

Saradnici/Contributors

Gabriele Dietze

Tatjana Greif

Marina Gržinić

Njideka Stephanie Iroh

Araba Evelyn
Johnston-Arthur

Tjaša Kancler

Klub Zwei:
Simone Bader i/and
Jo Schmeiser

Jorge Luis Marzo

Margarita Padilla

Mitja Perinčič

Jovita Pristovšek

Zvonka T Simčič

Aina Šmid

Šefik Tatlić

Nataša Velikonja

Marina Vishmidt

Jasmina Založnik

Platforma 0 za teoriju, umetnost, proteste i
politiku/
Platform 0 for theory, arts, protests and politics.

1.

Septembar 2012.

Izdanje na srpskom i engleskom

September 2012

Serbian/English edition

BELINA: BITI BEO [1]

Araba Evelin Džonston-Artur

„Ignorisati ovaj beli etnicitet znači udvostručiti mu njegovu hegemoniju, tako što bi bio predstavljen kao prirodan.“ („Coco Fusco u bell hooks.“ U: Yearning – Sehnsucht und Widerstand. Kultur, Ethnie, Geschlecht: Berlin 1996, str. 180)

Sam način određivanja i nazivanja belog etniciteta (Weißheit u nemačkom jeziku, Whiteness u engleskom jeziku, prim. prev.) u našem austrijskom kontekstu i još uvek pretežno beloj „antirasističkoj“ praksi još je u začetku. Belačka samorazumevajuća i nereflektovana objektivacija (Weißheit, prim. ur.) ostaje najčešće prilično netematizirana, i na taj način se njena moć i nasilje kontinuirano utemeljuju kao normalnost, tako se i realizuju, a njena hegemonija se na taj način uz pomoć pripisane joj neutralnosti udvostručuje.[2]

Da bih u ovom svom kontekstu uopšte pričala o nekakvoj „pretežno beloj ‘antirasističkoj’ praksi“, tj. da bih tu belinu (belačku nereflektovanu objektivaciju) tako i nazivala, meni je, kao pojedinačnom crnom subjektu, potrebna radikalnost i enorman napor. Hrabrost i odlučnost dugujem crnačkim aktivistima, teoretičarima i praktičarima, koji se doduše kreću izvan ovog mog austrijskog konteksta, ali koji su mene u ovoj mojoj poziciji u svakom slučaju učinili jačom.

Belačka samorazumevajuća i nereflektovana objektivacija kao ostvareni koncept rasizma je, pored globalne dimenzije bele superiornosti, označena i sopstvenom specifičnom, istorijski utemeljenom nacionalnom stvarnošću. U austrijskom kontekstu, taj koncept beline obično je obavijen tišinom i biva i dalje u veoma očiglednim dimenzijama realizovan u takozvanoj antirasističkoj radnoj praksi. Ovde se čak ni eksplicitni in-your-face-old-school rasizam i antisemitizam ne doživljavaju kao društveni tabu koji bi trebalo sankcionisati.

Procesi dekonstrukcije belih normalnosti su integralni i esencijalni delovi kompleksnih crnačkih protesta i oslobodilačkih borbi povodom rasističkog ugnjetavanja i zastrašivanja. I tako se dalekosežni i kontinuirani sporovi sa pojedinačnim, kontekstualno specifičnim belinama (belim nereflektovanim objektivacijama) ne mogu odvojiti od ovih emancipatorskih političkih borbi. Crnačka kritika, koja je u ovom kontekstu svakodnevno živela i bivala eksplicitno formulisana, bila je prilagođena ovoj nacionalnoj realnosti. Ukoliko se fragmenti „etabliranog“ crnačkog kritičkog diskursa, kao na primer iz konteksta SAD, jednostavno importuju u Austriju i tu predstave kao izuzetni teorijsko-progresivni komadići samokritike, onda nastaje nešto poput „pseudotematizacije“. „Austrijska belina“ se na taj način prilično elokventno izvlači iz praktično i akciono orijentisane lokalne crnačke kritike i sukoba sa specifično austrijskom belinom.

Novi segment na kritičkom intelektualnom tržištu? Ne, hvala! Da se ne bi samo reprodukovale dimenzije zastrašivanja i nasilja koje leži u osnovi bele nereflektovane objektivacije, njena tematizacija ne sme da ostane daleko od praktične realnosti, na nivou simboličnog čina političke korektnosti i sopstvene promocije. I sama dinamika dekonstrukcije beline, kao kontinuirani politički proces unutar antirasističkih borbi, leži u vezi između teorije i prakse. Ovde se ne sme raditi o tome da se izgradi nekakva bela „antirasistička“ kritička elita koja svoju belinu „pseudo tematizuje“ i iz svog tabora prozivodi diskurse koji joj omogućavaju da se ponovo zaljubi u sopstvenu belu

progresivnost. Na taj način se crnačka kritika u ovom ekskluzivnom, moćnom belom „kritičkom“ diskursu čini pogodna za samoreprezentovanje antirasističke beline. Belina se tako ne decentralizuje, već dobija samo jedno kritičko pakovanje, a nasilnost koja joj leži u osnovi ostaje netaknuta i normalizovana.

Sa nemačkog na srpski preveo Nemanja Vljaković

FUSNOTE

[1] Cf. Araba Evelyn Johnston-Arthur, »Weißheit«, U: BUM (izd.): Historisierung als Strategie. Positionen – Macht – Kritik. Beč, januar, 2004.

[2] Zanimljivo je da za reč Weißheit u slovenskim jezicima ne postoji nijedan primeren prevod, nego se stalno moramo služiti različitim objašnjenjima u zagradama, da bismo istakli ne belo kao takvo, već nereflektovani rasizam na koji upućuje činjenica da biti beo samo se po sebi podrazumeva (prim. urednice).

WHITENESS [1]

Araba Evelyn Johnston-Arthur

“To ignore this white ethnicity means to double its hegemony, as it would be presented as natural.” (Coco Fusco in bell hooks: In Yearning – Sehnsucht und Widerstand. Kultur, Ethnie, Geschlecht: Berlin 1996, p. 180)

The very way of defining and naming of the white ethnicity (Weißheit in German, trans. note), in our Austrian context and still predominantly white “antiracist” practice, is in its infancy. Whiteness (its self-understood and unreflected objectification, ed. note) often remains unthematized, and thus its power and violence keep continuously being established as a normality, that is also how they get realised, and how its hegemony doubles due to the attributed neutrality.[2]

In order to talk at all in this context of mine about a “predominantly white ‘anti-racist’ practice,” i.e. to call whiteness as whiteness, what I need, being a black subject, is radicalism and enormous effort. Courage and determination I owe to the black activists, theorists and practitioners, who, truth be told, do not work in my Austrian context, but have still made me stronger in this position of mine.

Whiteness, as a realized concept of racism, has been, apart from the global dimension of white superiority, marked by its own specific, historically-established national reality. In the Austrian context the concept of whiteness is usually shrouded in a veil of silence and is constantly realised in very obvious dimensions in the so-called anti-racist working practice. Over here even the explicit in-your-face-old-school racism and anti-Semitism are not seen as a social taboo that should be penalized.

The processes of deconstruction of white normalities are integral and essential part of complex Black protests and liberation struggles against racist oppression and intimidation. Thus the far-reaching and ongoing disputes with individual context-specific whitenesses cannot be separated from these emancipatory political struggles. The Black criticism, living daily in this context and being explicitly formulated, has been adapted to this national reality. If fragments of a “well-established” Black critical discourse, such as in the U.S. context, for instance, are simply imported into Austria and presented there as outstanding theoretical progressive pieces of self-criticism, then it all results in something such as “pseudo-thematization.” In that way “Austrian whiteness” pulls away rather elo-

quently from the practical and action-orientated local Black criticism and from the conflicts with specifically Austrian whiteness.

A new segment on the critical intellectual market? No, thank you! In order not to get just reproduced dimensions of intimidation and violence that underlie whiteness its thematization cannot stay away far from the practical reality, at the level of a symbolic act of political correctness and self-promotion. The very dynamics of the deconstruction of whiteness as a continuous political process within the anti-racist struggle, lies in the relationship between theory and practice. This must not turn out to be the building a kind of white "anti-racist" critical elite that "pseudo thematizes" its whiteness and produces from their camp discourses that allow it to re-fall in love with its own white progressivity. In this way, Black criticism in this exclusive, powerful white "critical" discourse seems suitable for self-representation of anti-racist whiteness. Whiteness is in such a way not decentralized, but just presents itself as a kind of a critical package, and the violence that underlies it remains therefore intact and normalized.

Translated from Serbian into English by Dragana Govedarica Kostopoulos

FOOTNOTES

[1] Araba Evelyn Johnston-Arthur, »Weiß-heit«, In: BUM (Hrsg.): Historisierung als Strategie. Positionen – Macht – Kritik. Vienna, January, 2004

[2] It is interesting that there is no adequate equivalent of the word Whiteness in Slavic languages so that we always have to use different explanations in brackets in order to highlight not the white as such, but the unreflected racism which is indicated by the fact that being white is simply self-implied (ed. note).

UVOD DEARTIKULACIJA

platforma za teoriju, umetnost, proteste i politiku

Marina Gržinić

Pre tačno pet godina, 2007, Staš Kleindienst, Sebastian Leban, Tanja Passoni i ja, Marina Gržinić, počeli smo da objavljujemo časopis, bolje rečeno, pokrenuli smo onlajn platformu za kritički diskurs koju smo nazvali RE-ARTIKULACIJA (Ljubljana, Slovenija).

Tokom tih pet godina radili smo bukvalno sve ne bismo li opstali sa izuzetno malim budžetom; toliko malim da smo u nekim periodima, kada smo isplaćivali ono malo odličnih prevodilaca i lektora koji su još uvek verovali u nas – to što su od nas dobijali kao honorar teško da se moglo nazvati novcem – strpljivo radili uglavnom noću, iz noći u noć, dok su na nas gledali kao na smešnu gomilu entuzijasta koji žele da objave časopis. Prvo smo želeli da izlazimo kvartalno, potom smo smanjili na dva broja godišnje, da bismo na kraju objavili jedan. Početkom ove godine, 2012, iscrpeli smo sve – sredstva, slobodno vreme, politiku zajedno provedenih noći zbog projekta koji na kraju nije donosio čak ni minimalan stalni prihod, što nam je bio osnovni cilj kako bismo standardizovali mogućnost produkcije (da imamo tim ljudi koji rade na časopisu i da su za to plaćeni). Nema šta nismo pokušali. Slali smo prijave slovenačkom Ministarstvu kulture, obraćali se privatnim/javnim međunarodnim fondacijama, kao što je fondacija Erste iz Beča. Ali ništa nismo dobili. U vidu usluga, imali smo, doduše, ogromnu podršku ljudi, zvaničnih i nevladinih organizacija. Tokom svih ovih godina imali smo podršku od strane ZRC SAZU, posebno njenog direktora, doktora Ota Luthara, u vidu velikodušnog podržavanja naših poštanskih/distributivnih usluga, usluga štampanja i pristupa izložbenim prostorima; podršku nekih galerija, na primer, Gradske galerije u Celju i sl. U nekim periodima imali smo i podršku izvesnih nevladinih organizacija kao i omladinskih organizacija iz Ljubljane. Bez grupe Irvin iz Ljubljane i njihove kontinuirane podrške da nam putem nekih svojih kanala obezbede besplatno štampanje, Re-artikulacija nikad ne bi ugledala svetlost dana. Bilo bi nemoguće platiti troškove štampanja. Stoga, dakle, grupi Irvin i njihovim kanalima i vezama (koje su izgradili tokom decenija napornog rada) u slovenačkom i međunarodnom kontekstu dugujemo ogromnu zahvalnost.

Najveća vera u čitav poduhvat dolazila je od strane brojnih saradnika: pisaca, umetnika, teoretičara, aktivista, akademika i istraživača iz Slovenije, sa prostora bivše Jugoslavije kao i sveta.

De-artikulacija je jasan znak kraja Re-artikulacije, ali možda je, s druge strane, početak nečega novog. Neki od nas su samo žilave zveri. Ovaj broj je štampan pošto sam prikupila toliko sjajnih tekstova koji treba da budu objavljeni, ali i zato što želimo da se zahvalimo jednom dobu i jednoj grupi ljudi koji su izgradili posebnu zajednicu. Iako mnogi od njih ostaju i u ovom poduhvatu, a možda i u budućnosti.

Objavljivanje De-artikulacije (ime je prikladnije pošto živimo u vremenu dekolonizacije) postalo je izvodljivo pošto smo velikodušno pozvani da učestvujemo na 15. Bijenalu umetnosti DE/RE/KONSTRUKCIJA: PROSTOR, VREME, SEĆANJE u Pančevu, Srbija. Poziv su nam uputili selektori vizuelnog segmenta Nikola Dedić i Aneta Stojnić. De-artikulacija neće biti objavljena u englesko-slovenačkom, već englesko-srpskom izdanju, jer je taj bilingvalni koncept jedna od suštinskih poenti čitave platforme. Ovaj poziv mi je omogućio da zaokružim projekat izdavanja Re-artikulacije, jer kada

smo početkom godine rešili da prekinemo projekat, prema mome mišljenju, taj smo posao ostavili nekako nedovršenim. Već smo tokom 2011. radili na broju za narednu 2012. godinu, a princip je bio da svaki od urednika, Gržinić i Leban, prikupe tekstove na smišljenu temu i koncept za sledeći broj.

Dakle, ovo je idealna prilika da se objave odlični tekstovi i priloge koje sam tada prikupila; da se zahvalim svima onima koji su godinama radili za nas; da se zahvalim ostalim članovima Re-artikulacije, i da se osvrnem na ono što (ni)smo postigli tokom proteklih pet godina.

Ako bih se sad osvrnula na slovenačku scenu i pokušala da se prisetim zašto smo i kako uopšte te 2007. godine odlučili da izdajemo Re-artikulaciju, mogla bih da kažem da je odluka proistekla iz katastrofalne situacije nepostojećeg konteksta za artikulaciju umetnosti, kulture, socijalnog, političkog i ekonomskog u Sloveniji od strane jedne nezavisne, radikalne i kritičke manjine koja je postojala i sad evoluirala, a imala je jaku istoriju u nekadašnjim pokretima u Sloveniji. Posebno smo insistirali na povezivanju onoga što je postojalo i radilo decenijama na tom prostoru, ali je bilo podeljeno žičanom logikom žanra, sfera interesovanja. U to vreme, ali i sada, u Sloveniji je vladao divlji, turbo, surovi, krvavi kapitalizam eksploatacije i otimanja. Mada se te 2007. na to nije tako gledalo, to je bilo vreme PRE krize, te oni koji su bili deo nacionalnog tela (zapisanog u paradoksalnom modelu krvi i časti) nisu razmišljali o kapitalizmu ili eksploataciji, oduzimanju imovine, rasizmu, diskriminaciji.

U tom trenutku, 2007. godine, imali smo istoriju brutalnog nekrokapitalističkog delovanja protiv onih za koje se smatralo da dolaze iz drugih republika bivše Jugoslavije, takozvanih „izbrisanih“ ljudi. Osim šačice aktivista i intelektualaca, koji su započeli pionirski posao sa izbrisanim ljudima tako što su informisali Slovence da novi zakon za Slovence (iz 1992) predstavlja grobnicu za 30.000 izbrisanih ljudi, primetili smo da drugi žive kao da su u bajci. Mislili su da je demokratija individualizam srednje klase i turbo-konzumerizam, a neobuzdana pljačka i privatizacija, koje su počele još devedesetih godina, prolazile su gotovo neopaženo. LGBTQ zajednica je iz dana u dan bivala sve više diskriminisana, sve do 2012. godine, kada novi porodični zakon nije prošao na referendumu koji su organizovale desničarske heteroseksualne, katoličke i neoliberalne snage – rekla bih fašistička većina – koja je odlučila o osnovnim ljudskim pravima LGBTQ manjine. Jednom rečju, 2012. godine mi koračamo, kao što je najavio slogan Parade ponosa u Ljubljani, „Napred ka srednjem veku“. Kada smo započeli Re-artikulaciju, postavili smo pitanja analize kapitalizma, kolonijalizma, rasizma, turbo-fašizma, ropstva, diskriminacije. Reakcije su bile skoro patetične zbog nerazumevanja šta ovi pojmovi znače (bukvalno su postavljana pitanja zašto da se priča o kapitalizmu i rasizmu; priprostiji čitaoci bili su iskreno začuđeni da Slovenija ima neke veze sa kolonijalizmom itd.). Ali kada je, godinu dana kasnije, kriza zakucala na slovenačka vrata, stvari su se vrlo brzo promenile.

Zbog toga je Re-artikulacija bila važan korak. Jer onog trenutka kada je kriza pogodila Sloveniju, mi smo već imali spreman izvestan teren koji je ubrzo potom bio oberučke prihvaćen. Važno je da istaknemo da su polazne tačke za Re-artikulaciju bila dva časopisa – Zarez iz Zagreba i Malmoe iz Beča. Oba i dalje redovno izlaze i postaju sve bolji budući da su poboljšali i sadržaj, a i urednike i saradnike.

Mada, u ovom trenutku u Ljubljani, mi imamo jedan časopis koji je neko vreme bio zamro, ali je ponovo aktiviran. To je Tribuna. Mnogi diskursi koje je donela Re-artikulacija žive i u ovom časopisu, koji ima bolje, u poređenju sa Re-artikulacijom, „odlične“ proizvodne pogone. Izdavač je studentska organizacija, a studenti su aktivni, imaju novca za produkciju i imaju duha i snage. To je veoma važan korak. Saveze treba gurati napred.

S druge satrane, i dela Re-artikulacije predstavljaju moć saveza. Za 2007. godinu bio je to revolucionaran potez.

Povezali smo izvesne značajne borbe iz Slovenije, LG-BTQ zajednicu, pre svega ljubljansko lezbejsko jezgro okupljeno oko ŠKUC-LL, sa umetničkim praksama i generacijama mladih pisaca iz Zagreba, Beograda, Sarajeva, Skoplja i Prištine. U čitavu tu priču uključili smo stavove aktivista, umetnika i teoretičara iz Beča i ostatka Austrije, Nemačke, Španije, Velike Britanije, Latinske Amerike, Azije i Australije. Takođe smo aktivirali odnose na prostorima bivše Istočne Evrope sa poletnom novom generacijom mladih teoretičara koja je opovrgla umereni stereotip da relevantne analize dolaze samo sa Zapada. Izuzetno je važno to što smo predložili diskusije na temu dekolonijalizacije naspram postkolonijalizma u razmišljanjima o kolonijalizmu i kolonijalizaciji, koje su pokazale snagu crne dijasporu u Evropi. Razotkrili smo formate fašizma i diskriminacije LGBTQ populacije zajedno sa diskriminacijom romske zajednice, migranata i azilanata.

Veoma važan zadatak bio je prevođenje svih ovih tekstova (što je koordinirala i broj po broj skoro u celini prevela Tanja Passoni) i mogućnost besplatnog onlajn pristupa platformi (po CC principu), koji je nadgledao Staš Kleindienst.

Mi smo svoj istorijski zadatak ispunili tako da sada možemo da se pojavimo u drugim oblicima, čak sličnim, ali možda u drugačijoj formaciji. Videćemo. Ono što je bitno je da – ovo što je sada pred vama – pročitate, da reagujete, pristupite mu, a ono što će možda nastaviti da postoji jeste De-artikulacija. Sa engleskog na srpski prevela Dragana Govedarica Kostopoulos

INTRODUCTION DEARTIKULACIJA

platform for theory, arts, protests
and politics

Marina Gržinić

Exactly five years ago in 2007, Staš Kleindienst, Sebastjan Leban, Tanja Passoni and Marina Gržinić started publishing a journal, better to say, we launched an online platform for critical discourse that we named RE-ARTIKULACIJA in Ljubljana, Slovenia.

In those 5 years we literally did everything to survive, with an extremely small budget, so small that when in certain periods we paid those few excellent and still believing in us translators and language editors they could barely call money what we gave them as a payment, then we patiently worked at night, mostly, night after night, being seen as a ridiculous bunch of enthusiasts who want to publish the journal. In the beginning we wanted to have a quarterly then we diminished to two numbers per year and ended up with one. In 2012 early this year we came to an end, of resources, free time, the politics of sharing the nights for a project that did not get in the end not even a small continuous amount of money that was our goal, in order to standardize the possibility of production (to have a team of people that work and are paid); we tried everything, sending applications to the Ministry of culture of Slovenia and also applying to private/public international foundations such as Erste Foundation, Vienna. But this was not coming through. We have though a huge support by people, official and NGO institutions in a form of services. We had during these years a support through generously being backed up in our mail/distribution services, printing services, and access to presentation floors and etc., by the ZRC SAZU, notably the director Dr. Oto Luthar,

some galleries as the city gallery in Celje and etc. We also were supported in some periods by some NGOs and as well youth organizations in Ljubljana. Without the group Irwin from Ljubljana, and their continuous support with arranging through their channels a possibility for free printing, Re-artikulacija would have never been published. To pay for the printing would have been impossible. Therefore to Irwin and to the group channels and connections (that they built in decades of their hard working) in the Slovenian and international contexts we owe our major gratitude.

The biggest trust in the whole endeavor came on the part of numerous contributors: writers, artists, theoreticians, activists, academics, and researchers from Slovenia, former-Yugoslavia and the world.

De-artikulacija is a clear sign of an end of Re-artikulacija and maybe on the other hand of a beginning of something new. Some of us are just resistant beasts. This number is published as I have collected so many great texts that have to be published and also because we have to say thank you to an era and to a group of people that build a specific community. Though many will stay the same this time as well as maybe in the future.

Publishing of De-artikulacija (the name is more appropriate giving the time of de-coloniality), became possible after the generous invitation to take part at the 15th Biennial of Art: DE/RE/CONSTRUCTION: space, time, memories in Pančevo, Serbia. The invitation came by the selectors of the visual segment: Nikola Dedić and Aneta Stojnić. De-artikulacija will be published in an English-Serbian edition and not English-Slovenian, as the bilingual concept is one of the main points of the entire platform. This invitation made it possible for me to conclude the project of publishing Re-artikulacija, since, when earlier in the year 2012 we decided to stop the project, from my point of view it was left as an unfinished job. We were already from 2011 on working on the number for 2012 and the logic was that each of the editors Gržinić and Leban gets texts on the conceived topic and concept for the respective number.

Therefore, this is an opportunity to publish the excellent texts and contributions I gathered, to thank all those who worked for years with us, to thank the other members of Re-artikulacija and to look back at what we dis/achieved in those five years.

Now if I look back into the Slovenian scene, and try to rethink why we decided to publish Re-artikulacija in 2007 in a first place, I can say that this decision came out of a catastrophic situation of the missing context of articulation of art, culture, the social, political and economical in Slovenia by an independent, radical and critical minority that existed and evolved now and had a strong history in the past movements in Slovenia. We insisted especially on connecting what was working and existing for decades in the space but was split through a wired logic of a genre, field of interests. In Slovenia at that time and today we have had a wild, turbo, ferocious, bloody capitalism of exploitation and dispossession. Though in 2007 it was not seen as such, it was still the time BEFORE the crisis, those who were part of the nation body (inscribed in the paradoxical model of soil and blood) did not think about capitalism or about exploitation, dispossession, racism, discrimination.

At that point in 2007 we had a history of the brutal necrocapitalist move against those seen as coming from other republics of the former-Yugoslavia, the so-called “erased people.” But except for a small number of activists and intellectuals that made a pioneering work with the erased people in informing the Slovenians that the new state of Slovenians (from 1992) is a cemetery for 30.000 erased people, we saw that others were living as if in a fairy tale. They thought democracy is a middle class individualism and turbo consumerism, and the wild robbery and privatization

going on from 1990s were almost unnoticed. The LGBT community was day by day more discriminated, until 2012 when the new Family Code failed to be approved in the referendum organized by right wing heterosexual, catholic and neoliberal forces, we will say fascist majority that decided about the basic human rights of LGBTQ minority. With a word in 2012 as it was announced by the Ljubljana Pride Parade slogan we are at the point of going “Forward in the Middle Ages.” When we started with Re-artikulacija, we brought up topics of analysis of capitalism, colonialism, racism, turbo-fascism, slavery, discrimination. The reactions were almost pathetic from not understanding what these terms mean (literally asking why to talk about capitalism and racism, while more common readers being astonished what it was that Slovenia has to do with colonialism), etc. But when the crisis hit as well Slovenia a year after, all changed very soon.

Therefore Re-artikulacija was an important step. As at that moment when the crisis hit Slovenia we already prepared a certain terrain that would be soon after embraced. It is important to state that the point of departure to have Re-artikulacija were also two journals, Zarez in Zagreb and Malmoe in Vienna. Both are still coming out regularly, and are getting better and better having enhanced both the contents and the editors and contributors.

Nevertheless, at the moment in Ljubljana we do have a journal that was defunct and is again reactivated. It is Tribuna, many of the discourses that were brought by Re-artikulacija live in this journal as well and it has a much better or in comparison to Re-artikulacija “excellent” production facilities. The publisher is the students’ organization, students are active, and they have money for production and they have spirit and strength. This is a very important step. Alliances are to be pushed forward.

On the other hand, Re-artikulacija deeds are the power of alliances. In 2007 this was a revolutionary move. What we did is to connect particular important struggles in Slovenia, the LGBTQ community, specifically the Ljubljana lesbian core scene around ŠKUC-LL with artistic practices and the generations of young writers coming from Zagreb, Belgrade, Sarajevo, Skopje and Priština. We included in the whole story the positions of activists, artists and theorists from Vienna and Austria, Germany, Spain, Great Britain, Latin America and Asia and Australia. We as well activated the relations with former Eastern European spaces and the powerful new generations of young theoreticians that contested the middle of the road produced stereotype that the pertinent analyses are produced in the West only. Extremely important is that we put forward discussions of decoloniality vs. post-colonialism that showed the power of the Black Diaspora in Europe when reflecting on colonialism and coloniality; we disclosed formats of fascism and discrimination of the LGBTQ population along the discrimination of the Roma community, migrants, and asylum seekers

A very important task was the translation of all these texts (coordinated and as well number by number almost fully translated by Tanja Passoni) and the online possibility to access the platform for free (on CC basis) that was supervised by Staš Kleindienst.

We completed our historical task and can therefore reemerge on other propositions, even a similar one, but maybe in another formation. Let’s see. But what matters is this that is in front of you now to read, react, access and maybe continue as De-reartikulacija.

NOVO JUTRO

Nataša Velikonja

Novo je jutro. Sa radija izveštavaju da je voda zagađena, „obogaćena”, kažu, pesticidima, izmetom; prekarni radnici odlaze na posao, kroz prozor mi ulaze izduvni gasovi, svi autobusi i automobili stoje u mestu, helikopteri su u vazduhu; policija je blokirala sve ulice u centru grada jer pred sud treba da izađe paradržavna kokainska grupa koja se dovodi u vezu sa nedozvoljenom trgovinom oružjem. Apolutno ista slika kao kada je pre nekoliko dana Angela Merkel bila u poseti Sloveniji. Slično gospodinu Smitu u Matriksu, koji se umnožava nebrojeno puta. Ljudi se pitaju hoće li biti rata, hoće li biti inflacije, hoće li se ponoviti Argentina iz 2001; gradski zlatari kače oglase sa posebnom prodajnom cenom grama zlata; festival alternativnih pozorišta je za otvaranje postavio scenu rušenja džinovskih domina, koju je uzbuđena umetnička publika pozdravila ushićenim aplauzom i klicanjem. A onda ta retardina publika odlazi pod beli šator, pije kapučino dok njihova glupava deca divljaju unaokolo s nadmenošću koju su naučili od roditelja; nadmenost sile koju će kasnije u životu obilno sadistički upražnjavati. Glavna tema festivala je zaštita životne sredine i održivi razvoj.

Godine 1967, godine kada sam rođena, Nova Gorica, taj arhitektonski eksperiment komunista Drugog svetskog rata, slovenački grad u blizini italijanske granice, već je bio podignut. Na travnjaku između stambenih zgrada u kojima smo živeli i glavnog puta, za svaku Novu godinu gradili su selo iz bajke – nekoliko drvenih kuća da se deca u njima igraju – u kom se apsolutno ništa nije dešavalo, osim što su ljudi, „narod”, tu dolazili noću da pišaju i seru.

Dobro, kratko. Tog novog jutra probudili su me sopstveni snovi. Bio je neki književni skup, i ja sam bila tamo. Događaj je bio malo urban, malo začinjjen pejzažom; u stvari, beše to nekakva seljačka tamnica, i u književnom smislu sve to beše, kao što obično biva, bez ikakvog smisla. Ko će danas čitati pesmu? Nagradu dobi jedna pička što je jednom pre popušila nekom slovenačkom piscu i to je bilo to; beše tu još neki drugi kurac, neki dosadni pisac koji je već osvojio stotine nagrada, ali mu i dalje nije bilo dosta; ah, kakve li bulimične svinje!

Potom je usledila izložba, sijaset fotografija koje su ljudi razgledali s uzbuđenjem ukoliko bi se prepoznali, onda neke slike kupljenja sena, s grupicama srećnih ljudi, ma, neke tipične situacije... nešto... uvek isto. Ako bih da budem precizna, bilo je tu i prizora iz Metelkove, dve devojke, dve pankerke koje se ljube, neki tip sa dredovima koji bljuje vatru, onda jedan što cepa po gitari, sve u svemu, samo alternativni ljudi, niko ne piša i ne sere, i to ne samo noću nego ni danju, iako je bilo nenormalno mnogo ljudi. Ne znam ko je još bio tamo. Ono što znam jeste da sam ja, kao u svim svojim snovima, tražila sobu da odsednem.

Bilo kako bilo, tog novog jutra, sedim u dvadeset kvadrata svoje sobe, pušim cigarete koje su, poštujući novu evropsku uredbu, prekrivene hemikalijom koja navodno „sprečava” opasnost od požara od neugašenog opuška, ali bih rekla i da „obustavlja” ione koji puše. Zbog toga je u poslednjih nekoliko nedelja nekoliko mojih poznanika prestalo da puši. Ne znam. Ja pušim od dvanaeste, i znam da, ovako ili onako, za mene nema šanse, jer ću koliko tog istog dana uveče otići u lezbejski bar, gde će se lezbejke bez milosti i prestanka jebati u mozak, a onda će tu da svrati jedan od mnogih histeričnih strejt likova koji u tim sjebanim lezbejkama vidi otelotvorenje revolucionarnog duha; njihov upad u naš mali prostor je kao ostvarenje nekog uzorka onog zajedničkog koje predstavlja novo doba socijalne deponije, gde oni vole da ubace svoje štipaljke i kineske štapiće.

Ukratko, doći će jedna od tih strejtašica sa svojim novim domaćim projektom za gej i lezbejsku scenu i silovaće nas organskim paradajzom koji se uzgaja u okiseljenom zemljištu u blizini železničke stanice. To se zove urbana permakulturna samoodrživost.

Noć u Metelkovi, vrlo blizu onih organskih paradajza: pet homofobičnih siledžija pretuklo je Tomislava i njegovog dečka. Došla je policija i prvo se žalila, tražeći da se isključi muzika ispred zgrade koja se zove „Lovci”, jer se komšiluk žalio na buku. To je trajalo pet sati. U tri sata ujutru četiri lezbejke i tri geja čekaju taksi na jednoj strani ulice, dok na drugoj, gore-dole po trotoaru tutnje, poput besnih pasa, homofobične siledžije s flašama piva u rukama, koji zbog saobraćaja na ulici ne mogu da dođu do nas. Gejevi uskočiše u taksi, a siledžije u pukom gnevju pobacaše za njima sve svoje flaše. Mi, lezbejke, potrcasmo natrag, tražeći sklonište na Metelkovi. Unutar zidova Autonomnog kulturnog centra Metelkova, u njenom srcu mnoštva, u klubu „Gromka”, pomokrili su se na Petru i Metu, lezbejski par.

To Mnoštvo nije bilo u stanju da sastavi ni jednu jedinu reč protesta ili osude. Ali, nemojte mi sad moralisati jer čak i u vašoj instituciji mokri se na gejeve i lezbejke. Dva Šveđanina, gej aktivisti, zbog ovoga daju zajedničkom fondu Međunarodnog partnerstva protiv homofobične diskriminacije sumu novca veću od drugih, pogotovo veću od zemalja Istočne Evrope. Taj gej aktivista sve vreme govori o „švedskom novcu”. Iz jedne zapadne države doneli su neki idiotski letak koji žele da plasiraju kao aktivističku deonicu u okviru idiotskog gej aktivizma Evropske unije. Više novca znači i više odluka. Šveđani su odlučili šta će uraditi sa zajedničkim fondom. Povećaće seriju štampanja svog idiotskog engleskog letka i čvrsto se usidriti u idiotskom EU gej aktivizmu; idiotski letak će biti dostupan svuda i tako ćemo svi postati idioti. Jedan od njih smatra da bi bilo pametno ne pomenuti, u finalnoj verziji letka, u odeljku o javnom i privatnom, feminizam. Kaže da ne vidi kako bi te dve stvari bile povezane. A mi duboko verujemo da se nama ne može desiti ništa gore od nesrećne ljubavi. Kada lezbejka ili gej postaju homoseksualci? Nakon opijumske fantazije koju zovemo ljubav, otkriju da svet ima svoja ograničenja; kada ih obuzme melanholija i tuga i očaj, i kada iz te melanholije, te tuge i tog očaja počnu da stvaraju umetnost; kada od lezbejke ili geja nastane stoički homoseksualni kemp koji na užase života gleda mirno i ravnodušno te mu tada više niko ništa ne može učiniti.

Mislim da, ako sada nemam materijala, kada sam u blizini ovih ljudi, ovog „naroda” koji je usporen svojim beskorisnim standardom i koji oseća egzistencijalni manjak, onda sam idiot.

Alkohol, pričanje pustolovnih priča bez razmišljanja, čitava gomila avantura, žalbe tridesetpetogodišnjaka na svoje roditelje, radikalno brutalni odnosi između ljubavnika i prijatelja, prihvatanje poklona bez razumevanja, jurcanje unaokolo, nerazgovaranje, užurbanost, agresivni pokreti, spektakl, adrenalin, turbo, događaji, strah od složenosti, strah od objašnjenja, oni koji nešto mogu da smisle, bez kontakata. Od rođenja do smrti, ljudi, uklješteni između konvencija i utopija, vole da misle da su slobodni; nadničari sa svojim neuhranjenim životima i malom sindikalnom binom na kojoj narodnjački bend svira državnu himnu. To je ta stvarnost. Mi ćemo biti sitničavi, čak i ako ne postojimo. Sve je preusmereno, sve je zloupotrebjeno. Bili smo u sobi, pili kafu, pušili i spremali se da krenemo, kada smo začuli glasove demonstiranja i istrčali na terasu, da bismo na raskrnicu videli tu mrvu, što je razlog zašto živim u toj proklesoj sobi: gomilu radnika, svi u crvenom, crveno more, crveni barjaci. Idemo!

Evo me ovde kako se malo zajebavam s vama. Decenijama je vreme idiotsko. Lezbejska beskućnica. Četrdeset i četiri godine u antiejdz civilizaciji. Antiurban šok. Antiindividualizam. Ne možeš da budeš sam.

Ne možeš da sedneš, naručiš piće i pišeš. Istog trena neko se nađe da ti dosađuje. Čitam pesme Džune Barns, „Knjiga o odbojnim ženama”. Punim baterije za foto-aparat, dorađujem slike na računaru, dodajem boje. Nekako mi ponestaje novca. Slomljeni i pijani homoseksualci iz mračnog polusveta, mi ne možemo da saosećamo sa visokoakademske blefiranjem. Mi nemamo ništa zajedničko s tim. Dok pišem ovaj tekst, pitam se da li je to u redu. Nema honorara, nema autorskog prava. Zbog solidarnosti i kreativnog opšteg dobra, umreću od gladi. Niko nije ni gej ni lezbejka. A kamoli homoseksualac. Prošla sam osmočasovnu razliku u vremenu da napišem tu priču. Međutim, nije se pojavila. U potrazi sam za pričom o ljubavi iako ne mogu da je nađem. Ljubav može da cveta samo u dalekim krajevima sveta, kao što su evropski gradovi, posebno Ljubljana. Dok sam bila tamo, u visokoj preriji, i lopatom čistila sneg, i poput Amerikanaca pozdravljala mahanjem svakoga ko prođe, kad sam kupila AC/DC majicu kakvu je nosila Fransis Mekdormand u filmu Kanjon Lorel, dok sam se vozila kroz pustinju i prolazila pored kaktusa, kroz Divlji zapad jugozapadnim autoputevima, koji više ne izgleda kao u knjigama Sema Šeparda, kada sam kupila čokoladni desert Twinkies da bih saznala šta piše Ričard Goldstajn kada piše o gejevima i za čim Vudi Harelson tako grozničavo traga u filmu Dobro došli u zemlju zombija, kada sam autoputevima sa šest traka ulazila u San Francisko i Los Anđeles, sve što sam našla bilo je: drumovi, mrtvi gradići, prazan grad, pun grad, preseljenje, brzina, raseljavanje, pokret, dezintegracija, humanist, izgubljenost u milijardama ulica, borba za prostor, za teritoriju, obeležavanje zone.

Ništa. Otići ću u prodavnicu i ukrasti hranu u vrednosti od 40 evra, baš kao ona žena u jučerašnjim vestima. Zakon protiv pušenja je još uvek na snazi. Za bolje vidike neophodno je dotaći dno.

Sa engleskog na srpski prevela Dragana Govedarica Kostopoulos

NEW MORNING

Nataša Velikonja

It is a new morning, the radio reports that the water is contaminated, “enriched,” it is said with pesticides, feces; the precarious are going to work, through my window the gasoline exhausts are entering, all buses and cars stand still on a spot, helicopters are in the air, the police has blocked all the streets of the city center, because in the court will appear a para-state cocaine group associated with arms trafficking. Exactly the way it was some days before when Angela Merkel visited Slovenia. Similarly to Mister Smith in The Matrix that replicates himself infinitely. People wonder if there will be a war, whether or not there will be inflation, if Argentina from 2001 will repeat or not, the jewelers in the city hang their ads for special selling offers of gold grams, the festival of alternative theaters for its opening event staged the demolition of giant dominoes and the art audience was excited, it applauded and screamed with excitement. Then all this retarded audience goes under the white canopy, drinking cappuccino, their dumb kids rage around with prepotency that they learned from their parents; power prepotency that will be later in their life abundantly sadistically practiced. The main topic of the festival is environmental protection and sustainable development.

In 1967, the year when I was born, Nova Gorica, this architectural experiment of the WWII Communists, a

Slovenian city near the Italian border, was already erected. On the lawn between our residential blocks and the main road at every new year they constructed a fairy village, a few wooden houses for children to play, in which absolutely nothing happened, except that the people, "folk," were there at night shitting and pissing.

Ok, in short. That new morning I was awakened by my own dreams. It was a literature event, and I was there, too, the event was a little urban, and a little flavored with a landscape; it was a peasant dungeon, actually, and in terms of literature, it was all so, as usual, without meaning. Who will read a poem today? The award was given to one cunt that once in the past performed a blow job to a Slovenian writer and that was it; there was as well another dick, a boring writer that has already won hundreds of awards, but he still did not have enough, ah what a bulimic pig.

Then there was an exhibition, a whole bunch of photos, over which people go excited, if they recognize themselves, then photographs with some hay racks, with happy groups of people, ah typical situations..., something..., always the same. If I am precise, this has been some glimpses of the Metelkova scene, two girls, two punks who kiss each other, one guy with dreadlocks that spits fire, another that shreds the guitar, all in all only alternative people, no one shitting and pissing, and not only at night, but not even in the day, though there were an enormous quantity of people. I do not know who else was still there. I know though, like in all my dreams, I was looking for a room, where to stay.

In that new morning, anyway, I'm sitting in a twenty square meters chamber, smoking cigarettes that are following the new European directives covered with chemicals, supposedly to suspend the danger of fire from smoldering cigarette butts, but I can also say to "suspend" the one who smokes. In recent weeks, therefore several of my acquaintances have stopped smoking. I don't. I have smoked since I was 12, and I know that in one or another way I have just no chance, as during that same day in the evening I will go to the lesbian bar where lesbians without mercy and without pause will fuck each other in the head, and then there will pass by one of the many hysterical straights that in these fucked lesbians sees the embodiment of revolutionary spirit; their intrusion into our small space is as a realization of a sample of the common that is a new age of social landfill, and where they love to insert their pincers and chopsticks. In short, there will come one of these straights with her new domestic project for the gay and lesbian scene and rape us with organic tomatoes that are grown in the acidified soil near the train station. This is called the urban perma self-sustainability.

Night at Metelkova, very close to the organic tomatoes: five homophobic thugs have beaten Tomislav and his boyfriend. Police came and first complained, demanding to switch off the music in front of the Hunters (Lovci) building, because the neighborhood complains. It lasted five hours. At three in the morning there are four lesbians and three gays waiting for a taxi and on the other side of the street up and down the sidewalk homophobic thugs rumble like Fireball Dogs with beer bottles in their hands and just because of the traffic they couldn't reach us. The gays jumped in the taxi and the thugs threw on it in a pure rage all their bottles. We, the lesbians ran back, searching for a shelter in Metelkova. Within the walls of the autonomous cultural center Metelkova, at its multitude heart, in the club Gromka, they urinated on Petra and Meta, a lesbian couple.

The Multitude was not capable to put together not one word of protest or condemnation. But do not start to moralize, because even in your institution they urinate on lesbians and gays. Two Swedes, gay activists, give because of this to a common fund of the International Partnership against Homophobic Discrimi-

nation a bigger amount of money than others, especially more than eastern European countries. The gay activist speaks all the time about "Swedish money." From a Western country they brought an idiotic leaflet that they want to market as an activist share within the idiotic EU-gay activism. More money means more decisions. The Swedes have decided what will be done with the common fund. They will increase a print run of their English idiotic leaflet and will firmly anchor themselves in the idiotic EU-gay activism; the idiotic leaflet will be available everywhere and so we will all become idiots. One of them considers it being a good idea not to mention, in the final version of the leaflet in the section on public and private, feminism. He says he does not know how these two things would be connected. And we truly believe that nothing worse than an unhappy love can happen to us. When does a lesbian or gay become a homosexual? After the Opium fantasy that we call love, they find out that the world has limits; when they are taken by melancholy and sadness and despair and start to create art from this melancholy and sadness and this despair; when from the lesbian or gay occurs a homosexual camp stoic, which at the disasters of life remains peaceful and light and then nobody really can do anything more to him.

I think if now I have no material, when I am in the vicinity of these people, of this "folk" that is slow down by its useless standard and which feels the existential deficit, then I'm an idiot. Alcohol, narrating adventures story without reflection, the whole mound of adventures, complaining of the people at the age of thirty-five years about their parents, radically brutal relations between lovers and friends, accepting gifts without understanding, hoofing it around, no talking, hustle, aggressive movements, spectacle, adrenaline, turbo, events, fear of complexity, fear of explanation, those who can come up with something, no contacts. People from birth to death, being clamped in between conventions and utopias, like to think that they are free, wage workers with their malnourished lives and their small unions-stage, on which a folk-song band plays the national anthem. That is the reality. We will be fussy, even if we do not exist. All is redirected, all is misused. We were in the room, we drank coffee, we were smoking and getting ready to go, and we heard the voice of demonstrations, we ran out onto the terrace and at the crossroads I see the crumb, which is the reason why I am living in that damn room: the crowd of workers, all in red, red sea, Red banners. Let's go!

