a sophisticated form of oligarchy.” While some subjects in the vid-eos elaborate their ideas of direct democracy or decision-making pro-cesses of indigenous communities, David McNeill (Sydney) raises the issue of whether it makes sense “to continue contesting for the right to own and define the term democracy” or whether “it has been so cor-rupted and polluted by the conservatives that claimed ownership of it, that it is better to be surrendered.”

The film discusses the contested notion of “democracy,” which is mis-used for the maintenance of order by those in power, while at the same time “democracy” still represents an ideal hundreds of millions of peo-ple in the South desperately want to achieve. Today it seems almost impossible to be against “democracy,” even though it is getting emptier and emptier. A potential strategy could try to fill what is called “democ-racy” with new meaning. In this sense, the film presents a multi-layered discourse on democracy, which expresses a broad field of opinions that go beyond the borders of nation-states and continents.

Concept, interviews, camera and sound recording: Oliver Ressler
Interviewees: Kuan-Hsing Chen, Noortje Marres, Lin Chalozin Dovrat, Thanasis Triaridis, Tone Olaf Nielsen, Jo van der Spek, Cheikh Papa Sakho, Wolf Dieter Narr, Tiny a.k.a. Lisa Gray-Garcia, Joanna Erbel, Yvonne Riano, Trevor Paglen, Tadeusz Kowalik, Adam Ostolski, Boris Kagarlitsky, Michal Kozłowski, Lize Mogel, Rick Ayers, Nikos Panagos, Macha Kurzina, Gabor Csillag, Zachary Running Wolf, Jenny Munroe, David McNeill
Video editing and production: Oliver Ressler
Image editing and subtitles: David Grohe
Animation: Zanny Begg
Composition and sound editing: Rudi Gottsberger
Footage: Sierpien 80 (Ó Telewizja Polska S.A.)
Special thanks to Louisa Avgita, Kai Bauer, Zanny Begg, Karen Ben-nett, Christine Boehler, Paul Chatterton, Amy Cheng, Eyal Danon, Hilla Dayan, Miklos Erhardt, Takis Fotopoulos, Frédérique Gautier, Peter Grabher, Hou Hanru, Laila Huber, Manray Hsu, Jens Kastner, Caroline Lensing-Hebben, Geert Lovink, Margarethe Makovec, Davor Miskovic, Nikos Panagos, Ted Purves, Gerald Raunig, Natalia Romik, Walter Seidl, Katharina Schlieben, Gregory Sholette, Kuba Szreder, Nora Theiss, Dmi-try Vilensky, Tom Waibel
Translation for English subtitles: Harold Otto
Translation for German subtitles: Otmar Lichtenwörther
Translation for French subtitles: Lucile Gourraud-Beyron

Grants: ERSTE Foundation, Kulturstadt der Steiermark, Lan-desregierung, Kulturstadt Graz, Otto-Mauer-Fonds, Biennale de Lyon, 2009

www.ressler.at

Oliver Ressler is an artist whose work constantly connects art and activism. He lives and works in Vienna.



Oliver Ressler, *Kaj je demokracija?*, 2009, prizor iz filma / Oliver Ressler, *What is Democracy?*, 2009, still from the film