Here I am little fucking with you. For decades, the weather is idiotic. Lesbian Down & Out. Forty-four years in anti-age civilization. Anti-urban shock. Anti-individualism. You cannot be alone. You cannot sit, order a drink and write. Immediately someone bothers you. I read poems by Djuna Barnes, "The book of repulsive women." I charge the camera batteries, reworking images on the computer, adding color. Kind of running out of money. Broken and drunken homosexuals from the dark half-world, we cannot identify with high academic bluff. We have nothing in common with it. As I am writing this text, I wonder if this is ok. There is no fee, no copyright. For reasons of solidarity and creative common good I will die of starvation. No one is gay or lesbian. Let alone homosexual. I went through eight hours time difference to draw up the story. However, it did not come up. I am looking for a story about love, though I can't find it. Love can flourish only in remote parts of the world, such as are European cities, especially Ljubljana. When I was there in the high prairie clearing the snow with a shovel and like Americans waving a greeting, if someone passed by, when I buy a T-shirt AC / DC, the same as Frances McDormand was wearing in the film Laurel Canyon, while driving through the desert, passing the cacti, through the wild west, through the south-west highways, which is no longer as in Sam Shepard books, when I bought a chocolate dessert Twinkies to find out what Richard Goldstein is writing, when he writes about gays, and what so feverishly Woody Harrelson

is searching in the movie *Zombieland*, when I was through the six lane highway entering San Francisco and Los Angeles, I found only this: the roads, dead towns, empty city, full city, relocation, speed, displacement, movement, disintegration, humanity, lost in billion of the streets, fighting for space, for territory, marking of the zone.

Nothing. I will go in the store and steal food in an amount of 40 Euros, just like that woman from yesterday's news. The anti-smoking law is still in force. For better perspectives, it is necessary to reach the bottom.

Translated from Slovenian into English by Marina Gržinić



Relations. 25 Years of the Lesbian Group ŠKUC-LL, Ljubljana (2012), M. Gržinić, A. Šmid and Z. Simčič

AMBIVALENCIJE: KAKO SE KĆERKE NOSE SA NACISTIČKOM PROŠLOŠĆU SVOJIH OČEVA?

Klub Dvojka (Simone Bader i Jo Šmajser)

I. Ambivalencije: kako se kćerke nose sa nacističkom prošlošću svojih očeva? Odlomci iz razgovora vođenog između Kluba Dvojka (Simone Bader i Jo Šmajser) i Helge Hofbauer, decembra 2006. godine u kafiću „Prikel” u Beču, Austrija.

Helga: Moj otac je bio pripadnik Vafen SS, oružanih jedinica SS (nacističkog „zaštitnog odreda”). U vreme kada im se pridružio bio je prilično mlad; dobrovoljno se prijavio sa 16 godina. Babe i dede mojih roditelja bili su nacističke pristalice. Nisu bili članovi stranke, ali znam da nisu pokazivali bilo kakvu vrstu otpora i zato mogu da ih zovem „pristalicama”.

Klub Dvojka: Kako su se Vaši roditelji upoznali?

Helga: Moja majka je 19 godina mlađa od mog oca. Ona je rođena 1942, a on 1923. Uzeli su se kasnije, nekih šezdesetih. Otac je, kada se vratio iz zarobljeničtva kao ratni zarobljenik, radio kao knjigovođa. Onda je započeo sopstveni biznis otvorišći radnju u kojoj je prodavao kancelarijski materijal i knjige u jednoj varošici u južnoj Štajerskoj gde smo rođeni i on i ja. Znam i da je želeo da postane kuvar i da je bio sportski tip. Mislim da je upravo zahvaljujući tom sportskom elanu stigao do nacista, naročito do SS jedinice.

Klub Dvojka: Koliko je nacistička prošlost bila prisutna u Vašoj porodici posle rata? Da li je Vaš otac pričao o tome šta je radio dok je bio pripadnik SS?

Helga: Prilično je bio opsednut time i iznova bi prepričavao iste priče. Istinski je idealizovao SS. To-liko je pričao o vremenu provedenom u SS jedinici da je već svima živima bilo dosadilo da ga slušaju. Majka bi po običaju ustala i napustila sobu istog trenutka kada je počinjao svoje priče. Sestra i ja nismo mogle tek tako da izađemo. Uvek bismo osporavale ono što je rekao i svađale smo se s njim. Što smo bivale starije to smo više insistirale da prestane s tim pričama. To je bio najobičniji psihološki teror, stalno iste priče.

Klub Dvojka: Da li Vaša majka znala da je bio esesovac kada su se upoznali?

Helga: Jeste. On to nikad nije krio. Imali smo i njegovu sliku sa SS kapom, sa lobanjom na mestu grba. Dugo je stajala na polici u našoj dnevnoj sobi.

Klub Dvojka: Kako ste Vi gledali na tu kapu? Mora da je bila strašna. Da li se s ponosom prikazivao na taj način?

Helga: Jeste. S njegove tačke gledišta, to što je ta slika stajala tamo bio je znak otpora. Mene nije plašila slika, već moj otac kao pojava. Dok sam bila dete, nikada mi nije odgovorio ni na jedno moje pitanje. Kada bih ga upitala „kako mu je bilo”, on bi uvek promumlao neki ofucani kliše.

Klub Dvojka: Da li postoji neki poseban događaj koji vas je naveo da se pozabavite nacističkom prošlošću svoga oca?

Helga: Kada sam u školi postala politički aktivnija počela sam da obrazujem sopstveno mišljenje i prestala da ponavljam ono što je rekao moj otac. Časovi istorije su nam bili zaista dobri. Sada se bavim konkretnim istraživanjem njegove prošlosti da bih otkrila, na primer, kojoj SS jedinici je pripadao i kada i gde je bio stacioniran u Evropi. Želela sam

da saznam jer sam opet počela da hodam u snu. To je bio razlog koji me je naterao da se još više usredsredim. Otac je u mom životu bio ambivalentna figura. S jedne strane, imao je veoma lošu narav i bio je psihički nasilan, dok je, s druge, u meni izazivao empatiju i saosećanje. Drama mog detinjstva i rane mladosti bila je u tome što su ova sukobljena osećanja bila neverovatna snažna. To je tako tipično osećanje prema počinocima nekog nedela – da ih u isto vreme i volite. U to vreme sam njegove postupke tumačila kao nešto što nije mogao da izbegne. Danas su moja osećanja prema njemu daleko jasnija. Ali, dok sam bila mlađa, stalno sam bila između odbacivanja i ljubavi, empatije i saosećanja prema njemu. Uvek je pričao o tome kako je bio ranjen i kakve je sve užasne stvari video dok je bio medicinar. Sebe je dosledno prikazivao kao žrtvu. Deca su veoma prijemčiva u odnosu na takve stvari. Ona nemaju logičku podlogu – kakvu ja sada imam – dok ne odrastu. Sada, kad mi se počinilac nedela opiše kao žrtva, imam znanje i moć da mu kažem – to je samo priča koja nema blage veze sa istorijom. Onda nisam imala uvid poput ovog, tako da je sve to bilo vrlo dvosmisleno i teško.

Klub Dvojka: Da li su od đaka u Vašoj školi tražili da na času pričaju o istoriji svoje porodice?

Helga: Ne, ali za razliku od mog oca, moj nastavnik istorije vladao je činjenicama. Budući da sam bila dete, dobro je što su u mojoj blizini bili racionalni ljudi. Zbog složene emotivne upletenosti moj otac je dirigovao čitavom porodicom tako da sam potvrdu nalazila u objektivnosti i istorijskim činjenicama. Na primer, u činjenicama koliko ljudi je ubijeno, ko je kome, gde i kada objavio rat i tako dalje. Otac je te činjenice uvek relativizovao, i poput mnogih drugih iz njegove generacije, menjao njihovo značenje na raznorazne načine. Na časovima istorije to se nije radilo; tamo je bilo upravo suprotno. U to vreme za mene je to predstavljalo veliku utehu.

Klub Dvojka: Rekli ste da Vam je majka sušta suprotnost ocu? Kako je to izgledalo?

Helga: Bila je učiteljica i zastupala je slobodnu pedagogiju. Smatrala je da decu treba pustiti da rade šta god požele sve dok to ne ide na štetu drugima. Veoma se protivila autoritativnim pravilima. Ukoliko bi uveče negde izašla, ostajala bi do kasno. Pokazivala nam je, sopstvenim primerom, da vodi svoj život i da ne dozvoljava da bude zatvorena u kući.

Klub Dvojka: Kakva je bila njena uloga kada se o nacističkoj eri govorilo u porodici?

Helga: Nikada nije želela da priča o tome. Nikada se nije izjasnila o nacističkoj eri. Ako bismo se okomili na nju i terali je da nam nešto kaže, jedino bi rekla da je ubeđena da naš otac nikad nije nikoga ubio. Kada čujete tako jaku izjavu kada vam je deset, dvanaest godina – ne možete da je ignorirate. Ona je doprinela mojim krajnje oprečnim osećanjima jer to jednostavno nije moglo biti. Izgovorila bi to kao da je najnormalnija stvar na svetu, ali nemoguće da je to zaista bilo tako!

Klub Dvojka: Očevu prošlost počeli ste da istražujete pre neke dve ili tri godine. Kako je na to reagovala Vaša porodica, to jest, Vaša majka?

Helga: Iskreno sam se plašila da joj saopštim. Ali morala sam pošto mi je trebala očeva umrlica zbog istraživanja u državnom arhivu. Mirno je to primila, nije mnogo pitala i sredila mi je da dobijem umrlicu. Tokom godina se sve više interesovala i čak je i sama započela neka istraživanja. Imam utisak da se pomirila s činjenicom da se ovim bavim. I dalje se sukobljavamo jer ona ima jedan veoma revizionistički pristup istoriji. Kad god pričamo o tome ona insistira na tome da su počinio nedela i sami bili žrtve, što me svaki put izbaci iz takta.

Klub Dvojka: Šta ste do sada otkrili?

Helga: U početku sam imala jaku želju da prikupim činjenične podatke. Sada mi je jasno s koliko muke se dolazi do takvih informacija. Teško je doći do

nekih dokumenata u arhivu jer je često neophodan potpis bliskog srodnika da bi se ona dobila. Da biste podneli zahtev za pristup nekom dokumentu morate da se bakćete sa čitavom porodicom. A to umnogome usporava stvari. Zbog toga sam se usredsredila na naš porodični kontekst i one od kojih mogu da dobijem podatke. Trenutno razmišljam o tome da se javim jednom očevom prijatelju, koji je zajedno s njim bio u SS. Sada živi u severnoj Nemačkoj.

Klub Dvojka: Da li ste znali za njega kad ste bili mlađi?

Helga: Često nas je posećivao. Jednom smo, kad smo bile male, moja sestra i ja tamo išle na raspust. Mislim da je dobro što se moj istraživački rad sada odvija u nekoliko pravaca.

Klub Dvojka: Pomenuli ste da je Vaš otac zloupotrebljavao svoju poziciju moći u porodici.

Helga: Imao je veoma lošu narav i bio je vrlo strog u svakom pogledu. Bio je krajnje autoritativan i manipulativan, a umeo je i da vređa. Ja sam uglavnom doživljavala psihičko zlostavljanje. Jednostavno nije znao za granice. Stalno je tražio pažnju, želeo je da drugi nešto čine za njega. Da bi to postigao uglavnom je koristio onu svoju ambivalentnu prirodu, koju sam već opisala. Koristio je činjenicu da ga njegova deca vole. Davao bi nam stvari i vodio nas na putovanja, ali bi nas i emotivno iskorišćavao stalno nas psujući i omalovažavajući nas. Bez prestanka.

Klub Dvojka: Kako to mislite „emotivno vas je iskorišćavao”?

Helga: Ponižavao nas je i vređao. Pod „emotivnim iskorišćavanjem” mislim na to što je koristio svoj položaj oca koga deca vole – jer sva deca vole svoje očeve – da bi nas maltretirao. Mislim da je to je veoma česta pojava. Gledao bi da su sve njegove potrebe zadovoljene i ako bi u tome otišao predaleko – ne možete ni decu beskraino ponižavati, jer će u nekom trenutku i ona poželeti da se otrgnu – kupio bi nam sladoled...

Klub Dvojka: Kako vas je ponižavao?

Helga: Govorio nam je razne stvari, kako smo glupe i kako se ponašamo kao da sve znamo a u stvari nemamo pojma ni o čemu. Često je to bilo nešto u vezi sa školom jer on sam nikad nije završio srednju školu. Rekao nam je da je bio veoma loš đak. Uvek nas je ponižavao kad smo donosile dobre ocene.

Ako bismo rekle nešto pametno, on bi obavezno tvrdio da je to glupost. Mislim da je to više bilo pitanje inteligencije. Takođe me je kritikovao zbog mog tela jer kao mala nisam baš bila vitka. Nije mi nikada rekao da sam debela ili da mi nešto ružno stoji, već bi redovno koristio tipične fraze kao „nikad se nećeš udati”. Bilo mi je drago kad je umro. Njegova smrt izazvala je visok stepen ambivalencije u meni. S jedne strane, bila sam vezana za njega i volela sam ga, dok sam ga se s druge plašila i mrzela ga. Zbog toga mi je, u stvari, bilo drago kad je umro. Onda sam počela da idem na terapiju. Nisam mogla da se oslobodim njegove slike, jer je bila tako neverovatno snažna i duboko urezana. Trebalo mi je zaista dosta vremena da je odagnam. Kako stvari stoje, još uvek radim na tome, upravo ovde i sada.

II. Ambivalencije: kako se kćerke nose sa nacističkom prošlošću svojih očeva? Odlomci iz razgovora vođenog između Kluba Dvojka (Simone Bader i Jo Šmajser) i Patricije Rošenbah, decembra 2006. godine u kafiću „Prikel” u Beču, Austrija.

Patricija: Moj otac se silno trudio da svi jasno znaju da je nacionalsocijalista.

Otvoreno i javno je iznosio antisemitske, rasističke, okrutne i nehumane primedbe.

Klub Dvojka: Možete li da nam date neki primer?

Patricija: Ne želim doslovce da ponavljam njegove reči. Ali mogu da vam opišem. Ja sam osetljiva na svoje poreklo. Znam kako sam odrasla i nije mi lako

da o tome pričam, pogotovo o događajima iz ranog detinjstva. Bilo je toliko mnogo protivrečnosti da mi je teško da ih restrospektivno sredim. U nekoj meri moram da se oslonim i na pamćenje. Ponekad se zapitam da li je bilo ovako ili onako, ili pokušavam da se setim kada nam je ispričao određenu priču. U više navrata sam pokušavala da se prisetim kada je tačno počeo da nam iznosi svoja bukvalno užasna sećanja, u šta se strastveno i s ponosom unosio... Moj otac je bio srčani član SS („Schutzstaffel”, nacističkog zaštitnog odreda) i tamo je dobio i priznanje. Nisam to mogla da shvatim kad sam bila dete.

Klub Dvojka: Ispričali ste nam priču o partizanima.
Patricija: Da. Vidite, ne znam koliko sam imala godina, ali sam mislila da su partizani jeleni ili neke divlje životinje jer se oduvek pričalo, ili sam ga čula nekoliko puta, kako je ubijao ili pucao na partizane. U mislima sam ga videla kako puca na nešto i mislila da mora da je išao u lov. Kasnije, kada sam saznala ko su zapravo partizani, bila sam apsolutno šokirana. Bila sam šokirana što sam verovala da su partizani „divlje životinje”.

Klub Dvojka: Suočili ste svog oca s činjenicom da mu istražujete prošlost. Kako ste se osećali kada ste mu postavljali pitanja vezana za njegovu ulogu tokom nacističke ere?

Patricija: Da. To se dešavalo tokom poslednjih pet godina njegovog života. Do dana današnjeg nisam otkrila njegov vojni čin. Nemam nikakve konkretne dokaze. Podnela sam zahtev za ispitivanje u Ahenu, ali tamo nisu ništa pronašli. Međutim, to ništa ne znači. Još uvek nisam bila u Berlinu. Ipak, u vojnom arhivu u Ahenu nemaju nikakvih podataka o njemu. Ni u državnom arhivu u Beču, u principu, izgleda da ne postoji ništa. Ostalo mi je da vidim da li moja polusestra i polubrat nešto znaju.

Klub Dvojka: Da li su oni stariji od Vas?

Patricija: Za njih sam saznala tek kada mi je bilo 20 godina. Svog polubrata sam videla svega dva puta u životu i s njim sam u problematičnim odnosima. Čim je video da pokušavam da saznam nešto više o našem ocu, osetio se da je pod pritiskom. Mora da mu je bilo prilično naporno da mi odgovori na tolika pitanja. Rekao mi je da više uopšte ne želi da se bavi „svojim starim”. Slika moje polusestre o našem ocu je prilično naivna. On ih je napustio kada je njoj bilo 15 godina. Iselio se i prekinuo sve veze. Verujem da bih iz razgovora sa bratom, sa svojim polubratom, mogla više da saznam. Želim da nađem očev vojni servisni broj, broj njegove jedinice u armiji, vojnu poštu u kojoj je bio stacioniran. To bi istraživanje u arhivu učinilo daleko lakšim. Ni moja majka nema nikakva dokumenta sa ovim podacima, a problem predstavlja i to što je moj otac šezdesetih godina promenio prezime. Hteo je da mu bude nemačko.

Klub Dvojka: Kako mu je bilo pravo prezime?

Patricija: Rzeschabek. Moj deda je bio Poljak. On je rođen 1888, moj otac 1914, a ja 1970.

Klub Dvojka: Da li se vaš otac oženio svojom prvom ženom tokom ili posle rata?

Patricija: Morala bih da proverim. Ne znam na pamet. Imala sam priliku samo jednom da je sretnem. Njena deca su organizovala jedno viđenje na koje su pozvali i svoju majku. Činilo mi se kao da mi je neko dao poklon kada je ušla u dnevnu sobu mog polubrata i pridružila se ostatku porodice. Rukovale smo se, a ja se nisam usudila da postavljam suviše pitanja. To svakako nije bila poenta večeri. Imala je tada 80 godina i nedugo potom je preminula.

Klub Dvojka: Kakva je bila uloga vašeg oca u porodici?

Patricija: Moj otac je bio poglavar. Ostao je nedodirljiv i nedokučiv. Bio je veoma rezervisan. Već je bio i relativno star – bilo mu je 60 kada smo brat i ja imali 6 odnosno 7 godina. Što se tiče njegove uloge u porodici, rekla bih da je bio tiranin. Imao je veoma

preku narav i stalno je vikao stvarajući sebi neverovatnu količinu prostora. Bio je prava enigma. Ja, na primer, nikada nisam znala koje je tačno godište. To je za mene bila tajna. Za svoje godine izgledao je relativno mlad. Nikada nisam otkrila koliko je star. Nikada nisam dobila nikakva dokumenta sa njegovim podacima. Ako je trebalo da odnesemo takve neke papire u školu, to je uvek činila moja majka. Sada znam da je to bilo zbog prezimena, jer se nije prezivao Reschenbach već Rzeschabek.

Klub Dvojka: Postoje li fotografije Vašeg oca iz nacističkog perioda?

Patricija: Da, imamo ih u porodičnom albumu. Postoji samo jedan album i to sa slikamanjegove druge porodice, to jest, naše porodice. Ima jedna mala crno-bela slika na kojoj maršira kroz Pariz. Ona je u našem albumu. Potom, fotografija na kojoj su baka i deda kada su se venčavali, što je iz neke 1908. ili 1909. Kao i jedna na kojoj je moj otac sa svojim bratom, koji je takođe poginuo u ratu. U našoj porodici ima mnogo tajni. Porodične tajne su štetne po ljude. Svi bi trebalo da imaju pravo da znaju neke stvari. Deca takođe imaju pravo da znaju, da otkriju bitne stvari. Eto, ja nisam ni znala da imam polubrata i polusestru. Moji roditelji su to krili od mene. Uz to je došao osećaj besa koji očigledno nisam znala na koga da usmerim pa sam ga usmerila prema sebi samoj, što je bilo autodestruktivno u najširem smislu. Osećaj krivice je takođe bila ozbiljna tema u našoj porodici. Kada sam saznala i prihvatila činjenicu da je moj otac nacista, osećala sam se krivom veoma dugo. On je umro 2000. godine. Tokom 1995. i 1996. godine, dok smo išli na porodičnu terapiju, konačno sam morala da se s time suočim. Bilo mi je strašno teško. Osećala sam odgovornost za očeve primedbe. Osećala sam i stid i krivicu. I često me je bilo užasno sramota zbog njega.

Klub Dvojka: Kako se osećate kada javno pričate o činjenici da je Vaš otac bio nacista?

Patricija: Za mene iznošenje te činjenice u javnost predstavlja deo suočavanja. Možda moja osećanja nisu uopšte bitna. Važno je da ja ovo radim! Iznošenje u javnost predstavlja čin raskrštanja s tim. A što se tiče mojih osećanja – radije o njima ne bih pričala.

Klub Dvojka: Napisali ste da imate unutrašnji otpor prema sopstvenim osećanjima.

Patricija: Tako je. Zato što su me sopstvena osećanja navela na pogrešan put. Zbog toga. Analitičko ili kritičko angažovanje daleko je korisnije od slušanja emocija. Isuviše dugo sam bila zavedena svojim osećanjima.

Klub Dvojka: Šta u ovom trenutku znate? Šta ste otkrili dosadašnjim istraživanjem? Šta Vam je rekao otac?

Patricija: Reкао mi je da je bio pripadnik SS-a; ponekad bi rekao da su to bile jedinice Vafen SS, nacistički zaštitni odred. U to vreme već je imao više od 80 godina i bio je pomalo izgubljen. Uz to, tokom poslednjih godina života više uopšte nije znao ko sam. Umeo je često da mi kaže: „Što te to interesuje? To se tebe ne tiče!” Kao da sam pokušavala da prođem glavom kroz zid. Bilo mi je zaista teško da mu postavljam ta pitanja. Poseta državnom arhivu beše događaj od 15 minuta. Ušla sam unutra, tražila okružnu evidenciju, iskopirala je i nakratko razgovarala sa istoričarem. Reкао mi je da im je datoteka tanka. Kada sam ga pitala šta to znači, rekao mi je da ne znači ništa posebno već da bi više podataka moglo postojati u Nemačkoj, gde mi je predložio da nastavim svoje istraživanje. Ono najvažnije za mene danas jeste da saznam da li je moj otac ostao nacionalsocijalista, nacista, do kraja. Preneo mi je to kroz ono što je govorio i čitavom svojom životnom filozofijom. Sada mi najteže pada što nikada nisam pronašla način da ga pitam dok je bio živ. Ono što mu najviše zameram jeste to što je zadržao taj stav do kraja.

Klub Dvojka: Htele bismo da Vas pitamo nešto o Vašoj kćerki. Kako s njom pričate o svom ocu?

Patricija: Moja kćerka je pročitala nekoliko kn-

jiga primerenih njenom uzrastu koje se bave nacionalsocijalističkom erom. Nije me mnogo pitala. Možda će kasnije. Sada ima 11 godina i zna da je njen deda – deka, koga je znala svega nekoliko godina, ali ga se ipak seća – bio nacista. Rekla sam joj da je bio deo te istorije. Da, to zna. I što bude starija, više će znati. Ipak, malo ću sačekati. Ne želim da je opteretim sa previše stvari. Možda će čak jednog dana poželeti da mi pomogne u ovom istraživanju. To bi bilo sjajno!

Klub Dvojka: Ispričali ste nam kako je jednom prilikom došla iz škole i postavila Vam izvesno pitanje.

Patricija: Da, a ja sam se nesmotreno upecala! Čekajte, kako je to bilo...

Klub Dvojka: Pitala Vas je kako je moguće da neko uradi tako nešto.

Patricija: Da. Tako je. Rekla sam joj: „Verovatno znaš kako je to kada si deo nečega i radiš stvari ne razmišljajući. Ili kada svi drugi rade nešto glupo, i ti se pridružiš bez protivljenja”. Tog trenutka sam shvatila koliko je moja sopstvena istorija beznadežno zamršena. Nisam uopšte imala nameru da to tako ublažim. To nije način na koji želim s tim da se nosim.

www.klubzwei.at

Sa engleskog na srpski prevela Dragana Govedarica Kostopoulos

AMBIVALENCES: DAUGHTERS DEALING WITH THEIR FATHER'S NAZI PASTS

Klub Zwei (Simone Bader and Jo Schmeiser)

I. **Ambivalences: Daughters dealing with their father's Nazi pasts; passages from a conversation between Klub Zwei (Simone Bader and Jo Schmeiser) and Helga Hofbauer in December 2006 at Café Prückel in Vienna, Austria.**

Helga: My father was in the Waffen SS, the armed unit of the SS ("Schutzstaffel," the Nazi's "Protective Squadron"). He was pretty young when he joined, he volunteered at 16. Both my mother's and my father's grandparents were Nazi followers. They weren't members of the Nazi Party, but I don't know of any acts of resistance, which is why I would call them "followers."

Klub Zwei: How did your mother and father meet?

Helga: My mother is 19 years younger than my father. She was born in 1942 and he was born in 1923. My parents married later, in the 1960s. My father worked as a bookkeeper after returning from captivity as a prisoner of war. He started up his own business and opened up a store selling stationery and books in a small town in southern Styria where he was born, and where I was born. I also know my father had wanted to become a cook and that he had been very athletic. I think it was his enthusiasm for sports that led him to the Nazis and particularly to the SS.

Klub Zwei: How present was the Nazi past in your family after the war? Did your father talk about what he did while he was in the SS?

Helga: He pretty much obsessively told the same stories over and over. He really idolized the SS. He talked about his time in the SS so much that everyone was tired of hearing about it. My mother regularly got up and left the room when he started telling stories. My sister and I couldn't just leave. We would always challenge what he said and fight with him. The older we got the more we insisted he stop talking about it. It was sheer psychological terror, always having to hear the same stories.

Klub Zwei: Did your mother know he was in the SS when they met?

Helga: Yes. He never hid it. There was a picture of him wearing a cap with a skull on the front, the SS cap. That picture was on a shelf in our living room for a very long time.

Klub Zwei: What was your reaction to this cap as a child? It must have been scary. Was he proud to present himself in that way?

Helga: Yes. From his point of view, not putting it away was an act of resistance. I didn't find the image threatening, but my father as a figure. When I was a child he never answered any of my questions. I would ask him things like "how was it for you?" He would always just regurgitate some old cliché.

Klub Zwei: Was there a particular incident that made you become interested in addressing your father's Nazi past?

Helga: In school when I became more political I started to form my own opinions and stopped repeating what my father said. Our history class was really good. Now I am doing concrete research on his past to find out, for example, what SS unit he belonged to and when and where he was stationed in Europe. I wanted to find out, because I started sleepwalking again. That was a reason for me to concentrate on it more. My father was an ambiva-

lent figure in my life. On the one hand he had an extremely bad temper and was psychologically violent, but on the other hand he made me feel empathy and compassion. The drama of my childhood and adolescence was that these conflicting feelings were so incredibly strong. It's typical to feel that way towards perpetrators, to also love them. At the time I interpreted his actions as something he just couldn't help doing. Now I have more clarity in my feelings toward him. But when I was young I kept going back and forth between rejecting and loving him and having empathy and compassion for him. My father always talked about being wounded and about all the terrible things he saw during his time as a medic. He consistently depicted himself as a victim. Children are really receptive to things like that. Children don't have the rationale - like I have now - until they are adults. Now, when perpetrators describe themselves as victims to me, I have the knowledge and power to say: that's only a story that doesn't have anything to do with history. I didn't have this insight back then, so it was all very ambivalent and tough.

Klub Zwei: Were the students in your school asked to discuss their families' histories in class?

Helga: No, but unlike my father, my history teacher was very factual. As a child it was good for me to be around rational people. Because of the elaborate emotional entanglement my father orchestrated with the entire family, I found reassurance in objectivity and historical facts. For example, in facts about how many people were murdered, who declared war on whom, when, where and so on. My father had always relativized these facts and, like so many others of his generation, he also changed their meaning in all kinds of ways. History class didn't do that at all; it did just the opposite. That was a great comfort to me at the time.

Klub Zwei: You said that your mother is the total opposite of your father. What was that like?

Helga: She was a teacher and free pedagogy was one of her aims. She believed children should be able to do anything they want as long as they don't harm anyone else. She was very strongly opposed to authoritarian rules. If she went out at night, she would stay out really long. She showed us, by example, that she led her own life and she would not allow herself be confined to the household.

Klub Zwei: What was her role when you spoke about the Nazi era within the family?

Helga: She never wanted to talk about it. She never said what she thought about the Nazi era. If we cornered her and forced her to say something, she would say that she's sure that my father never killed anyone. That really stuck in my mind, because it was a very strong statement to hear at the age of ten or twelve. It also contributed to my extremely conflicting feelings, because that couldn't possibly be. She would say it like it was the most natural thing, but it couldn't possibly have been like that!

Klub Zwei: You began researching your father's past two or three years ago. How did your family, i.e. your mother react?

Helga: I was really afraid to tell her. But I needed my father's death certificate for my research at the National Archives. She was cool, didn't ask too many questions, and arranged the death certificate for me. Over the years she's become more and more interested and has even started to do some research on her own. I have the feeling that she's accepted the fact that I'm doing this research. We still have conflicts about it, because she has a very revisionist approach to history. Whenever we talk about it, she always brings up how the perpetrators were also victims and that gets me worked up every time.

Klub Zwei: What have you found out so far?

Helga: In the beginning, I felt the strong need to gather factual information. Now I know how hard it

actually is to get this kind of information. It is difficult to gain access to certain documents in the archives, because they often require a close relative to sign for their release. In order to submit a request for a document at the archives, you have to deal with the whole family. That really slows the work down. That's why I shifted my focus onto my own family context and contexts that I am able to access information on. At the moment I am considering contacting my father's friend who was in the SS with him. He lives in northern Germany.

Klub Zwei: Did you know about him when you were younger?

Helga: He often visited us. When we were children, my sister and I went there for vacation once. I find it positive that my research now runs along several paths.

Klub Zwei: You mentioned that your father abused his position of power within the family.

Helga: He had an extremely bad temper and was very controlling all across the board. He was particularly authoritative and manipulative. I know that he was abusive too. I mainly experienced psychological abuse. He just wouldn't accept boundaries. He always wanted attention; he wanted you to do things for him. It was mostly his ambivalent nature that I already described, which he would use to his advantage. He took advantage of the fact that his children loved him. He would give us things and take us on trips. But he would also take advantage of us emotionally by constantly bad-mouthing and belittling us, non-stop.

Klub Zwei: What do you mean when you say he took advantage of you emotionally?

Helga: He was very degrading and insulting. What I mean by "emotionally taking advantage" is that he used his position as a father whose children loved him - because all children love their fathers - in order to mistreat us. That's a pretty common phenomenon, I think. He would make sure his own needs were met and if he went too far - you can't just keep on humiliating children endlessly, at some point even children will want to run away - he would buy us ice cream...

Klub Zwei: How did he degrade you?

Helga: He said all kinds of things, like that we were stupid and we only acted like we knew things, but that we actually knew nothing. It was often in reference to school, because he never finished secondary school. He did really poorly in school, he told us so. He would always put us down when we got high marks. If we said something smart he was bound to tell us that it was stupid. It was more an issue of intelligence, I think. He also put me down because of my body, because I wasn't thin as a child. He never said I was too fat or that something looked ugly on me, instead he would always use typical phrases like "you'll never find a husband." I was glad when he died. His death triggered a high level of ambivalence in me. On the one hand I was attached to him and loved him, and on the other hand I hated and feared him. That's why I was actually glad when he died. Then I went into therapy. I hadn't been able to get rid of that image of him, because it was so incredibly powerful and deeply ingrained. It has taken me a really long time to dispel it. As a matter of fact I am still working on it, right here and now.

II. **Ambivalences: Daughters dealing with their father's Nazi pasts; passages from a conversation between Klub Zwei (Simone Bader and Jo Schmeiser) and Patricia Reschenbach in December 2006 at Café Prückel in Vienna, Austria.**

Patricia: My father made sure that there was no question about his being a National Socialist. He openly made anti-Semitic, racist, cruel and inhuman remarks.

Klub Zwei: Could you give us an example?

Patricia: I don't want to repeat his exact words. But I can describe it to you. I am conscious of my background. I know how I grew up and it's not easy to talk about it, particularly about my early childhood experiences. There were so many contradictions that it's difficult for me to sort it all out in retrospect. I also have to rely on my memory to some extent. Sometimes I ask myself if it was like this or that, or I try to remember when he told a certain story. I have made repeated attempts to reconstruct when it was that he began recounting – his literally horrific reminiscences – in which he indulged with such pride and passion... My father had been an enthusiastic member of the SS ("Schutzstaffel," the Nazi's "Protective Squadron"), which is also where he got his recognition. I wasn't able to make sense of that when I was a child.

Klub Zwei: You told us a story about the partisans.

Patricia: Yes. Well, I don't know how old I was, but I had always thought that partisans were deer or wild animals because there was always talk about – or I heard him say a couple of times that he had been – shooting partisans or "shooting at" them. I thought about him "shooting at" something and thought he must've been hunting. Later I found out what partisans really were and was totally shocked. I was really shocked that I had thought "partisans are wild animals."

Klub Zwei: You confronted your father with the fact that you are researching his history. What was it like to ask him questions about his role during the Nazi era?

Patricia: Yes. That took place during the last five years of his life. To this very day, I still don't know his military rank. I don't have any real evidence. I put in a research request in Aachen, but they didn't find anything out. But that doesn't mean much, because I haven't been to Berlin yet. Still, the military archive in Aachen had nothing on him. In principle, the National Archives in Vienna doesn't seem to have anything either. I still need to get information from my half-siblings.

Klub Zwei: Are your half-siblings older than you?

Patricia: I only found out about them when I was 20 years old. I've only seen my half-brother twice in my life and we have a very troubled relationship. As soon as he notices that I am trying to get more information on my father he feels pressured. It must have been really taxing for him to have me ask so many questions. He said that he didn't want to have to deal with his "old man" at all anymore. My half-sister's idea of my father is fairly naïve. He left when she was 15. He moved out and cut off all contact completely. I think I could find out more by talking to my brother, my half-brother. I want to know my father's military service number and his fieldpost number, the military postal code of where he was stationed. That would make research at the archives much easier. My mother has no documents with this information either and another problem is that my father changed his name in the 1960s. He wanted to have a German name.

Klub Zwei: What was his name originally?

Patricia: Rzeschabek. My grandfather was Polish. He was born in 1888. My father was born in 1914 and I was born in 1970.

Klub Zwei: Did your father marry his first wife during or after the war?

Patricia: I'd have to look that up. I don't know it off hand. I only had the opportunity to meet her once. Her children had arranged a meeting and invited their mother to their house. It was like receiving a present when she came into my brother's living room and joined the family. I shook her hand and did not dare ask her too many questions. That wasn't what that evening was about anyway. She was 80 years of age at the time. She died shortly after.

Klub Zwei: What was your father's role in the family?

Patricia: He was a patriarch. He always remained intangible and incomprehensible. He was a very distanced person. He was relatively old already, too – he was 60 when my brother and I were six and seven years old. As for my father's role in the family, I would say that it was powerful and tyrannical. He had a very short temper and would always shout and create an incredible amount of space for himself. He was an enigma, too. For instance, I never really knew how old he was. It was always a mystery to me. My father looked relatively young for his age. I never found out how old he was. I was never given any documents that contained information about him. If we had to bring anything like that to school my mother always held onto it. Now I know that it was because his name had been Rzeschabek and not Reschenbach.

Klub Zwei: Are there any photographs of your father during the Nazi era?

Patricia: Yes, in our family album. There's only one album from his second family, our family. There's a small black and white photograph of him marching in Paris. That's in our family album. There's also a photo of my grandparents when they got married, which is from 1908 or 1909. And there's another photo of my father with his brother who also died in the war. We had lots of family secrets. Family secrets are damaging to people. They should have a right to know certain things. Children also have the right to know, to find out important things. For example, I didn't even know that I had half-siblings. My parents kept this from me. There's a feeling of anger attached to it, and I obviously didn't know who to direct this anger at, so I directed it at myself, which was self-destructive in the broadest sense. Guilt was also a big topic in our family. When I found out and accepted the fact that my father is a Nazi, I felt guilty for a really long time. He died in 2000. In 1995 or 1996, when I did the family reconstruction in therapy, I finally had to contend with it. It was difficult for me. I felt responsible for my father's remarks. I also felt shame and guilt. I was often terribly ashamed of him.

Klub Zwei: What's it like for you to speak in public about the fact that your father was a Nazi?

Patricia: To me, making it public is part of dealing with it. Perhaps my feelings don't matter at all. What's important is that I do this! Making it a public issue is an act of breaking with it. And as for my emotions – I'd rather not speak about them.

Klub Zwei: You wrote that you have an inner resistance to your own emotions.

Patricia: Yes, because my emotions have been misleading. That's why. Analytical or critical engagement is much more helpful than following my emotions. My emotions have led me astray for so long.

Klub Zwei: What do you know at this point? What have you found out in your research so far? What did your father tell you?

Patricia: He said that he had been in the SS; sometimes he would say it was the Waffen SS, the Nazi's armed "Protective Squadron." He was over 80 at the time and a bit disoriented. And, in the last few years of his life he didn't recognize me at all anymore. He would also often say: "Why do you want to know that? That's none of anyone's business!" It was like coming up against a brick wall. It was pretty difficult to ask him questions. My visit to the National Archives was a fifteen-minute affair. I went inside, requested the district records, copied them and spoke briefly to the historian. He said that the file was thin. When I asked him what that meant, he said that it didn't mean much and that there may be more information in Germany, which is where he suggested I continue my research. The most important thing for me to know today is whether my father remained a National Socialist, a Nazi, to the very end. He conveyed this to me through what he said and his entire

life philosophy. The most difficult thing for me now is that I never found a way to question it while he was still alive. What I mainly blame him for is that he kept that attitude until the very end.

Klub Zwei: We wanted to ask you about your daughter. How do you speak to her about your father?

Patricia: My daughter has read several books written for her age group that deal with the National Socialist era. She hasn't asked many questions. She may later. She is now eleven and knows her grandfather – grandpa, who she only knew for a few years but still has memories of – was a Nazi. I told her that he had been part of that history. Yes, she knows that. And her knowledge will grow when she's older. But I'm going to wait a little bit. I don't want to overburden her with too many things. Maybe she'll even want to help me do this research one day. That would be wonderful!

Klub Zwei: You told us about a situation when your daughter came home from school and asked you a certain question.

Patricia: Yes, I fell into a terrible trap. Wait, how was it then exactly...

Klub Zwei: She asked you how it was possible that someone could do something like that.

Patricia: Yes. That's right. I told her, "You probably know what it's like when you are part of something and you do things without thinking. Or when everyone else is doing something silly and you participate without saying anything against it." It was then that I realized how inextricably entangled my own history is. I had not wanted to downplay it at all. That is not the way I want to deal with it.

www.klubzwei.at

HVALA ŠTO NE RUŠITE OGRADU

Tatjana Grajf

Ovo što sledi u prvom delu teksta napisano je pre Referenduma o novom porodičnom zakonu u Sloveniji, održanog 25. marta 2012. godine. Zakon je odbačen jer je 54,55% glasača glasalo protiv. Ipak, videćete da nije trebalo promeniti ni jednu jedinu reč, jer ono što se dešavalo u Sloveniji pre referenduma samo je potvrđeno njegovim ishodom.

Nekada, u doba socijalizma, brojni vinogradi, voćnjaci, njive i plastenici između obronaka Kalvarije i Vinarske ulice na periferiji Maribora pripadali su srednjoj Poljoprivrednoj školi, koja je nasledila prvobitnu instituciju Pokrajinsku voćarsku i vinogradarsku školu, osnovanu 1872. Priroda i panoramska staza koja vijuga školskim dobrom namenjena je stanovnicima Maribora. Više od 130 godina škola je uspevala da preživi razne režime i vlasti, sve do slovenačke nezavisnosti. Onda je došla denacionalizacija i rimokatolička crkva je zaplenila svoj feudalni posed. Pokraj ogromne zgrade Poljoprivredne škole sada stoji novi kompleks zgrada eparhijske gimnazije, dok su zelene površine ograđene žicom na kojoj se nalaze table s natpisima „Hvala što ne rušite ogradu!” i „Prostor je pod video-nadzorom!”. Privatna svojina je sveta.

Senovite stare staze i putevi koji se protežu kroz vinograde predstavljaju, do dana današnjeg, lakšu trasu za stanovnike koji idu sve do gradskog parka i tri jezerceta. Nema šanse da ih neko otera, čak ni preteća upozorenja o opasnosti po zdravlje ukoliko pojedete voće tretirano pesticidima, koja se s vremena na vreme masovno pojavu na ogradama oko voćnjaka, da bi potom jednako masovno i nestala. Čini se da prolaznici ne mare mnogo za bilo kakve znakove, i ništa, osim popustljivog osmeha, neće sprečiti da se jabuke, višnje, grožđe prebace preko ograde... Ključaju ptice, pa i ljudi.

U ataru bivše Poljoprivredne škole, nekada jedne od najvećih školskih zgrada u Sloveniji, iznikao je Institut „Anton Marko Slomšek” – eparhijska gimnazija, eparhijski đачki dom, eparhijski studentski dom, katoličko obdanište, muzička i baletska škola, a uskoro će biti izgrađen i katolički dom za stara lica. Ukratko, zbrinute su sve generacije. Rimokatolička crkva je, kao i uvek, gospodar duša ljudi svih dobi. Čak i na sahrani oni stoje napred, odmah uz grob; potom tek, dolaze bliski srodnici. Kada porušite sve ograde i pokradete voće, možete se zaputiti u zgradu Mariborskog univerziteta, koji ovih dana slavi 36. godišnjicu. Pred zgradom su gnevni ljudi, kadril ljudi od značaja prikazanih skulpturom. To bi možda moglo da pomogne.

Crkveni referendum

Skupština Republike Slovenije je 2. septembra 2011. donela odluku, sa 45 glasova za i 36 protiv, da Referendum o porodičnom zakonu, koji je zatražila Građanska inicijativa za porodična i dečija prava, bude predmet Ustavne presude. Neposredno pre toga, vatreni inicijatori referenduma sakupili su za manje od tri dana preko 25.000 potpisa. Upravo tom istom brzinom možemo da očekujemo, da neće samo porodični zakon biti odbačen, nego da će iz Slovenije biti deportovani i homoseksualci. Presuda da li će većina stanovništva koja učestvuje na referendumu

odlučivati o ljudskim pravima manjine u rukama je Ustavnog suda. To ne iznenađuje budući da su referendum i njegovu ustavnu presudu zajedno najavile obe klike – protivnici i inicijatori porodičnog zakona. Čini se da su ta dva gesta jedini argumenti koji su ostali akterima ove tužne priče o braku i porodičnim pravima gejeva i lezbejki; priče koje je počela davno i kao da joj nema kraja. Njena jedina konstanta je pregovaranje o vrednostima jednakosti pred zakonom i ljudskim pravima gejeva i lezbejki. Počev od ranih inicijativa o jednakosti istopolnih parova i porodica pred zakonom sredinom osamdesetih godina prošlog veka, preko beživotnih, praznih osnutaka zakona tokom devedesetih i usvajanja kontroverznog Zakona o registraciji istospolne partnerske skupnosti (ZRIPS) 2005. godine, sve do današnjeg porodičnog zakona, krećemo se korak po korak, napred-nazad.

Lider građanske inicijative i kampanje protiv ljudskih prava gejeva i lezbejki, kao i jedan od promotera referenduma je Aleš Primc. Isti onaj Aleš Primc koji je 2001. organizovao građansku inicijativu i kampanju protiv ljudskih prava neudatih žena, te sakupio potpise za Referendum protiv veštačke oplodnje. Tada mu je pošlo za rukom. Čak 88% onih koji su izašli na referendum oduzelo je neudatim ženama pravo na medicinski potpomognutu veštačku oplodnju. Javno mnjenje bilo je gnevno zbog ideje da lezbejke ili žene sa invaliditetom imaju pravo na decu. Međutim, ove žene do dana današnjeg dobijaju decu uprkos nedemokratskoj odluci referenduma. Javna rasprava oko Referenduma o veštačkoj oplodnji bila je, baš kao i ona oko Referenduma o porodičnom zakonu, primer govora mržnje u najsirovijem obliku.

Kakav će biti ishod ovog referenduma ostaje pitanje na koje se odgovor daje sagledavanjem pravnih i političkih poteza vladajućeg režima koji je nestabilan, nepouzdan i nedostojan građanskog poverenja. Za ovakvu šah-mat situaciju ne treba kriviti Primca i krstaške trupe, jer iza marionetske mašinerije stoje katolička crkva i političke stranke u režiji Vatikana. Veći udarac je, međutim, priznanje da tri decenije politički sistem i slovenačko zakonodavstvo dozvoljavaju i omogućavaju građansku nejednakost i kršenje prava LGBT manjina. Ogroman nedostatak političke volje da se legalizuju gej i lezbejska prava, prećutna saglasnost da društvene manjine budu žrtvena jagnjad, panično izbegavanje biračkog rizika ljudskih prava gejeva i lezbejki, strah od političkog razgovora o usvajanju seksualnih prava i pravnih aranžmana seksualnog građanstva odražavaju moralnu paranoju levičarskih i desničarskih partija i u isto vreme predstavljaju najpodobnije okruženje za lansiranje crkvene agende. Strah, istrajnost i odricanje. Represija i diskriminacija.

Bez tračka nade na horizontu

Split u Hrvatskoj je katolički grad, takođe. U toj tradiciji, homoseksualnost se ne toleriše. Međutim, 2011. godine tamo je održana prva Parada ponosa. Ispostavilo se da je dalmatinski dragulj, u najsunčanijem delu centralnog Sredozemlja, sa neverovatnih 270 sunčanih dana godišnje, čvrsto jezgro homofobije, rasadnik posleratnog zdušnog nacionalizma. Uz ogromne napore organizatora, grupa Iskorak, Kontra i Domine, Parada ponosa Split 2011. krenula je svojom kratkom putanjom od poznatog gradskog parka Đardin; okupilo se nekih 200 učesnika, uglavnom iz drugih hrvatskih gradova i iz inostranstva. Mala i mirna povorka, u pratnji radoznalih novinara kretala se ulicom Marmont – gde su građani još ujutro sebi obezbedili mesto u lokalnim kafićima i terasama ne bi li videli paradu sopstvenim očima – dalje ka rivi, gde je šačicu učesnika parade sačekala velika zaseda – rulja od nekoliko hiljada krvoločnih fudbalskih huligana, nacionalista, klerika i drugih ekstremista, koji su nasrnuli na paradu suzavcima, Molotovljevim koktelima, dimnim bombama, petardama, kamenjem, flašama. Iz obližnjih barova gađali su ih pepeljarama, čašama, ciglama, kamenim pločama, saksijama s cvećem, oleandrima... Potpuno opkoljeni, učesnici parade našli su se usred unakrsne

vatre, dima i divljih pokliča: „Ubij pедера!”, „Ubij Srbi-na!”, „Cigani!”, „Ubij, ubij, ubij!”. Gradonačelnik Splita i tajkun Željko Kerum sedeo je obučen u crno, u kafiću svoje žene Fani Horvat, i opušteno posmatrao neredu izbliza.

Na kraju je policija uspevala da zadrži siledžije iza gvozdene ograde i evakuise učesnike. Mada, ostaje činjenica da je policijska strategija osiguranja bezbednosti na javnoj manifestaciji gejeva i lezbejki bila apsolutna politička katastrofa. Četiristo na početku, a potom šeststo policajaca, iako obučenih kao kopnena, pomorska ili vazduhoplovna policija, naspram više od deset hiljada siledžija na rivi, bila je veoma loša procena javne manifestacije visokog rizika. Ministar policije Karamarko energično je odbacio sve osude, dok su političari, na ovaj ili onaj način, izbegli da se pojave na paradi. Uz jedan izuzetak; holandski član Evropskog parlamenta Marija Cornelisen u poodmakloj trudnoći učestvovala je u paradi, nakon koje je užasnuta i šokirana, izjavila da se ništa takvo nije dalo za očekivati. Ali, nijedan od lokalnih ili državnih političara nije podržao paradu. Kao što se niko nije javno obratio građanima i pozvao ih da pokažu toleranciju i poštovanje prema manjinama. Niko nije javno, jasno i glasno, izjavio da su netrpeljivost i nasilje nedopustivi. Ipak, hrvatski predsednik Josipović poslao je pismo organizatorima, ali nije uspeo da dođe u Split. Premijerka iz redova Hrvatske demokratske zajednice (HDZ) Jadranka Kosor izustila je nekoliko nemuštih reči o osudi nasilja. Očigledno nepristustvo hrvatskih političara u Splitu i otvorena odbojnost tih hrvatskih političara prema paradi u godini poslednje faze hrvatskih pregovora o pristupanju Evropskoj uniji dokaz su da uslovi za ulazak u Uniju koji pozivaju na poštovanje ljudskih prava i drugih suštinskih vrednosti nisu ništa drugo do kliše u egzotičnom cvetnom aranžmanu Aki kominotera (Acquis communautaire).

Policija je uhapsila više od 300 izgrednika, ali je splitski javni tužilac uspeo da podnese svega dvadeset tužbi zbog nasilja. Sve ostalo je tretirano kao sitan prekršaj – kršenje javnog reda i mira. Oni koji su uputili proteste protiv nasilja i protestne note hrvatskim vlastima bili su iz redova organa Evropskog parlamenta, stranih ambasada i nevladinih organizacija. Iz nevladinog sektora među poslednjima je reagovala međunarodna organizacija ILGA Evropa, čiji su lideri bili u Rimu na paradi Euro Pride, i behu zauzeti daleko važnijim stvarima, od kojih je jedna koncert Lejdi Gage.

Split je do dana današnjeg ispisan grafitima koji pozivaju na nasilje nad gejevima i lezbejkama. Niko od odgovornih iz redova policije i gradskih vlasti nije kažnjen za svoje postupke; niko nije ni za šta kriv. Uvek ista priča.

2011, u centru Ljubljane jedna banda siledžija štanglama je pretukla grupu britanskih turista za koje su verovali da su homoseksualci. Na železničkoj stanici u Ljubljani grupa mladića prebila je italijanskog gej aktivistu. 2011 napadnut je i pretučen i vođa jedne religiozne sekte; ne katoličke, naravno. Na fudbalskoj utakmici u Stožicama, vatreni navijači istakli su transparent sa neprijateljskom porukom za gejeve i lezbejke, a potom razvili zastavu duginih boja i zapalili je.

Sa engleskog na srpski prevela Dragana Govedarica Kostopoulos



Relations. 25 Years of the Lesbian Group ŠKUC-LL, Ljubljana (2012), M. Gržinić, A. Šmid and Z. Simčič

THANK YOU FOR NOT TEARING DOWN THE FENCE

Tatjana Greif

What follows in the first part of this text was written before the referendum in Slovenia on 25 March 2012 on the new Family Code. The code was rejected with 54.55% of voters being against the law. Nevertheless you will see not one word is necessary to be changed, as what had been going on before the referendum in Slovenia was just confirmed by it.

Once, at the time of socialism, the ample vineyards, orchards, fields and greenhouses between the slopes of Kalvarija and Vinarska Street at the outskirts of Maribor belonged to the Secondary School of Agriculture which succeeded the original institution, the Provincial Fruit-growing and Viticulture School founded in 1872. The nature and panorama trail that winds across the school areas was designed for the inhabitants of Maribor. For more than 130 years the school managed to survive the various regimes and rules until Slovenia's independence. Then denationalization occurred and the RCC (Roman Catholic Church) seized its feudatory position. By the immense building of the agricultural school now stands a new building conglomerate of the diocesan gymnasium, while the green plots surrounded by wire fence are equipped with signs "Thank you for not tearing down the fence!" and "The area is under video surveillance!" Private property is sacred.

The shaded old avenues and roads that stretch across the vineyards represent, to this day, the extenuated promenade for the residents who walk all the way down to the city park and the three ponds. There is no way they can be chased away, not even by the threatening signs about the health risk of eating pesticide-treated fruits, which from time to time massively appear on the fences surrounding orchards and then again massively disappear. The passers-by don't seem to care about the signs whatsoever, and nothing, except a smile of indulgence, helps prevent apples, cherries or grapes from being thrown over the fence... Birds are pecking, and so do people.

In the district of the former Agricultural School, once one of the largest school buildings in Slovenia, the Institute of Anton Martin Slomšek emerged – a diocesan grammar school, a diocesan hostel for pupils, diocesan hostels for students, a catholic nursery school, music and ballet school, and soon there is to be built the catholic hostel for senior citizens. In short, all generations are taken care of. RCC is, as always, the Master of souls of people of all ages. Even at a funeral they stand in the forefront, right next to the grave and only then come close relatives.

After tearing down all the fences and stealing the fruit, one can set out for the building of the University of Maribor which these days is celebrating its 36th anniversary. In front of it are furious men, a quadrille of men of importance realized in sculpture. Perhaps, this might be of help.

The ecclesiastic referendum

On September 2nd, 2011, the Parliament of the Republic of Slovenia decided, with 45 votes for and 36 against, that the referendum about the Family Code demanded by the Civil Initiative for family and children rights should be made subject to constitutional judgment. Just before this, the ardent initiators of the referendum gathered in less than three days more than 25,000 signatures. At this exact speed we can expect homosexuals to be deported from Slovenia, and not only that the Family Code will be rejected.

The judgment whether the majority of the population taking part at the referendum will be deciding about human rights of a minority is in the hands of the Constitutional Court. Unsurprisingly so, since the referendum and its constitutional judgment has been announced all along by both cliques – the opponents and initiators of the Family Code. The two gestures seem to be the only arguments that are left to the actors of the sad story about marriage and family rights of gays and lesbians; a story that began long ago and seems to have no ending. Its only constant is negotiation with values of equality before the law and of human rights of gays and lesbians. From the early initiatives for equality of same-sex couples and families before the law in the middle of the 1980s, through the paper-based draft laws in the 1990s and the passing of the controversial Registration of Same-Sex Civil Partnership Act (ZRIPS) in 2005, up to today's Family Law Act we are moving forward and backward little by little.

The leader of the civil initiative and of the campaign against gays and lesbians human rights and as well as the one promoting the referendum is Aleš Primc. This is the same Aleš Primc who in 2001 organized the civil initiative and the campaign against human rights of single women and gathered signatures for the referendum against artificial insemination. He succeeded back then. As much as 88% of those who attended the referendum took away from unmarried women the right to medically assisted artificial insemination. Public opinion expressed indignation at the idea of lesbians or disabled women having the right to children. However, these women have had children to this day despite undemocratic referendum decision. The public debate around the referendum about artificial insemination was, just as the debate around the referendum about Family Code, an example of hostile speech in its rawest form.

What will be the outcome of this referendum remains a question to be answered considering the judicial and political moves of the governing regime which are unstable, unreliable and unworthy of civil credo. For this checkmate situation one is not to blame Primc and the crusade troops, since standing behind the puppet machinery are the Catholic Church and political parties directed by the Vatican. A sharper blow, however, is the recognition that the political system and Slovenian legislation has allowed and enabled for three decades the civil inequality and violation of rights of LGBT minorities. The huge lack of political will for the legalization of gay and lesbian rights, the silent consent to be sacrificial lambs of social minorities, panic avoidance of the voting risk of human rights of gays and lesbians, fear of political discourse about enacting sexual rights and legal arrangements of sexual citizenship reflect the moral paranoia of the left- and right-wing parties and are at the same time the most fertile environment for launching the ecclesiastic agenda. Fear, perseverance and renouncement. Repression and discrimination.

No Glimmer of Hope on the Horizon

Split in Croatia is a catholic city, too. In this tradition homosexuality is not tolerated. However, in 2011 the first Pride Parade was organized there. The Dalmatian gem, in the sunniest part of Central Mediterranean, with an astonishing 2700 hours of sun a year, turned out to be a hard kernel of homophobia, a hotbed of postwar fervent nationalism. With exceptional efforts by organizers, groups Iskorak, Kontra and Domine, the Pride Parade Split 2011 set out on its short path from the famous Djardin Park, some 200

participants gathered, mainly from other Croatian cities and from abroad. A small and peaceful procession, accompanied by curious journalists, moved along the Marmont Street – where city residents secured already in the morning their places in the local cafeterias and terraces in order to be able to see the parade beyond comparison – towards Riva, where a handful of paraders were awaited by a massive ambush – a mob of thousands of blood-thirsty football hooligans, nationalists, clerics and other extremists who attacked with tear gas, Molotov cocktails, smoke-bombs, petards, stones, bottles. Ashtrays, glasses, bricks, paving stones, flowerpots, oleanders were being thrown from the neighbouring bars... Completely surrounded, the paraders found themselves in a crosswise fire of flying objects, smoke and noisy roaring "Kill the faggot," "Kill the Serb," "Gypsies," "Kill, kill, kill"... The mayor of the city of Split and the money mogul Željko Kerum sat dressed in black, in a café, the property of his wife Fani Horvat, leisurely watching the riots from close by.

Eventually, the police managed to hold back the thugs behind the iron fence and evacuate the participant from the scene of the attack. However, the fact is that the police strategy of assuring security at the public manifestation of gays and lesbians a complete political catastrophe. At first 400 and then 600 policemen, although they are trained as land, marine or air police, compared to the more than 10,000 thugs on Riva, there was a miscalculation for a public event with high degree of risk. The police minister Karamarko vigorously rejected all reproaches, while the politicians, in one way or another, failed to show up at the parade. With only one exception; the Dutch member of the European Parliament Marija Cornelissen, in an advanced state of pregnancy, took part in the parade and declared later, obviously horrified and shocked, that nothing like that was expected. Yet, not one of the local or state politicians supported the parade. Just as no one called publicly upon the citizens to show tolerance and respect towards minorities. No one stated publicly, clearly and aloud that intolerance and violence are not allowed. However, the Croatian president Josipović did send a letter to the organizers, but failed to come to Split. The prime Minister of the Croatian Democratic Union (HDZ) Jadranka Kosor uttered some vague word about the condemnation of violence. An explicit absence of Croatian politicians at the Parade and the explicit aversion of the Croatian politicians to the Parade in Split in the year of the last stage of Croatia's accession negotiations with the EU gives proof that the accession criteria calling for the respect of human rights and other fundamental values of the Union is but a cliché in the exotic floral arrangement *Acquis communautaire*.

The police arrested more than 300 rioters, but the Split public prosecutor managed to file only some twenty charges on account of violence. All the rest was regarded as minor offence against public peace and order. Those who protested against the violence and sent protests notes to the Croatian authorities were from the ranks of the Euro-parliamentary bodies, foreign embassies and nongovernmental organizations. From the NGO sector as one of the last reacted the international association ILGA-Europe, whose leaders were at the Rome Euro Pride Parade and were occupied with far more important things, one such being the Lady Gaga concert.

Split is to this day covered in graffiti that prompt violence against gays and lesbians. Those responsible from the police and city authorities have never been punished for their actions; no one is guilty of anything. The same old story.

2011, in the center of Ljubljana a gang of thugs beat a group of British tourists with rods, believing them to be gays. At the Ljubljana railway station a group of youngsters beat a gay activist from Italy. 2011, also the principal of a religious sect was attacked and beaten; of course, not of the catholic sect. At the football match in Stožice the ardent fans hung out a banner with the wording hostile to gays and lesbians, they hung out an iridescent flag and burnt it.

Translated from Slovenian into English by Tanja Passoni

PESMA

Njidžideka Stefani Ajro

Pesma je lična prezentacija sadašnjih pretpostavki, E-mocije koje se ljušte u slojevima, prodiru ti u dušu i služe je na tacni, i streme ka ličnom cilju. Ličnom?

Moje Lično je P O L I T I Č K O, stalna opasnost...
Moje E-motivno je političko.
Odbijam da me žrtvuju, isuviše dugo smo bili dehumanizovani i odbijam da me uguraju u kutiju...

"Aaa, to je PESMA. Hajde da je stavimo u kutiju za pesme... Ona je tako emotivna; crnkinje su taaako emotivne. Oh, vidi, ovde je počela da hysteriše. Ovo nije pesma. Mislim, pesma je najfinija lirska UMETNOST. A, ne. Ovo – nije – pesma."

Ja ne tražim da me oni hvale. Kažu mi da je ovo prolazna faza... Kažu da sam gnevna, da ne volim belce i da ne želim da budem u mojoj blizini. Heeej? Je l' vi mene slušate? Moje usne se pomeraju, puštaju reči da uteknu, ali, da li one nalaze put do vaših ušiju?

Vaše neznanje je jasno.

Vi pričate o mržnji i gnevu...

Da, ja sam gnevna u zemlji u kojoj jedan pas vredi više od crnog muškarca, žene i deteta... U metrou vidite ljude koji stoje i govore: *"Mei, is des a liaber Hund, so ein süßer Hund, so an Hund hob I a!"* dok u isto vreme s nipodaštavanjem gledaju na crnce.

Da, ljuta sam, ponekad ceptim od besa. Zastajem nakratko... (...)

...ponekad osećajući se pretužnom, utrnulom i paralizovanom od neverice, ne-ve-ri-ce, u potrazi za olakšanjem od ovog sveprisutnog sranja.

Pod stalnom inspekcijom i analizom, pokušavajući da izbegneš gušenje u paralizu, moraš da smogneš SNAGE da se izvučješ!

(Ona mrzi belce)

Ja mrzim ono što nam je kao narodu učinjeno, ono što nam još uvek rade.

Oni pričaju o integraciji. IN-TE-GRA-CI-JA. Crnce ubijaju a oni govore o integraciji. Ko da je bratu Seibanu pomoglo nešto što je govorio nemački. Integracija – asimilacija – eliminacija. Ili mnoga druga bezimena braća i sestre koja su umrla u rukama tih svinja.

Integracija.

Zašto ne integrišu činjenicu da ja neću integrisati ništa ni za koga...

Neka uzmu moje reči, uvaljaju ih u brašno, jaja i prezle, isprže ih ko šniclu i pojedu. Neka progutaju činjenicu da ja neću integrisati ništa ni za koga! Progutajte to! Integrišite to u svoj dnevni jelovnik i ako u tome što izgovarate ima govora rasizma: ćutite!

Pesma je lična prezentacija sadašnjih pretpostavki, E-mocije koje se ljušte u slojevima, prodiru ti u dušu i služe je na tacni, i streme ka ličnom cilju – LIČNOM?

A POEM

Njideka Stephanie Iroh

A poem is a personal presentation of present presumptions, E-motions peeling through layers, penetrating your soul, presenting it on a plate and pursuing a personal goal.

Personal?

My Personal is P O L I T I C A L, perpetual danger...
My E-motional is political.

I refuse to be victimized, far too long we were de-humanized and I refuse to be boxed...

"Oh, it's a POEM, let's put it in a poem box... She's so emotional, Black women are sooo emotional. Oh look, she's getting hysterical! This is not a poem, I mean, a poem is lyrical ART at its finest. Oh no. This – is – not – a – poem."

I'm not looking for their praise, people telling me it's just a phase... They say I'm angry, I don't like white people and I don't want them around me.

Hello? Are you listening to me? My mouth is forming shapes, allowing words to escape, but are they finding their way to your ear?

Your ignorance is clear.

You are talking about hate and anger...

Well, yes I am angry in a country where a dog is worth more than a Black man woman and child...

You can see people standing in the U Bahn saying: *"Mei, is des a liaber Hund, so ein süßer Hund, so an Hund hob I a!"* And at the same time they are looking down on Black people.

Yes I am angry, fuming mad sometimes. I pause for a bit ... (...)

...feeling too sad sometimes, feeling numb and paralyzed in disbelief, dis-be-lief, searching for relief from this omni-present bullshit.

Under constant inspection and analysis, trying to avoid suffocation and paralysis, you've got to have the STRENGTH to get outta this!

(She hates white people)

I hate what has been done to us as a people, what is still being done.

They are talking about integration.

IN-TE-GRA-TION. Black people are being killed and they are talking about integration. Like speaking German saved Brother Seibane. Integration – assimilation - elimination. Or the many unnamed brothers and sisters who have died at the hands of the pigs.

Integration.

Why don't they integrate the fact that I won't integrate nothing for no one...

Why don't they take my words, cover them in flour, egg and breadcrumbs and fry them like a Schnitzel for all I care and eat them. Eat the fact that I won't integrate nothing for no one! Eat that! Integrate that in your daily diet and if it's racist talk you articulate: Keep quiet!

A poem is a personal presentation of present presumptions, E-motions peeling through layers, penetrating your soul, presenting it on a plate and pursuing a personal goal-
PERSONAL?

PONEKAD

Njidžideka Stefani Ajro

Ponekad je smešno.

Es ist komisch.

Da vidimo ima li ovde rime.

Sama pravim svoj kiš.

Ponekad moram da se nasmejem kada u društvo gledam, iako su te spoljne strukture deo i ličnosti moje. Ali kada si crnkinja, uvek će upirati prstom i buljiti u tebe neko vreme dok im se misli roje...

Wo ist dei her? Was ist dei eigentlich? Die Hautfarb ist ned so dunkel, jo wirklich nicht, aber irgendwie kehrt die ned do her. Die Nasen ist anders... do is noch mehr... Ihre Hoar, die Lippen, i sog's eich gleich, die ist ned von do, dei is net aus Österreich.

I zato i pre nego što pokušaju da me definišu kao nešto falično

– ja sam Crnkinja – kažem im odlučno.

Also, tut nicht so als könnt ihr mich definieren und s-t-a-r-r-t nicht so! Habt ihr denn keine Manieren?

Nisam ni koktel ni milkšejk – ne, živci su mi tanki i IZGUBIĆU strpljenje.

Mi ne hodamo ulicama zbog zabave vaše, previše se već dobilo od ugnjetavanja crnaca. Ako tražite nešto da proučavate i *buljite* – u muzej haj'te. Predmeti su *tamo*, platite pa gledajte.

Wos hot sie denn? Dei is so unhöflich, i wuit's ja nur wissen...und jetzt steht sie do und wü uns olle... wie haßt des? Dissen?

SOMETIMES

Njideka Stephanie Iroh

It's funny sometimes.

Es ist komisch.

Let's see if this rhymes.

I make my own dish.

I have to laugh sometimes when I look at society, even though the external structures are also a part of me.

But when you're a Black woman, they will always point a finger and stare at you a while as their thoughts will linger....

Wo ist dei her? Was ist dei eigentlich? Die Hautfarb ist ned so dunkel, jo wirklich nicht, aber irgendwie kehrt die ned do her. Die Nasen ist anders... do is noch mehr... Ihre Hoar, die Lippen, i sog's eich gleich, die ist ned von do, dei is net aus Österreich.

So before they try to define me as if there is something I lack,

I say it straight up: I am Black.

Also, tut nicht so als könnt ihr mich definieren und s-t-a-r-r-t nicht so! Habt ihr denn keine Manieren?

I am not a cocktail or a milkshake, my nerves are running thin and my patience WILL break.

We do not walk these streets to keep you entertained, by oppressing Black people, too much has been gained.

If you need something to analyse and *stare* at go to the museum.

The objects are *there* and you might pay to see 'em.

Wos hot sie denn? Dei is so unhöflich, i wuit's ja nur wissen... und jetzt steht sie do und wü uns olle... wie haßt des? Dissen?

RELATIONS

25 YEARS OF THE LESBIAN GROUP ŠKUC-LL Ljubljana

Film directed by Marina Gržinić, Aina Šmid, Zvonka T Simčič 2012

SCRIPT

Dr. Tatjana Greif, ŠKUC-LL, archaeologist, LGBT activist
At the Lesbian Library ŠKUC-LL

Tatjana Greif: It is a sort of retardation. Given the fact that homosexuality was decriminalized somewhere in the middle of 1970s and the fact that as a result of the gay and lesbian movement, which is basically the oldest of this type not only in Yugoslavia but in Eastern Europe at all, and depending on the long tradition of public demands, public efforts, emancipatory movement of sexual minorities in this region, that lasts for decades and decades, and taking into account the amount of visibility of these issues in the public realm, it is really strange that the amount of stigma and homophobia is still very high, when we talk about homosexuality and lesbians in the Slovenian society. This society does not differ much from other communities that emerged in the territory of Yugoslavia. Slovenia shares all traditional, patriarchal and religiously inspired mentality features, as we seen them in Croatia, Bosnia, Serbia, Macedonia, everywhere.

Suzana Tratnik, writer and activist

Suzana Tratnik: I think the lesbian movement has developed precisely in Ljubljana as here we had a good base in the 1980s. I was in the 1980s in Ljubljana, and I see a strong connection with the then-peace movement, the punk movement, even though I was not part of the then punk movement, as I did not do anything in this field of art actually, I did not even write at that time, nevertheless these were spaces of freedom, variety and diversity of sexuality and as well spaces of courage. Just think what the group Borgheisia was doing, think about the films in which you also participated, and other authors. Women have been present here in a very strong way, creative and active. It was the information that "women can do it," no matter what others think, whether they are able or not. Women did it.

Marina Gržinić: We are doing a movie about 25 years of ŠKUC-LL!

Nataša Sukič, activist, DJ and writer

Nataša Sukič: First of all, I would not so much make a comparison with the West, because it was really two different social contexts, as you said. There it was capitalism, here socialism. We went from socialism through the transition into the most chaotic and bloody capitalism. I do not know but already the fact that it had been necessary in that different context to establish ourselves from a zero point that we had to start to build something; it is such a powerful moment to resist and to insist here. It is one thing. Now it is true, that other movements that were here as well in the 1980s, for example the peace movement, they changed. They did not disappear with a new period, with new political circumstances, but were transformed. They institutionalized themselves, and this is, in a way, logical to me. However, we proceed from our own position, and from the struggle for equal opportunity. In this we are authentic. We do not derive only

from the idea of how it should be, because these are our lives. Because we are fighting that our lives could be more decent and because this struggle will never end we continue this struggle.

Gržinić: How started the lesbian movement in Slovenia? The lesbian coming out? When, with whom and in what context?

Tratnik: I would say that the lesbian movement has actually more starting points. I was involved in some, in others not. The first such point is the establishment of Magnus, a group for the socialization of male homosexuality, and the Magnus Festival. The first was in 1984, which was actually aimed at male homosexuality, but it was also attended by women. It opened a new field of sexuality and homosexuality.

Festival MAGNUS. Homosexuality and Culture, Gallery ŠKUC. Ljubljana 1984

Bogdan Lešnik: I'm Bogdan Lešnik, president of the institution in which this project is taking part (ŠKUC-Forum). The project is called Magnus. Its subtitle is Homosexuality and Culture. This project seeks to present a multitude of activities and productions of gay subcultures within a European scale. Here is Spare Rib, practically the only exclusively lesbian magazine that we present. It is also true that many magazines that we are exhibiting here, that are hanging on the walls, include both, female and male homosexuals.

Toni Marošević: My name is Toni Marošević. I come from Zagreb. In Ljubljana, I am because of this event, Homosexuality and Culture. I am gay myself. For 15 years I have been dealing with the topic of liberation of homosexuality.

1984

Aldo Ivančić, group Borgheisia

Nada Vodusek: Is the project already a success thanks to some of you that came out in public, or not?

Aldo Ivančić: I think it's not so easy. This is basically a process that lasts, and it is quite difficult to come out overnight, to take a decision for a coming out.

Vodusek: We had the contact program on the radio. What do you think about the reactions of the people?

Guy Hocquenghem, Paris

Guy Hocquenghem: Not having any clear opinion on the subject. This is my main concern. It is interesting, he was, she was gay. Which is interesting meaning that obviously even if you have no risk, as it was no names, the voice was not possible to recognize, anything like that, it was this fear of visibility. So, I would say that certain phase of visibility is not yet obtained. I am sure of that. Of course, you can do an exhibition, which is very good, you can show everything you want, films, you have no censorship, but you have a personal censorship that seems to be very strong.

Tratnik: Then the next year it was the year of 1985. It was founded, actually not yet, but it started, the movement for women rights by the group Lilit. Likewise in the club K4. There, in April 1985 Lilit organized the first evening, which was designed just for women. This was a novelty, to organize an evening that is designed just for women. This led to a lot of comments, of course. The group Lilit wanted a comprehensive political and social activity, so it organized sub-groups at this inaugural meeting, if I can call it in such a way, in K4. And one of these subgroups was also the lesbian subgroup that I joined. We had our first meeting on May 30, 1985 in the restaurant Rio (Ljubljana). We were 5. At the meeting we did not come up with something significant, because the vast majority of us who

came said that they were there because of other interests, because they were journalists, sociologists, political scientists.

Gržinić: What were the conditions in those socialist times? Why did you decide to start up the group Lilit? As you were its founder.

Mojca Dobnikar, feminist and translator

Mojca Dobnikar: Yes. Now, the feminist group Lilit has a prehistory. Before, there existed a women's group that was part of the Society for Sociology. This group was formed, I dare to say, on the initiative of male members of the society. In that group women interested in feminism came together, though it was quite a theoretically oriented group. This did not satisfy all of us. Some of us wanted a more activist feminist group. Incidentally, during that period I went for a vacation to Berlin. There, through an acquaintance, who was a feminist and lesbian, I got to know their feminist scene which was so rich, that I could have never imagined before. The feminist scene encompassed everything from feminist libraries, bookshops, discos, and even feminist theater, to shelter for women victims of violence, various women's cafés, bars and the like. Important activists in the Berlin's feminist scene were lesbians. So, for me joining feminism meant at the same time getting to know lesbian activism. When, in the woman group of the Society for Sociology at the end of 1984 we began to think about constituting a more activist group, more open to the public, we already discussed the lesbian topic. To be honest, this topic was already present when the Society for Sociology was preparing a special section Pogledi (Views) in the magazine Mladina (Youth). There was already a translated article on the subject of lesbianism included in it. In spring 1985, three of us decided to write a proposal on two typed pages, I can still see them clearly now, for ŠKUC-Forum (Student Cultural Organization) because we felt that ŠKUC-Forum was the organization that could accept a new group, giving us the space, and perhaps some financial support.

Nataša Velikonja, writer and lesbian activist

Nataša Velikonja: Journals and magazines of ŠKUC-LL: Lesbozine; the first issue was published in 1988. Another publication in combination with ŠKUC-LL, the Pink Club and Magnus is the magazine Revolver. The next thing is the bulletin Pandora, it lasted for one year and was edited by my generation of lesbians within the ŠKUC-LL. Then in 1997 we started to publish the Lesbo magazine. The beginning of everything was the pink VIKS, the journal. Editor Marina Gržinić with the team. 1984. VIKS provides the visual language of the movement at its very beginning. Not only for LL but in general. It presents the diction of homosexuality.

GRAFFITI POSTER, 1984:

1968 is over

1983 is over

Future is Between Your Legs

Gržinić: 1987 is the year when the group LL was established. LL stands for Lesbian Lilit. It was in Ljubljana, in ŠKUC. Everybody mentions you. All those reminiscent of that moment, mention you. It was important that you came to that first "trans-Yugoslav" feminist meeting. Tell me what happened. Who was there?

Lepa Mladenović, lesbian and feminist, Belgrade
At the peace organization Žene u crnom (Women in Black), Belgrade

Lepa Mladenović: In fact, before this I had already met Suzana Tratnik, at the international conference ILIS in Geneva. When? In 1986. I went there hitchhiking. I was told there that we had the official representative of Yugoslavia. It was a big thing. I

was really proud. As you say – punk. I realized that after the conference she did a lot to set up ŠKUC-LL.

Then we had this first historical feminist meeting in Ljubljana, which was really fantastic. I remember that we came by train, it was very cold, December. In my mind I bear two scenes.

One scene that I remember was a lesbian who was in charge of technical equipment.

Oh, what a sweet butch. She connected some cables and managed the sound system, microphones, etc. It was fantastic. A huge step in comparison with other conferences in SKC (Belgrade) where all the technicians were males. Another thing was that the last day of the conference, we prepared the manifesto.

Gržinić: Many of the texts are in connection with the communist party, aren't they?

Archive ŠKUC-LL, Lesbian Library

Velikonja: These were the polemics in the 1980s. The state was gradually becoming more liberal. In the public you had debates on gay civil rights, feminism, ecology, freedom of speech. The communist party was responsible for the public sphere. How shall I put it? It was the guardian of the public space and of the public word.

Dobnikar: In December 1987, the group Lilit, organized what we named then, The First Yugoslav Feminist Meeting. This idea had been present in our minds for some time, at least for half a year, if not longer. There existed various feminist initiatives in Ljubljana, Zagreb, Belgrade. We were connected, but we never, all of us, came together. That happened in December (1987) in Ljubljana. It lasted for three days. There were 40 participants. Apart from those from Ljubljana, Zagreb and Belgrade, there were also some participants from Sarajevo. There were not feminist groups there, only individuals. One of the important topics at the meeting was lesbianism in several different ways. For example, Slađana Marković spoke about lesbian literature, on which she had worked professionally for years. This was one aspect of, let's say, a more theoretical one. The second aspect was that it was the first public presentation of ŠKUC-LL. It had been established two months before this meeting. Lesbians inside the group Lilit decided to organize a special group and to formalize itself inside ŠKUC-Forum. This is the beginning of the waves of lesbian activism. This has lasted until today. The group was then introduced by Suzana Tratnik.

Recordings of the speech by S. Tratnik, 1987

Tratnik: The group LL was established just recently, this October (1987). Otherwise, we had often thought in the past of forming such a group.

Gržinić: Were you aware that this was a historical event? Since you recorded it.

Dobnikar: I think we were all very aware that we were doing great things, which had to be documented. The first meeting was wholly archived on audio cassettes. Recently, I gave them all for digitalization, so that it can go into public circulation. Unfortunately, such recordings were not a case in the subsequent meetings that were held in Zagreb and Belgrade. The next meetings were not documented in such a way.

Gržinić: Let's start with the beginnings. How was the lesbian scene established? How did this lesbian coming out happen?

Sukič: The milestone in establishing the lesbian scene is certainly the publishing of our manifest in the special section Pogledi (Views) in the magazine Mladina (Youth). It appeared October 30, 1987. This was a huge break.

Mladina (Youth): We love women.
Pogledi (Views): Love between women.

Sukič: This was the first time in Slovenia and Yugoslavia, and even in the entire Eastern Europe, that lesbians articulated themselves in such a way, that they began to politicize their position in the society. This was of course linked to the previously established feminist movement and gay movement. This last was in 1987 in ruins, because the state canceled one of the Magnus festivals. But despite this, the alternative scene was that condition, that environment, where such coming out was possible. That is to say, this whole subculture was a key factor. Not only the feminist, gay movements. All the others were as well important, the mix of the music scene, subculture, alternative scene. The dissident art and video scene as well started then in Ljubljana. Not to forget the intellectual subculture, the movement for peace, the ecological movement, the movement for the protection of insanity, if I'm not mistaken about its naming, in a word all these scenes were intertwined. This led, finally, to a lesbian coming out. Though it is not surprising, that we were the last that came out from all these scenes.

Gržinić: Why?

Sukič: Because it was of course obvious that a "woman" was immediately a problem, even more a woman's sexuality, for socialism. Precisely, what I was mentioning, this dissident art scene, the subculture, that started in a first place to discuss the body in relation to sexuality was a provocation. It presented the politicization of the homosexual body in that social context. Now, female sexuality was in an even more problematic position, if we make a relation toward a gay sexuality. On the one hand, the gay body was seen as a big "threat" for that social order, but on the other the lesbian body did not even exist.

Gržinić: Do you remember any sentence from the manifesto which you published in Mladina?

Tratnik: Yeah, it was very short, something like it is time we came out from the anonymity as lesbians, because if we are anonymous, today I would say if we are in the closet, we are not only isolated from the society, but also from each other. In short, the punch line was that if we do not start to recognize ourselves as lesbians, and we do not start to connect in between us, we will forever remain a white spot, which actually means that we will forever remain completely invisible.

Sukič: I found myself in the feminist group Lilit. I went there because I suspected I could be a lesbian. I was not convinced yet, as in those times nothing was known about this, no writings, no talks. In high school we were introduced in short to Sappho's literature. For me that was the only information that something like this existed. To me, my position was not quite clear, and I said, if I want to come clear this will be of course in that place. This meant among feminists; because there existed a stereotype that there where were feminists there were also lesbians. Ok. I went there. Then, one day Aldo Ivančič came up to us and asked if somebody would join him to Enschede in the Netherlands, where we were invited, but he didn't say exactly why we were invited to go there. I was excited and with another colleague of mine we hitchhiked through whole Europe, in some trucks, and after 36 hours we finally arrived in Enschede. You can imagine, we were dead, and just wanted to go to sleep. Aldo reappeared, of course. He always used to appear suddenly, out of nowhere, and said "we are invited to a reception given by the mayor of Enschede, and if anybody asks you anything, just say that you are lesbians." I just looked at him. My colleague had no problem with that as she was not a lesbian and for her it was fun. For me, who had suspicions about being lesbian, it was the end of the world. I went mad, protesting, asking why he did not tell us before, etc. Anyway, Aldo said it was too late, asked me not to cause problems since it was such an event, and that if they asked us we should

say we were lesbians, though probably nobody would ask us anything. We went to the reception, it was a great event, and I did not believe that they thought we were all lesbians and gays out there. It was an awesome reception. The second day it was a big Pride Parade, the whole town was in flags, everyone was excited. I could not believe that such a thing was possible. I thought that I found myself in another world. This was such a shock, literally, a cultural shock that cultivated me in a second. The same day I thought if they had it, the Pride Parade, we would have it, too.

Tratnik: I am often asked what is different, if we only talk about the lesbian movement, between before and after. Or, how much (western) Europe helped us in this? I say, Europe could not do more than we did earlier, before the 1990, and before the change of the system from socialism to capitalism, if I state this in such a simple way, and before entering the EU. What is happening now, of course, is a situation that some, let's say, non-democratic countries such as Albania, Montenegro, etc., start to talk about the need to adopt any law for registration of same-sex partnerships, because, of course, this is the demand that is coming from Europe. In these countries there are no lesbian and gay movements and the society still does not want to have them. In the case of Slovenia it was arranged much earlier and it seems to me that in socialism, in the end, the human rights movement which also included lesbian and gay movements, had had some respect. Even if it was an embarrassment regarding these movements and though it was not earlier than in the mid of 1970s that homosexuality was decriminalized, if I do not mention the precise year. Today, on the contrary, it seems to me that a terrorism of opinions governs the society, when in the true sense, everyone is entitled to have its five minutes, and even if it is a stupid, or an offensive opinion, though we cannot prove it, we see that the respect is gone. It seems that we have such a pluralism of views that today, somebody can just say something, anything, about human rights and it is seen that he or she is fighting for human rights.

Greif: I think that Europe, the European Union and countries within the EU, are all in some stage of decomposition. Especially, regarding what can prosper and what not. We have reached a point of a dark and terrifying bottom. Power is held by those who should not have it. Where on vital matters and on the lives of millions, of a community of millions, which Europe is, decide people who are close to capital and near the Catholic Church. They easily get rid of humanity. They are literally trampling on dead bodies and humanity when they go towards the achievement of their objectives, which are capitalist or institutionally connected with the church.

Tratnik: One thing has become clear to me that the hatred of Others was previously seen as domestic violence. It was violence against homosexuals in the parks, against homosexuals seen as secondary grade citizens, as less valuable people. Such violence was therefore never reported, because homosexuals were ashamed. This is now very interesting to read, a bunch of novels appeared in the East, also a writer under a pseudonym from Belgrade, another from Poland. What was the life of gays in the time of socialism? It was in the closet, literally in public toilets, meeting in parks and etc. In fact, when the coming out occurred, when these people are no longer satisfied with such a position, when they come out and say, we are exactly just like you, or, we are different and we have a right to this difference and still we want to be respected, then begins this violent response. Because in the East it was no familiarity with this type of civil movements, there was no Black Movement as in America, which made the situation there completely different. There was no women's movement, as it was said in fact that it is no longer needed. All these situations, plus some ideological closures, that ruled there, still, on the other hand I do not want to say that the West was open, and then the presence of the war,

many years of war violence, horrible killings, rapes, etc., situations that are not resolved, disastrous situations wandering from court to court, the result is an explosive mixture and the situation therefore cannot be otherwise.

Greif: I think that when we talk about the lesbian movement, or about a group as the lesbian group ŠKUC-LL is, then we can go into alliances primarily with those groups and movements that are similar to us, whether at home or in Yugoslavia, which I find very useful, as we all share the same mentality and the same patriarchal and traditional patterns, at least in this area, and therefore we understand each other very well. A lesbian group from Slovenia or a lesbian group from Serbia, we are immediately on the same line, as opposed to when we connect with some groups in the West. This is one thing. Of course, we connect with other movements, the gay movement, the queer movement, the movement of disabled people, to the Roma minority, etc. We connect with all those that like lesbian initiatives are pushed to the edge, and they try to keep us there. This is performed systematically. We also cooperate with international organizations, with European networks, such as ILGA Europe, and the like. This type of connection is again different, as Europe is essentially characterized by a bureaucratic European touch. The priorities held by ILGA Europe, etc., differ from the priorities of ŠKUC-LL, or some other lesbian and gay groups in our space. Simply because ILGA Europe and others are part of the European system of institutions and operate not by their priorities, but according to the priorities given to them from the outside. This would also be, in a way, the critique of international activism, or of the Western type of activism that is slowly falling into a mainstream conservative flow, as it tries at all costs to be integrated and included, and therefore assimilated.

ALLIANCES



Relations. 25 Years of the Lesbian Group ŠKUC-LL, Ljubljana (2012), M. Gržinić, A. Šmid and Z. Simčič

Nela Pamuković, feminist and lesbian, Kontra, Zagreb

Nela Pamuković: Let's start with the first lesbian group in Zagreb, Croatia. In 1989, when Lila initiative was established, a sort of subgroup of the Women's Group Trešnjevka, a feminist group. For the lesbian movement, the feminist movement and existing organizations in Slovenia were a very important stimulus. It was a kind of frame of references, as we spoke about the context of former Yugoslavia. We were all following what was happening in which city and this was in fact the value of Yugoslavia, this interaction and influences. So, we were well connected and this intensified the formation of the organization in Zagreb. The feminist and lesbian scene at that time had the support of the Socialist youth organizations. Of course, we safeguarded our autonomy, and they gave us room to work.

With the advent to power by Franjo Tuđman in Croatia all crumbled down at once. The group Lila initiative lost its place and stopped working. Partly because of personal stories, as the founder of the initiative went

to work elsewhere so the group stopped to work.

Another group was formed then, the Lesbian and Gay Men Action – LIGMA, which was supported by the then Transnational Radical Movement. LIGMA worked for several years, with the first activists that came out. Even in the Lila initiative we had a person that was out, and was interviewed by student and youth newspapers in that 1980s revolutionary time.

LIGMA contributed greatly at the time of Tuđman, as any LGBT activism was revolutionary for the then Catholic fundamentalist consciousness. Unfortunately LIGMA gradually ceased to function as well. The two main activists went to Sweden and Canada. Then the lesbian group Kontra appeared whose founders were part of the Lila initiative. During the war many of us participated in a sort of feminist-humanist work in support of refugees, war victims, women, etc. Communities were in the underground. Just some party and closed lesbian circles. During the war foreign feminists used to come to Croatia. Many of them were lesbians, and we had a sort of closed community in which we empowered each other. Kontra has occurred in the absence of persons who were out.

There were no any public appearances. The space was at the time of Tuđman still quite closed. Kontra mostly operated with strengthening the community: the first SOS phone for lesbians, counseling, legal aid, and some common campaigns, exhibitions, workshops, photos and the like.

In 2002, there was a flourishing scene in Croatia. There was a large number of new young activists who were out. For example, Sanja (Juras) who came out very young, but was immediately very strong in her identity and public performance. And not only that. The first gay group Iskorak and the lesbian group LORI in Rijeka (Croatia) were founded. We started to connect. The result was a bit more powerful scene. We connected when organizing the first Pride Parade in Zagreb in 2002, which was partially motivated by the events in Belgrade, with the terrible attempt to organize the Pride Parade in Belgrade in 2001, when they were beaten. On the other hand, we connected with the Slovenian Pride. We came all together when organizing the Pride Parade. And this was a total boom.

Pride Parade in Split, 11. 6. 2011
LET'S DESTROY FASCISM
LET'S SUPPORT GAY ACTIVISM!
Antifa, Zagreb

Sanja Juras, lawyer and activist, Kontra, Zagreb

Sanja Juras The police had the parade under full control the whole time. But when the bullies gathered around the parade and started throwing rocks, explosives, bags with shit and other objects they were carrying, the police really did nothing to stop or arrest them.

The police stood there in between the violent bullies and participants of the parade. The police could have identified them easily, who they were, they could have moved them away from the parade, but this did not happen. At the place where we met, we were constantly under the attack, they threw constantly objects on us. The police did not even then evacuate the parade participants, although, we, the organizers, requested it. It is clear that the police did not do everything they could have to protect the public gathering. But the moment they decided to evacuate the participants, it was literally done in five minutes. All bullies were removed in a very short time. So when there is will, things can happen.

The state now claims that there were no serious disturbances. That all went on smoothly, that the program ran smoothly and that, following the last speech, the participants were invited to the organization Domine

for cakes and sandwiches. Although it is clear that the speeches in the true sense did not take place. We had only a very short program during the evacuation, in order to encourage people and to invite them to come to the next event.

Pride Parade in Belgrade, 30. 6. 2001
Kill the faggots! Kill the faggots!

Gržinić: Now, the period since 2000. A period of psychosis, homophobia. A scary period, horrors. The recordings we are looking at, for those who were not present and for all of us in other parts ex-Yugoslavia, are until today, scary, horrible. What is this? What does this mean?

Mladenović: I always insisted that I did not create a political analysis of what was actually happening. As a member of the team that organized the Pride Parade in 2001, I did not realize what would happen. We did not take seriously the threats of the ultra-fascists from the organization Obraz (Face). When they said "We will beat you" we thought it was just threats. We had experience with Žene u crnom (Women in Black). I myself had this experience. They hit us once, maybe twice, but never to death.

I thought when we had demonstrated as Women in Black against Milošević, saying NO to the regime, as antifascists and for all victims of the war that this was a major political statement, bigger than lesbians and gays who want to publicly express their love.

Celebrate love. We did not understand that this was a much bigger blow to patriarchy than saying NO to fascism. This was quite a surprise. But what was important was to see that this represented the continuation of Yugoslavia. In 2001 when we organized the Pride, there were with us also feminists and lesbians from Zagreb and Ljubljana. They were with us in the parade. They came to be with us. In the end there were nearly a thousand of those who came to beat us and twenty of us. We had not yet managed to gather when they already began to beat us. Then it became really clear for the first time in what kind of society we lived.

We were wrong; we thought that with Djindjić we got democracy and that we had done with Milošević. We thought we could do what was to be done in a democracy. But we ignored, especially me, the fact that in those ten years, Milošević had created fascism, and we were not at all aware of it. We thought that these were those fighting out there, there and there. But, not, they were here. And they were kids who hadn't experienced war. Those who had beaten us were not ex-soldiers. Maybe only some of them. Actually, this is fascism, which derives from that time and reproduces itself constantly. Its source is militarism and hatred of the other. So it is a constant production of hate. Constant.

Pride Parade in Ljubljana, 2. 6. 2012

Barbara Rajgelj, lawyer and co-owner of Cafe Open

Barbara Rajgelj: After the rejection of the Family Code at the referendum, I thought to stop with human rights advocacy. To stop writing complaints to the police, to centers for social work, to the ministry. To stop carrying crates of beers and coca colas in the Cafe Open; to stop arguing with the local alcoholics. To stop explaining why the Pride Parade is so important. To stop organizing round tables and attending seminars. In a word to stop going crazy.

I thought to assume the style of a number of colleagues at various institutions of higher education, particularly those at the University of Law. In the protected bubble of my study cabinet I would write scientific papers and collect points for my academic advancement. Once every two to five years I would

give some neutral and apolitical interview for the local dailies, preferably for their Saturday special sections. I would try to attend conferences and try to meet distinguished foreign professors and researchers. I would try to get a scholarship for visiting a foreign university. I would improve a membership in an international or national project team. Here and there I would prepare a well-paid legal advice for some ministry or company. In short, instead of public exposure, in which I am, because of the populist stance of mass media, most of the time in contact with vulgar and profane readers, I would try seriously and genuinely to engage in the industry of high education, which would allow for a comfortable position of a distant observer. I would lose a sense of my work, but I would gain peace. I would get an oasis of peace in which everything goes, where everything is off and you're not responsible for anything, because you only observe, analyze and interpret.

But I soon abandoned such a stance of discouragement, since I do not want to join the passive majority that with their tacit consent helped the loud Catholic Church and the Slovenian right wing parties to reject the Family Code. The Family Code was not taking anything away from them, but was merely granting rights and obligations to gays and lesbians and their children. Of course, the law in particular was rejected because of the tireless production of lies and malice by Anton Stres, Tadej Strehovec, Aleš Primc, Angelca Likovič, France Cukjati, Tomaž Merše and others, more or less passionate and angry defenders of discrimination. The Family Code was rejected due to the passive and complicit minority, oops, I wanted to say majority! This majority consists particularly of those who have access to the media space but did not react. They could have easily, because of their social status, entered the space of the debate, but they withdrew. I have in mind professors, researchers, social scientists, public officials, lawyers and other professionals.

This majority consists as well of 1.471.000 citizens of the Republic of Slovenia, who are eligible to vote. They either voted against equal rights. So did 280.000 of them. Or, did not come to the polls to vote at all. So did 1.191.000 citizens eligible to vote. The latter are obviously expressing their care for others in their intimate and private world. For the Family Code and for equal rights were only 233.000 voters out of 1.709.000. Therefore only 14% of adult citizens of this country devoted five minutes of their time to go to the polls and to vote for equal rights for all before the law.

14% is slightly higher than the number of gays and lesbians in Slovenia. This is not the result with which anyone would be happy. When we compare the rejection of the Family Code with past referendums, when Slovenians were as well deciding on minority rights, especially with the referendum on the rights of single women for artificial insemination (2001) and with the referendum on the Erased people (2004), the result is indeed much better, but we cannot overlook that this time people knew that they were voting for rights of already born and living children.

Nina Hudej, Female's'cream, Club Monokel

Nina Hudej: I would say that the slogan of this year's Pride Parade "Forward to the Middle Ages" tells about the fact that the conservative forces, and especially the Roman Catholic Church, in this year of the referendum and of the election campaign, had with their impatient and manipulative campaigns led to the rejection of the referendum on the Family Code. The rejected referendum has deprived same-sex partners and their children of their rights. That is why this year's Pride Parade is so important. It is great that so many people joined it, a number that we did not count for years. This also suggests that many are very unsatisfied with the way how this institution, the church, acts. It is time for them to seriously con-

sider their actions.

Referendum on the Family Code, 25. 3. 2012, Ljubljana. The Family Code was rejected.

Barbara Rajgelj

At the LGBT people friendly bar Cafe Open in Ljubljana

Rajgelj: Actually, for the second time we have in power a person who came to power with infringement of human rights. This is a man -

Gržinič: You are talking about Janša?

Rajgelj: Janez Janša came to power in 2004 on the shoulders of the Erased people, on the shoulders of 20.000 people who had been deprived of life. If for doing this, you are rewarded with the most important position in the country, becoming a prime minister, then surely you can do anything bad to anyone. Since doing something bad to the other, is not punished, but rewarded. It is an alarming fact that this country does not purify itself from bad things.

Nataša Sukič

At "Lesbomania" at Radio Student, Ljubljana, 28. 1. 2012

Sukič: The Family Code does not allow artificial insemination for lesbians and does not legalize the so called "replacement motherhood." Intentions to eliminate the rights of minorities are dirty spots on the consciousness of politics and the Catholic Church.

Greif: The fact that even today, in February 2012, lesbianism, which means female homoeroticism on the personal level, or at the level of sexual practices and as well society, at a theoretical level, academic level, represents a threat. It is seen as something that threatens the existing status quo, something that threatens the nation state. Because lesbians do not swear on motherhood, on the reproduction of the nation, they are seen as something that threatens the traditional Christian family; because lesbians do not accept the traditional family patterns. Lesbians are seen as a threat to public and academic discourses, because they simply do not fall within the patriarchal patterns and relationships of dominance within society.

It is simply not allowed to a group of women to take some power and represent their own interests by rejecting heterosexism, heteronormativity, and dominant power relations in society. As for the queer movement, queer theory, maybe someone will not agree with me, but my view is that the queer movement brings certain openness. Queer movement, theory, means inclusion of all marginalized minorities. Marginalized identities are included within a framework, which previously covered only homosexuality and lesbianism. Today we are talking about transgender, intersexuality, and the right to choose sex of various queer identities. It is about merging within the paradigm of queer, not only lesbians and gay men, which means not only homosexuals, but of all fragments of a vast mosaic; fragments, which were not included anywhere else. The queer movement includes the movement for rights of sex workers, prostitutes, those affected by AIDS crisis. It includes therefore all that was left outside the frame and has now found its place in the paradigm of a queer movement and theory. This is obviously very positive and good, but on the other hand, it is this wide palette, this queer palette that covers all "dissidents," of course in quotation marks, that functions again as a possible hiding place. We are again confronted with the strategies of hiding, with strategies of deleting and censorship. As within such collectives, as diverse as queer, it can soon happen that a weak link remains without its visible face.

Velikonja: Polemical debates in the 1970s. In 1976,

1977 the old Slovenian Penal Code was changed. Homosexuality was decriminalized, and therefore we had polemical debates in the mass media. The socialist government was not as totalitarian, it sought public consensus on the topics it wanted to change. The debates on the decriminalization of homosexuality were held in public places. It is interesting that Ljubo Bavcon (a Slovenian lawyer) stated, a few years ago in an interview with Tatjana Greif, that the Socialist party managed the decriminalization of homosexuality because certain parts of the public opinion and certain institutions had no power.

Tratnik: The movement is today called LGBT. I prefer this term rather than queer. Queer is something that covers all, and I have become afraid of this, I do not know if I am part of such a movement, if it covers everything. I think it is still important to name things; we have long fought for the right to have a name, to pronounce it. To say lesbians, gays, also queer, transgender, bisexual, etc. This question of transgender really brings an interesting dimension, since on the one hand, it kills the binary, and on the other, it reconfirms it. Let's say, for me, it was a moment of awakening when I was translating the book by Kate Bornstein, *Gender Outlaws*. Bornstein is an American activist, writer, transgender activist, who spent most of her life as a man and then changed sex. After being operated on, she is now a woman and a lesbian. The comments she received were something like "if you like women why did you undergo the operation since you could have remained a man who was with women" – as in the past she was a heterosexual man. She said, no, I am a lesbian and I had to traverse this path. This testifies, on the one hand to an openness of these new gender definitions. On the other hand, she says, "I still have many skins. I had a male skin and I took it off. I had a heterosexual skin and I took it off. Now I am a lesbian. I don't know what follows."

Performance "In the Shoes of My Gender," LORI, Rijeka, Croatia

What is Matej experiencing? What is happening to him? Why are these things happening to him? Where do you see a problem? Do you see a problem?

Danijela Almesberger, LORI, Rijeka

Danijela Almesberger: Association LORI was founded in 2000; we have existed for almost 12 years. We started as a Lesbian Organization Rijeka. But after a few years, we extended our work on the whole LGBT community, or, let's say, that in the past few years we have been dealing with transgender and transsexual topics. Society dictates what kind of life we have to create for ourselves, in terms of our gender and sexual identity. The same goes for sexual orientation. It is just that, in this case, it is about attraction; there it is about identity. But in the end all comes down to discrimination on the basis of biological sex and gender. We recognize this as a key issue. In particular, the transgender community is highly marginalized. Not only by the society, but also by lesbians, gays and bisexuals.

AIDS

Greif: In fact, AIDS still has the status of an outlaw, even today. Already in the 1980s, when the gay movement was founded in Slovenia, in the then Socialist Republic of Slovenia a lot of attacks on homosexuality took place in the public sphere, precisely because of this stigma. This stigma was introduced also by the occurrence of AIDS. And all the opposition to various requirements, which was set against the gay movement, which was soon joined by the lesbian movement, was built on the stigma of AIDS. I think that this is the case today; it presents a quasi-moralist argument, which is purely populist in its nature and serves to mislead public opinion and to build a negative image of the community. It is interesting that the awareness regarding safe sex and prevention came from the gay

movement, with the initiatives of the group Magnus. It was this group in Slovenia that first started to educate and raise awareness on AIDS not only within the gay population, but in general in Slovenia. It started with education on safe sexuality; what is safe sex and what are the preventive measures. And then, only after many years the initiative was joined by the state institutions, which should have already been active for years, intervening, etc. These institutions joined much later, as well as health institutions and relevant ministries joined in much later. So this Enlightenment mission, in terms of prevention and awareness, to prevent the spread of HIV and AIDS, was put forward by the non-governmental associations, which were active, working in the area of homosexuality.



Relations. 25 Years of the Lesbian Group ŠKUC-LL, Ljubljana (2012), M. Gržinič, A. Šmid and Z. Simčič

Velikonja: AIDS was for the authorities in connection with the homosexual movement immediately a problem. Already in 1987? Marina, is this so? At that time the socialist government banned the third Magnus Festival basing it on the assumption that it would bring to Ljubljana an AIDS epidemic that would bring on a whole cataclysm. In fact, this allowed the government to ban the Magnus Festival. Then, for two years there was silence in public space. The topic came back again with the Slovenian-nation state, along with sanitization, purity, and Christian right wing demands in politics.

Lesbian Rebellion, Ljubljana, 2007

Petra Hrovatin / VJ Perikle, designer, poet and activist

Petra Hrovatin: Lesbian Rebellion started with one event in a club named Orto Bar in Ljubljana. At that time in 2007, we were a couple, and at a concert there. At a certain point the security guard came and escorted us out. He said that that was not a club for such a sort of people. What we did was kissing each other. We were about to leave, anyway, but he came and told us that very clearly.

Simona Jerala, Red Dawn

Simona Jerala The security guard told us that we were in a wrong club, that that was not a suitable place for us. He emphasized that several times and escorted us out of the club. There was no chance we could stay.

Activists protest, Lesbian Rebellion, Ljubljana, 2007

Ajgul Hakimova, activist, Social center Rog, Ljubljana

Ajgul Hakimova: I suggest talking about one day mobilizing meeting. That will be joined by The Autonomous Tribune, Social center Rog, the LGBT movement in Slovenia, Metelkova city, by the alternative gardeners, that is... by all the realities that have suddenly become nothing, a society excrement. Everyone listens to the same story, it is really bad. Therefore it is important to get together, to say we will do this and that; it does not mean uniformity, it can be chaotic, a million of communities, collectives, all do-

ing something specific, though, it will be full nice to talk about and to know that we are in some mobilizing points together. I call for an action in relation to what the LGBT community experienced. Yesterday we were hanging banners around the city until five in the morning. I have battle wounds on my fingers.

Jerala: What happened is a coming together of all these Lesbians, the LGBT scene. All started to connect; before, there were no such links, and this generated a very powerful charge, some of us came together and then we started the campaign.

Hrovatin: Probably it was in the air – a need for something, to go forward. As it was lethargy. Not so many debates, as it was the case last year regarding the Family Code. It was another period. It seems to me that there was a connection of similarly thinking people. They did not come because of the two of us, but because of being against, to say that this is not permitted. This was an explicit intervention in public space, where we were supposedly free to move, to freely express ourselves. This was a direct prohibition of this freedom. Then we did not call it Lesbian Rebellion, it was a combination of half of the second generation of activists, who then set up themselves. It has united us in this insurrection, going on the street in a public space and investigating the visibility of gays and lesbians in the space. With some direct actions. The first began after the demonstrations, when we walked the streets of Ljubljana, around Orto Bar, hanging banners with different slogans, such as “Kissing is a human right,” “Expulsion of lesbians is prohibited,” “Ljubljana is a homophobic city.”

The Square of Lesbian Revolution; The Square of Lesbian Brigades

Kristina Hočevar, poet and prof. of Slovenian language
At the Lesbian Club Monokel, Ljubljana

Kristina Hočevar: Lesbian desire, which is sovereign and articulated, is subversive. It undermines, it is purple. It is the one that clearly stands out from the matrix of heterosexual sexuality. This is evident in poetry as well. Lesbian desire is rebellious, does not allow apathy towards the world, has a rhythm of its own. At the same time, what is essential is its integration into the social. Even when it does not want, it is embedded in the social that however defines it.

Urška Sterle, writer and performer, ŠKUC-LL
Stand-up tragedy “The Secretary”

Urška Sterle: Hello, did I get the General Headquarters of National Nationalists of Slovenia? To whom am I speaking? Oh, Hans, fine, fine. The son of Slovenian father and Slovenian mother... and Slovenian grandfather and Slovenian ...
Damn it, this is going to take a while.

Really? The dog is also Slovenian? Are you fucking with me? Which breed is it? German Shepherd. Fine, fine.

Listen, Hans or Sven or whatever your name is, I am calling from the secretariat of Lesbian Mafia. We are having a Pride Parade next week. Pride Parade. Parade ... Oh, you understand that word. What part of it you don't get then? What is pride? Oh, pride? Pride is... it's Gay Pride. Yes, that's it! We are having a Gay Pride next week. Yeah, yeah, you will fuck us all up, hundreds of you are coming... look I just wanted to know which day you are coming so we can put you in the program. No problemo.
Well, think about it and let us know.

Hey, Rajgelj, Rajgelj. I know you are here so stop hiding. I have some very bad news for her.

Sterle: Do you feel lonely, listless? Is your daily routine dull? Do you crave existential challenges, such

as unemployment, self-employment, refusal of status, living on minimum wage? Want to do something good for your health? We offer an annual Nazi attack on your favorite lesbian bar. Confirmed, you will get your blood pumping through your veins. By joining the Lesbian Mafia you will become a target of assaults, insults and underestimation.

All that will help you in honing your patience, rhetorical and stress management skills.

Should you have any health problems, feel free to visit our Friday Bar-Clinic. But no matter what trouble plagues you in life, remember that with a membership in the Lesbian Mafia you will never be alone.

Performing

LGBTQ community
Ajgul Hakimova
Aldo Ivančič
Barbara Rajgelj
Bogdan Lešnik
Danijela Almesberger
Guy Hocquenghem
Kristina Hočevar
Lepa Mladenović
Marina Gržinič
Mojca Dobnikar
Nada Vodušek
Nataša Sukič
Nataša Velikonja
Nela Pamuković
Nina Hudej
Petra Hrovatin
Sanja Juras
Simona Jerala
Slon in Sadež
Suzana Tratnik
Tatjana Greif
Toni Marošević
Urška Sterle

Concept by Marina Gržinič

Camera by Zvonka T Simčič

Camera at locations:

Urška Djukič, Goran Lazin, Valerija Zabret

Editing by Marina Gržinič, Aina Šmid, Zvonka T Simčič

Sound by Zvonka T Simčič

Music in the film:

Party Girl, Chinawoman
Borghesia
Smak svita, TBF

Used on-line materials:

Pride parade, Belgrade, 2001
Pride parade, Split, 2011

Used archive materials:

ŠKUC Gallery 1983-88 (directed by M. Gržinič and B. Zadravec);
Lesbian Rebellion, 2007

Art photographs by Jane Štravs

Filmed in Ljubljana and Belgrade in 2012.

Producer: Zvonka T Simčič

Produced by Zavod CCC, Ljubljana

2012, Ljubljana, Slovenia

Translated from Slovenian into English by Marina Gržinič

POVODOM DESETOGODIŠNJE SMRTI MARKUSA OMOFUME 1999–2009^[1]

Araba Evelin Džonston-Artur

1. maj 1999. i 15. jul 2003. vidim kao dane pogibije Markusa Omofume (počivao u miru/r.i.p.) i Seibane Vague (počivao u miru/r.i.p.). Kao dane koji su urezani u naš život ovde u Austriji, u našu još delimično zatrpanu prošlost, našu sadašnjost i budućnost. Istovremeno postoji, postojao je i uvek će postojati otpor tamo gde ima represije.

I kada pogledam na 1999. godinu, setim se formiranja organizovanog otpora od strane Crnačke zajednice a povodom rasističkih policijskih akcija i smrti Ahmeda F. (počivao u miru/r.i.p.) u Beču. Setim se vremena političkih početaka, vremena emancipacije ponizne zahvalnosti (tj. hvala što uopšte smemo da budemo ovde u Evropi, odnosno Austriji), ali i vremena lične mobilizacije i samoorganizovanja. Setim se i vremena osvešćenja da imamo posla sa svim drugim osim sa „nesrećnim pojedinačnim slučajevima“, i da je u pitanju institucionalizovani rasizam. Setim se vremena spoznaje da je pesma Boba Marlija Get Up, Stand Up, Stand Up For Your Rights u našem bivstvovanju sada i ovde od životnog značaja, jer prava potlačenih nikad i nigde na ovome svetu nisu pala kao poklon s neba.

Mreža afričkih zajednica, koja okuplja otprilike 17 različitih organizacija, pozvala je zajedno sa levičarskim i migrantskim organizacijama marta 1999. na demonstracije pod nazivom „Zustavite rasistički policijski teror!“. Mi – ili da govorim samo u svoje ime – ja tada još nisam bila svesna nikakvog radikalizma. Kada se saznalo za smrt Markusa Omofume, na osnovu činjenice da je mučenički ubijen od strane tri austrijska policajca prilikom deportacije i to na bugarskoj suverenoj teritoriji, Crnačka zajednica se nalazila u već politizovanom procesu mobilizacije.

Svesni političke odgovornosti Ministarstva unutrašnjih poslova, Mreža afričkih zajednica organizovala je od 5. maja bdenja ispred zgrade Ministarstva, a 8. maja usledile su velike demonstracije. Naša bdenja završena su iznenada 27. maja 1999. U ranim jutarnjim satima najveća policijska akcija u istoriji Druge Republike Austrije, prilikom čega su prvi put korišćeni prisluškivači, rasturila je, prema sopstvenim navodima, međunarodni lanac narkotika iz Nigerije. Čarls Ofoedu, pesnik i aktivista u tom momentu sve jačeg protestnog pokreta Crnačke zajednice, te noći je bio uhapšen i, bez izuzetka, u svim štampanim medijima, kao i na nacionalnoj televiziji ORF, predstavljen je kao šef ove navodno kriminalne organizacije.

Naš otpor protiv rasističkog nasilja policije je u javnosti uspešno predstavljen kao važan segment ove kriminalne organizacije. Razlog zbog kojeg želim da se ovom prilikom pismeno podsetim svega toga je to što imam osećaj da je ova priča o počecima pobuna Crnačke zajednice do 2009. skoro potpuno marginalizovana, a mi kao politički subjekti sa političkim zahtevima ostali učutkani i nevidljivi u sadašnjosti. U medijima se moglo čuti da su policijski službenici smrtonosnu borbu Markusa Omofume doživeli kao preteću, animalnu agresivnost od koje su morali da se odbrane. Ideju o crncima kao prirodno agresivnim

ljudima izrekla je 1999. na vanrednoj sednici Parlamenta Helene Patrik-Pable, tadašnja portparolka Slobodarske partije Austrije (FPÖ) i nekadašnji sudija(!). Ta ideja se već odavno odražava kao smrtonosna, rasistička praksa u realnostima, prilikama, medijskim, političkim (ne)reakcijama i sudskim presudama povodom smrti Seibane Vague, a s njim i u realnostima drugih žrtava policijskog nasilja.

Markus Omofuma je shodno tom obrascu u pravom smislu te reči bio učutkan – jer je mučenički ugušen. Nakon policijske operacije „Spring“ o protestu Crnačke zajednice, kao što je objavljeno i na konferenciji za štampu tadašnjeg generalnog direktora za javnu bezbednost Mihaela Sike, moglo se saznati sledeće: „Prisluškivanje dokumentuje da su narkobosovi upućivali svoje potročke da se prilikom policijske kontrole pozovu na ‘rasistički tretman’. Znamo da su bili pozivani da učestvuju na demonstracijama i bdenjima za Omofumu“. Shodno tadašnjem gušenju našeg protesta putem jedne delotvorne, sistemat-ske, direktne i medijski pripremljene kriminalizacije, postaje jasan značaj otpora i potreba da se setimo te priče koja je doterana do ruba zaborava, te da ostanemo u vezi sa njom.

U aprilu 2009. Amnesty International je objavio izveštaj koji jasno predočava da institucionalizovani rasizam predstavlja realnost kako u austrijskoj egzekutivi, tako i u okviru pravnog sistema. Tako je deset godina kasnije svrha borbe Crnačke zajednice dospela u javnost, što predstavlja veliki napredak. Taj izveštaj istovremeno baca svetlo i na jedan deo rasističkog potlačivanja u Austriji. I upravo ovde se, prema mom mišljenju, vidi važnost ostvarivanja veze između Crnačke zajednice i drugih migrantskih zajednica i rasno ugroženih manjina u Austriji.

Danas se uz dozu samokritike pitam da li bi 2009. bile moguće demonstracije pod geslom „Zustavite rasistički policijski teror!“. Da li bi imale ikakvu šansu? I kao što sam već rekla, mi – ili bolje da ostanem pri sebi – ja u to vreme nisam bila svesna nikakvog radikalizma. Danas mi se naziv ovih demonstracija ne čini neradikalnim. Istovremeno razmišljam u sebi o rečima afričko-američke pozorišne spisateljice Lorejn Hensberi: „Prihvatanje našeg sadašnjeg stanja je jedini oblik ekstremizma koji nas diskredituje pred našom decom“. Otpor postoji i dalje, i ima mnogo glasova i lica... Don't give up the Fight...

Sa nemačkog na srpski preveo Nemanja Vlajković

FUSNOTE

[1] Cf. U: Dolmeç. Deutsche Beilage der türkischen Monatszeitung Yeni Hareket, Nr. 04/Mai 2009, Beč, str. 2. http://www.afrikanet.info/uploads/media/Dolmec_04.pdf

THE OMOFUMA DEPORTATION

Three years ago this May 1st, a young African, Mr. Marcus Omofuma was killed during his deportation from Austria to Nigeria via Sofia (Bulgaria). Mr. Omofuma, 25 years old, protested against his deportation - an act which cost him his life. He was taped down to his airplane seat so tightly that he was almost totally immobile. Even his ability to breathe was greatly reduced.

Apart from the questionable equality of deportation per se, this case is a prime example of how irresponsibly the authorities sometimes deal with human life. Of protection of human dignity there is not a trace. Such treatment of any human being should not and may not be accepted in a constitutional state of law, as Austria claims to be, even if such deportations involve criminals. Mr. Omofuma was not a criminal.



ON THE OCCASION OF THE 10TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE DEATH OF MARCUS OMOFUMA 1999–2009^[1]

Araba Evelyn Johnston-Arthur

May 1st 1999 and July 15th 2003 I see as the days of deaths of Marcus Omofuma (R.I.P.) and Seibane Wague (R.I.P.), as the days that are etched in our life here in Austria, in our still partially cluttered past, our present and our future. Where there is oppression there has always been resistance at the same time.

When I look back at 1999, I recall the formation of the organized resistance by the Black community provoked by racist police actions and the death of Ahmed F. (R.I.P.) in Vienna. I remember a time of political beginnings, time of emancipation of the humble gratitude (i.e. thank you for letting us be here in Europe, in Austria), but also the time of personal mobilization and self-organization. I remember the time of awakening as well as of realising that we were dealing with anything but just “unfortunate individual cases,” and that it was at stake institutionalized racism. I remember the time when I realised that Bob Marley’s song Get Up, Stand Up, Stand Up For Your Rights was of vital importance for our being now and here, because the rights of the oppressed have never and nowhere in the world been dropped down as a gift from heaven.

African Communities Network which brings together some 17 different organisations called, along with leftist and migrant organisations, for demonstrations called “Stop Racist Police Terror!” in March, 1999. We – or I’d better speak only for myself – I wasn’t aware of any radicalism at the time. When we learnt of the death of Marcus Omofuma and the fact that he was brutally killed by three Austrian policemen while being deported and that this happened in the Bulgarian sovereign territory, the Black community was already in the politicized process of mobilization.

Aware of the political responsibility of the Ministry of Internal Affairs, African Communities Network organized vigils in front of the Ministry building on May 5th, and on May 8th there followed massive rallies. Our vigils ended abruptly on May 27th, 1999. In the early hours, the biggest police operation in the history of the Second Republic of Austria, during which they had first used taps, dismantled according to their own statements, an international drug supply chain from Nigeria. Charles Ofoedu, a poet and activist of the, at that moment, ever-growing protest movement of the Black community, was arrested that night and, presented without exception in all media, as well as on national television ORF, as the head of the alleged criminal organization.

Our resistance against racist police violence was successfully shown in public as an important part of the criminal organization. The reason why I want to take this opportunity to remind myself in writing of all that is because I have a feeling that this story about the beginnings of the Black community rebellion was almost completely marginalized until 2009, and that we, as political subjects with political demands, remained silenced and invisible in the present. In the media you could learn that police officers experienced the lethal

fight of Marcus Omofuma as a threatening, animalistic aggressiveness from which they had to defend themselves. The idea of Black people being naturally aggressive was passed at an emergency session of the Parliament in 1999 by Helene Patrik-Pable, the former spokeswoman for the Freedom Party of Austria (FPÖ) and a former judge (!). This idea has for a long time been reflected as a deadly, racist practice in realities, circumstances, media, political (non) reaction and court rulings on the death Seibane Wague, and along with him, in the realities of other victims of police violence.

In compliance with this pattern Marcus Omofuma was, in the true sense of the word, silenced – as he was brutally suffocated. Following the police operation “Spring,” about the protest of the Black community, as it was announced at the press conference of the then Director General of Public Safety Michael Sike, you could find out the following: “The tapping has documented that the drug lords instructed their errand boys to call for ‘racist treatment’ in the occasion of the police raid. We know that they were invited to participate in demonstrations and vigils for Omofuma.” In accordance with the then putting down of our protest by the means of effective, systematic, direct and media-prepared criminalisation, the importance of resistance and the need to remember the story that has been pushed to the edge of oblivion, and to keep in touch with it – become evident.

In April 2009 Amnesty International released a report that clearly revealed that institutionalized racism is a reality both in Austrian executive and within the legal system. Thus ten years later the purpose of the struggle of the Black community is brought to light, which is a huge improvement. The report also throws light on some of the racist oppression in Austria. And it is right here, in my opinion, where one can see the importance of establishing connections between the Black community and other migrant communities and racially oppressed minorities in Austria.

Today, with a dose of self-criticism, I wonder whether demonstrations under the slogan “Stop Racist Police Terror” could be possible in 2009. Would they stand the slightest chance? And as I already mentioned, at that time we – or, I had better stick to myself – I was not aware of any radicalism. Today I don't see the name of these demonstrations as non-radical. At the same time I'm pondering over the words of the African-American theatre writer, Lorraine Hansberry: “Accepting our present state is the only form of extremism which discredits us in front of our children.” The resistance still exists, and there are many voices and faces to it ... Do not give up the Fight...

Translated from Serbian into English by Dragana Govedarica Kostopoulos

FOOTNOTES

[1] In: Dolmeç. Deutsche Beilage der türkischen Monatszeitung Yeni Hareket, Nr.04/Mai 2009, Vienna, p. 2. http://www.afrikanet.info/uploads/media/Dolmec_04.pdf

NEOLIBERALNI „OMNIBUS”: KULTURNO KOLEKTIVNO DOBRO PROTIV KULTURNE INDUSTRIJE

Intervju Tjaše Kancler sa Horheom Luisom Marsom

Nacrt zakona o pojednostavljenju, agilnosti i administrativnom restrukturiranju i unapređenju ekonomske delatnosti [Anteproyecto de Ley de simplificación, de agilidad y reestructuración administrativa y de promoción de la actividad Económica], takođe poznat pod nazivom „Omnibus zakon” (zbog mnoštva pitanja koje reguliše pod istim normativnim sistemom) objavljen je 1. juna 2011. godine u Službenom listu Generaliteta Katalonije (DOGC). Prema preambuli, cilj ovog zakonodavnog tela je administrativna racionalizacija, kao i reaktiviranje ekonomske delatnosti kako bi se omogućila konkurentnost i produktivnost. Uzimajući u obzir reviziju i osavremenjivanje nekih aspekata strukture produktivnog tkiva, podrazumeva se izmena normi koje se odnose na prirodnu sredinu, kulturu i sport, privatno pravo, ekonomiju, bezbednost, farmaceutsku industriju i socijalne službe, teritoriju i pravni sistem državnih uprava.

Ukratko, ovaj zakonodavni dokument jasno pokazuje nameru da se nastavi privatizacija javnog sektora i kroz takve izmene teži da nas podvrgne propisima potrebnim za beskrajnu akumulaciju kapitala. Ostvarivanje profita je iznad bilo kog drugog shvatanja sadržaja i prirode prava utvrđenih na osnovu trenutno postojećih društvenih odnosa. U okviru ovog projekta reforme na makro nivou, koja će ozbiljno uticati na društvo u celini, između ostalih izmena, predložena je promena modela kulturne politike, koja će, sada izričito u službi privatnih preduzeća, podstaći još više kulturnu proizvodnju, koja ima za cilj spektakularizaciju kulture i ekonomski dobitak, u obliku kulturnih i kreativnih industrija, kako bi se u potpunosti iskoristile prednosti koje stvara. Kultura u neoliberalnom režimu ima vrednost samo ako doprinosi ekonomiji.

U središtu ove duboke krize političke i ekonomske legitimnosti, čiji smo svedoci, ne samo u Kataloniji, već i u Evropi i svetu, moramo radikalno preispitati odnos politike i kulture, te ponovo postaviti pitanje zašto je kultura postala glavni instrument globalnog kapitalizma. Kako smo došli do ove tačke? Šta nam je činiti?

Horhe Luis Marso je istoričar umetnosti, kustos, pisac i profesor. Njegova najnovija istraživanja i kustoski projekti su: *El d_efecto barroco. Políticas de la imagen hispana* [Barokni d_efekat. Politika latino slike] (CCCB, 2010); *Low-Cost. Libres o cómplices* [Low-cost. Slobodni ili saučesnici] (FAD, 2009); *Spots electorales. El espectáculo de la democracia* [Izborni spotovi. Spektakl demokratije], (Virreina, 2008); *Hempreslaradio* [Preuzeli smo radio] (2006–2007), i *Tourismos* [Tur-izmi], (Fundació Antoni Tàpies, 2004).

U poslednjoj deceniji objavio je sledeće knjige: *¿Puedo hablarle con Libertad, excelencia? Arte y poder en España Desde 1950* [Mogu li razgovarati sa vama slobodno, ekscelencijo? Umetnost i moć u Španiji od 1950] (2010); *Arte Moderno y Franquismo. Los orígenes conservadores de la Vanguardia y de la política artística en España* [Moderna umet-

nost i frankizam. Konzervativno poreklo avangarde i umetničke politike u Španiji] (2008); *Fotografía y activismo social* [Fotografija i socijalni aktivizam] (2006); *Me, Mycell and I. Tecnología, movilidad y vida social* [Samo ja, moj mobilni telefon i ja. Tehnologija, mobilnost i društveni život] (2003) i *Planeta Kurtz* [Planeta Kurc] (2002).

Već godinama Horhe Luis Marso piše o stanju kulturnih politika u Španiji i Kataloniji, koje prema njegovoj analizi dele izrazitu sklonost ka instrumentalizaciji kulture i umetnosti od strane političkih i ekonomskih sila kako bi promovisale nestvarne elitne krugove, vršile direktnu kontrolu resursa na štetu samostalne i nezavisne profesionalizacije kulturnog tkiva, i predstavljale razumevanje kulture kao viška vrednosti, kao marketinškog elementa, sa jedinim ciljem promovisanja turističke privrede.

Tjaša Kancler: U ranim 80-im, nakon dugog razdoblja razorne diktature, započeo je demokratski period u Španiji, koji je bio vrlo bitan, između ostalog, i za izradu nove kulturne politike. Kakav je odnos između kulturne politike frankizma (kulturna politika tokom režima generala Franka) i savremene umetnosti? Kakvo je čitanje savremene umetnosti (španski modernizam) predloženo tokom perioda tranzicije i kako je nova uloga kulture definisana u tom pogledu?

Horhe Luis Marso: Tokom Frankovog režima, kultura je pretrpela dvostruku upotrebu, ali sa istom funkcijom: sa jedne strane, režim elite zadobio je relativno integracionističku viziju kulture kao alternativnog puta do politike, što je, sa ove tačke gledišta, omogućilo nastanak avangardnog slikarstva 1950-ih. Sa druge strane, kultura je bila označena kao standard otpora: zahvaljujući njoj, bilo je moguće očuvati plamen slobode i san da se mogu povratiti građanske slobode. Nakon dolaska demokratije, nastala je čudna simbioza: kultura je predstavljala svojevrsno mesto okupljanja, ne toliko političkih, koliko građanskih. Problem je upravo to: umetnost predstavlja slobodu, ali niko se nikada nije zapitao o funkciji umetnosti u okviru sistema slobode. Institucionalna garancija ponuđena u ranim 1980-im u Španiji, u smislu davanja podrške kako bi umetnost mogla nastajati u slobodi, došla je u pratnji odbijanja da se razmišlja o funkciji kulturne prakse u demokratiji. To je bila garantna politika, a ne društveno diskurzivna. To je stvorilo monstruma, koji je ništa drugo nego sprovođenje kulturne politike kao zamene za kulturu. U ovoj krivudavoj derivaciji skrivao se neoliberalni put koji je garantovao depolitizaciju umetničkih, kulturnih i društvenih praksi.

Ideja koju je levica promovisala tokom tranzicionih godina bila je da kultura treba da stvori bolje i pripremljenije građane., Nivo obrazovanja, jednakost, učešće i društvena odgovornost Španaca bili bi poboljšani kroz kulturu. Zahvaljujući umetnosti, Španci bi pristupili sveobuhvatnom razumevanju informacija i sredstvima izražavanja koja su bila zaplenjena 40 godina. Međutim, nije došlo do željenih rezultata. Tehnički nivo obrazovanja je najniži u Evropi, jednakost sigurno nije došla od strane umetničke proizvodnje podvrgnute stalnim prekarnostima i nejednakošću između polova; učešće građana u izgradnji kulturnih modela je praktično nepostojeće, a o pristupu stvaralaca otvorenim mehanizmima produkcije i eksperimentisanja se ne može ni govoriti; ni društvena odgovornost zajednice nije rezultat kulturnog polja, već dnevne borbe mnogih pojedinaca i grupa (kolektiva) u različitim društvenim sferama. Istorijske knjige nam govore da su trijumfalni umetnički oblici 1950-ih bili opravdani „stvaranjem liberalnog” u uskom okviru diktature ekstremne desnice. Ovo intelektualno „sredstvo” se u ranim 1980-im brzo prilagodilo davanju legitimiteta umetnosti i kulturi kao proizvodnim mehanizmima građanstva. Ovaj proces proizvodnje željenog „građanina” će se sudariti sa pravom kontradikcijom svojih temeljnih pojmova. Tu se ne radi o participa-

tivnom građanstvu kao pokretaču politike, već se građanstvo temelji na blagostanju i liberalnosti, koja je depolitizovana; to je ostavština frankizma. Kulturna industrija je postala suštinski faktor u transformaciji misaonih i društvenih predstava, ali ne u himeričnom stvaranju građanstva, koje je na kraju postalo puki potrošač kulture. Vrednost kulture u Španiji u svojim različitim oblicima proizvela je izuzetno zajedništvo državnih interesa, privatnih inicijativa i intelektualaca koji pripadaju sistemu, stvarajući duboku interiorizaciju i subjektivaciju diskursa moći, kako kod stvaralaca tako i kod potrošača.

Tjaša Kancler: Dinamika kulturne politike u Kataloniji obeležena je potrebom da se uspostavi tržište i izgradnja identiteta. Kako je uspostavljen most između ove dve ideje i kakva je njegova veza sa pokušajem da se odvoje polja kulture i politike?

Horhe Luis Marso: U Kataloniji, kultura je uvek bila nečija baština: opšti politički osećaj fundamentalno je povezan s katalonskim jezikom, glavnim simbolom identiteta unutar okviradržave Španije, koja vrši ogroman pritisak i jezičku represiju. Sa druge strane, za intelektualnu katalonsku buržoaziju, koja je godinama održavala pitanje jezika u životu, kultura je mesto gde se manifestuje identitet u nedostatku odgovarajućeg administrativnog aparata: to je bilo polje na kome se manifestuje moć „civilnog društva” nasuprot španskom i francuskom etatističkom (državnom) modelu. U međuvremenu, katalonska levica je oduvek smatrala kulturu za svoju istinsku očevinu protiv desnice, previše fokusirane na esencijalizam nastao iz kulturnih pokreta sa kraja devetnaestog veka. Ukratko, kultura je mesto gde se sublimiraju nacionalne političke praznine, ali i gde se izražavaju liberalne čežnje jednog društva koje želi biti moderno, a pre svega građansko. To je bio glavni adut katalonske kulture. Tokom proteklih trideset godina, sa sve većom institucionalizacijom kulture i stvaranjem velikog administrativnog aparata koji upravlja kulturom (kako na levcici, tako i na desnici), mit o civilnom društvu je otkrio himeru. Nema civilnog društva, niti strukturiranog kao takvo, niti samosvesnog, koje je u stanju da stvori shvatanje kulture nezavisno od kulturne politike. A to se upravo dogodilo zbog ogromnog tereta koji su identitarni mitovi (i stvaranje brendova u vezi sa njima) imali: mitovi su postali turističke ikone ogromnog viška vrednosti na globalnom tržištu za nacionalni logos: reč je o novcu, ništa drugo. Svi su se našli u kulturnoj politici, ignorišući pravi razlog koji se predstavljao kao cilj: civilno društvo.

Tjaša Kancler: Retorika kulturne politike u službi blagostanja, građanstva i konsenzusa skriva proces neoliberalizma pokrenut tokom poslednjih decenija u Kataloniji, koji je garantovao depolitizaciju društvene, kulturne i umetničke prakse. Možete li objasniti kako su četiri aspekta o kojima govorite u tekstu „Neoliberalizam i kultura u Kataloniji”, tj. ideja slobode povezana s kulturom, zabuna između modernosti i modernizacije, administrativna subjektivacija i nemoć, povezane sa neoliberalnom agendom?

Horhe Luis Marso: Što se tiče ideje slobode povezane sa kulturom, kao što sam objasnio ranije, kultura je u okviru frankizma bila valuta i odbrana, kako za režim, tako i za njegove protivnike; ali kada je stigla demokratija, niko nije postavio pitanje o ulozi umetnosti u režimu slobode: činilo se da uzimaju zdravo za gotovo da bi se trijumfom kulture nad diktaturom dobio institucionalni status koji bi trebalo da bude brend nove države. U tom trenutku, prilika za stvaranje dinamičkih kulturnih pojmova, nezavisnih i kritičkih, bila je oduzeta. Kultura je morala biti „zaštićena” kao bitna roba liberalne demokratije: kako bi se to ostvarilo, konstituisana je garantna kulturna politika. Ali liberalizam ne garantuje slobodu, on je razgraničava tako da se može proizvoditi; a iz toga proizlazi kastrativna kulturna politika kulturnih stvarnosti, koja predstavlja sankcionisanje društvenih procesa koji tvore kulturne proizvode.

O zabuni između modernosti i modernizacije. U 1980-im, postmoderni diskurs se pojavio u Španiji i Kataloniji, kao i na mnogim drugim mestima u svetu. Debata se podrazumevala, ali nije bila reflektovana. Postmodernizam je dozvolio da se omogući modernost (koja je imala tako malo uticaja na društvo), a u isto vreme on jača tradiciju (koja ima tako veliki značaj u Kataloniji i Španiji), ali u toj jednačini niko nije shvatio da je, ako se govori o modernosti u realnim terminima konflikta i dijalektike, potpuno neophodno govoriti i o modernizaciji. Ovde smo želeli da budemo postmoderni, ali ne da bismo bili postindustrijski, a u isto vreme, želeli smo da budemo postindustrijski (što označava finansijsku industriju usluga i turizma na službenom španskom jeziku), kako bismo bili postmoderni. Ono što se dogodilo je da su mnogi, previše njih, bili oduševljeni da budu postmoderni (evropski, međunarodni, globalni), jer je time prevaziđen paradoks zemlje kojoj nikada nije odgovarala modernost.

Postmodernost je za kulturu bilo ono što je postindustrijsko bilo za ekonomiju: kako postići standarde proizvodnje, kako prilagoditi zastarele strukture, kako podići (dobiti) ulaganja. To je ozbiljno uticalo na kulturu; podrazumevalo je rano shvatanje kulture u okvirima brenda, produktivnog logotipa, modernizacije, ali niko nije preuzeo težak zadatak da razmisli o tome da je modernost složen skup napetosti i protivrečnosti koje ga po svom ličnom iskustvu čine društveno produktivnim. Budući da je ekonomija postala finansijska a ne produktivna, došlo se do zaključka da bi i kultura trebalo da ispuni iste kriterijume, posebno kada bruto domaći proizvod zavisi od turizma i identiteta i kulturnog brenda u vezi sa njim. Ukratko, kulturne politike u Kataloniji skrivale su različite kulturne stvarnosti u zemlji.

Sledeće: administrativna subjektivacija. U principu, kulturni sektori su pretpostavili da je kultura kulturna politika. Nedostatak javnog i privatnog ulaganja i podrške za lokalne platforme, male i samostalne, podrazumevao je implicitno prihvatanje ograničenog institucionalnog okvira za implementaciju istraživanja i finansijskih resursa od strane mnogih stvaralaca. Zajedno sa potpunim preuzimanjem administrativnih procedura nametnutih od strane javnih ustanova ovo je rezultiralo katastrofalnom identifikacijom između određenih kreativnih oblika i načina upravljanja, čiji je krajnji zaključak da umetnici rade za institucije, a ne obrnuto. Ovaj proces se nastavio zahvaljujući lažnom garantnom stanju javne administracije, i inteligentno je iskorišćen od strane neoliberalnih diskursa kako bi se dao legitimitet suzbijanju svih tih stvaralačkih procesa koji nisu bili u mogućnosti da proizvedu direktnu tržišnu vrednost niti su ušli u krugove globalne kulturne industrije. Tu se ne radi o podvrgavanju stvaralaca tržišnom učinku, nego o podvrgavanju konkurentnoj dinamici, upravo zahvaljujući administrativnim i promotivnim mehanizmima. Ona ne samo da se vodi na tržištu, već je namera da stvaralaci shvate da su oni samo tržište.

Konačno, nemoć. Ovo je povezano sa nedostatkom razumevanja kreativnog tkiva. Elite, kada misle o umetnicima, nisu u stanju da pobegnu od medijskih ikona, velikih imena, ustanovljenih brendova, koje – insistiram na tome – oni uvek veoma zloupotrebljavaju. Oni nisu u stanju da razumeju umetničko tkivo u drugim okvirima; kao što su pokretačka snaga za istrage koje se ne završavaju uvek potpisom ili proizvodom; pokretačka snaga neslaganja; artikulatura u istraživanjima, drugačijih od onih koja su predviđena; oblik izraza koji neguje kolektivnu misao sposobnu da razvije različite poglede na skrivene odnose između stvari, daleko od spektakularnih fantazija. Oni nisu u stanju da razmišljaju dugoročno o kreativnosti, bez kratkoročnih ulaganja, već kao o procesu koji se stalno razvija i koji je sposoban da se prilagodi promenljivim stvarnostima.

Tjaša Kancler: Postepeno podvrgavanje kulture vlasti i državnim intervencijama kroz kulturne politike, kao i njen sve bliskiji odnos sa privatnom in-

dustrijom kao sponzorom kulturnih/umetničkih praksi koje promovišu spektakularizaciju i komercijalizaciju kulture, proizveli su, kao što ste rekli, dvostruku krizu legitimnosti, simboličku i institucionalnu. Koja su obeležja ove dvostruke krize i kako, u vezi sa ovom situacijom, objasniti stvaranje Nacionalnog veća za kulturu i umetnost (CONCA) 2008. u Kataloniji?

Horhe Luis Marso: Očito je da je došlo do poremećaja na mestu koje umetnost zauzima u političkoj i administrativnoj svesti. Danas umetnost znači vrlo malo u mentalnim strukturama institucija. Za njih, ona nije sredstvo za ostvarivanje bilo čega. To ima mnogo veze sa činjenicom da je slikarstvo osamdesetih potonulo na tržištu sredinom devedesetih i da je došlo do velikog uvećanja uloge institucija u mehanizmima stvaranja mišljenja. Za vlast, kultura je jednostavno upravljanje resursima, nekretninama. Vlast nije preterano zainteresovana za umetnost, osim da zadrži kontrolu nad njenom simboličnom vrednošću kao brenda zemlje i vlade. To je razlog zašto upravlja kulturom kao spektaklom, sredstvom za sticanje ekonomskih i političkih ulaganja i kao mehanizmom za slanje političkih i diplomatskih poruka. Otuda potiče i dugotrajno otimanje sredstava i resursa svih uprava prema CONCA, javnom organizmu koji bi trebalo da bude autonoman u svom upravljanju i koji bi bio zadužen za sve, od samostalnosti kriterijuma do uloge radiografa kulturne proizvodnje i dodeljivanja resursa: umetnost neće služiti ničemu, ali njena simbolička vrednost je jasno merljiva i žarko željena od strane vlada.

Zavisnost umetnosti u odnosu na javnu administraciju u Kataloniji je ne samo neoboriva, već i posebno relevantna činjenica: pored ispitivanja zvaničnih himera civilnog društva, sada je konačno uspela i da kontaminira sve kreativne strukture zemlje: institucionalizovala je kulturu i učinila da kulturnim menadžmentom dominiraju politički interesi i birokratski sistemi. Upravo, pre ove situacije, CONCA je imala svoj razlog za postojanje: ponudila je mogućnost da prekine ovaj pad i da postane novo sredstvo administrativne transformacije u službi stvaranja, a ne obrnuto. CONCA je mogla da predstavlja pouzdanu i dugotrajnu vezu između kulturnih stvarnosti zemlje i kulturnih mehanizama upravljanja, bez nametanja ili ventrilokvencije. To se nije dogodilo.

Tjaša Kancler: CONCA je imala mogućnost da postane samostalni organizam administrativne transformacije, most između kreativnog tkiva i uprave. Kako je glasio njen predlog, kako redefinisati i transformisati postojeći odnos između politike i kulture? Koje su dileme nastale?

Horhe Luis Marso: Stvaranje CONCA, prema mome mišljenju, odgovor je na više suštinskih pitanja: na prvom mestu, to je rezultat sve učestalijeg između umetnosti kao pokretačke snage društvenih odnosa; političari znaju sve manje i manje o umetnosti, i CONCA bi trebalo da bude depozit gde bi se smestili ljudi koji rade na kulturnom polju, iako ona kontroliše administrativni aparat (kontrola subvencija i donacija). Malo ljudi na položaju je zamislilo CONCA kao organizam istinske debate, razmišljanja i učestvovanja. Na drugom mestu, CONCA je stvorena kako bi se obrisala prašina sa političkih argumenata unutar profesionalnog menadžmenta kreativnih resursa na kontradiktornom tržištu kao što je katalonsko, koje je prvenstveno institucionalno, ali želi biti liberalno: ima mnogo endogamija i CONCA bi mogla pomoći u tom pogledu. Na trećem mestu, CONCA takođe proizlazi iz potrebe da se prodube moguća rešenja za udaljevanje umetnosti od društva: za neke je to značilo pronalaziti formule za razmenu između umetnosti, dizajna, tehnologije, nauke; nešto što se zapravo već praktikuje na mnogim kreativnim poljima; za druge je to zapravo pretvaranje umetnosti u kulturnu industriju, pozivajući se na ulaganja i korišćenje licemernog rešenja I + R (istraživanje i razvoj), dok se falsifikuje ono što umetnička produkcija ima od stvarnog I + R danas. Konačno, nezavisnost CONCA

mogla bi se koristiti za oporavak „konfliktnog” pojma kulture, udaljavanje od „sporazumne” ideje koju vlast uvek promovira. Naravno, to se nije dogodilo.

Tjaša Kancler: Neoliberalna vladavina prava, kako Dejvid Harvi ističe u svojoj knjizi „Kratka istorija neoliberalizma”, ne nudi nikakvu alternativu osim života pod sistemom beskrajne akumulacije kapitala i ekonomskog rasta u kome njegove društvene, ekološke i političke posledice nemaju nikakav značaj. Preispitivanje određenih prava omogućuje nam da preispitamo društvene procese koji su za njega svojstveni. Novi neoliberalni napad javno je najavljen početkom juna 2011, a dolazi iz tzv. „Omnibus zakona”. Namera je da se reaktivira ekonomija i da agilna katalonska administracija pokrije reforme čiji je jasan cilj privatizacija javnih službi, „nudeći” sredinu za korporativne lobije i potpunu preduzetničku kulturu. Koje će nadležnosti preuzeti Katalonski institut za stvaranje i kulturna preduzetništva (ICCEC), čije se konstituisanje predlaže? Šta to znači biti nazvan kulturnim preduzetništvom kao pojedinac, a kakav će uticaj na kulturne/umetničke prakse u bliskoj budućnosti „Omnibus zakon” imati u slučaju da bude odobren?

Horhe Luis Marso: U tekstu „Omnibus zakona” proglašeno je više stvari: remodelovanje nacionalnog veća umetnosti, koje bi konkretno zavisilo od specifičnih kriterijima odbornika; poništenje autonomije kulturnih centara povezanih sa Vladom; oduzimanje određenih prava pojedinih kulturnih entiteta upravljanja i aktivnosti. Primena ovoga će stvoriti ogromnu štetu nezavisnosti procesa stvaranja programa. Ali još više zabrinjava to da se, prema nekim stavovima u tekstu, umetnici smatraju „kulturnim preduzetništvom”, tako da se može jasno zaključiti da će javno finansiranje dobiti samo oni stvaraoci koji su u stanju da proizvedu tržišno orijentisane radove. Nedostatak novca u državnoj blagajni očigledno nameće usvajanje diskursa koji bi opravdali nove kriterijume raspodele sredstava, što naravno znači da svi mi znamo ko će imati koristi, a ko neće. „Subvencija” postaje jednostavno povezana sa „ostatkom” delatnosti umetničkog ceha, koji nije u stanju da se poveže sa građanima i koji je zastareo u svojim funkcionalnim kriterijima.

„Investiciji” se priznaje korist „beneficije”: sposobnost da se istraži teren autentično modernog, onoga što je aktuelno, veze s novim kreativnim i tehnološkim industrijama koje imaju mnogo oduševljene publike. Investicija (kulturna industrija) postaje denominirana kao I + R (istraživanje i razvoj) na štetu subvencije (umetnosti), podrivajući, kao što sam rekao ranije, ulogu te iste I + R u istinskom savremenom stvaralaštvu i njegovim sposobnostima, sada nepravedno uskraćenim, da definiše kolektivnu imaginaciju, što na kraju i jeste ono što elite koriste kako bi se okitile medaljama i stvorile zaštitne znakove. U tom pravcu je neophodno protumačiti nedavne reči Ferana Maskarela, kulturnog savetnika, upućene kritičarima situacije: „Vi ste konzervativci. Vi ometate rast i transformaciju kulturnog sistema.”

Tjaša Kancler: Protiv ogromnih rezova u kulturi i komercijalizacije kulturnih/umetničkih praksi, u okviru Barselona 15M kampa na Katalonskom trgu, otvorio se prostor za političku borbu i traganje za alternativama. U toku protekla dva meseca kulturna komisija Barselona 15M kampa zajednički je uredila deklaraciju kulturne komisije Barselona 15M kampa (beta verzija), dokument koji je stalno otvoren i u razvoju. Kakva je bila/jeste dinamika rada, šta je ideja kulture i model kulturne politike za koji se zalažemo i u koje se svrhe ovaj dokument piše?

Horhe Luis Marso: To je spor proces, nalik skupštinskoj dinamici. Lično, meni je bilo najzanimljivije da razgovaram sa mnogim ljudima koje nisam znao ranije, a verovatno ih ne bih nikada ni upoznao da nisam bio tamo. To je imalo ogromnu vrednost jer nam je pokazalo da smo zaboravili mnoge postupke razmišljanja pod stalnom institucionalnom zaštitom.

Što se tiče onoga što ste me pitali o modelu kulturne politike koji promoviramo, ja ću vas odmah uputiti na sâm dokument, koji je i dalje otvoren za doprinose i debate, a možete ga pogledati ovde: <http://culturaacampadabcn.wordpress.com/declaracio-declaracion/>.

Tjaša Kancler: Kako redefinisati mesta političkog i kulturnog, kako bi se zaustavila instrumentalizacija umetnosti i kulture od strane političkih i ekonomskih sila i kako bi se, umesto toga, ponovo politizovala kultura?

Horhe Luis Marso: Političko nije fosil kome se divimo u vitrini kao nečemu osvojenom, već postignutom: to je proces stalne pokretljivosti, transformacija. Isto je i sa kulturom: to nije mesto koje bi trebalo da nas zaštiti od onoga što se događa u sadašnjem društvenom i ekonomskom sistemu; to je upravo mesto gde se može preispitati ovakva situacija. Dosta je bilo lepih slika koje će nas zaštititi od patnje: to je mesto za vizualizaciju konflikta, za njihovu razmenu, pa čak i za otvorenu borbu. A koga svrbi, trebalo bi da se počese.

Sa engleskog na srpski preveo Miloš Dimitrijević

NEOLIBERAL „OMNIBUS”: CULTURE COMMONS AGAINST CULTURAL INDUSTRIES

Interview with Jorge Luis Marzo by Tjaša Kancler

On June 1st, 2011, The Draft Law on Simplification, Agility and Administrative Restructuring and Promotion of Economic Activity [Anteproyecto de ley de simplificación, de agilidad y reestructuración administrativa y de promoción de la actividad económica], also called Omnibus Law (because of the multitude of matters it regulates under the same normative umbrella) was published in the Official Journal of the Generalitat of Catalonia (DOGC). According to the Preamble, the objective of this legislature is administrative rationalization as well as reactivation of economic activity to facilitate competitiveness and productivity. Taking into special consideration the revision and actualization of some aspects of the structure of the productive tissue, it implies the modification of norms concerning the natural environment, culture and sports, private law, economics, security, pharmaceutical industry and social services, territory, and legal system of public administrations.

In short, this legislative document shows clearly the intention to continue privatizing public sector and through such modifications tends to submit us to the regulation necessary for the endless accumulation of capital. Making profit is above any other conception of the content and nature of the rights determined on the basis of currently existing social relations. Within the framework of this project of macro reform which will seriously affect the society as a whole, among other modifications, the change of the model of cultural policy is proposed, which now, explicitly in the

service of private enterprises will encourage further more the cultural production that aims at the spectacularization of culture and economic gain, in the form of cultural and creative industries, to be able to fully exploit the benefits it generates. Culture in the neoliberal regime has value only if it contributes to the economy.

In the midst of this profound crisis of political and economic legitimacy that we are witnessing not only in Catalonia but also in Europe and globally, we need to rethink radically the relationship between politics and culture and ask again why culture has become the main instrument of global capitalism. How did we get to this point? What is to be done?

Jorge Luis Marzo is an art historian, curator, writer and professor. His latest research and curatorial projects are *El efecto barroco. Políticas de la imagen hispana* [The Baroque effect. Politics of the Hispanic Image], (CCCB, 2010); *Low-Cost. Libres o cómplices* [Low-Cost. Free or Accomplices], (FAD, 2009); *Spots electorales. El espectáculo de la democracia* [Electoral Spots. The Spectacle of Democracy], (The Virreina, 2008); *Hempreslaradio* [We have taken the radio], (2006-2007); and *Tour-ismos* [Tour-isms], (Fundació Antoni Tàpies, 2004).

In the last decade he published the following books: *¿Puedo hablarle con libertad, excelencia? Arte y poder en España desde 1950* [Can I speak to you freely, Excellency? Art and Power in Spain since 1950] (2010); *Arte Moderno y Franquismo. Los orígenes conservadores de la vanguardia y de la política artística en España* [Modern Art and Franquismo. The conservative origins of the avant-garde and artistic politics in Spain] (2008); *Fotografía y activismo social* [Photography and Social Activism] (2006); *Me, Mycell and I. Tecnología, movilidad y vida social* [Me, Mycell and I. Technology, mobility and social life] (2003); and *Planeta Kurtz* [Kurtz Planet] (2002).

For years, Jorge Luis Marzo writes about the situation of cultural policies in Spain and Catalonia, which according to his analysis share a marked tendencies of the instrumentalization of culture and art by political and economic powers to promote the imaginary of the elite circles, exercise direct control of the resources in the detriment of independent and autonomous professionalization of the cultural tissue, as well as understanding the culture as a surplus value, as the marketing element, with the sole purpose of promoting tourism economy.

Tjaša Kancler: In the early 80s, after a long period of devastating dictatorship, a democratic period opened in Spain that has been decisive, among other things, as well for the formulation of a new cultural policy. What has been the relationship between franquismo cultural policy (cultural policy during General Franco's regime) and modern art? What reading of modern art (Spanish modernity) was proposed during the period of transition and how the new role of culture was defined in this regard?

Jorge Luis Marzo: During the Franco's regime, the culture suffered a double use, but with the same functionality: on the one hand, the regime's elites wielded relatively integrationist vision of culture as an alternative way to politics, hence from this point the painter avant-garde of the 1950s could be born. On the other hand, culture was branded as the standard of resistance: thanks to it, it was possible to keep alive the flame of liberty and the dream to recover civil liberties. Once democracy arrived, a curious symbiosis was produced: the culture represented a sort of a meeting place, not so much political, but that of citizenship. The problem is precisely this: that the arts represent freedom, but nobody ever asked about the function of these arts in the framework of a system of liberties. The institutional guarantee offered in the early 1980s in Spain, in the sense of giv-

ing coverage so that art could be produced in liberty, came accompanied by a refusal to think about the function that cultural practices have in democracy. It has been a guarantor policy, not a socially discursive. That has created a monster, which is none other than the implementation of cultural policy as a substitute for culture. In this tortuous derivation a neoliberal path was hiding, which guaranteed the depoliticization of artistic, cultural and social practices.

The idea put on the table by the left during the years of transition was that culture was to create better and more prepared citizens. Through culture, the levels of education, equality, participation and social responsibility of the Spaniards would improve. Thanks to art, the Spaniards would access the comprehensive understanding of information and the tools of expression that had been sequestered for 40 years. But the results were not as desired. The technical levels of education are the lowest in Europe, equality, certainly did not come from the hand of artistic production, subjected under the constant precarity and gender inequality; citizen participation in the construction of cultural models is practically null, let alone the access of creators to open mechanisms of production and experimentation; and social community responsibility is not the result of the cultural field but of daily struggles of many individuals and groups (collectives) in different social spheres. The history books tell us that the triumphant artistic manifestations of the 1950s were justified by the "creation of liberality" in the narrow framework of the dictatorship of the extreme right. This intellectual "gadget" adapted quickly in the early 1980s in a framework of reference when it comes to legitimize the art and culture as a generating mechanism of citizenship. This desired "citizen" process will collide with the proper contradiction of its foundational terms. It is not about the participative citizenship as generator of the politics, but a citizenship based on the welfare and liberality, that is depoliticized; this is the legacy of franquismo. The cultural industry has become a fundamental factor in the transformation of the imaginary and social representations, but not in the chimerical creation of citizenship, which finally has become a mere cultural consumer. The value of culture in Spain has produced an extraordinary communion of state interests, in its various forms, the private initiative and the intellectuals embedded in the system, creating a deep interiorization and subjectivation of the discourse of power, in both, creators and consumers.

Tjaša Kancler: The dynamics of cultural policy in Catalonia has been marked by the need to establish a market and the construction of identity. How the bridge between these two records has been constituted and what is its relation to the attempt to separate the fields of culture and politics?

Jorge Luis Marzo: In Catalonia, the culture has always been someone's heritage: the general political sense is fundamentally linked to the Catalan language, the principal identity symbol within the framework of a Spain state, which exercises an enormous pressure and linguistic repression. On the other hand, for the intellectual Catalan bourgeoisie, who has kept alive the issue of language throughout the years, culture has been a place where to manifest the identity in the absence of a proper administrative apparatus: it was the territory in which to manifest the power of "civil society" against the Spanish or French statist (state) model. Meanwhile, the Catalan left has always considered the culture as their proper patrimony against the right, too much focused on essentialisms proceeding from the cultural movements of the late nineteenth century. In short, culture has been the place where to sublimate the national political gaps but also where to express liberal yearnings of a society that wants to be modern, and especially, civil. That has been the battle horse of the Catalan culture. Over the past thirty years, with the progressive institutionalization of the culture and the creation

of a huge administrative apparatus that manages it (both on the right and left), the myth of civil society revealed chimera. There is no civil society, neither structured as such, nor self-conscious, that has been able to generate a conception of culture independent of cultural policy. And this precisely happened because of the enormous burden that the identitarian myths (and the creation of brands associated with them) have had: the myths have become touristic icons of tremendous surplus value in the global market for national logos: it is about money, nothing else. All have found themselves in cultural policy, ignoring the proper reason wielded as the goal: the civil society.

Tjaša Kancler: The rhetoric of a cultural policy in the service of the welfare, citizenship and consensus hides the process of neoliberalism undertaken during the last decades in Catalonia, which guaranteed the depoliticization of social, cultural and artistic practices. Could you explain how the four aspects that you speak about in the text Neoliberalism and culture in Catalonia, that is, the idea of freedom associated with the culture, the confusion between modernity and modernization, administrative subjectification and impotency are related with the neoliberal agenda?

Jorge Luis Marzo: Regarding the idea of freedom associated with the culture, as I explained earlier, within franquismo the culture was a currency and a defence, both, for the regime as well as for its detractors; but when democracy arrived, nobody asked about the role of the arts in a regime of liberties: it seemed taken for granted that from the triumph of culture over the dictatorship derived its institutional status that should be the brand of a new country. At that point the opportunity to generate dynamic cultural notions, independent and critical, was seized. The culture had to be "protected" as an essential commodity of a liberal democracy: to accomplish this cultural guarantor policy was constituted. But liberalism does not guarantee freedom, it delimits it so that it can be produced; from this derived a castrating cultural policy of cultural realities, sanctioning of the social processes that constitute cultural products. About the confusion between modernity and modernization. In the 1980s, the postmodern discourse appeared in Spain and Catalonia, as in many other places in the world. The debate was assumed but not reflected. Postmodernity allowed to make proper the modernity (which had such a little impact on society) while strengthening tradition (which has so much importance in Catalonia or Spain), but in that equation nobody realized that talking about modernity in real terms of conflict and dialectic, it was entirely necessary to speak as well of modernization. Here we wanted to be postmodern without being postindustrial, and at the same time, we wanted to be postindustrial (financial industry of services and tourism in the official Spanish language), to be postmodern. What happened is that many, too many, were delighted to be post-modern (European, international, global) because thereby the paradox of a country that had never been comfortable within modernity was surpassed.

The postmodern was to culture what the post-industrial was to economy: how to achieve the standards of production, how to adapt obsolete structures, how to raise (obtain) investments. This severely affected the culture; it entailed the early assumption of culture in terms of brand, of productive logo, modernization, but no one undertook the painful task of thinking that modernity is a complex set of tensions and contradictions that in its own experience makes it socially productive. Because the economy became financial and not productive, the conclusion was reached that also culture should meet the same criteria, especially when the gross domestic product depends on tourism and identity and the cultural brand associated with it. In short, cultural policy in Catalonia hid the various cultural realities of the country.

Next: the administrative subjectification. In general, the cultural sectors have assumed that culture is the cultural policy. The absence of public and private investment and the support for local platforms, small and autonomous, involved the implicit acceptance by many creators, of restricted institutional framework to deploy their research and funding (re)resources. This, along with the full assumption of administrative procedures imposed by public institutions has resulted in disastrous identification between certain creative forms and modes of management, whose ultimate conclusion is that the artists work for institutions and not vice versa. This process went on due to false guarantor condition of the public administration, and has been intelligently exploited by neoliberal discourses to legitimize the suppression of all those creative processes that were not able neither to produce a direct market value nor being inserted in the circuits of global cultural industry. It is not about subjecting the creators to the commodity effect, but to subject them to competitive dynamics, precisely thanks to the administrative and promotional mechanisms. It is not only being waged on the market, but the intention is that the creators understand that they are only the market. Finally, the impotency. This is connected with the lack of understanding of the creative tissue. The elites, when they think of artists, they are unable to escape the media icons, the big names, the established brands, of which, I insist, they always very much abuse. They are unable to understand the artistic tissue in other terms; such as the driving force for investigation that do not always end up with the signature or a product; as driving force of dissent, articulators of explorations, different to those predicted; as forms of expression that cultivate the collective imagination capable to develop perspectives on the hidden relations of things, far from spectacularized fantasies. They are unable to think of creativity in the long term, with no short-term investments, but as processes in perpetual gestation capable of adapting to changing realities.

Tjaša Kancler: The gradual subjection of culture to the government and state intervention through cultural policies as well as its increasingly close relationship with private industry as sponsor of cultural/artistic practices, promoting the spectacularization and commodification of culture, has produced, as you say, the double crisis of legitimacy, symbolic and institutional. What are the characteristics of this double crisis and how do you explain the creation of the National Council for Culture and the Arts (CONCA) in 2008 in Catalonia, in relation to this situation?

Jorge Luis Marzo: It is evident that there has been a displacement in the place that art occupies in political and administrative imagination. Today art represents very little in mental institutional structures. For them, it is not a vehicle of anything. This has much to do with the fact that the painting of the eighties sank in the market in the mid-nineties and the burst of the role of institutions in mechanisms of creating the opinion. For power, culture is a simple management of resources, of real estate. Power is not very interested in art, besides to maintain control over its symbolic value as a brand of country and government. That is why it is managing the culture as spectacle, captor of economic and political investments and as mechanism of political and diplomatic transmission. From there starts the prolonged kidnapping of means and resources by all administrations towards CONCA public organism which should be autonomous in its management and which would be in charge from the independency of criteria to radiograph cultural production and assigning resources: art will not serve for anything, but its symbolic value is clearly quantifiable and fervently desired by governments.

The dependence of the arts in relation to public administration in Catalonia is not only an irrefutable fact, but one that is particularly relevant: besides questioning the official chimeras of civil society, it has finally also ended up contaminating all the creative structure of the country: it has institutionalized culture and

has made the cultural management being dominated by political interests and bureaucratic systems. Precisely, before this situation, CONCA had its reason for being: it offered the possibility to break this slump and become a new tool of administrative transformation in the service of creation and not on the reverse. The CONCA could represent a reliable and durable nexus among the country's cultural realities and cultural management mechanisms, without impositions or ventriloquism. This has not happened.

Tjaša Kancler: The CONCA had the possibility of becoming an independent organism of administrative transformation, the bridge between the creative tissue and administration. What was its proposal to redefine and transform the existing relationship between politics and culture? Which dilemmas have arisen?

Jorge Luis Marzo: The creation of the CONCA, in my opinion, responds to multiple bottom lines: in the first place, it is the result of the progressive displacement of art as a driving force of social relations; the politicians know less and less about art, and CONCA is supposed to be a deposit where to place the people working in cultural field, although controlling the administrative apparatus (the control of subventions and grants). Few official people imagined the CONCA as an organism of a real debate, reflection and participation. In the second place, CONCA was born from the necessity to dust off the political arguments within the professional management of creative resources in a contradictory market such as the Catalan market that is primarily institutional but wants to be liberal: the endogamies are many and CONCA could help in this regard. In the third place, the CONCA also arises from the need to deepen in possible solutions to the social drift of art: for some, it is about finding formulas for the interchange between art, design, technology, science; something that in fact it is already practiced in many creative fields; for others it is actually about turning art into cultural industry, appealing to investment and using hypocritically the solution of I+D (investigation and development), while falsifying what the artistic production has of the real I+D today. Finally, the independence of CONCA could be used to recover the "conflictive" notion of culture, further on from the "consensual" notion that power always promotes. Of course, this has not happened.

Tjaša Kancler: The neoliberal rule of law, as David Harvey points out in his book "A Brief History of Neoliberalism" offers no alternative but to live under a system of endless accumulation of capital and economic growth in which its social, ecological or political consequences do not matter. Questioning the specific rights enables us to question the social processes that are inherent to it. The new neoliberal attack was announced publicly at the beginning of June 2011, coming from the so-called "Omnibus Law." The intention of reactivating the economy and to make agile the Catalan administration cover the reforms that clearly aim at privatization of public services, "offering" the environment to corporate lobbies and full enterprising culture. What competences will assume the Catalan Institute for Creation and Cultural Enterprises (ICCEC) that is proposed to be constituted? What does it mean being called cultural enterprise as an individual and what impact will the "Omnibus Law" have on cultural / artistic practices in the near future, in case it is approved?

Jorge Luis Marzo: In the text of the "Omnibus Law" a number of things are declared: the remodelling of National Council of Arts, which would directly depend on the specific criteria of the Counselors; the annulment of the autonomy of the cultural centers attached to government; the dispossession of certain rights of some cultural entities of management and activities. The application of this will create an enormous damage to the independence of the programming. But more worrying is that according some paragraphs in the text the artists become considered "cultural enterprises," so it can be clearly deduced that only those

creators who are able to produce marketable works, will receive public funding. The absence of money in the public cash register evidently supposes the adoption of justificatory discourses for new criteria of distribution of resources, which of course means that we all know who will benefit and who won't. The "subvention" becomes simply associated with the "vestige" of artistic guild practice, unable to connect with citizens, obsolete in its functional criteria.

To "investment" is conceded the benefit of "benefit": the capacity to explore the terrain of the authentically modern, of what is up to date, the connections with the new creative and technological industries, replete by enthusiastic audience. The investment (cultural industry) becomes denominated as I+D (investigation and development) in the detriment of the subvention (of art), subverting, as I said earlier, the role of that same I + D proper of contemporary creation and its capacity, now unjustly denied, to define collective imaginary, which ultimately are what the elites use to put on themselves medals and generate trademarks. In this direction is necessary to interpret some recent words of Ferran Mascarell, cultural counselor, towards the critics of the situation: "You are conservatives. You impede the growth and transformation of the cultural system."

Tjaša Kancler: Against the massive cuts in culture and the commodification of cultural/artistic practices, within the framework of the Barcelona 15M Camp in Catalonia Square, a space for political struggle and search for alternatives opened up. Over the past two months the Barcelona 15M Camp Culture Commission edited assemblyly the Declaration of the Barcelona 15M Camp Culture Commission (v Beta), a document which is permanently open and in progress. What was / is the dynamic of work, what idea of culture and the model of cultural policy we stand for and with what purpose this document is being written?

Jorge Luis Marzo: It has been a slow process, proper of an assembly dynamic. Personally, the most interesting was to be able to discuss with many people who I did not know before, and probably I would have never known if I would not be right there. That had tremendous value because it shown us that we had forgotten many procedures of reflection under the constant institutional coverage. As for what you ask me about the model of cultural politics that we promote, I direct you right away to the document itself, which remains open to contributions and debates, and you can check it out here: <http://culturaacampad-abcn.wordpress.com/declaracio-declaracion/>

Tjaša Kancler: How to redefine the places of the political and the cultural in order to stop the instrumentalization of art and culture by political and economic powers and instead to re-politicize culture?

Jorge Luis Marzo: The political is not a fossil that we admire in a display as a conquest, already accomplished: it is a process of constant mobility, transformation. The same with culture: it is not a place to shelter us from what is going on in the current social and economic system; it is precisely a place where to question this situation. Enough with pretty pictures that comfort us from the pains: it is the place to visualize the conflicts, share and even fight them frontally. And to whom it itches, those should scratch themselves.

DAVANJE GLASA DRUGOM

Jasmina Založnik

U ovom članku govoriću o dve pozorišne predstave: Too Late! – (Antigone) Contest # 2, u izvođenju grupe Motus i Macadamia nut brittle, predstavi tima Riči/Forte. Obe su sasvim (ne)očekivano potpisali italijanski autori. Gledali smo ih na međunarodnom festivalu Mladi lavovi, 2011. godine u Ljubljani, tokom četrnaestog izdanja festivala. Ovaj festival daje dobrodošao uvid u međunarodne pozorišne događaje, što dalje otkriva i geo-kulturno-politički prostor globalnog kapitalističkog sveta.

Možda je samo puka slučajnost, ali čini se da ove dve predstave, koje proizlaze iz fizičkog pozorišta i ostvaruju se u svojoj neposrednosti, brutalnosti i telesnosti, takođe omogućuju odmak od italijanskog konteksta i njegovih dominantnih konvencionalnih pozorišnih formi. Ovde se radi o direktnom prenošenju iz stvarnosti u pozorište, stvarnosti kojom u Italiji dominiraju mediji i Berlusconijska televizija. Korupcija, mafija, spektakularnost, golotinja, kič i preterivanje pokretačka su snaga moderne Italije, koja uređuje sadašnji trenutak u politici kao i u njenoj produženoj ruci – masovnim medijima. U isto vreme pozorišne predstave pokazuju pomak od preovlađujuće formalističko-konceptualne estetike zasnovane na, već duže vreme, ispraznoj retorici levičarske formalističko-konceptualne umetnosti na Zapadu.

Na koji način se stvara jedna takva razlika?

Prvo, dozvolite mi da naglasim da su u materijalu, koji su priredili PR predstavnici festivala, prazni označitelji opisali ove dve predstave kao brutalne, kontroverzne, radikalne, ekstremne, kao i sveže, nove itd. (što, na primer, možemo pročitati i u katalogu festivala Mladi lavovi, 2011). Zahvaljujući bogatoj istoriji fizičkog teatra (npr. DV 8, Wooster Group; u Sloveniji, brend fizičkog teatra razrađen je u nekim predstavama koje je na početku svoje karijere režirao Matjaž Pograjc, dok se danas može videti u pozorišnim predstavama reditelja Ivce Buljana) na ove predstave se ne može gledati kao na potpunu novinu.

Drugo, obeležje „radikalan“ u današnje vreme pokazuje, kao što je to u svom eseju prikazao Mark Lavreti (2008), ekonomsku logiku savremene eksploatacije politički nekorektnih tema i sadržaja. Ispostavilo se da je brend radikalnog uspešna marketinška strategija (ljudi i dalje „padaju“ na senzacionalne događaje) koja se pridržava levičarskih, kritičkih umetničkih praksi, dok im je kritička snaga, u stvari, ograničena. Ovo obeležje deo je kanibalističke kapitalističke matrice, koja obezbeđuje da biti „radikalan“ za kapital znači uspeh i profitabilnost. Stoga, to znači da umetnost koja se krije pod velom kritike, kontroverze, radikalizma itd., predstavlja uspešno sredstvo kojim se služi kapitalistička mašinerija. Stvaranjem utiska o tome da se sloboda izražavanja predstavlja kao opoziciona, umetnost se, u stvari, ne suprotstavlja vlasti, već je konsoliduje.

Zbog toga, umesto da budem deo tih i takvih obeležavanja, ja ću pokušati da o ove dve predstave govorim u okviru političkog u umetnosti, onako kako je to razradio Žak Ransijer u svojoj politici estetike.

Ransijer je veoma mnogo pisao o ovim pitanjima i kategorički se protivi pojmu „angažovane” umetnosti. Prema njegovom mišljenju, umetnik može da bude posvećen kao osoba, i možda može da bude posvećen svom pisanju, svojim slikama, filmovima, što doprinosi određenom vidu političke borbe. Umetnik, dakle, može da bude posvećen, ali šta znači reći da je njegova umetnost posvećena? Ransijer tvrdi da posvećenost ne predstavlja umetničku kategoriju. Mada, nastavlja on, to ne znači ni da je umetnost apolitična, već zaključuje da to znači da umetnost ima svoju politiku, ili svoju sopstvenu metapolitiku (up. Ransijer 2004). Shodno tome, prema Ransijerovom mišljenju, srž problematičnog odnosa između umetnosti i politike leži u tome što „ne postoji kriterijum za uspostavljanje odgovarajuće korelacije između politike estetike i estetike politike. [...] One se u svakom slučaju mešaju; politika ima svoju estetiku, a estetika svoju politiku. Ali nema formule za odgovarajuću korelaciju” (isto). Drugim rečima, u zavisnosti od vremena ili situacije u kojoj se čovek nađe, umetničko delo može se čitati i tumačiti različito i zbog toga biti viđeno kao političko u većoj ili manjoj meri.

Ransijer politiku ne vidi kao praksu i širenje moći, već kao stvaranje sfere (kolektivnog) iskustva, kao distribuciju razumnog te, kroz nju, kao estetsku aktivnost. Jedno takvo tumačenje omogućava da se umetnost uvek doživi kao politička aktivnost, kao potencijal koji seče kroz socijalnu distribuciju razumnog, što je tačka neslaganja u sporazumnom poretku, ili kao izum razumnih oblika i materijalnih struktura na kojima se uspostavlja novi oblici života. To se takođe doživljava i kao estetska demokratizacija. Katja Čičigaj je to ovako formulisala: ova vrsta „estetske demokratizacije” koja je nezavisna od umetnikove namere, ova „politika estetike” zasnovana na Ransijeru, pojavljuje se kao „efekat strukturiranja razumnih iskustava u oblike koji su povezani sa režimom umetnosti na polju politike.” U estetskom režimu umetnosti to znači uspostavljanje neutralisanih prostora, gubitak svrhe i njihovu ravnodušnu dostupnost; to je preklapanje heterogene temporalnosti, jednakost zastupljenih subjekata i anonimnost onih kojima su radovi namenjeni (up. Ransijer 2004). Hajde, da vidimo! Naročito je važno da istaknemo dve teze koje su ključ uspeha ovih predstava. Prva se tiče mehanizama funkcionisanja modernog društva zasnovanog na praznoj retorici oglašavanja; druga leži u analizi ili preispitivanju sadržaja i formi, što vodi ka skoro direktnom suprotstavljanju gledaoca sa socijalno stvarnom, mada i dalje marginalizovanom, društvenosti. Ta kompleksnost u obe predstave postaje jedna, sa „dimenzijom” modernog sveta (zasnovanog na konzumerizmu, otuđenju, ispraznosti, kao i na spektaklu, brutalnosti, telesnosti, preterivanju – prisutnim u medijskoj stvarnosti); obe pokušavaju da naprave rezove u realno(sti) kojoj pripadaju. Čini se da ove predstave otvaraju mogućnost konfrontacije sa sopstvenom stvarnošću pojedinca, sa onim što je stvarno i besmisleno u svojoj neposrednosti.

Ne radi se ovde toliko o izumevanju formi razumnog, koliko o predstavljanju njihovog bombardovanja i eliminacije. Na ovaj način predstave uvlače gledaoca u vrtlog slika i reči, auditivni i fizički, iz kog ne mogu da pobegnu (bar) tokom trajanja predstave. Vezani i prikovani pozorišnim pejzažom koji predstave stvaraju, ulazimo u polje „otpora” koji ne igra na kartu stava opozicije niti se vraća na ono za što je Brajan Masumi tvrdio da je prisutno, a to je prolaženje žaljenja zbog gubitka tradicionalnih vrednosti kao što su iskrenost i vera u moral, ili oplakivanje „smrti subjekta”. Ovo potonje nas vraća jedan korak unazad ka kapitalizmu ili nečem još gore. Zbog toga Masumi smatra da, ukoliko postoji izlaz, on počinje upravo ovde gde mi sada stojimo (up. Masumi 1992: 140). I to je baš ovo sada, bez ikakvih pretenzija, bez neophodnog argumenta, već samo razdvajanje koje nam sloj po sloj daje uvid u naše, recimo, kolektivno iskustvo kome smo podvrgnuti. Pre nego što započnemo analizu, hajde da ponovimo naše početne teze da se pred-

stave odnose na „stvarnost”, dakle odvajaju se od simboličkih koordinata koje određuju šta je to što doživljavamo kao realnost. Ove predstave ukazuju na niz protivrečnosti između reči i gesta, prisustva i odsustva, savijanja i nabiranja, na polje dijalektike između pojavnog i stvarnog, koje ne može biti verno virtualizaciji naših svakodnevnih života, jer imamo iskustvo da sve više živimo u veštački konstruisanom svetu, što dovodi do ogromne potrebe za „povratkom stvarnom”, kao i potrebe da se iznova nađe čvrsto tle u „istinskoj stvarnosti”. ALI STVARNO KOJE SE VRAĆA IMA STATUS DRUGE POJAVE upravo zato što ne možemo, zbog njegovog traumatičnog/prekomernog karaktera, da integrišemo to stvarno u (ono što doživljavamo kao) našu stvarnost i zbog toga smo primorani da ga doživimo kao košmarno priviđenje (Žižek 2002: 15).

1. Macadamia nut brittle

Macadamia nut brittle italijanskog dvojca Riči/Forte inspirisana je američkim snuff piscem fantastike i pesnikom, uglednim autorom na temu otuđenja, Denisom Kuperom. Predstava zadržava suštinu Kuperove priče, premda je umanjena oštrina njegove radikalizacije subjektivnosti sa društvenih margina. Predstava u središte stavlja pojedince koji se ne uklapaju u stereotip o biološkim i socijalnim seksualnim opedeljenjima i stoga stvara kontrapunkt naspram heteroseksističke i homofobične Italije, koja kao takva promovira govor rimokatoličke crkve, odnosno Silvija Berlusconi.

Poput Kuperovih priča i Macadamia nut brittle se može tumačiti kao „priča o očajničkoj potrazi za ljubavlju u nemogućem svetu u kom, na kraju dana, otkrijemo da je priroda, kao i sam čovek, kučka i da je neverna. Uvek” (iz kataloga Mladi lavovi, 2011). Na kraju možda završimo tako što ćemo jebati jedni druge do smrti. U svetu u kome je najlakši način da se preživi uranjanje u TV ekrane privržene izmišljenim slikama, jer svet koji se nudi jeste svet praznine, svet pojava, slika koje izlaze iz TV ekrana u stvarni život, u svet u kome se sve može kupiti i prodati, gde je vrednost ispisana na krajnjim ivicama, u ekstremnim iskustvima i željom za njihovim približavanjem. Te slike, žive u Kuperovoj poeziji, koje odražavaju savremenu fetišizaciju svega onoga što je čudno, naopako itd., ponavljaju se u predstavi, što nam govori da jedna od velikih istina subjektivizacije u kapitalizmu jeste ta zavisnost od supstituta koji pružaju nivo psihosomatskog uzbuđenja.

Ovim smo se približili centralnom izvoru postfordovskog kapitalizma, kako ga tumači Beatris Presiado u svom radu pod nazivom „Pharmaco-Pornographic Capitalism, Postporn Politics and the Decolonization of Sexual Representations” (2010). Presiado kaže da „stvarna pokretačka snaga današnjeg kapitalizma jeste farmakološko-pornografska kontrola subjektivnosti, čiji su proizvodi serotonin, testosteron, antacidi, kortizon, antibiotici, estradiol, alkohol i burmut, morfijum, insulin, sildenafil citrat (Viagra^(C)) i svi oni složeni, virtuelni materijali koji pomažu da se stvori mentalno ili psihosomatsko stanje uzbuđenosti, relaksacije i opuštenosti, kao i svemoćnosti i potpune kontrole. Ovde čak i novac postaje značajna psihotropna apstrakcija. Ovisnik/zavisnik i seksualno telo, seks i svi njegovi tehno-semiotički derivati glavni su izvor postfordovskog kapitalizma danas” (Presiado 2010).

Pokušajmo pre analize da u nekoliko crta skiciramo Macadamia nut brittle. Pozorišna scena je gruba, ispunjena sa svega nekoliko predmeta iz svakodnevnog života (kese, plastične stolice, cipele, flaše od vode, peškiri, kupovne pogačice). Na bini su tri izvođača (dva muškarca i žena), koja ponavljaju procedure (koreografiju), koje su dobili kao uputstvo za bezbednost na aerodromu. Muzika u pozadini kreće se od ponovljenih bezbednosnih instrukcija do pesme Futter Mein Ego („Nahrani mi ego”, prim. prev.) kultne tehno-grupe Einsturzende

Neubauten. U virtuelnoj poplavi praznih reči i nepovezanih rečenica iz navoda bez ikakvih referenci, predstava se odvija munjevitom brzinom, ostavljajući utisak da se krećemo unazad kroz naše živote, kroz svet koji želi da bude puka fikcija, performans, daleko od stvarnosti. Otuđenje. Otuđenje kao dominantno stanje našeg postojanja. Kao što je, na primer, scena u kojoj devojka izgovara sve one prazne fraze uzete iz sapunica, a njen gej kolega, koji to više ne može da podnese, iskazujući prezir, pokušava brutalno da je učutka. U utvrđenoj ideologiji univerzalne tekstualnosti ponovo se približavamo Žižeku: stvarnost ne postoji, to je samo mnoštvo slučajnih priča koje nam govore o sebi. Mi smo upareni sa televizijskim slikama, referencama, ličnim biografijama.

Odlomak koji sledi je iz teksta predstave i ilustruje ritam, snagu i brendiranje (iako su prevodi na slovenačkom išli prebrzo da bi se mogli pratiti/ukapirati, značenje je moglo da se shvati kroz zbirku brendova/poznatih imena koji su se tu i tamo pojavljivali: IKEA, jebi se, Bijonse, Ljubljana, Hajmlih...):

Ananjina. (metro-stanica na periferiji Rima)
 IKEA
 Pored Mekdonaldsa.
 Ja sam unutra.
 Red najk patika.
 Trijumf neuronskog nakita.
 Zagrizao sam nešto što
 nešto što je ne tako davno imalo noge.
 Sedim.
 Jedem nešto što je hodalo.
 Žvaćem još jedno popodne.
 Imam sve. Ništa mi ne fali.
 Izlazim.
 Pokušavam da se uložim.
 Zatvaram oči.
 Čim se pojavilo crveno za pešake
 prelazim ulicu
 da bih odmah čuo sudar.
 Nema larme.
 Osim škripe kočnica i vozačevog „jebi se”.
 Trideset puta za redom slušam Bijonsein Oreol
 dok u kaficu „Palombini” čekam
 nekoga ko je obećao da će me povrediti.
 Ja sam zaljubljen u sebe,
 u ono što mogu da dam drugima.
 Šta više boli?
 Udarac u lice
 ili da ostaneš zatvoren u kući i gledaš Daily ili X-Factor?
 Šta najviše povređuje
 nečiju želju?
 Neko ko će ponovo doći da traži
 nekakvu vezu.
 Pokušajte da ih zamislite,
 dva, tri, pet kuraca koji me poništavaju.
 Gomila usta koja je zapljunula svaki moj atom.
 Tako mnogo su me tukli.
 Ostavljaju me u krvi u Hitnoj.
 Posmatrajte na način
 na koji to oni rade.
 Zaljubljeno.
 I odjednom
 ja sam Džoni Dep,
 idol i superstar.
 Ožiljak je neka vrsta Božića.
 On ti govori da si bio nešto za nekog drugog.
 Čak i onaj bol u dupetu
 koji te oduzima nedeljama
 čini me posebnim.
 Džin koji hoda među smrtnicima.
 I smejem se
 jer je bol
 sveti pečat.
 Islamski militanti mažu čmar irake dece lepkom
 koji se može ukloniti samo hirurškim putem.
 A onda im daju jak laksativ.
 Od toga može da se umre.
 Ili već.
 Kakva mi je kosa?

Plastični sanduci moje majke,
taperver-nešto sa dnevnom dozom parmezana.
Ukoliko ga zaboraviš u frižideru
pojave se dlakave mrlje.
Ja ih imam.
Unutra.
Sve vreme oni drugi ni pogled ne bace na mene.
Imam glupo dupe.
Znam.
Ne bira.
Dozvoljava ti da staviš sve.
Nema ukusa.
Ima li kakve štete ukoliko ga ja vidim kao moj Hajmlih
manevar protiv gušenja?
Voleo bih da me ubiješ.
Stvarno želim da se rešim sebe,
da izbrišem povratnu grupu,
polufinale,
i učestvujem u gala završnici.
Kakva mi je kosa?
Dok te jebem, samo želim da ti razbijem glavu, se-
ronjo!
Meni je to romantično.
Zar ti nisi jedan od onih koji vide ljubav
kao nešto za ceo život?



Macadamia nut brittle italijanskog dvojca Riči/Forte
Foto: Urška Boljkovac

Ovo podseća na tok misli, često nepovezanih, kao rizom koji povezuje, bira, uzima, naseljava i iznova stvara poznate i prefinjene slike. Skače sa slike na sliku brzinom kojom daljinskim menjamo kanale na TV-u. Međutim, u slučaju Macadamia nut brittle mi nismo ti koji upravljaju daljinskim, već smo na mestu onih koje vode i kojima se upravlja. Potpuno pasivni. Bez kontrole. Tako blizu onome što Bodrijar tvrdi u svojoj teoriji o simulakrumu. Takvim pristupom tvorci ne šalju očekivanu kritiku neoliberalnog sistema koji leži u centralnim institucijama savremenih izvođačkih umetnosti, pre se distanciraju od nje, bez protesta, stvarajući jaz otvaranjem koje podrazumeva istinu, koja je, kako tvrdi Lakan (a i Žak-Alen Miler), uslovna, neuhvatljiva, varljiva, pristrasna, dostupna samo preko nemogućeg, kojim se povezuje sa stvarnim. Istina kao pojava je neuhvatljiva, čak i kada se krije iza autoriteta. Dvojac Riči/Forte skicira njenu tranzitivnost, pristrasnost, proširenu priču o kontingenciji produženoj u fragmentarnoj dramaturgiji; bina je pretvorena u „radno mesto”, u deponiju odbačenih, previđenih, na margine stavljenih subjektiviteta.

2. Too Late! – (Antigone) Contest # 2

Too Late! – (Antigone) Contest # 2 inspirisana je Sofoklovom Antigonom. Ova predstava je jedna od tri koje bi mogle biti protumačene preko tri moguća dijaloga i komentara o Antigoni, koje potpisuje Motus. Antigona stoji kao paradigma kroz koju Enriko Kazagrande i Danijela Nikolo (autori i reditelji komada) otvaraju mogućnost njenog razumevanja i značaja u današnje vreme. U središtu drame Too Late! – (Antigone) Contest # 2 jeste tema vlasti i moći pojedinca u cilju stvaranja višeslojnog i, zahvaljujući svom bogatstvu i brzo izmenljivim diskursima, neukrotivog trijaloga.

Autori stavljaju akcenat na tri glavna lika iz Sofoklove Antigone: Kreonta (u izvođenju Vladimira Aleksića), Antigonu i Hemonu (koje oboje izvodi androgena Silvija Kalderon). Tekst je fragmentiran do tančina i proširen autobiografskim elementima i društveno-političkim pitanjima (Kreont se pretvara u Berlusconi, Miloševića itd.). Izvorni tekst ilustriran je prisustvom plastičnih maski koje glumci stavljaju i skidaju s lica. Ovo je takođe i način na koji se simbolički nivo ponovo unosi u univerzalnost simboličkih uloga glavnih likova. Simbolički gest „cepanja” Kreontove maske na početku ukazuje na sumnju u vlast i simboličku moć koja uz nju ide.

Scenografija je formalno prečišćena (smanjen broj scenskih rekvizita), čime se pravi prostor za stvaranje složene i strukturirane drame. Ona nesmetano teče iz prošlosti u sadašnjost i proširena je ličnim pečatom kroz pažljivo osmišljeno smenjivanje različitih nivoa tekstualnosti (metapripovedanje, interpretacija, intervencija, komentari, lične priče itd.). Original je sveden na odabrane scene. Postavka Antigone je produžena komentarima (i ličnim i profesionalnim od strane glumaca) i kao takva iz mikro- i metanivoa prerasta u predstavu obeleženu autobiografskim elementima, ćaskanjem izvođača i otkrivanjem mehanizama vlasti.

Silvija Kalderon, svojim dečaćkim izgledom, otelotvoruje zahtev Ćudit Batler za proširenjem heteroseksualne matrice. Zbog njenog prisustva i onoga što otelotvoruje, ne možete je prosto umetnuti u paradigmatu ženstvenosti. Njen polni identitet se obelodanjuje tek pošto skida i odbacuje košulju. Tek tada njen polni identitet postojano izmiče definiciji. Od nošenja kopački i muške trenerke u agoniji besa i agresije, do pretvaranja iz osionog besnog psa u krotko slatko štene.

Sukob simboličkog i polnog identiteta (devojke, žene) stalno izmiče i zbog toga se otvara na nekoliko nivoa. Prvo, kao stalni prelazak iz lika u lik, Antigone i Hemonu (dečak/devojčica, muškarac/žena, sin/ćerka); potom, prelasci između različitih identiteta (buntovnica/bespomoćna devojčica, neposlušna učenica, ludi mladić itd.) koji nas vode do prelaska između životinje i čoveka (na metaforičkom kao i u bukvalnom smislu, pretvaranje u psa). Ta neprekidna transformacija vredna je isticanja. Preliivanje iz drugih i u druge identitete prisutno je u drugim znakovima koji nam omogućavaju da odgonetnemo prelaske i njihova značenja kroz naše sopstveno telo.

Preliivanje i neuhvatljivost su otkrovenje za izgrađene simboličke strukture, koje se ogledaju u porodici i nacionalnom/društvenom zakonu. Prema mišljenju Ćudit Batler, ove strukture su direktno povezane jer „simbolično je sedimentacija društvenih praksi” (Butler 2010: 38). Srodstvo odražava moduse zamornih običaja i konvencija koji, prema mišljenju Ćudit Batler, rade po sopstvenoj kontingenciji (isto: 86). Ne iznenađuje činjenica da oba izvođača tokom čitave predstave neprestano polažu pravo na moć i ulogu simboličnog reda. Kreont predstavlja „psa čuvara” državnih zakona, vlastodršca, zastupnika društvenog reda koji se prenosi na savremene vlastodršce. Odnos sa naizgled univerzalnim zakonom je kapriciozan. Zakoni u njihovim rukama se čitaju i postavljaju po njihovom kursu. Univerzalnost ne postoji, to je isprazna i zastarela forma, u kojoj se, kroz mitologiju, održavaju simboličke funkcije i na njima se zasniva društvena moć.

Pošto se porodica i društveno preklapaju, neophodno je izvoditi transformacije, uz otvaranje njihovog isprepletenog postojanja, dekonstruisati i konstruisati simboličko u nove strukture. Predstava igra na kartu dekonstruktivne metode dok otkriva mehanizme moći koji rade kroz izvođački i tekstualni nivo. To su načini konsolidovani u postojećem društvenom poretku. To je nemi poziv silaska, moguć samo uz razumevanje načina na koji radi.

3. Zaključak

Obe predstave uspešno povlače paralelu između života i pozorišta, uspevajući da ožive renesansno viđenje pozorišta kao života – pozorišta koje otvara sam život.

One razotkrivaju simbolička i lingvistička pravila koja podržavaju srodničke odnose predstavljene kao univerzalne, izvan mogućnosti njihovog sopstvenog preobražaja. Ipak, kako Ć. Batler pokazuje, ova pretpostavka je pogrešna. Registar pola se stalno proširuje te su stoga simbolička pravila izložena kontingenciji. Da bi objasnila ovu vrstu odnosa, Ć. Batler uzima koncepciju jezika koju koristi Ostin, proisteklu iz osnovnih razlika između dva tipa govornih činova: konstativni i performativni. Performativni iskazi se definišu kao rečenice koje ne samo da pasivno opisuju datu realnost već i menjaju (društvenu) realnost koju opisuju. Ovo nas približava razumevanju zakona, kao što je to definisao Mladen Dolar. Dolar tvrdi da zakon postaje moćan samo kroz suveren iskaz. Antigona se upliće u ovaj zakon tek kada počne da deluje u jeziku. „Antigona otelotvoruje norme kojima se protivi. Ona obavlja normativni posao vlasti, a da pri tome sama ne postaje moćna [...] prkoseći zakonu prisvajajući njegov glas” (up. Bahovec 2010: 135–36).

Antigona bi mogla da stoji kao nova paradigma čovečanstva – uključujući ono što je isključeno iz zakona. Ona daje glas drugima dok privlači pažnju s ciljem da izbriše zone indistinkcije gde se nalazi većina života.

Ove dve predstave zastupaju one koji stoje na marginama, ali bez zahteva za njihovim uključenjem. Fizičko pozorište je samo poznati recept za savremeno pozorište današnjice, mada kvalitet ove dve predstave leži više u njihovoj fragmentarnoj dramaturgiji, odličnim scenarijima i dijaloškom tekstu, ubedljivim izvođačima, kao i isprepletenim temama koje moćno otvaraju polje politike identiteta.

Sa engleskog na srpski prevela Dragana Govedarica Kostopoulos

Videti literaturu, str. 28.

GIVING A VOICE TO THE OTHER

Jasmina Založnik

In this article I will discuss two theater performances, Too Late! – (Antigone) Contest # 2 by the Motus group and Macadamia nut brittle by Ricci/Forte. Both surprisingly (or not) are signed by Italian authors. We watched them at the International Festival Mladi levi (Young Lions), 2011, Ljubljana, at the festival 14th edition. This festival creates a welcome insight into

the international theater performances events, which unveils as well the geo-cultural-political space of the global capitalist world.

Maybe it is just a mere coincidence, but nevertheless it seems that the two theater performances that are departing from a physical theater and appear with its immediacy, brutality, physicality create a departure as well from the Italian context with its dominant, conventional theatrical forms. We're talking about a direct transfer from reality into theater, reality that is in Italy dominated by the media and Berlusconi TV. Corruption, mafia, spectacle, nudity, kitsch and excess are the driving force of modern Italy that regulates the present in politics and in its extension – the mass media. At the same time the performances show a shift away from the prevailing formalist-conceptual aesthetics, based on already for a long time an empty rhetoric of the leftist formalist-conceptual art in the West.

In what way is such a difference produced?

First, let me emphasize that the two performances are in the materials produced by the festivals Public Relations' representatives described by empty signifiers as brutal, controversial, radical, extremist, and a fresh, new, etc., (that we could read, for example, as well in the catalogue of the festival The Young Lions, 2011). Due to a rich history of physical theater (e.g. DV 8, Wooster Group, and as well in Slovenia this brand of physical theater was elaborated in some performances directed by Matjaž Pograjc at the beginning of his career and today this brand is present in the theater performances directed by Ivica Buljan) the performances cannot be seen as a complete novelty.

Secondly, the designation "radical" shows today, as it presented in the essay by Marc Levretti (2008), the economic logic of contemporary exploitation of politically incorrect themes and contents. The brand radical turns out to be a successful marketing strategy (people still "fall" for sensational events), which adheres to leftist, critical artistic practices, whereas their critical power is in fact limited. This designation is included in the cannibalistic capitalist matrix that ensures that being "radical" means success and profitability for capital. Consequently, it means that art that hides itself under the guise of criticism, controversy, radicalism, etc., is a successful tool used by the capitalist machine. By creating an impression of freedom of expression being presented as oppositional in fact art does not oppose but consolidates power.

Therefore instead of being part of such designations I will try to present the two performances within the political in arts, as it is elaborated by Jacques Rancière in his politics of aesthetics. Rancière has written extensively on these questions. He has spoken categorically against this notion of "engaged" art. Rancière exposes that an artist can be committed as a person, and possibly that he is committed by his writings, his paintings, his films, which contribute to a certain type of political struggle. An artist can be committed, but what does it mean to say that his art is committed? Rancière argues that commitment is not a category of art. Though, he continues that this does not mean that art is apolitical. It means that aesthetics has its own politics, or its own metapolitics, concludes Rancière (Cf. Rancière, 2004). Consequently, according to Rancière, the core of the problematic relationship between art and politics is "that there is no criterion for establishing an appropriate correlation between the politics of aesthetics and the aesthetics of politics. (...) They intermix in any case; politics has its aesthetics and aesthetics has its politics. But there is no formula for an appropriate correlation" (Ibid. Rancière). In other words, depending on the time or situation in which one finds oneself, a work of art can be read and interpreted differently and therefore be seen to be political to a

greater or lesser degree.

For Rancière politics is not seen as a practice and dissemination of power, but is seen as a creation of the sphere of (a collective) experience, as a distribution of the sensible and through it as an aesthetic activity. Such a reading allows that art is always perceived as a political activity as a potential that cuts through the social distribution of the sensible, that is the place of disagreement in the consensual order and / or an invention of sensible forms and material structures on which new life forms are established. This is also perceived as aesthetic democratization. Katja Čičigoj formed the following statement: This sort of "aesthetic democratization, which is non-dependent of the artists intentions," this "politics of aesthetics," based on Rancière emerges as "an effect of structuring the sensible experience into forms, that cohere with the regime of art in the field of politics." In the aesthetic regime of art this means establishing neutralized spaces, the loss of purpose and their indifferent availability; it presents the overlapping of heterogeneous temporality, the equality of the represented subjects and the anonymity of those to whom the works are aimed (Cf. Rancière, 2004).

Let's see. It is important to highlight particularly two theses which are the key to the success of these performances. The first concerns the mechanisms of functioning of a modern society based on the empty rhetoric of advertising, the other lies in the analysis or questioning the content and form, which leads to almost a direct confrontation of the viewer with the socially actual, though still marginalized sociality. The complexity in both performances is becoming one with the "dimension" of the modern world (based on consumerism, alienation, emptiness as well as on spectacle, the brutality, physicality, excess – present in the media reality); both try to cut within the real(ity) to which they appertain. It seems that the performances are opening the possibility of confrontation with the individual's own reality, with what is real and senseless, in all its immediacy. This is not so much about the invention of the forms of the sensible, but presents their bombing and elimination. In this way the performances drag the viewer into the vortex of images and words, auditory and physical; they cannot escape them (at least) for the duration of the performance. Fastened to and strapped by the theatrical landscape, which the performances create, we enter the field of "resistance" that does not bet on the attitude of opposition, nor goes back to what Brian Massumi argued that is present, and it is the turn of the complaint about the loss of traditional values such as faith and sincerity into moralism or mourning of "the death of the subject." This last then takes us a step back to capitalism or something even worse. Therefore Massumi states that if there is a way out, it starts exactly where we stand now (Cf. Massumi, 1992, p. 140). And it is exactly this now, without any pretension, without the necessary argument, but only by moving apart that reveals layer after layer, an insight into our own, let's say collective experience, to which we are subjected. Before going into the analysis lets repeat our initial theses that the performances refer to "reality," therefore they move apart from the symbolic coordinates, which determine what we experience as reality. The performances open up in a series of contradictions between word and gesture, presence and absence, folding and creasing, the field of dialectics between the appearance and the Real, which cannot be faithful to the virtualization of our everyday lives, as we have the experience that we more and more live in an artificially constructed world, which causes the overwhelming need for "a return to the real", to a need to find solid ground again in a "true reality". BUT THE REAL THAT RETURNS HAS A STATUS OF ANOTHER APPEARANCE precisely because we are unable to integrate the real, because of its traumatic / excessive character into (what we experience as) our reality and we are therefore compelled to experience it as a nightmarish apparition (Žižek, 2002, p.15).

1. Macadamia nut brittle

Macadamia nut brittle by the Italian duo Ricci / Forte is inspired by the American snuff fiction writer / poet, eminent author on alienation, Dennis Cooper. The performance keeps the essentiality of the narrative by Cooper, though Cooper's radicalization of subjectivities from the edge of the social is made less sharpen. In the center, the performance puts individuals who do not fit the stereotype of the biological and social sex determinations and creates therefore counterpoints against heterosexist and homophobic Italy that promotes as such the Roman Catholic Church's discourse and that of Silvio Berlusconi.

Like Cooper's stories, Macadamia nut brittle can be read as "the story of a desperate search for love in the impossible world in which we discover, at the end of the day, that nature as well as man is a bitch and is unfaithful. Always." (From the catalogue, The Young Lions, 2011). In the end we can end up just fucking each other until death. In a world where the easiest way to survive is to immerse ourselves into television screens attached to fictitious images, because the world that is offered is a world of emptiness, the world of appearances, of images that come from television screens into real life, in a world in which it is possible to buy and sell all, where value is inscribed on the extreme edges, in extreme experience and desire for their approximation. Images, alive in Cooper poetry, reflecting the contemporary fetishization of all what is strange, deviant, etc., are repeated in the performance, which shows that one of the great truths of subjectivation in capitalism is this addiction to substitutes that provide the level of psychosomatic arousal. With this we come closer to the central source of post-Fordist capitalism, as interpreted by Beatriz Preciado in her paper entitled *Pharmaco-Pornographic Capitalism, Postporn Politics and the Decolonization of Sexual Representations* (2010). Preciado said that "The real driving force of current capitalism is the pharmaco-pornographic control of subjectivity, whose products are serotonin, testosterone, antacids, cortisone, antibiotics, estradiol, alcohol and snuff, morphine, insulin, sildenafil citrate (Viagra^(C)) and all those complex, virtual materials that can help produce mental and psychosomatic states of arousal, relaxation and release, of omnipotence and total control. Here, even money becomes a significant psychotropic abstract. The addict/addictive and sexual body, sex and all its techno-semiotic derivatives, are the main source of post-Fordist capitalism today." (Preciado, 2010).

Before the analysis, let us try to roughly sketch Macadamia nut brittle. The theater stage is rough, fulfilled only with objects of everyday life (shopping bags, plastic chairs, shoes, water bottles, towels, muffins from department stores). Three performers (2 male and a female) are on the stage repeating the choreography acquired from airport security instructions. Background music ranges from repeated safety instructions to the techno cult group Einstuerzende Neubauten with the song Futter Mein Ego. In a virtual flood of empty words, unrelated sentences in quotations without giving any references, the performance flows at a breakneck speed, giving impression of moving backwards through our lives, a world wishing to be just a fiction, a performance, far away from the reality. Alienation. Alienation as a dominant state of our existence. As for example the scene, in which the girl referring to these empty phrases taken from soap operas, the gay colleague, who cannot stand listening to it, tries brutally to silence her, expressing his contempt. In the established ideology of universal textuality, we come close to Žižek again: "there is no reality, only the multitude of random stories we tell about ourselves." We are coupled with television images, references, personal biographies.

The excerpt that follows from the text of the performance illustrates the rhythm, strength and branding (although the subtitles in Slovenian were projected much too fast to be followed/ caught up, the meaning could be grasped through the collection of brands

appearing here and there: IKEA, fuck, Beyonce, Ljubljana, Heimlich...):

Anagnina. (Metro stop on the outskirts of Rome)
 IKEA
 next to McDonald's.
 I'm inside.
 Rows of Nike.
 A triumph of neuronal jewelry.
 I bit into something that
 something that not long ago had its legs.
 I'm sitting.
 I eat something that walked.
 I chew another afternoon.
 I have everything. I do not miss anything.
 I go out.
 I try to get me invested.
 I close my eyes.
 As soon as the light is red for pedestrians
 I cross the road
 to hear the crash.
 No noise.
 Apart from the brakes and the drivers' Fuck you.
 I listen thirty times in a row Beyonce singing Halo
 while I'm waiting at Palombini Café
 for someone who has promised to hurt me.
 I'm in love with me
 with what I can give to others.
 What's more painful?
 A punch on the face
 or to remain locked inside own house watching the
 Daily or X Factor?
 What hurts most
 one's desire?
 One who will come again to look for
 a sort of relationship.
 Try to see them
 two three five cocks that cancel me.
 Crowd of mouths insalivating every atom of myself.
 They beat me so much.
 They leave me bleeding at the emergency room.
 Observe the looks
 as they do.
 In love.
 And suddenly
 I'm Johnny Depp
 idolized superstar.
 A scar is a sort of Christmas.
 It advises that you have been something for someone
 else.
 Even that pain in the ass
 that stuns for weeks
 makes me special.
 A giant walking among mortals.
 And I smile
 because the pain
 is a sacred seal.
 A grail
 that sanctifies me.
 Islamic militants paste the anus of Iraqi children with
 mastic.
 It can only be removed by surgery.
 Then they administer a powerful laxative.
 You can die so.
 Or so.
 How is my hair?
 The plastic coffins of my mother,
 the tupperware-something with the daily dose of parmesan.
 If you forget them in the fridge
 they develop hairy spots.
 I've got them.
 Inside.
 All the time those others do not lay eyes on me.
 I have a stupid ass.
 I know.
 It does not choose.
 It lets you put everything.
 No taste.
 What harm is there if I consider it my Heimlich anti-
 suffocation maneuver?
 I would like you to kill me.
 I really want to get rid of myself

to delete the return group,
 the semi-finals,
 and to take part in the closing gala.
 How is my hair?
 While I fuck you, I would just like to smash your face
 kicked, dickhead.
 I find it romantic.
 Will you not be one of those who consider love
 as something for a lifetime?
 (Translated by the Ricci/Forte company.)



Macadamia nut brittle by the Italian duo Ricci/Forte
 Photo: Urška Boljkovac

Reminding us of a stream of thoughts often disjointed, as rhizome, which connects, selects, takes, inhabits and recreates famous and refined images. Jumping between images and meanings so fast as zapping with the television remote control. However, in the case of *Macadamia nut brittle* we do not manage the remote control, but are being put in the position in which we are managed and guided. Completely passive. Without control. So close to what Baudrillard is claiming in his theory on the simulacra. With such approach the creators do not assume the expected criticism of the neoliberal system that resides at the core institutions of contemporary performing arts, but more probably with distancing from it, without protesting against it, but rather create a gap with opening up implying the truth, which is, as argued by Lacan (as well as Jacques-Alain Miller) contingent, elusive, shifting, partial, accessible only through the impossibility, with which it attaches onto the real. The truth as appearance is elusive, even when hiding behind the authority. Ricci/Forte outline its transitivity, partiality, the extended narrative of contingency prolonged in the fragmentary dramaturgy, the stage is changed to a "work site," into a dump of discarded, overlooked, at the margins set subjectivities.

2. Too Late! – (Antigone) Contest # 2

Too Late! – (Antigone) Contest # 2 took its inspiration from Sophocles' *Antigone*. This performance is one among three, which could be interpreted by three possible dialogues and comments on *Antigone*, signed by Motus. *Antigone* stands as a paradigm, through which Enrico Casagrande & Daniela Nicolò (authors and directors of the performance) are opening up its possible understanding and its importance today. In the centre of the performance *Too Late! – (Antigone) Contest # 2* lies the topic of authority and the power of the individual in order to create a multi-layered and due to its richness and quickly changeable discourses uncontrollable – triologue.

The authors put the focus on the three main characters of Sophocles' *Antigone*: Creon (performed by Vladimir Aleksić), *Antigone* and *Haemon* (performed both by the androgynous Silvia Calderon). The text is fragmented till its bones and extended with autobiographical elements and socio-political issues (Creon transforms into Berlusconi, Milošević, etc.). The original text is illustrated by the presence of the plastic masks, being put on and off by the performers. This is also a way in which symbolic level is reinvestigated into universal of the symbolic roles of the central characters. The symbolic gesture of "tearing apart" of

Creon's mask from the outset indicates a doubt into authority and the symbolic power that is attached to it. The staging is formally purified (reduction of scenic props), thus making room for the construction of a complex and structured play. It fluidly runs between the past and the present and is extended by a personal touch through a thoughtful interplay of different levels of textuality (meta-narrative, interpretation, intervention, commentary, staging trials, personal stories, etc.). The original is reduced to chosen scenes. *Antigone* staging is prolonged by comments (both personal and professional by the performers), and as such passes from micro-and meta-levels to a performance marked by autobiographical elements, chatting by the performers and revealing the mechanisms of authority.

Silvia Calderon, with her boyish image embodies Butler's request of expanding heterosexual matrix. Due to her presence and what she embodies she cannot be simply inserted into the paradigm of femininity. Her sexual identity is disclosed only after she discards her shirt.

Only then does her gender identity consistently elude definition. Wearing cleats and a male tracksuit in an agony of rage, aggression, transforming from a rampant mad dog into a sleek cute puppy.

The conflict of a symbolic and sexual identity (young girls, women) continually eludes and therefore opens at several levels. First, as continuous transition between the characters of *Antigone* and *Haemon* (girl / boy; woman / man; son / daughter); transitions between various identities (rebel/ helpless girls, disobedient schoolgirl, mad young man, etc.) leading us toward the passage between the animal and the human (at the metaphorical level as well literally transforming into a dog). It is worth emphasizing the ceaseless transformation. Slipping and shifting in between identities is present through other signs that allow us to decode passages and their meanings through our own body.

Sliding and elusiveness are revealing to the constructed symbolic structures, reflected through the family and its national / social law. These structures are according to Butler directly related as the "symbolic is the sedimentation of social practices" (Butler, 2010, p. 38). Kinship reflects the modes of tiring customs and conventions that operates according to Butler with its own contingency (ibid., p. 86). Not surprisingly both performers are through performance continuity requisitioning the power and role of the symbolic order. Creon represents a "watchdog" of state laws, the holder of the power, an advocate of social order that is transmitted to the modern beholders of authority. The relationship with the seemingly universal law is capricious. Laws in their hands are read and placed at their own rate. Universality does not exist, it is an empty and obsolete form, within which, through mythology, symbolic functions are maintained and on them social power is based.

As the family and the social overlap, it is necessary to make transformations, with opening up their intertwined existence, deconstruct and reconstruct the symbolic into a new structure. The performance bets on the deconstructive method, while revealing the mechanisms of power operating through performative and textual level. These are the modes consolidated in the existing social order. It is a silent call of descent, possible only with understanding the way it operates.

3. Conclusion

Both performances successfully draw parallels between life and theater, succeeding in reviving the Renaissance insight on theater as life – on theater that opens up life itself. They disclose symbolic and linguistic rules supporting kinship relationships presented as universal, beyond the possibility of their

own transformation. However, as Butler shows, this assumption is wrong. The register of sex is steadily expanding, and thus are symbolic rules subjected to contingency. In order to explain this kind of relationship, Butler took Austin's conception of language, derived from the basic differences between two types of speech acts: the constative and the performative. Performative utterances are defined as sentences which are not only passively describing a given reality, but they are changing the (social) reality they are describing. This leads closer to the understanding of the law, as defined by Mladen Dolar. Dolar is claiming that the law becomes powerful only through the sovereign uttering. Antigone intervenes in this law only when she starts to act in the language. "Antigone embodies the norms that she opposes. She performs the normative operation of power, without itself becoming powerful / ... / defying the law with appropriating its voice" (Cf. Bahovec, 2010, pp. 135-36).

Antigone could stay as a new paradigm of humanity – including what is excluded from the Law. She gives the voice to the others while drawing attention in order to erase zones of indistinction where the majority of life is situated.

The performances represent those standing in the margins but without demand of their inclusion. Physical theater is just a known recipe for contemporary theater today, though the two performances' quality resides more in their fragmentary dramaturgy, excellent scripts and dialogue texts, compelling performers, and intertwined topics that open up powerfully the field of identity politics.

Translated from Slovenian into English by M. Gržinić

LITERATURA/E/:

- Bahovec, Eva: Antigona je mož besede. [Antigona is a man of a word], preface. In: Butler, Judith: Antigona zahteva [Antigone's Claim]. Sorodstvo med življenjem in smrtjo [Kinship med life and death]. Ljubljana: Študentska založba, 2010.
- Butler, Judith: Antigona zahteva [Antigone's Claim]. Sorodstvo med življenjem in smrtjo [Kinship med life and death]. Ljubljana: Študentska založba, 2010.
- It's Not TV: Watching HBO in the Post-Television Era, Marc Leverette, Brian L. Ott and Clara Louise Buckley (Eds.), New York: Routledge, 2008.
- Massumi, Brian. A User's Guide to Capitalism and Schizophrenia. Deviations from Deleuze and Guattari. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1992.
- Preciado, Beatriz: Pharmaco-Pornographic Capitalism Postporn Politics and the Decolonization of Sexual Representations, 2010. Sa španskog na engleski prevela / Translated from Spanish into English M. Gržinić, 2010.
- Rancière, Jacques: The Politics of Aesthetics: The distribution of the sensible, Continuum, London, 2004.
- Žižek, Slavoj: Paralaksa. Za politični suspenz etičnega [Parallax. For a political suspension of ethics]. Analekta, Ljubljana, 2004.
- Žižek, Slavoj: Nasilje, kultura in globalni kapitalizam [Violence, culture and global capitalism] (online).
- Žižek, Slavoj: Sreća po 11. Septembru [Happiness after September, 11]. In: Problemi, Ljubljana, 2002, str./pp. 5-24.

POLITIZACIJE U SAJBER- PROSTORU

Margarita Padilja

1. Šta je u igri u sajberprostoru

Nije lako razumeti internet, jer internet je rekurzivan. On je u isto vreme proizvod i sopsveno sredstvo proizvodnje. Toliko je apstraktan kao kod i toliko konkretan kao telekomunikaciona infrastruktura (globalna i univerzalne namene). Tako je artefakt, sa svojim jasno prepoznatljivim kompjuterima, kablovima i satelitima, kao i simbolički, jer omogućava građenje novih materijalnih i virtuelnih realnosti koje se ne bi mogle proizvesti na drugi način. Internet je složena stvar. Takav je bio u svom začetku i takav je i sada. Njegovi slojevi ne prestaju da podržavaju nove napretke. Da citiram neke današnje karakteristike: na fizičkom nivou, povezanost interneta i telefona; na logičkom nivou, softver kao usluga; i na nivou sadržaja, društvene mreže. Složenost interneta nije samo tehnička (iako je i to). Njegova složenost je i politička, budući da je internet po poreklu plod jedne monstruoze alijanse koja destabilizuje sve uključene strane.

Kao što svi znaju, početkom šezdesetih godina, Rand Korporacija, istraživački centar povezan sa vojno-industrijskim, bezbednosnim i odbrambenim kompleksom SAD, postavila je pitanje kako očuvati mogućnost komunikacije u hipotetičkom nuklearnom ratu. Kao odgovor na ovo neobično pitanje pojavila se neverovatna ideja o jednoj mreži koja nema centar, već čvorove sa dve osobine: inteligencijom (za donošenje dobrih odluka) i autonomijom (za njihovo izvršenje).

Šezdesetih godina su mreže već postojale (telegraf, telefon, radio), ali su bile centralizovane i hijerarhijske. Industrija nije bila zainteresovana za menjanje svoje ideje o mreži koja je već tako dobro funkcionisala i sjajan predlog o mreži bez centralnog upravljanja lutao je sve dok nije stigao na univerzitete. A na univerzitetima nisu bili samo profesori, odseci i studijski programi. Tamo su bili i studenti: tehnolita koja je bila deo individualističke libertiniističke kontrakulture (u svetu jakih geopolitičkih blokova) i koja je ovde pronašla šansu za građenje iz temelja jednog novog i slobodnog sveta: sajberprostora. Studenti su prihvatili ponudu Rand Korporacije i isporučili joj jaku i neprobojnu mrežu. Ali noću su radili i izvan plana. Imali su znanje i volju, tako da su u internet ugradili noćne dodatke, za obične ljude, koji su odgovarali njihovim idejama iz kontrakulture o tome kakav treba da bude novi svet. Pojavila se elektronska pošta, diskusione grupe...

Dakle, internet je nastao iz spoja velike posleratne nauke (nauke atomskih bombi) i individualističke libertiniističke kontrakulture sa američkih univerziteta šezdesetih i sedamdesetih godina prošlog veka. To je jedna monstruoza alijansa između establišmenta i antiestablišmenta, sa inicijalnim svojevolumnim isključenjem industrije.

Ovaj savez je izazvao i još izaziva (nestabilne) promene u arhitekturi stvarnosti, promene koje mogu proizvesti nove i još veće promene. Rekurzivnost. Industrija će zatečena posmatrati multiplikaciju novih i obilnih nematerijalnih dobara, za čije upravljanje i akumulaciju neće imati odgovarajuće mehanizme, pa će se podeliti na one koji hoće da od interneta naprave novu televiziju i one koji hoće da od njega naprave Veb 2.0. Politička vlast će morati da se nosi sa jednim novim (sajber)prostorom koji je otvoren i fleksibilan, kojim niko ne može centralno upravljati i čije

interne zakone ne uspeva da razume; videće kako se rađa nova javno-privatna sfera i zadržtaće. A društveni pokreti biće zgranuti apstraktnošću sajberprostora i dvosmislenošću namera hakera, koji se bore, ali na svoj način: bez nostalgije do politične zajednice; stvarajući od zajedničkog znanja garanciju za slobodu; stvarajući zajednicu na bazi individualizma, horizontalnu jednakost na bazi meritokratije...

Ali sve ovo još nije završeno. Internet je rekurzivan i nečist. Njegova arhitektura je njegova politika. I nedovršen je. Konstruiše se i rekonstruiše u realnom vremenu u obliku spirale od talasa, od plime i oseke, gde su jedni vođeni prevlašću u industriji i politici, a drugi borbom koja može imati za cilj različite (čak i protivrečne) ideje o jednakosti i slobodi.

2. Uživanje u nematerijalnim dobrima

Digitalna revolucija donosi svetu nove resurse: nematerijalna dobra. Primenjujući logiku starog kapitalističkog sveta, to će samo po sebi pokrenuti borbu za njihovu kontrolu i eksploataciju, kao kada se otkrije novi izvor nafte ili novi virus.

Međutim, ovo novo nematerijalno bogatstvo je u isto vreme sredstvo proizvodnje i potrošački proizvod, i ne podleže zakonima starog kapitalističkog sveta: to su dobra koja se ne troše, mogu biti moja i tvoja u isto vreme, možemo ih proizvoditi ti i ja u ravnopravnoj saradnji, umnožavaju se sa nula troškova i što se više koriste, više rastu. Ni manje, ni više. Digitalna revolucija omogućila je svetu novo bogatstvo, koje se ne mora deliti! [1] Pojava novog bogatstva pokrenuće borbu za njegovo kontrolisanje i eksploataciju. To je ono što se sada događa, unutar i izvan interneta. Ali, ta borba ne funkcioniše po zakonima starog kapitalističkog sveta.

U društvenom ugovoru između buržoazije i radničke klase na Zapadu, donetom posle Drugog svetskog rata, socijalna prava vezuju se za radnika, a demokratske slobode za građanina. Autorska prava, potpuno nebitna za ovaj sporazum, nisu uključena u pregovore, jer su, kao sitnoburžoaska prava, bila praktično nevažna.

Nakon šezdeset godina, društveni ugovor propada i, zajedno sa tim propadanjem, nove borbe za pristup ovom novom bogatstvu i njegovo korišćenje premeštaju se iz sajberprostora na ulice i obrnuto, suočavajući se, napadajući i pružajući otpor izazivanju veštačke nestašice od strane država i korporacija iz industrije kulture i zabave, koji pokušavaju da je opravdaju ciničnom pričom o autorskim pravima.

U razgovoru sa prijateljima, čula sam mišljenja da je borba na internetu dimna zavesa za odvlačenje pažnje od onoga što je zaista važno: borbe protiv prekarnog rada i za odbranu javnog vlasništva. Ne slažem se sa ovakvim mišljenjem. Borba za korišćenje nematerijalnih dobara jednako je važna. Čak bih otišla još dalje. Mladi ljudi, koji su digli ruke od pregovora o pravima radnika, koji prihvataju prekarnost kao novo područje koje treba otkriti, kao da kažu: „U redu, prihvatamo posao na određeno, odričemo se penzije... ali, zauzvrat tražimo slobodu i konekciju. Nesigurnost, u redu, ali sloboda i konekcija!" Ovo je izgleda granica između onoga što se može i ne može tolerisati.

3. Sloboda kao (ekonomsko) pravo

Borba za korišćenje novog bogatstva (ekonomija) i borba protiv cenzure (politika) idu ruku pod ruku. Kopiraj i cenzura su ista stvar. Promene u arhitekturi stvarnosti ponovo spajaju ono što je stari kapitalistički svet hteo da razdvoji: ekonomiju (fabriku i sindikat) i politiku (parlament i stranku).

Autorska prava, tako kako su sada uređena, služe kao alibi korporacijama za očuvanje moći i bogaćenje. Budući da su autorska prava donekle ekonomska prava, borba za slobodu pristupa novom bogatstvu

je u isto vreme ekonomska borba (protiv veštačke nestašice) i politička borba (za priznavanje slobode u sajberprostoru). Kako u sajberprostoru još uvek nije priznato nijedno pravo, borba protiv cenzure traži utočište u starim garancijama i oslanja se na pravo na slobodu štampe i informisanja. Od društvenih pokreta koji trenutno postoje, bez sumnje su najvažniji pokret za slobodu kretanja ljudi (papiri za sve) i pokret za slobodnu kulturu (ukidanje autorskih prava). Ova dva pokreta su međusobno više povezana nego što nam se to može učiniti na prvi pogled.

4. Nova javno-privatna sfera

Pokret za slobodnu kulturu bori se za prava na pristup i korišćenje novog zajednički napravljenog bogatstva, ali ne samo to: on uz to menja načine borbe. Oprema borca (alat, znanje i praksa) menja se, kao i uloga avangarde. Ali, razvoj novih komunikacionih tehnologija nije samo otvorio novi front za borbu protiv akumulacije i nejednakosti. Nije sve tako jednostavno. Osim toga, on je promenio „normalnost”, svakodnevicu konektovanih generacija.

Nisu sve promene u „normalnosti” dobre. Često su to nezavršeni rekurzivni procesi, mešavina različitih političkih, industrijskih i društvenih interesa, u okviru monstroznih alijansi između različitih organa vlasti i različitih pokreta za emancipaciju i lični razvoj. Remedios Safra, sajberfeministkinja, ovako govori o promeni na „normalnosti” u životu na internetu: „Promene o kojima govorim tiču se naših dana koje provodimo na internetu. Ne ruše se kule, nema vike u banci, ratova za naftu ni fizičke smrti. Ne postoji jedna epska slika koja simbolizuje promenu o kojoj govorim. To je kao kap vode na kamenu. To je kao uticaj simboličkog na telesno. Uticaj koji je spor, ali krucijalan”. [2]

Prema njenim rečima, promene u „normalnosti” odnose se na novi odnos između javnog i privatnog, na stvaranje jedne nove javno-privatne sfere na internetu: „Danas koegzistiraju stari i novi modeli prostorne i političke organizacije našeg ličnog vremena i prostora, gde je lična i kritička umešanost neophodna više nego ikada. Dešava se, osim toga, jedna presudna promena u privatnoj i kućnoj sferi: internet ulazi u moju kuću. [...] internet povezuje privatni prostor na razne načine sa spoljašnjim svetom i javnom sferom, [...] i u tim uslovima [...] javljaju se šanse za kolektivno i društveno delovanje koje je ranije bilo ograničeno na 'onu stranu praga'. Privatni prostor se bukvalno meša sa javnim, da bi se zatim uvećavo politički prostor, [...] jer taj spoj između sopstvene sobe, samoće, anonimnosti i ukrštanje privatnog i javnog... ima subverzivni potencijal”.

Prema Safrinom mišljenju, kada je kompjuter ušao u kuće i, tačnije, u spavaće sobe (privatni prostor par ekselans), stvorila se mreža povezanih privatnih prostora koja prelazi prag i postaje javni prostor. To je moć „konektovane sopstvene sobe”. Ono što su bile „garaže” buduće Silicijumske doline za tehnološku revoluciju, biće konektovane sopstvene sobe za revoluciju u javno-privatnoj sferi.

Privatno se doslovno spaja sa javnim. Ekonomija i politika se takođe spajaju. Politički prostor se uvećava. Oprema borca i uloga avangarde se menjaju. Lična i kritička umešanost neophodna je više nego ikada. Cilj ovog članka je da se zapitamo kako se ispoljava sve ovo u jednoj mreži kojom ne mogu da upravljaju čak ni oni koji su napisali njen kôd i koja je po prirodi dvosmislena. Razmotrićemo to kroz četiri iskustva: Vikiliks, Anonimusi, Haktivisti i Večera straha.

5. Vikiliks

Dana 28. novembra 2010. godine, Vikiliks prosleđuje međunarodnoj štampi (Gardijan, Njujork Tajms, Le Mond, El Pais, Der Špigl) kolekciju od 251 187 depeši ili prepiski između Stejt departmenta i američkih ambasada po celom svetu. To je naveće objavljivanje tajnih dokumenata u istoriji, koje utiče na veliki broj zemalja, između ostalih i na Španiju.

U vreme kada su objavljene depeše, Vikiliks postaje meta distribuiranog napada uskraćivanjem usluga (DDoS napada). Haker pod pseudonimom Jester (Džester, što znači klovn) izjavljuje na svom Tviteru da je on odgovoran za napad. Da bi izbegao napad, 30. novembra Vikiliks se premešta na server Amazon EC2, računarstvo u oblaku. Prvog decembra Amazon, pod pritiskom američkog senatora Džoa Libermana, prestaje da pruža usluge Vikiliks, što u praksi znači da briše Vikiliks sa interneta, ili makar pokušava da ga obriše.

Dana 2. decembra EveryDNS, firma koja izdaje imena na internetu, prekida svoj kontakt sa Vikiliks, što bi trebalo da mu obriše ime. Kroz nekoliko sati Vikiliks pronalazi utočište na jednom francuskom serveru koji je švajcarska Piratska partija zakupila od firme OVH i 3. decembra ponovo postaje dostupan pod domenom wikileaks.ch, što je njegovo novo ime, takođe vlasništvo švajcarske Piratske partije.

Francuski ministar za industriju, energetiku i digitalnu ekonomiju Erik Beson, traži od OVH da uskrati uslugu Vikiliks. OVH traži od suda da razjasni legalnost ili nelegalnost Vikiliksa ali oni kažu da to nije u njihovoj nadležnosti. Sve se ovo događa istog 3. decembra. Tog istog dana, završava se reforma jednog zakona u SAD, poznatog pod imenom Acta SHIELD (Securing Human Intelligence and Enforcing Lawful Dissemination), modifikacija starog zakona o špijunaži koji zabranjuje objavljivanje informacija klasifikovanih kao šifrovane tajne ili prepiske između međunarodnih obaveštajnih službi.

Dana 4. decembra, PayPal zatvara račun preko kojeg je Vikiliks dobijao donacije: navodi da nije dozvoljeno „delovanje koje brani, promovise, olakšava ilegalne aktivnosti, ili izaziva druge da učestvuju u njima”. U međuvremenu su međusobno nepovezani simpatizeri napravili više od hiljadu ogleđala (kopija na internetu) Vikiliksa ne bi li osigurali njegovo postojanje. Dana 6. decembra, MasterCard blokira svoj sistem preko kojeg je Vikiliks primao donacije. Tog dana i švajcarska banka PostFinance otkazuje mogućnost donacija ili uplata. Dana 7. decembra, Visa odbija mogućnost donacija ili uplata.

U međuvremenu javno mnjenje je u neverici: depeše procurele putem Vikiliksa pokazuju da vlade imaju mnogo tajni i da ozbiljno uskraćuju istinu građanima. Vlade odgovaraju udruživanjem sa ekonomskim gigantima i obrušavanjem na internet bez ikakvog sudskog rešenja. To je zadalo tako jak udarac slobodi govora da se zatresla čitava vladavina prava. Ono što je u igri u ovom ratu je sloboda informisanja i, u nastavku, sloboda govora i sama demokratija. Debata, ukoliko je bude bilo, baviće se time da li će sloboda govora morati da bude ograničena u ime bezbednosti.

5.1. Postpolitičko novinarstvo

Ova analiza, iako veoma tačna i razumna, u isto vreme je neobična. Istraživačko novinarstvo i curenje informacija postoje od kada postoji sama štampa. Tako je i sa skandalima zbog korupcije. Osim toga, depeše ne otkrivaju prave tajne i ne ugrožavaju bezbednost. Samo potvrđuju opipljivim dokazima ono što je javno mnjenje već ranije naslućivalo. Osim toga, fenomen Vikiliksa ne može se pripisati samo efektima koje proizvodi objavljivanje jedne tajne informacije; na primer, oduvek smo znali kako i zašto je počela finansijska kriza, pa opet to nije imalo isti efekat. Pa onda, šta čini Vikiliks tako jedinstvenim?

Iako Vikiliks ima neke karakteristike novina, on nije sasvim isto što i novine okačene na internet. „Štampa”, onakva kakvu danas poznajemo, pojavila se u uskoj vezi sa određenim oblicima demokratije.

David de Ugarte govori o tome u Moći mreža: „Teško je razumeti koje su promene demokratiji donele novinske agencije. U početku, novina je bila to što je

omogućeno prenošenje nacionalnih i globalnih vesti u lokalnoj štampi u trenutku kada je pismenost toliko rasla zbog potreba na poslu (od radnika su se tražile sve veće i veće sposobnosti rukovanja mašinama), kao i zbog edukativnih akcija samih sindikata i udruženja. Ali kako su u popularnu štampu (a ne samo 'buržoasku', nepristupačnu većini ljudi, što zbog cene, što zbog jezika) uključena nacionalna i internacionalna pitanja, do tada rezervisana za kabinete i elitu, spoljašnja i državna politika postala je deo nečega o čemu bilo koji prosečni građanin, bez obzira na društveni položaj, ima svoje mišljenje. Argumenti u korist ograničenog biračkog prava izgubili su smisao jer se sada mogućnost da budu informisani i imaju mišljenje proširila na sve građane”. [3]

Ako samo pogledamo teme bilo kojih novina (internacionalne, nacionalne, lokalne itd.), njihovo političko opredeljenje (levo, desno, sredina), sadržaje (mešavina informacija, mišljenja i propagande), videćemo kopiju šeme podele vlasti u starom kapitalističkom svetu i njegovoj demokratiji. Ali, Vikiliks je transnacionalan. Ne uklapa se dobro ni u levu ni u desnu opciju. Nema poverenja ni u SAD, ni u njihove protivnike. Objavljivanjem dokumenata ne pokušava da svrgne određenu vladu da bi na njeno mesto postavio neku koja odgovara njegovom političkom opredeljenju. I, objavljuje informacije, ali ih ne analizira. Vikiliks nije tek neka stara ideja koja se reciklira da bi se uz pomoć interneta pojačalo njeno dejstvo. On je novo sazvežđe od kojeg lude stari kompasi.

Feliks Stadler u tekstu „Zašto se institucije muče da očuvaju svoje tajne” [4], na temu Vikiliksa, izlaže kako se menjaju medijske strukture: „Deregulacija medija komunikacije i povezivanje novina i sredstva komunikacije razlog su propadanja javnog prostora kao i demokratske arene. Ekonomski i politički pritisci uticali su na redakcije da ističu lake vesti (soft news), koje se bave načinom života ili potenciraju komentare, na uštrb istraživanja o političkim pitanjima. [...] Blogovi i 'građansko novinarstvo' u jednom trenutku počinju da zamenjuju zastarele medijske strukture. Iako nije došlo do najavljene promene, javna sfera ipak prolazi kroz sporu transformaciju. Pojavljuju se različiti akteri koji uvećavaju ponudu. Nezaobilazni pravni rizik koji donosi širenje poverljivih sadržaja prebacuje se na drugoga: niko ne otkriva sâm neku opasnu informaciju, već analizira ono što otkriva neko drugi. [...] Istraživačko novinarstvo se reorganizuje, i tako pronalazi novu snagu, najpre zato što, odnedavno, koristi nove izvore finansiranja. [...] U ovoj šemi, različiti zadaci karakteristični za istraživačkog novinara – zaštita izvora, potraga za dokumentima, sakupljanje, selekcija i raspoređivanje informacija, pomoć oko razumevanja i širenja – podeljeni su između raznih saradnika, različitih ekonomskih modela (komercijalna firma, neprofitabilna organizacija, mreže), koji zajedno rade na tome da ta priča dospe u javnu sferu”.

5.2. Kontrainformacija u XXI veku

Na pitanje da li Vikiliks spada u kontrainformaciju, txarlie, Haktivista, nudi sledeću analizu: „Krajem devedesetih godina javna komunikacija bila je kontrolisana medijima, koji brojčano nisu činili ni polovinu današnjih. To je bilo zatvoreno i nepristupačno novinarstvo koje nije progovaralo o ideologiji ili delovanju bilo kog oblika antiglobalizacije. U takvoj sredini rađaju se Nodo50, a kasnije i mreža Indimedia (Indymedia), koji pokušavaju da taj nedostatak isprave kroz aktivizam i tehnologiju: 'Ne mrzite medije, budite mediji’.

Godine 2003. planula je blogerska revolucija ponajviše zahvaljujući Blogspotu. Bilo ko je mogao (u tom trenutku se više činilo da mora) da ima blog na internetu. Počinje kriza novinarstva i prezasićenje informacijama. Indimedia i slični su preživeli na isti način kao i novine, zahvaljujući starim korisnicima. U

tom periodu više nije problem podići glas, već medijski se probiti. Manje-više 2006. godine, više od polovine blogova je zatvoreno. Logično je: blogovi su sredstvo za nekoga ko piše, ali ne realna potreba publike. Ako nemaš šta da napišeš, koji je smisao tvog bloga? Pojavljuje se koncept građanskog novinarstva: ne čekaj da nešto izađe u novinama, ispričaj to sam! Pojavljuju se portali, kao meneame.net, koji pokušavaju da filtriraju sav taj sadržaj građanskog novinarstva. Te godine se pojavljuje Vikiliks, jer oni znaju da ima tajni koje se ne mogu staviti na blog. Potreban im je prostor koji nije tako zatvoren, kao cryptome.org (najstarija mreža za razotkrivanje tajni), i gde materijal koji je već procureo 'novinari građani' mogu da analiziraju i komentarišu.

Idemo u 2008. godinu. Mediji konačno shvataju da je meneame.net izvor za popunjavanje vesti. Osim toga, postaju veoma otvoreni za akcije i kampanje društvenih pokreta, mada sadržaje prate siromašnim tekstovima i banalizuju ih. Ali internaut je negde drugde. On već ima profil na Fejsbuku i ekperimentiše sa Tviterom. Informacije se šire od usta do usta, ili od zida do zida, ili od tvita na tvit. Da bi bio informisan samo treba da pogledaš svoju stranicu; važno je ko ti je 'prijatelj' ili koga 'pratiš'. Vikiliks objavljuje svoje prve važne tekstove, a prvi put im je naređeno i zatvaranje, i zbog toga su čuveni među Haktivistima iz celog sveta.

Godine 2010, počinje era open disclosure, koji ima dve sposobnosti: nemogućnost ostvarivanja efektivne cenzure u digitalnom svetu i efekat Strajsend. Vikiliks zna za ove sposobnosti i stavlja ih na probu. Zna da Amazon nije siguran hosting, iako nema dokaze za to. Zbog toga ga koristi, da bi Amazon pokazao na čijoj je strani. Banke nisu jednostavne za saradnju, ali Švajcarska je poznata po tome što brani svoje klijente makar oni bili kriminalci. Zbog toga Asanžov račun mora da bude tamo. Hoće da proveriti da li će mu zatvoriti račun, i zatvaraju ga. Sada Švajcarska više nije poznata po tome što brani svoje klijente, već po tome što brani kriminalce.

Borba protiv ovoga mora da bude dvojak: sa jedne strane hosting sa političkom orijentacijom (ili strogo poštovanje zakona koji su takođe politički), sa druge strane stotine ogledala. Problem je u tome što kontrainformacioni mediji nisu pokazali interesovanje za Vikiliks tokom te četiri godine. Isto važi i za tradicionalne medije. Kontrainformacija danas znači objaviti nešto što se želi sakriti i analizirati to tako da svi mogu da razumeju. Grupama više nije potrebna neka Indimedia da im govori šta se dešava. Za to sada postoje blogovi. Kao strategija za osiguranje vidljivosti više se ne koristi portal.

Ljudi neće da čitaju cele depeše, kao što neće da čitaju ceo Zakon o ekonomskoj uzdržanosti. To nije problem. Ako ne možeš da budeš Vikiliks, treba da budeš posrednik koji će biti u stanju da izdvoji informaciju i prenese je narodu. To je kontrainformacija XXI veka. Ili otkrivaš tajne, ili ih analiziraš. Vikiliks nisu potrebni kontrainformativni portali. Situacija je obrnuta. Nodo50, Kaos en la Red, Rebelión, LaHaine, A las Barricadas, Klinamen, Insurgente itd. moraju da pročitaju depeše, stave ih u kontekst i pišu o njima. Ne mogu više da budu običan hab (uređaj za povezivanje) čitavog pokreta koji ne postoji niti napreduje zajedno. Ne trebaju nam portali, trebaju nam ljudi koji će analizirati. I osim toga, ljudi koji će umeti da razrađuju problem a ne da ga banalizuju. Jasne ali duboke poruke. Ako nemaš interesantne informacije, letiš'.

U kontekstu nematerijalnog bogatstva, „informacije”, txarlie izvlači iz opreme borca klasične kontrainformacione portale, a ubacuje sposobnost za duboku, a ne banalnu, analizu.

5.3. Namerna konfuzija

U starom komunističkom svetu sloboda štampe je bila osigurano pravo. U novoj javno-privatnoj onlajn sferi još uvek nema nijednog priznatog prava. Ova neodređenost omogućuje da sistem bude napadnut

sopstvenim mehanizmima: obrušiti se na pravo slobode štampe da bi se prijavilo svako kršenje ovog prava. Jedna ovako dvosmislena strategija ne može da ima uspeha ako se proklamuje kao antisistemska. U Vikiliks nema ničeg antisistemskog, iako je on razoran po sistem. Njegov cilj je produbiti slobodu govora. Njegov program je liberalan: nisu važne ideje, već sloboda njihovog iskazivanja (iako se u Vikiliks ne iskazuju ideje). Njegov aparat je mejnstrim (Amazon, PayPal, MasterCard, švajcarska banka itd.). Njegovi saveznici su veliki listovi (Gardijan, Njujork Tajms, Le Mond, El Pais i Der Špigl...).

Prkositi sistemu starog demokratskog kapitalizma igrajući po njegovim sopstvenim pravilima je paradoks koji se ogleda u samoj misterioznoj ličnosti Džulijana Asanža – ličnosti koja nam se sviđa i ne sviđa u isto vreme, koja plaća veliku ličnu cenu za svoju smelost i koja u sebi sadrži sve što po staroj logici samo može da se protumači kao kontradiktorno: treba da branimo nekog tipa koji je optužen za silovanje? Vikiliks zahteva transparentnost, a deluje iz tajnosti? Zašto se udružuje (možda želeći osudu, možda želeći zaštitu) sa listovima koji su u vezi sa vlastima koje želi da optuži i zašto im nudi da oni ekskluzivno objave informacije? Treba da podržimo centralistički i personalizovani projekat koji nije u skladu sa decentralističkim i kolaboracionim karakterom interneta?

Džulijan Asanž stavlja u opremu borca anonimnost u prvom licu[5]. Anonimnost, zato što ne znamo da li je on heroj ili đavo; a u prvom licu, zato što sebe izlaže u prvi plan pod svetla reflektora i tako štiti i sakriva ono što stoji iza njega.

5.4. Nezavršeni mehanizmi

Ima li smisla igrati se životom radi objavljivanja informacija i „ni zbog čega drugog”? Ako rekapituliramo već izloženo, dobijamo: štampa je približila politiku narodu. Nakon toga, njena deregulacija i povećana koncentracija pomogle su u propadanju javnog prostora i demokratske arene. Istraživačko novinarstvo se reorganizuje u oblik u kome se zadaci raspoređuju na čvorove koji sarađuju (ali nisu uvek koordinisani), ne bi li informaciju doveli do javne sfere.

Vrlo je verovatno da Vikiliks nije automat, da analizira koje depeše da objavi i u kom trenutku... Vrlo je verovatno da su njegove analize prožete nekom politikom. Ali ta politika nije eksplicitna. Vikiliks stavlja svoj ulog putem nezavršenog mehanizma, što ima smisla samo ako ga dovrše ostali čvorovi u mreži. Pokretači ovog nezavršenog mehanizma se odriču kontrole (čudan mehanizam: veoma personalizovan i centralizovan, a u isto vreme ustupa deo kontrole). Nudi neutralan pristup (jednako levoj kao i desnoj struji) jednom obilnom nematerijalnom dobru: informaciji. Kako je ova informacija nezavršena, različite mreže mogu da tumače značenja depeša na različite (čak i suprotne) načine. Vikiliks mi nudi nešto što mogu da dodam svome, a tako da moje ostaje moje. Čini informaciju bogatom. Doprinosi zajedničkom ne tražeći kontrolu. I što manje traži kontrolu, to je zajedničko više zajedničko.

Ponavljam: Je li ovo ludost? Koja politička grupa bi uradila sličnu stvar, tako političku a tako malo eksplicitnu?

Uprkos njegovom centralizmu, Vikiliks je sjajan prilog veu. Nudi model koji se može umnožavati: lokalni Vikiliks, tematski Vikiliks... Dokazuje važnost tehničkih i profesionalnih znanja, počev od novinara i matematičara do vojnika Bredlija Meninga. Dovodi u pitanje ulogu avangarde i vadi iz opreme borca diskurse koji su potpuno nabijeni i dovršeni te strah od gubitka kontrole.

Vikiliks je pretpostavio inteligenciju i autonomiju čvorova, a čvorovi su podržali Vikiliks na dva načina: pravljjenjem ogledala i napadima na one koji su njega napali. Svaka solidarnost, sa svoje strane, nezavršena je akcija koja će dobiti na smislu u zavisnosti od mreže kroz koju prolazi.

6. Anonimus

Dana 6. decembra 2010, u odbranu Vikiliksa, Anonimus započinje Operation Payback (sajbernapad Operacija osveta) protiv PostFinance-a i Paypal-a zbog toga što su blokirali račune Vikiliksa. Anonimus objašnjava da je #payback protiv zakona ACTA (Anti-Counterfeiting Trade Agreement, odnosno, „Trgovinski sporazum protiv falsifikacije”), cenzure na internetu i kopirajta. Vikiliks pokazuje da nije ni za, ni protiv sajbernapada u njegovu odbranu, već da su oni izraz mišljenja jednog dela javnog mnjenja.

Dana 9. decembra, Tviter isključuje nalog Anonimusa, a Fejsbuk briše stranicu Operacije Payback. Dana 10. decembra, Anonimus menja svoju strategiju napada na korporacije koje su blokirale Vikiliks i, u svojoj digitalnoj borbi za zaštitu slobode informisanja na internetu, odlučuje da svoje napore fokusira na širenje procurelih informacija.

6.1. Generični diskurs

Po kom programu se organizuju akcije Anonimusa? Izlažu ga su svom čuvenom pismu: „Anonimus nije uvek ista grupa ljudi. [...] To je jedna živa ideja. Anonimus je ideja koja može biti prepravljena, usavremenjena ili promenjena po sopstvenoj volji. Nismo teroristička organizacija, kao što žele da nas predstave vlasti, demagozi i mediji. U ovom trenutku Anonimus je usredsređen na miroljubivu kampanju za slobodu govora. Tražimo od sveta da nas podrži, ne radi nas, već radi dobra čitavog sveta. Kada vlade kontrolišu slobodu, kontrolišu vas. Internet je poslednji bastion slobode u ovom svetu koji je u stalnom tehničkom razvitku. Internet nas može sve povezati. Kada smo povezani, onda smo jaki. Kada smo jaki, imamo moć. Kada imamo moć, možemo da ostvarimo i nemoguće. Zbog toga su se vlasti digle protiv Vikiliksa. Toga se oni plaše. Nikada to nemojte zaboraviti: plaše se naše moći kada se udružimo!”

Poruka je jednostavna: sloboda govora. Previše jednostavna? Vikiliks ovako definiše svoju misiju: „U širem smislu, princip na kojem je zasnovan naš rad je odbrana slobode govora i slobode medija, poboljšanje naših zajedničkih istorijskih znanja i održavanje prava svih ljudi da pišu novu istoriju. Ove principe izvlačimo iz Univerzalne deklaracije o ljudskim pravima”. Haktivisti se definišu kao prostor za „koordinaciju našeg delovanja na globalnom nivou, osmišljavanje strategija, deljenje resursa i sinhronizovanje pokreta za stvaranje i otpor koji vode ka slobodnom društvu sa slobodnim tehnologijama”.

„Sloboda” je jedna veoma zgodna reč koja kruži po raznim mestima na internetu. Jedna opšta ključna reč, ali možda je sve toliko jasno, da više od toga nije ni potrebno. Iako se grupe ne trude mnogo da se međusobno razlikuju u jeziku, ipak one nisu tako slične. Svaka od njih je jedinstvena. Ima razlika, ali nema blokova. Važnije je šta se i kako radi od reči koje se koriste da se o tome govori? Upotreba opštih reči, zgodnih, bez obeležja (jer imaju sva obeležja) i zbog toga anonimnih („ljudska prava”, „svi”, „vlade”, „sloboda govora”, „mirni protest”, „slobodno društvo”, „građanska neposlušnost”...) način je da se prevaziđe kriza reči?[6]

Ova iskustva stavljaju u opremu borca nekoliko opštih reči zajedničke upotrebe a vade reči s kojima se političke struje identifikuju i preko kojih pokušavaju da se odvoje jedne od drugih.

6.2. Dinamika pijanke

U svom pismu Anonimusi dodaju: „Naša prošlost nije naša sadašnjost. Ovde smo da bismo se borili za sve”. Zaista, njihova prošlost nije njihova sadašnjost. Anonimus dolazi sa 4chan.org, jednog foruma okrenutog objavljivanju slika umesto tekstova, mesta prepunog čudaka zavisnih od skidanja filmova, video-igrice, stripova i IRC dopisivanja. Neki mediji su ih nazvali „internetna mašina mržnje” puna „hakera na steroidima” i „kućnih terorista” ne samo zbog njihovih šala

i crnog humora, već i zbog njihovih sajbernapada. U ovoj bizarnoj i mračnoj potkulturi, čije je delovanje na ivici ilegalnog i društveno neprihvatljivog i kojoj ništa nije sveto ni zabranjeno (izuzev dečje pornografije) sakupljaju se ljudi kojima je, da bi odbranili slobodu na internetu, potreban privremeni promenjivi prostor u kojem će biti potpuno anonimni. To su Anonimusi.

Pred kraj 2007. godine, putem videa Anonimusi organizuju napad na mreže Sajentološke crkve, koja je uništavala jednu porodicu koja je izašla iz sekte. Zašto napadaju Sajentološku crkvu? Zato što je, kako se ne okupljaju, njihov najbolji način da postignu konsenzus korišćenje već postignutog konsenzusa. I, od tada, napadaju zloupotrebu vlasti. Anonimus nije organizacija, nema strukturu ni vođe. To su ljudi koji deluju po svome, iz svoje konektovane sopstvene sobe, mada ponekad dogovaraju akcije i na ulici, kao što je protest u Madridu na poslednjoj svečanosti dodele nagrada Goja (2011).

Znamo dosta o tome kako se organizuju ljudi kada postoji stabilnost. Ali šta se dešava kada se veliki deo društva pretvori u gomilu rasejanih anonimnih pojedinaца koji se kreću u anonimnim prostorima? Kako možemo razumeti samoorganizaciju u tom slučaju? Jedan od odgovora je jato (swarm). Jato je oblik samoorganizacije u realnom vremenu: osobe i grupe koje spontano koordinišu svoje pokrete, a ne izdaju i ne primaju naređenja. Radi se o šemi napada: slabe (i možda poneke snažnije) jedinice, rasute po mreži, kreću se sa različitih mesta ka istom cilju. Glavni cilj je održati pritisak. Mreže ovog tipa treba da budu u stanju da se brzo i lako udruže oko istog cilja (autonomni i inteligentni čvorovi), a da se onda raziđu i razdvoje, ali da ostanu u pripravnosti za novo grupisanje i novi pritisak. Ovo je samoorganizacija u realnom vremenu koja kao da se pojavljuje ni iz čega, ali je prepoznatljiva, jer se kreće manje-više ritmički.

Na sajtu Indianopedia društva Las Indias Electrónicas[7] razlikuje se rat, model militantne borbe i jato, specifičan oblik konflikta u novoj javno-privatnoj sferi: sa mnogo aktera i mnogo kanala koji se povezuju sa manje-više nenasilnim oblicima građanskog otpora. Za stručnjake i komercijalna tumačenja, ključni elementi jata su komunikacija i informacija. Putem mobilnih telefona i interneta stvaraju se mreže koje omogućavaju skoro trenutni kontakt, a ovaj proces neizmerno su olakšale društvene mreže, kao i blogovi. Informacija i komunikacija su ključne reči ovih „jata” koje imaju „dinamiku pijanke”.

Jato stavlja u opremu borca visoku povezanost, sposobnost za održavanje marljivih mikrokomunikacija i veštu akciju u realnom vremenu.

6.3. Samoorganizacija u realnom vremenu

Ali za druge mislioe, više filozofski ili politički nastrojene, informacija i komunikacija same po sebi nikada ne bi mogle da izazovu efekat jata bez druga dva elementa: zajednički horizont i razmena događaja i afiniteta.

Zajednički horizont (estetski, etički, filozofski i/ili metafizički) pruža onima koji čine jato mogućnost da se međusobno prepoznaju kao pojedinci istih shvatanja, iako su rasejani i pokretni. To je nešto kao „stvaranje sveta”. Razmena događaja i afiniteta definiše smernice koje, iako se često menjaju, kada se prouče, pomažu da se odredi pravac delovanja u zajedničkom svetu.

Tako razlika između samoorganizacije u realnom vremenu i delovanja velikih firmi koje se bore za stvaranje sveta jedinstvene estetske percepcije i afiniteta, podeljenog na proizvođače i kupce, sa ciljem da ih okupi u zajednice koje funkcionišu u skladu sa uslovnima savremenog života, ne dolazi toliko iz mogućnosti informisanja i komunikacije, već iz potencijala koji samoorganizacija ima za stvaranje boljih svetova, bo-

gatijih i širih, svetova sve snažnijeg impulsa koji idu u susret prijateljima koje čak i ne poznaju, koji traže nova poznanstva, ali ne iz koristi, koji traže različitost da bi ojačali spone koje možda i ne postoje.

Ako je tako, važno je zapitati se od čega je sastavljen zajednički horizont. Od estetika? Od ideja? Od priča? Od slika? Od reči? Od anonimnosti? Trebalo bi razmisliti o tome koji horizonti se rađaju iz borbi i da li oni mogu biti zaista zajednički. Sloboda, ta zgodna opšta reč, pokazuje se kao dobar zajednički horizont.

Ali postoji i drugo pitanje: kako se pravi zajednički horizont? Prema mišljenju nekih pisaca (filozofa i političara), zajednički horizont se gradi strpljivo i promišljeno. Možda, ali je li prelaz od 4chan-a do Anonimusa strpljiv i promišljen? I ko ga gradi? I koja avangarda će posetiti 4chan (ne kao njuškala, već kao Anonimusi) samo da proveru da li se to dešava? Neko je gradio jato na protestu jedanaestog maja (11-M) strpljivo i promišljeno? Svi smo to radili? Kako?

Posle toliko vremena, jasno je da su akcije Anonimusa političke: prijave, protesti, napadi na one koji ne priznaju slobode. Do tog zaključka nije teško doći. Ali zamislimo 4chan pre nekoliko godina. Ko bi iz političkih razloga dao i dinara za taj forum? Da bi neko zaista cenio (i to ne samo iz koristi kao prostore za propagandu) ove dinamike pijanke, ova jata, tako dvosmislena, mračna, koja donekle možemo i osuđivati, mora biti spreman da učestvuje u zajedničkom horizontu punom nepoželjnih prijatelja ili, kako neki kažu, monstroznih alijansi.

Anonimus stavlja u opremu borca dinamiku pijanke a iz nje vadi dinamiku skupštinskog okupljanja.

6.4. Monstrozne alijanse

Na blogu rpp.com.pe[8], neko ko kaže da je bio u Anonimusu, piše: „Anonimusi kažu da se bore za slobodu na internetu, nešto što podržavam sa ovog bloga. Međutim, ja znam da iza te borbe stoji želja da se uradi nešto 'epsko', želja inspirisana filmovima Borilački klub ili V kao vendeta. Čini mi se da Anonimusi sebe vide kao antiheroje sajbersveta.

Iako mnogi misle da su stripovi, televizijske serije, naučnofantastični filmovi stvari za decu, treba da pogledaju malo bolje, jer iza svega toga stoji snažna politička poruka koja podstiče na borbu za slobodu. Anonimusi nisu dobri momci iz filmova. Kao u Borilačkom klubu, oni žive normalan život, ali imaju i drugi, tajni život, u kojem se bore iz senke. To su ljudi koji se u suštini zabavljaju više od svih, uprkos tome što se bore za neki ideal. To je kao film u kome su hteli da žive, sada su jači nego pre nekoliko godina i, najvažnije od svega, mi u medijima obračamo pažnju na njihove akcije”. Industrija zabave pravi stripove, televizijske serije i komercijalne filmove čije se slike/ideje koriste u borbi protiv te iste industrije! Anonimusi maskirani maskama iz filma V za vendetu uzvikuju parole protiv filmske industrije na dodeli nagrada Goja![9]

Leonidas Martin Saura se zainteresovao za subverzivni potencijal ideja/slika koje proizvodi sama industrija zabave[10]: filmovi, klipovi, reklame...

Martin Saura kaže da ima događaja koji su na pola puta između ideje/slike i aktivizma: oni uzimaju jednu ideju/sliku, tumače je i deluju u tom pravcu. Drugim rečima, oživljavaju tu sliku/ideju. U tim događajima, gledalac nije pasivna figura, već uzima sliku kao nezavršenu i aktivno je tumači. Ne samo što je tumači, već je pogrešno tumači i iz te „greške” se rađa mogućnost za subverziju. Ta subverzija se dešava zbog bliske i potpune identifikacije sa nekim klišeima koje nudi tržište, na primer, u filmovima Matriks, Avatar ili V za vendetu. Zbog ove identifikacije kroz kliše živi ideja, putem klišea se stvaraju načini prepoznavanja i empatije te razmena afiniteta. Korišćenje tih ideja ublažava ozbiljnost politike i prevazilazi klasične referencijalne crte (levo i desno), čineći ih otvorenijim, a šireći zajednički horizont. Anonimus ima nepoželjne prijatelje (industriju i njene epsko-muževne slike), što ih

pretvara u nepoželjne (za druge): previše nejasnoća, previše nečistoća, previše testosterona. Previše mešanja huliganstva, građanske neposlušnosti, „vandalizma” i „nereda” na internetu.

Vikiliks i Anonimus stavlja u opremu borca mogućnost monstroznih alijansi (sa hromom i iskrivljenom štampom i filmskom industrijom...), što ne znači da nude prijateljstvo nepoželjnima. Svaka monstrozna alijansa mora da dopusti „pogrešno tumačenje”.

6.5. Političko se povećava

Od 23. decembra 2010. godine u Španiji su omiljena tehnika hakera – DDoS (Distributed Denial of Service, distribuirano uskraćivanje usluga) napadi, krivično kažnjivi. Ali Anonimus nije Španija. I još, osim toga da li je nešto legalno, postoji i pitanje da li je to legitimno. Protivnici ove vrste napada imaju etičke i taktičke argumente: ne sme se braniti sloboda govora napadima na tuđu slobodu govora; napadi mogu da izazovu veću i goru kontrolu na internetu i povrh svega, da kriminalizuju ono za šta se bore. Trebalo bi utvrditi da li su ovi napadi građanska neposlušnost, ili „vandalizam”, ili „nered” na internetu.

Na ovu temu je 17. decembra Ričard Stalman objavio članak[11] u Gardijanu o legitimnosti ovih akcija: „Protesti Anonimusa u cilju podrške Vikiliks na internetu su ekvivalent masovnih demonstracija. Radi se o ljudima koji traže način da protestuju u digitalnom prostoru. Internet ne može da funkcioniše ako postoje grupe koje blokiraju mreže, kao što jedan grad ne može da funkcioniše ako su ulice pune demonstracija. Ali, pre nego što ishitreno zatražimo kaznu za one koje učestvuju u ovim protestima na internetu, treba da se zapitamo zbog čega oni protestuju: na internetu korisnici nemaju prava. Kao što je pokazao slučaj Vikiliksa, sve što radimo na internetu, radimo dok nam to dozvoljavaju.

U fizičkom svetu imamo pravo da štampamo i prodajemo knjige. Ako neko hoće da nas u tome spreči, mora da ide na sud. Međutim, da bismo pokrenuli vebstranicu moramo da platimo nekoj firmi domen, internet provajdera, a često i hosting; sve ove kompanije mogu pod pritiskom da zatvore našu stranicu. U Sjedinjenim Državama nijedan zakon ne reguliše ovu nezgodnu situaciju. Čak postoje ugovori koji nas obavezuju da dopustimo kompanijama da funkcionišu na taj način, kao nešto normalno. To je kao kad bismo svi živeli u iznajmljenim sobama iz kojih gazda može u svakom trenutku da nas izbacit”.

Stalmanova argumentacija je vrlo jasna: na internetu nema prava ni garancija. U nesigurnom smo položaju. To je dokazao slučaj Vikiliksa. Ako jednog dana PayPal odluči da ukine račun Vikipediji, na primer, nećemo više moći da doniramo novac za taj projekat: sve što radimo na internetu, radimo dok nam to dozvoljavaju.

Osim toga, Stalman pokazuje „da je pogrešno nazivati (ove akcije) hakingom (igra inteligencije i sposobnosti) ili kringom (probijanje sigurnosnih sistema). Ovi protesti se isto tako ne mogu nazvati DDoS napadima”. Da bi smo razumeli zašto Stalman negira da su ovo DDoS napadi, morali bismo da zađemo u veoma važne tehničke detalje o tome šta tačno rade Anonimusi iz svojih konektovanih sopstvenih soba. Ričard Stalman stavlja u opremu borca precizna tehnička znanja i detalje, neophodne stvari za razumevanje jedne akcije (i argumentaciju za ili protiv) kada je ona vođena pomoću tehnologije.

6.6. Plan B

Slučaj Vikiliks je priča o tome kako stvari funkcionišu na internetu u vanrednim situacijama: kako na internetu nema prava, sve što radimo radimo dok nam to dozvoljavaju (Amazon, EveryDNS, Visa, MasterCard, PayPal... i odgovarajuće vlade).

Odlučna podrška dela industrije ideji Veb 2.0 (Google, Youtube, Facebook, Twitter, itd.) stvorila je iluziju da nam je ono što radimo sada zajamčeno. Pogrešno. Ima mnogo vanrednih situacija i biće ih

još. U vanrednim situacijama dobijaju na značaju slobodni softver i politički orijentisane firme (ili politički neutralne, što je isto neka orijentacija).

Ponavlja se rasprava o tome da li treba napraviti alternativni Veb 2.0. Ja mislim da ne, budući da Veb 2.0 ne funkcionira u nekom izuzetnom svetu, već normalnom (sa mešavinom različitih političkih, industrijskih i društvenih interesa, često u monstruoznim alijansama između različitih oblika vlasti i pojedinaca koji žele ličnu slobodu i bogaćenje). U normalnom svetu nema potrebe za alternativnim Fejsbukom, već Fejsbukom takvim kakav jeste: nezavršen mehanizam, nečist, sa anonimnošću u prvom licu itd. Ali, to što imamo lift u zgradi i često ga koristimo ne znači da smo eliminisali stepenice, one su tu za vanredne situacije (nestanak struje, požar...). Slobodan softver i firme političke orijentacije su stepenice: nešto što treba čuvati i održavati u dobrom stanju za svaki slučaj, uz svest da se „za svaki slučaj” desi, pre ili kasnije.

Egipatska vlada nije ugasila Vikiliks: ugasila je čitav internet! I šta su uradili hakeri aktivisti? Ako u Egiptu postoji telefon, pomislili su, i dalje imamo mogućnost da se konektujemo preko telefona (kao što se to radi preko ADSL-a). Moderni telefoni mogu da funkcioniraju kao modemi, ali treba znati kako. Kako možemo da naučimo Egipćane da se konektuju na internet preko mobilnih telefona, ako nemamo internet da im to objasnimo? Faksom. Slaćemo masovno, neselektivno poruke na sve faks-mašine u Egiptu. Kao bacanje pamfleta, samo faksom. A gde će da se konektuju preko mobilnih telefona? Na servere koje smo specijalno u tu svrhu pokrenuli i koje smo pretvorili u internet provajdere. Ali, konekcije preko telefona imaju slab signal. Da li će imati smisla? Da, ako se, umesto grafičkog interfejsa, vratimo na interfejs komandne linije. Faksom ćemo poslati i uputstva za chat na interfejsu komandne linije. Oni će nam reći na chat-u šta se dešava. Mi ćemo to da objavimo i objasnimo im šta se napolju događa. I neće biti represije? Te konekcije biće anonimne, tako da se može biti bilo ko. Hakeri aktivisti iz celog sveta uspeali su u realnom vremenu da osposobe taj vanredni sistem jer su imali četiri stvari: znanje, resurse, samoorganizaciju u realnom vremenu i zajednički horizont.

Hakeri aktivisti stavljaju u opremu borca slobodan softver, znanje za njegovo korišćenje, resurse za njegovo osposobljavanje, sve tehnologije koje postoje i potojače, ma kako zastarelo da deluju, kreativnost u realnom vremenu za menjanje svega i zajednički horizont koji uključuje sve (u ovom slučaju sve Egipćane), iako su neki od tih „svih” nepoželjni. Ali znanja i resursi ne padaju sa neba. Plaćaju se vremenom, novcem i voljom. Mnogi hakeri aktivisti su, kao rešenje za svoju prekaru situaciju, otvorili politički orijentisane „firme”. Na primer guifi.net, lorea.org i oiga.me.

6.7. Politički orijentisane firme

Guifi.net je javna telekomunikaciona mreža sastavljena iz delića mreža koje pripadaju njenim korisnicima. To je javna infrastruktura u privatnom vlasništvu i zajednički vođena, koja je postala telekomunikacioni operater. Guifi.net je plan B za privatni internet ukoliko dođe do nestanka interneta. Možda se u Španiji to nikada neće desiti, ali to ne čini guifi.net manje vrednom. Ona je primer jednog ekonomskog modela u kome je vlasništvo podeljeno, modela telekomunikacione infrastrukture koja akumulira veliku količinu tehničkih, organizacionih, zakonskih i operativnih znanja koja se mogu preneti na mesta na kojima je nestanak više verovatan. Ako živiš u potkrovlju, iako ne razumeš najbolje zašto, razmisli o tome da se povežeš sa guifi.net i da finansiraš i imaš svoju antenu.

Lorea.org se definiše kao nađubrena leja društvenih mreža na polju ujedinjenih jedinica eksperimentisanja. Njen cilj je da stvori distribuiranu, sigurnu

čvornatu organizaciju koja se ujedinjuje u savez. To je jedan militantni projekat, neprofitabilni, koji proizvodi nešto slično Fejsbuku, ali sa bezbednom komunikacijom (šifrovanje da bi se izbeglo prisluškivanje) raspoređenom u povezane semenke (svaka grupa upravlja svojom semenkom na svom sopstvenom serveru, ali sve semenke se konektuju na veću mrežu). Lorea.org već radi, mada se i dalje razvija (ne tako brzo kao što bi želeli, zbog nedostatka resursa). Kako je to slobodan i deljeni softver, on je sam po sebi kao Fejsbuk u obliku mreže. Lorea.org kao softver i guifi.net kao hardver obezbedili bi veoma zgodan plan B za slučaj nestanka interneta. Ako si deo nekog kolektiva, razmisli o tome da naučiš da koristiš Lorea.org kao način interno-eksterne komunikacije i da joj ponudiš finansijsku podršku.

Oiga.me je platforma za direktnu komunikaciju između građana i njihovih predstavnika. Sada, kada neko hoće da organizuje neku kampanju, on traži potpise i podršku preko zatvorenih formulara, „skuplja” potpise (snagu, poverenje) i sa tim što je skupio izlazi pred svog protivnika. Oiga.me hoće da promeni ovaj obrazac: neko predloži kampanju, ali mu sistem ne dozvoljava da „sakupi” podršku, ni da ima kontrolu nad diskusijom, jer će svaka osoba poslati svoj protest direktno protivnicima i napisati ga i formulirati svojim rečima i argumentima, tj. svaka osoba će sama oblikovati kampanju. Društvo aLabs putem oiga.me želi da iskoristi kolektivno iskustvo hakerskog aktivizma i ponudi ga građanima kao način za direktno učestvovanje. Trenutno je tehničko-društveni model u fazi oblikovanja. Videćemo da li će oni koji organizuju kampanje prihvatiti da učestvuju i finansiraju ovaj nedovršen model koji im nudi da se odreknu dela kontrole. Do koje mere oiga.me treba da bude nedovršen mehanizam? Kako nova javno-privatna sfera, koja se oblikuje kroz konekciju iz sopstvenih soba, menja model „političke kampanje”? Ako si član nekog društva, razmisli o tome da razgovaraš sa aLabs o društvenom modelu za oiga.me.

Kakva je politička vrednost ovih „firmi”? Kako to da dobijaju dovoljnu podršku i sredstva putem svojih prirodnih mreža? Koliko treba da bude (političko) uništavanje koje bi izazvalo njenu smrt od krize, manjka prometnosti, teškoća bilo koje vrste? „Firme” političke orijentacije nisu samo plan B, one proizvode, čuvaju i šire tehnička znanja; imaju i nude fizičke i simboličke resurse; omogućavaju ukidanje podele između posla i borbe; gomilaju organizaciona i operativna znanja. To je prirodna evolucija haking aktivizma koji sazreva. Jedan sjajan plan A.

Vikiliks stavlja u opremu borca firme političke orijentacije ili političke neutralnosti. U njegovom slučaju to su švajcarska Piratska partija i OVH Francuska. Ali pazite, ove firme ne moraju uvek biti militantne „firme”. Već smo pričali o monstruoznim alijansama između različitih oblika vlasti i različitih boraca za emancipaciju. Svaki događaj, svaki izuzetak, otkriće ko je ko.

6.8. Haktivisti (Hacktivistas)

Haktivisti su tehnopolitička platforma za aktivizam na internetu, koja se rodila iz hakerskih laboratorija na sastanku hakera 2008. godine, baš kada je Vikiliks objavio jedan dokument zakona ACTA.

ACTA je odgovor svetske industrije na „porast falsifikovanih dobara i dela zaštićenih kopirajtom koja su piratizovana na globalnom tržištu”. Iako ACTA ima širok opseg i obuhvata sve od falsifikovanja fizičkih dobara do distribucije tehnologija i informacija na internetu, Haktivisti (i mnogi drugi) na internetu vide ko zna koji po redu napad svetskih korporacija zabavne industrije na slobodu pristupa nematerijalnim dobrima. I organizuju se da ga spreče.

Od 2007. godine pregovori o zakonu ACTA vode se u tajnosti, ali se zna da je cilj industrije da se zakon odobri u njihovu korist. Može li grupa momaka da pomisli da će uspeti u suprotstavljanju velikoj svetskoj indus-

triji? Pa, momci nisu glupi. Analiziraju situaciju, tumače plan protivnika, predviđaju tok događaja, ocenjuju sopstvene snage i osmišljavaju strategiju i taktiku.

Šta će uraditi? Ograničavaju opseg svoje borbe: Španija. Vlada Sapatara je slaba i duguje usluge svetu kulture, koji ju je postavio tu gde je (setimo se protesta „Ne ratu”). Španija će početi svoje predsedavanje Evropskom unijom u prvoj polovini 2010. Kao prvo, treba sprečiti da Španija usvoji zakone u korist industrije zabave pre 1. januara 2010. A kao drugo, treba sprečiti da Španija iskoristi svoju poziciju da ih prenese u Evropu.

Tih dana, iako nekolikovešti objavljenih u novinama nije dovoljno da se predstavi ova priča, Haktivisti znaju da su dobro postavili svoju strategiju. U decembru 2010, kada je procurilo preko dvesta pedeset depeša na Vikiliks, dokazi da je vlada SAD vršila pritisak na špansku Vladu da odobri zakone u korist industrije (jedan od njih je bio i zakon Sinde; zakon Sinde je odredba u okviru Španskog zakona održivog gospodarstva s kojim bi uređivali internet piratstvo, prim. urednice) postali su javni.

Ali, šta su mogli da urade protiv toga? Lokese i apardo, Haktivisti, govoreći o počecima, ispričali su mi: „Napravili smo mrežu za borbu protiv giganata. Osmislili smo trogodišnji plan. Plan nije bio da pobedimo; znali smo da ne možemo da pobedimo. Plan je bio da kada se usvoje svi ti zakoni, oni već budu bez ikakvog legitimiteta i spremni za masovnu građansku neposlušnost. I počeli smo da radimo kao da se to može postići. Danas možemo da kažemo da je plan uspeo: zakon Sinde je oboren nekoliko puta i kada je usvojen krajem 2010, nije imao više nikakav legitimitet sam za sebe. Ministar Molina morao je da se povuče, napadnut je paket Telekom sa strane Xmailer, Redtel sa strane patadón itd.”.

Naravno, zasluga ne pripada jedino Haktivistima. Ovo je borba društvenog pokreta koji prelazi iz leve u desnicu i obrnuto, i koji je sposoban za monstruozne alijanse. Lokese i apardo pričaju: „Morali smo da stupimo u vezu od jakog poverenja sa drugim strateškim mrežama koje će nam omogućiti da stignemo dalje nego što smo mi mogli. Dobri smo u komunikaciji, pokretanju i organizaciji snažnih i brzih akcija. Ali potrebni su nam sagovornici, pregovarači i druge vrste društvenih aktera koji mogu da reše druge stvari. Mi nismo ljudi koji idu da pregovaraju sa ministrima. Za to postoje drugi akteri koji to mogu mnogo bolje da urade. I mi se uzdamo u njih”.

6.9. Kopileft haktivizam

Haktivisti se definišu kao kopileft haktivizam. To znači obznanići kôd: kod Haktivista sve je javno i svemu se može pristupiti. Platforma se koordinira uz pomoć mejling liste na koju bilo ko, bukvalno bilo ko, može da se upiše. S vremena na vreme se okupljaju na IRC-u. Na javnom vikiju[12] se beleže diskusije i dogovori. Uz pomoć tih onlajn resursa i rada interesnih grupa i pojedinih sastanaka, analizira se situacija i organizuju kampanje i akcije.

Njihovo delovanje je neprestano. Kao primer, pomenućemo lažnu verziju kampanje „Ako si legalan, onda si legalan” i Xmailer protiv paketa Telekom. Jula 2008. BOE (Boletín Oficial del Estado, službeni glasnik Španije) objavio je konkurs za kampanju Ministarstva kulture protiv P2P mreža „Ako si legalan onda si legalan”, sa budžetom od 1.948.000 evra. Odgovor Haktivista bilo je gugl bombardovanje, metoda kojom se postiže da se neka internet stranica pojavljuje visoko u gugl pretrazi. Napravljena je replika, internet stranica slična pravoj, a u korist slobodne kulture. Haktivisti su postigli da se njihova stranica pojavljuje mnogo ispred stranice Ministarstva kulture, tako da, što je ono više promovisalo svoj slogan „Ako si legalan, onda si legalan”, više je poseta imala stranica protiv kampanje koja brani slobodnu kulturu. Skoro dva miliona evra iz budžeta bačenih u vodu! Popularnost i podrška koju su dobili „ilegalni” bila je toliko velika da je Ministarstvo kulture moralo da se preda i u medijima objasni zbog

čega toliko neprijateljstvo prema tim „ilegalnim“.

Dana 6. maja 2009. godine trebalo je da Evropski parlament glasa o paketu zakona poznatom kao paket Telekom, ali pritisak građana sprečio je još jednom usvajanje zakona koji bi od interneta napravio novu televiziju. Paket Telekom je skup evropskih uredbi za regulisanje usluga i mreža za elektronsku komunikaciju, to jest infrastruktura i programa neophodnih za prenos signala. Godine 2007. Evropska komisija je predstavila predlog za njihovu izmenu. Ono što je predstavljeno kao jednostavno i praktično ujednačavanje različitih normi i zakona svih zemalja o telekomunikacijama i internetu, u stvari je bila alijansa tri najveća svetska lobija: političkog lobija, lobija telekomunikacija i lobija autorskih prava, koji su oblikovali paket prema svojim interesima sa ciljem da unište neutralnost na internetu onakvu kakvu poznajemo.

Neutralna mreža je ona koja dopušta komunikaciju od tačke do tačke bez obzira na sadržaj. Neutralnost na internetu nije stvar samo privatnosti ili cenzure (mada na kraju to postaje), već i usluge. Moj operater mora da mi obezbedi isti protok podataka bez obzira na to koliko ga ja koristim, čak i ako ga koristim za skidanje podataka preko P2P. Tehnički detalji oko neutralnosti na internetu nisu predmet ovog članka (iako ponavljam da su tehnički detalji veoma važni), ali, da uprostim, ako internet prestane da bude neutralna mreža, to znači da se pretvorio u televiziju.

Evropski internauti su se udružili protiv paketa Telekom sa jasnom strategijom: sprečiti evoposlanike, svako svoje predstavnike i svi zajedničke, da ga odobre, i skrenuti im pažnju na političku cenu tog paketa. Haktivisti su napravili softver Xmailer, mali informatički kôd pogodan za svaku mrežu, koji omogućava da se popuni formular i pošalje mejl čitavoj listi adresa, u ovom slučaju listi evroposlanika. Internauti su dozvolili svima, bez izuzetka, da instaliraju Xmailer kod sebe (nešto što mogu da dodam na svoje, a da moje ostane moje), i tako je ovaj način komunikacije od osobe do osobe (od građana do evroposlanika) omogućio slanje više od 200.000 mejlova evropskih građana/ki svojim visokim predstavnicima u prvih četrdeset osam sati kampanje. Lokese i apardo se sećaju: „Evropski parlamentarci govorili su nam da prestanemo sa slanjem mejlova“, a mi smo odgovarali: „Mi vam ne šaljem nikakve mejlove. Nismo mi, već narod“.

Haktivisti su poslali snažnu poruku lobistima iz kulturne industrije, upravljačima i španskim i evropskim političarima koji zajedno učestvuju u pljačkanju javnog dobra: „P2P je došao i ne mrda odavde. Vi čak ni ne razumete problem kojem se suprotstavljate. Stvarnost će vas spustiti na zemlju, a na internetu će zauvek biti sačuvana vaša sramota“. Tako rade Haktivisti. Sve njihove akcije su unapred najavljene. Komuniciraju čak i sa policijom. Sve što rade je legalno, javno i otvoreno. Vade iz opreme borca strah od praćenja i strah od objavljivanja koda, i stavljaju transparentnost kao strategiju za rast i legalni haking kao strategiju protiv represije i reakcionih posledica.

6.10. Slobodni protok

Haktivisti su mnogo drugačiji od Anonimusa. Haktivisti deluju po danu, otkrivenog lica, ne prelaze granicu legalnog... Anonimusi deluju noću, nose maske, prelaze granicu legalnog... Ali opet je udaljenost između jednih i drugih veoma mala, pa tako neki Haktivisti mogu da ulaze i izlaze iz Anonimusa i obrnuto. Bez ljutnje, bez problema. Kao što kaže Juan Urutia, jedna od osobina slobodnih mreža je dobro prihvatanje disidencije: „Da bi bio svoj gazda, moraš da se odrekneš smernica svoje grupe, mreže kojoj pripadaš, i prepustiš se nekoj drugoj mreži, pod uslovom da u ontologiji o kojoj pričam nema praznina u mreži. TIC (mreže od poverenja) omogućavaju generisanje široko distribuirane mreže koja samostalno funkcioniše ali za razliku od drugih kolektivnih sistema, omogućava disidenciju bez stroge kazne sa interesantnim posledicama. U ovim mrežama, koje su vrlo guste, različiti društveni

identiteti socijalnih grupa su veoma blizu jedni do drugih i lako se prelazi iz jedne u drugu, i lako se međusobno razumeju“.[13]

Drugim rečima, biti sitni disident u mreži (disident na sniženju, kaže autor) veoma se malo plaća, budući da grupa dosta dobro prihvata reintegraciju nakon disidencije. Haktivisti i Anonimusi su međusobno različiti ali postoji cirkulacija između njih. Možemo da uporedimo tu cirkulaciju (u kojoj je moguća razmena događaja i afiniteta) sa organizacijom blokova na protestima: ne možeš biti u plavom i roze bloku u isto vreme. Moraš da izabereš. Ali možeš da budeš u isto vreme u Haktivistima i Anonimusima, najpre zato što je virtualni svet svet izobilja, a zatim i zato što se menja način „prisustvovanja“, smanjujući značaj „pripadanja“ a povećavajući značaj „pojavlivanja“ (ja sam Anonimus ako se pojavljujem na forumu, na IRC-u, na operacijama... ne ako pripadam nekoj grupi koja zapravo i ne postoji).

Haktivisti i Anonimusi stavljaju u opremu borca situaciju disidenciju. Pitanje koje se nameće kada Huan Urutia priča o „razumevanju drugih“, o efektu disidencije koja se malo plaća, jeste da li je to slabost ili snaga? (Ko su oni drugi? Do koje mere ih moramo razumeti?) Možemo navesti mnogo slučajeva saradnje između strana koje se ne slažu (čak i između protivnika). Iako često, uvek me iznenađuje kada vidim na blogu Enrikea Dansa link Haktivista ili čujem prijatelje Haktiviste kako bez problema prihvataju da ima ljudi koji su bolji od njih za pregovore u ministarstvima. Zajednički horizonti uključuju nepoželjne prijatelje, koji međusobno dele događaje i afinitete.

6.11. Zakon Sinde

Krajem 2009. godine obznanjene su namere Vlade za usvajanje zakona Sinde. U ovom članku nema prostora za analizu tog zakona. Ukratko, njegov cilj je da jedna komisija pri Ministarstvu kulture ima moć da zatvara internet stranice koje po njenom kriterijumu narušavaju prava na intelektualnu svojinu, s prethodnim odobrenjem Vrhovnog suda, Veće Upravnog spora. Sudija odobrava ali ne vrši istragu.

Ovaj zakon, koji bi, kad bi se rigorozno primenjivao, značio zatvaranje Google-a, jeste zbrka u kojoj su pomešani linkovi, domeni, P2P, stranice za skidanje itd. Dokaz da oni koji donose zakone nemaju pojma o problemu na koji se neki zakon odnosi i zato su kritikovani sa svih strana na internetu:

> **Radi** se o zakonu bez jasnih ograničenja, samim tim što, da bi se primenio, ne moraju da postoje dokazi da je bilo prekršaja, nego je dovoljno da postoji mogućnost da do prekršaja dođe (postojanje linkova ka sadržaju sa kopirajtom, na primer).

> **Izvrće** značaj dokaza tako što, ako ti zatvore stranicu, treba da ti pokreneš proces u Vrhovnom sudu (tamo gde se sudi teroristima i somalijskim piratima) da bi ti ponovo otvorili stranicu. Ne moraju oni koji su te tužili da dokažu prekršaj, već ti moraš da dokažeš da si nevin.

> **Preširok** je: ako se „ilegalni“ sadržaji ne nalaze u Španiji (jer je hosting kompanija u drugoj državi ili osoba živi u inostranstvu), onda se može blokirati čitav domen ili čak čitava IP adresa!

Zakon Sinde se smatra napadom na garancije za ostvarivanje slobode govora, jer dozvoljava zatvaranje stranica administrativnim putem (to jest, putem jednog vladinog organa), a ne sudskim putem, što povređuje pravo na jednu fundamentalnu slobodu u Španiji, slobodu govora, i predstavlja šamar sudskom sistemu u Španiji. Ali kao da ovo nije dovoljno, decembra 2010. godine na Vikiliks su procurile informacije koje otkrivaju da je zakon pokrenut i napisan pod snažnim pritiskom američkih lobista, predstavnika audio-vizuelne industrije (to jest, studija i diskografskih kuća). Depeše su otkrile da je od 2004. godine Vlada SAD vršila pritisak na špansku Vladu i tražila da, u skladu sa njihovim represivnim idejama, Ministarstvo kulture ukine slobodu na internetu u korist industrije zabave.

Kao toliki drugi, i Haktivisti su se neprestano borili protiv ovog zakona. Sada, kada je on usvojen, usredsredili su se na širenje saveta za njegovo zaobilazanje, nešto izvodljivo, budući da je arhitektura interneta osmišljena za izbegavanje kontrole: „Svejedno je šta pokušavaju, uvek će postojati način da se to izbegne“.

6.12. Samoupravljanje po slojevima

Politici emancipacije se mnogo sviđa samoupravljanje. Ipak, potpuno samoupravljanje, kao ideal kome se teži, u ovako složenom svetu u kakvom živimo danas, troši sve vreme i energiju, i propada.

Ako samoupravljanje počne da zauzima sve naše vreme za emancipaciju (nešto uobičajeno kada se teži političkoj koherentnosti), ne vredi nam mnogo, jer postaje neizvodljivo. Dakle, da li je neophodno prilagoditi samoupravljanje svakoj situaciji i napustiti ideal udruživanja? Da li bi bilo u skladu sa idejom emancipacije kombinovati nivoe samoupravljanja i nivoe predstavničkog sistema? Koju vrstu horizontalnosti imaju Vikiliks, Anonimus, Haktivisti? Koju vrstu predstavničkog sistema? U sva tri slučaja postoji jezgro (core) koje preuzima inicijativu, osmišljava nezavršene mehanizme i otkriva ih odričući se potpuno ili delimično kontrole. Bilo kako bilo, oni ne pozivaju agresivno na pridruživanje i uključivanje. Stvaraju mehanizme pomoću kojih se priključivanje dešava samo od sebe, što nije isto. Možda će uloga avangarde u novoj javno-privatnoj sferi biti osmišljavanje i implementacija mehanizma pomoću kojih će drugi moći da odlučuju i deluju. Način upravljanja koji se odriče kontrole podržava nepoželjna prijateljstva i vjeruje u inteligenciju i autonomiju svih čvorova.

7. Večera straha

Početak januara 2011. godine, Amador Fernandes-Savater, kopileft izdavač povezan sa slobodnom kulturom, dobija poziv ministra kulture da 7. januara prisustvuje večeri na kojoj će biti važne ličnosti iz španske industrije kulture, i da razgovara o zakonu Sinde, skidanju P2P i o svemu tome.

Nakon te večere, 12. januara, objavljuje na jednom od mnogih blogova ono što je doživeo, čuo i mislio tih dana. Njegov zaključak je jednostavan: „Strah je taj koji vlada, strah hrani krizu dominantnih modela, strah od ljudi (pogotovo mladih ljudi), strah od pobune javnosti, od interneta i od neizvesne budućnosti“.

Post koji se zove Večera straha (moj sastanak sa ministarkom Gonzales Sinde)[14], dostiže nezapamćenu popularnost: stotine komentara, linkova, prosleđivanja, tvitova, retvitova, prenosa, šerova... i mnogo diskusija i razgovora putem mejla i lično, i čak jedan odgovor Ministarke u El Paisu nekoliko dana kasnije.

Šta je to u tom postu što je probilo ideološke granice, dotaklo nešto zajedničko u ljudima svih političkih i apolitičkih opredeljenja i različitih društvenih profila i izazvalo ogromno poverenje i veru u istinitost ličnog iskaza? Almador Fernandes-Savater, upitan o tome, izlaže nekoliko značajnih stvari: „Pre nego što sam napisao post, imao sam hiljadu strahova. Najviše zato što mislim da ima prijatelja koji bi mi tražili da napravim oružje protiv zakona Sinde, za rat kome su oni posvećeni telom i dušom (uzgred budi rečeno, to je jedan od retkih ratova u kome vidim ljude posvećene telom i dušom).

Ali, ja sam morao da napišem nešto čime bih bio lično zadovoljan i čiji teret bih mogao da podnesem. Ne zadovoljava me model-optužba, jer je to suprotno novom (kritičkom) senzibilitetu kojim se bavim zajedno sa drugima od 11. maja, i koji između ostalog znači: pričati kao bilo ko, još jedan neki, da bi se mogao obratiti bilo kome i pričati sa bilo kim; izbe-

gavati što je više moguće direktnu kritiku; govoriti u svoje ime, ne kriti se iza nekog 'mi' i ne stavljati se na superiorno mesto, već tražiti zajednički problem (čak, ako je moguće, sa protivnikom).

Napisao sam tekst držeći se ovih smernica i odatle potiče efekat dvosmislenosti. Kada sam pokazao prvu verziju nekim prijateljima, rekli su mi: 'Nije jasno gde si, s kim si, protiv koga si, uz koga si'. I ja sam tako mislio, ali za mene je bilo važno oceniti da li je ta dvosmislenost loša ili dobra. Tako da je ono što je tekstu donelo uspeh paradoksalno: dvosmislena pozicija, ali čvrsta i odlučna. Moji prijatelji, koji su bili više uključeni u rat, rekli su mi da tekstu fali konkretnosti. Fali mu oštine. Lebdi u vazduhu. Ne razotkriva nikoga. Zaboravlja da kaže šta su radili ti ljudi na toj večeri. Ne diže glas. Ali ja mislim da je model-optužba opasno sličan propagandi. I pomislio sam: 'Verujmo u inteligenciju ljudi! Ne borimo se protiv propagande propagandom, jer je propaganda sama po sebi zaglupljujuća (koji god cilj imala)! Ne posmatrajmo javnost kao stado koje treba huškati! Ne potcenjujmo njegovu sposobnost da dešifruje i aktivno tumači tekst!'

Tako da je tekst napisan 'umerenim' tonom, ne zato što sam hteo da sačuvam svoju kožu, već zato što verujem da samo takav tekst može da zaista predstavi istinu. Ali, to nije lako uvideti. Ja sam prvi sumnjao u to. Nisam bio siguran. Ali, imao sam 'predosećaj'. I eto, od tada se pitam šta je danas kritički diskurs. Danijel Blanšar sjajno objašnjava da je kritički diskurs onaj koji je 'u stanju da sakupi, sačuva i prenese bezbroj rasutih glasova', a to se dešava 'kada je ono što ga pokreće odjek pokreta koji se pojavljuje u realnom svetu; to jest, kada nastaje i oblikuje se analogno krizi u realnosti'. Kada sam objavio post, prijatelji (najpre razočarani) odmah su apsolutno oduševljeno primetili kako je tekst planuo u svim pravcima. Ono što je izgledalo kao 'manje' (kritičko) na kraju je bilo 'više'. Ono što je izgledalo kao manje bučno, na kraju je bilo efektnije. Trebalo bi da se ponovo zapitamo i smislimo novi način da prenesemo krizu iz realnosti". Ova procena pisca nije sasvim prihvaćena u njegovoj mreži poverenja. Fernandes Savater insistira na deljenju problema sa protivnikom, što bi u ovom slučaju bio strah: strah industrije od gubitka privilegija i strah svih (uključujući i autore) od ekonomske i socijalne nesigurnosti. Ali, drugi prijatelji misle da razlog što su se toliki ljudi prepoznali u tom postu nije toliko zajednički problem, već jasna podela na „njih” i „nas”, koja odgovara ideji bunkera: oni su u bunkeru uplašeni a jedan je napolju kao deo nečega u čemu smo „svi”.

U svakom slučaju, Večera straha vadi iz opreme borca model-optužbu koji jedino može da ubedi one koji su već ubeđeni, a stavlja istinitost kojom odiše neko ko govori u svoje ime (u prvom licu) i otvaranje jednog „mi” kome svako može da pripada.

8. Politička složenost

Večera straha nas dovodi do kraja puta kroz odabrana iskustva. Ona pokazuje kako internet nije samo medij za nove vrste skupina (Anonimusi, Haktivisti), niti je samo kanal za komunikaciju (Vikiliks). Internet je sam po sebi organizacija, unitaristička (kao stare sindikalne organizacije) i, možda, politička?

Složenost interneta nije samo tehnička stvar: njegova složenost je i politička. Sama mreža je, rekurzivno, u isto vreme kontekst i akcija, u isto vreme bojište i u isto vreme organizacija za menjanje tog konteksta u korist više sloboda (kao staro i novo ekonomsko pravo). Internet je promenio arhitekturu stvarnosti, a svaka arhitektura je jedna politika. Internetom se ne može upravljati, on je sastavljen od inteligentnih i autonomnih čvorova. Iz povezanosti između tih čvorova izvire nova javno-privatna sfera u kojoj se samo prisustvom (objavlivanjem posta, njegovim komentarisanjem, povezivanjem, prenošenjem, tvitovanjem, retvitovanjem, širenjem, deljenjem...) učestvuje u politici. Ali zašto politika? To je san „učestvovanja” koje

ima maksimalnu moć, samo što to „učestvovanje” ne može imati predstavnike, ni vladu. To znači da ne funkcioniše baš po pravilima starih kapitalističkih demokratija. Znači da oprema borca (alati, znanja i iskustva) menja i ulogu avangarde same.

Svako instrumentalizovanje interneta je unapred osuđeno na propast. Čvorovi nemaju milosti za one koji negiraju njihovu inteligenciju, za one koji ih pretvaraju u gledaoce nove televizije, pa makar ta televizija emitovala kanal pun radikalnih optužbi. Ako su se u davna vremena mogli pisati veoma dobri pamfleti bez veštine rukovanja mašinama za kopiranje, sada to nije više moguće, budući da su pamfleti i mašine za kopiranje rekurzivno ista stvar. Oprema militantnog borca treba da se ojača novim znanjima, tako političkim kao što su to bili časovi opismenjavanja, koje su anarhosindikalisti organizovali u radničkim krugovima. Tehnopolitika. Osim što se internet ne studira i ne uči. Internet se praktikuje, sa drugima, u mreži. I o njemu se razmišlja kroz praksu. Internet je mreža koja se pleće, raspliće i zapliće kao pletenica. Tržišta, industrija, vlade... provode dane misleći o internetu i radeći na njemu, kao i Vikiliks, Anonimusi, Haktivisti i bilo ko (na hiljadu različitih načina i sa različitim i čak suprotnim idejama o jednakosti i slobodi) raspliće ga i zapliće boreći se iz nove javno-privatne sfere za socijalizaciju nematerijalnih dobara i pristup novom bogatstvu.

Raditi i misliti. Kao što je nestanak struje u Egiptu pokazao da nijedna tehnologija nije za bacanje i, ma kako se činila zastarelom, može ponovo biti korisna ako se iznova poveže na nedovršeni mehanizam koji ima smisla u zajedničkom horizontu, kao što stara oprema borca ima alate, znanja i iskustva koje ne koristi, ali i ne baca, koji čekaju veće i bolje saveze koji ih ponovo čine korisnim. Drugim rečima, ne treba se prepustiti fascinaciji tehnološkim novinama, već postaviti (krucijalno) pitanje, za koju borbu ide i koja bi trebala biti uloga avangarde kada više ne važi (samo) logika starog kapitalističkog sveta.

Sa španskog na srpski prevela Miljana Stojanović

FUSNOTE

[1] Naravno, proizvodnja, očuvanje i distribucija nematerijalnih dobara troše energiju i druge materijalne resurse. Ipak, energetska i materijalna strana interneta nije trenutno predmet rasprave, možda zato što je nematerijalna strana, za sada, mnogo interesantnija.

[2] ZAFRA, R. Un cuarto propio conectado. Fórcola Ediciones, Madrid, 2010.

[3] DE UGARTE, D. El poder de las redes. El Cobre ediciones, Madrid, 2007.

[4] Le Monde Diplomatique, februar 2011.

[5] Anonimnost u prvom licu je koncept obrađen u časopisu Espai en Blanc, br. 5-6: „Snaga anonimnosti”, La fuerza del anonimato (<http://www.espaienblanc.net/Revista-de-Espai-en-Blanc-no-5-6-.html>). Videti još „Veb 2.0 i anonimnost u prvom licu”, «La Web 2.0 y el anonimato en primera persona» (<http://www.barcelonametropolis.cat/es/page.asp?id=23&ui=420>).

[6] Ono što se naziva krajem ideologija je kriza reči, kada svi koristimo iste termine za suprotne probleme. Danijel Blanšar, stari član grupe Socijalizam ili varvarizam, koristi izraz „kriza reči” kao ključ za razumevanje odnosa između kritičkog diskursa i realnosti. Godine 2009, Espai en Blanc je organizovala seminar o ovom problemu (<http://www.espaienblanc.net/Materiales-del-seminario-Crisis-de.html>)

[7] <http://lasindias.net/indianopedia>

[8] <http://blogs.rpp.com.pe/technovida/2010/12/09/%C2%B4fquienes-son-los-anonymous-mis-experiencias-en-4chan/>

[9] <http://www.unalinasobreelmar.net/2011/02/14/paisaje-sonoro-de-anonymous-en-losgoya/>

[10] http://www.unalinasobreelmar.net/2010/11/16/_nos-hacemos/

[11] <http://acuarelalibros.blogspot.com/2010/12/anonymous-protestas-contr-el-gran.html>

[12] <http://hacktivistas.net/>

[13] URRUTIA, J. «Lógicas, ontología y disidencia de y en la blogosfera», predgovor u knjizi DE UGARTE, D. El poder de las redes. El Cobre ediciones, Madrid, 2007.

[14] <http://acuarelalibros.blogspot.com/2011/01/la-cena-del-miedo-mi-reunion-con-la.html>

POLITICIZATIONS IN THE CYBERSPACE

Margarita Padilla

1. What is at stake in the cyberspace

It is not easy to understand the Internet, because the Internet is recursive. It is at the same time a product and its own means of production. It is as abstract as a code and as concrete as telecommunication infrastructure (global and of universal purpose). It is as artificial, with computers, cables and satellites, clearly identifiable as symbolic, since it allows the construction of new material and virtual realities that could not be produced otherwise. The Internet is a complex matter. It was complex in its origins and it remains that way. Its layers never stop supporting new developments. To mention but a few: the gateway between the Internet and the telephony in the physical layer; software as a service in the logical layer; social networks in the content layer. The complexity of the Internet is not just a mere technical issue. Its complexity is political, since its origin is a result of a monstrous alliance that destabilizes all sides involved.

As it is known, at the beginning of the 1960s the RAND Corporation, a think tank linked to the military-industrial complex and the U.S. Department of Homeland Security and Defense, brought up the problem of maintaining communication in a hypothetical nuclear war. As a solution to this unusual problem, a crazy concept emerged of a web that has no center, but rather nodes with two qualities: intelligence (to make good decisions) and autonomy (to carry them out).

Networks already existed in the 1960s (telegraphy, telephony, radio), but they were centralized and hierarchical. The industry was not interested in changing its concept of networks, as it was already functioning so well, so it took a while for the great idea of a network without a central authority to reach universities. Besides professors, departments and curriculums, universities also included students: a techno-elite that took part in the libertarian individualist counterculture (in a world with strong geopolitical blocs) and saw the opportunity to build a new free world from scratch: the cyberspace. The students accepted the offer of the RAND Corporation and delivered a bomb-proof internet network. But at night, they worked out of the script. They had the knowledge and the will, so they embedded nocturnal, countercultural additions for ordinary people, that corresponded to their ideas about the new world. What emerged was email, newsgroups etc. Hence, the Internet is a result of the great post-war science (the science of atomic bombs) and the libertarian individualist counterculture from the American universities in the 1960s and the 1970s, a monstrous alliance between the establishment and the anti-establishment, with the initial self-exclusion of industry.

This alliance produced and keeps on producing (unstable) changes in the architecture of the reality, changes that can generate other, even better changes. Recursion. In an astonishing way, industry will witness the proliferation of new and abundant immaterial goods, and, not having the appropriate mechanisms for their management and accumulation, it will split into those who want to make new television out of the Internet and those who want to make Web 2.0. The political power will have to struggle with a new (cyber) space, open and flexible, ungovernable by any central authority, whose internal laws it doesn't understand; it

will see the new private-public sphere emerging and will tremble. And the social movements will be perplexed by the abstraction of cyberspace and the ambiguity of hackers' aims, who fight in their own way: without nostalgia towards a political community; making the shared knowledge a guarantor of freedom; building the community based on individualism and horizontal equality based on meritocracy...

But this is not over yet. The Internet is recursive and impure. Its architecture is its politics. And it is incomplete. It is being constructed and reconstructed in real time in a swirl of waves, of high and low tides, where some are driven by the hegemony of the industries and political powers, and others by a struggle that can draw different (even contradictory) ideas of equality and freedom.

2. Enjoying immaterial goods

The digital revolution is bringing to the world a new set of resources: the immaterial goods. Applying the logics of the old capitalist world, this per se will trigger a fight for its control and exploitation, the same as when a new oil well or a new virus are discovered.

Nevertheless, this new set of immaterial goods, which are at the same time means of production and consumer products, is not governed by the laws of the old capitalist world: these goods do not wear out, they can be mine and yours at the same time, we can produce them in an equal cooperation, they multiply at zero cost and the more you use them the more they grow. No question about it, the digital revolution brought the possibility of a new abundance and there is no need to share it![1]

The emergence of a new abundance will trigger a fight for its control and exploitation. That is what is happening now, in and outside of the Internet. However, this fight does not work according to the logics of the old capitalist world. In the social contract agreed upon by the bourgeoisie and the working class of the West after the Second World War, the social rights were linked to the figure of the worker, and the democratic freedoms to the figure of the citizen. Completely insignificant for this pact the copyrights, stayed out of the negotiation, practically irrelevant as petite bourgeoisie rights.

After sixty years, the social contract collapses and, coinciding with this collapse, the new fights for the access to and the use of this new abundance move back and forth from cyberspace to the streets and vice versa, confronting, attacking and resisting the imposition of an artificial scarcity caused by the alliance between the States and entertainment and culture industry corporations, which try to legitimize it resorting to the cynical discourse about copyrights.

Talking with friends, I heard them say that fights on the Internet are smoke curtains to distract from what is really important: fight against precarious work and in defense of the public good. I disagree with this valuation. The fight for the use of immaterial goods is as important. I would even go a step further. Young people, who gave up on negotiations on workers' rights and who accept precocity as a new area to discover, seem to be saying: "We agree to temporary jobs; we agree to forget the retirement..., but in exchange for a free and connected life. Precariousness is ok, but so are freedom and connection!". This seems to be the border between the tolerable and the intolerable.

3. Freedom as (economic) right

The fight for the use of a new abundance (economy) and the fight against the censorship (politics) go hand in hand. Copyright and censorship are the same thing. The changes in the architecture of reality unite once again what the old capitalist world wanted to separate: economy (factory and trade union) and politics (parliament and party). Copyrights, as they are arranged

now, serve as an alibi for the corporations to grow rich and keep their power. Since copyrights are partly economic rights, the fight for free access to the new abundance is at the same time an economic fight (against artificial scarcity) and a political fight (for the recognition of freedom in the cyberspace). Since there are still no recognized rights in the cyberspace, the fight against censorship resorts to the old guarantees and sticks to the right to freedom of information and freedom of the press.

Of all the existing movements, the most important are certainly the right of free movement for all people (papers for everyone) and the free culture movement (the abolition of copyrights), and they are more related than it may appear at first.

4. New private-public sphere

The free culture movement is not only fighting openly for the right to access and use of the new collectively produced abundance, but it is also transforming the ways of fighting. The fighter's kit (tools, skills and experience) is changing, and so is the role of the avant-garde. However, the development of new communication technologies has not just created a new front to fight against accumulation and inequality. It is not that simple. It has also changed the "normality," the lifestyle of connected generations.

Not all the changes in the "normality" are good. They are often recursive unfinished processes, a mix of different political, economic and social interests, within monstrous alliances between different authorities and different movements for emancipation and personal development. This is how Remedios Zafra, a cyberfeminist, refers to the changes in the "normality" of online life: "The changes I am talking about concern the days we spend on the Internet. No towers are falling, there is no shouting in the bank, no oil wars or physical death. There isn't one epic image that symbolizes the change I am referring to. It is like a drop of water on a stone. It is like the influence of the symbolic aspect over the physical aspect. It is slow, but crucial."[2]

For this author, the changes in the "normality" lie in the new relation between the public and the private, in the structure of the new private-public sphere formed online: "Today, old and new models of spatial and political organization of our own times and places are in coexistence, where personal and critical involvement is more important than ever. Moreover, a decisive transformation occurs in the private and domestic sphere: the Web moves into my house [...] The Web links the private space in many ways to the outside world and the public sphere [...] and in that framework [...] the opportunities appear for collective and social action that was previously on "the other side of the threshold". The private space is literally merging with the public, thus increasing the political space is, [...] because this combination of the personal room, solitude, anonymity and public-private intersection ... has a subversive potential."

According to Zafra, as the computer entered into our houses, more precisely our bedrooms (private space par excellence), a network was formed of private connected spaces, which passes over the threshold and becomes public space. This is the power of the "personal connected room". What pre-Silicon Valley "garages" represented in the technological revolution is what personal connected rooms will stand for in the revolution of the public-private sphere. The private is literally merging with the public. Economy and politics are merging as well. The political space is increasing. The fighter's kit and the role of the avant-garde are changing. Personal and critical involvement is more important than ever.

The goal of this article is to wonder how all of this is expressed in a network that is ungovernable even by those who wrote its code, and which is ambiguous by nature. We are going to contemplate this through four experiences: WikiLeaks, Anonymous, Hacktivists and The dinner of fear.

5. WikiLeaks

On November 28, 2010, WikiLeaks releases a collection of 251.187 cables and correspondences between the U.S. Department of State and its embassies around the globe to the international press (The Guardian, The New York Times, Le Monde, El País and Der Spiegel). It is the biggest leak of secret documents in history, which affects a large number of countries, including Spain.

Coinciding with the leaking of the cables, WikiLeaks becomes victim of a Distributed Denial of Service attack (DDoS attack). A hacker known as the Jester claims on his Twitter page that he is responsible for the attack. To avoid it, on November 30, WikiLeaks shifts to Amazon's EC2 (Elastic Cloud Computing) servers.

On December 1, under the pressure of United States Senator Joe Lieberman, Amazon stops providing service to WikiLeaks, which practically means eliminating it from the Internet, or at least, trying to do so. EveryDNS, which provided DNS (Domain Name System) services to WikiLeaks, terminates them on December 2, which means erasing its name. In a few hours, WikiLeaks takes refuge on a French server, which the Pirate Party Switzerland hired from the company OVH and on December 3 becomes accessible again under the domain wikileaks.ch, its new name, also the property of the Pirate Party Switzerland.

On December 3, French Minister of Industry, Energy and the Digital economy, Éric Besson, calls on OVH to cease providing service to WikiLeaks. OVH asks the court to clarify whether WikiLeaks is legal or not, but the court says it is not in their jurisdiction. At the same day, a reform of the law Acta SHIELD (Securing Human Intelligence and Enforcing Lawful Dissemination) is carried out in the U.S, it is a modification of the law Acta Espionage, which bans publication of classified information about encrypted data or international intelligence communications. On December 4, PayPal cancels the account that WikiLeaks used to get donations, stating that "activities that defend, promote, facilitate or lead others to participate in illegal activities" are not permitted. Meanwhile, uncoordinated sympathizers created more than a thousand mirrors (copies on the Internet) of WikiLeaks in order to guarantee its existence.

On December 6, MasterCard stops servicing WikiLeaks. On the same day, Swiss bank PostFinance also blocs donations and payments to WikiLeaks. So does Visa on December 7. Meanwhile, the public is in disbelief: the cables published by WikiLeaks show that governments have many secrets, concealing a great deal from citizens. In reply, governments form alliances with economic giants and turn the web upside down without any court order. This is such a big attack on the freedom of expression that it makes the entire rule of law stagger. In this war, the freedom of information is at stake, hence the freedom of expression and democracy itself. The debate, if there is to be one, will try to establish whether freedom of expression is to be limited for the sake of security.

5.1. Post-political journalism

Although exact and reasonable, this analysis, is also very unusual. Investigative journalism and information leakage is as old as as the press. The same goes for corruption scandals. Besides, the cables do not reveal real secrets nor do they jeopardize safety. They only have tangible proofs to confirm what the public had already suspected. On the other hand, the success of WikiLeaks cannot be only the result of publishing concealed information; for example, we have already known how and why financial crisis started, and it still did not have the same effect. Therefore, what is so unique about WikiLeaks ?

Although WikiLeaks shares some characteristics

with newspapers, it is not exactly the same as an online newspaper. The “press,” as we know it today, appeared in close connection with certain forms of democracy. David de Ugarte talks about it in *The Power of Networks*: “It is hard to understand what changes news agencies brought to democracy. At first, the change it brought was that national and global news appeared in the local press at the time when literacy was increasing for productive reasons (the machines required workers to constantly improve their operational abilities), as well as owing to educational campaigns by trade unions and associative movements. However, by adding to the popular press (and not only to the “bourgeois” one, inaccessible to the majority, for its cost and language) national and international matters, until then reserved for chancelleries and the elite, the foreign and the national policy became a part of what average citizens, regardless of their social class, had an opinion about. The arguments in favor of the census suffrage became obsolete since every citizen could be informed and entitled to his own opinion.”[3]

One should just look at the pages of a newspaper (international, national, local, etc.), their editorial lines (left, right, center) and the contents (a mix of information, opinion and propaganda) in order to see that it is the exact replica of the distribution of power in the old capitalist world and its democracies. But WikiLeaks is transnational. It does not adjust well either to the left or to the right side.

It defies the U.S. as well as its enemies. It does not try to overthrow a government by publishing its secrets in order to place one that suits its political views. It publishes the information, but it does not analyze it. WikiLeaks is not just an old idea being recycled using the Internet as an amplifier. It is a new constellation that drives the old compasses mad.

In relation to WikiLeaks Felix Stadler explains in “Why the institutions struggle to preserve their secrets”[4] how the media structures change: “The deregulation of the media of communication and the connection of the news and communication media are responsible for the decline of the public space as well as of the democratic arena. Pressures, economic as well as political, forced the editorial offices to give priority to soft news, focusing on life style or focus on comments, at the expense of public issues. [...] At one point, blogs and citizen journalism appeared as a substitute for obsolete media structures. Although the announced change did not occur, the public sphere still underwent a slow transformation. Different participants are appearing and enriching the offer. Legal risks connected with spreading sensitive content are being subtlet: one does not reveal a dangerous information, but rather analyses what somebody else revealed. [...] Investigative journalism is being reorganized, thus discovering new strength, especially because it recently started using new funding sources. [...] In this diagram, different tasks typical for investigative journalism - protection of sources, search for documents, collecting, cutting and putting the information into perspective, clarification and spreading - are divided between various partners of different economic profiles (commercial company, non-profit organization, networks), who work together to bring the story to the public sphere.”

5.2. Counter Information in the XXI century

When I ask whether WikiLeaks belongs to the area of counter information, txarlie, a hacktivist, offers the following analysis: “At the end of the 90s, public communication was controlled by the media that was half the size of today’s media. It was a closed and inaccessible journalism that was silent about the discourse and the practices of any kind of antiglobalization. It was in this culture medium that Nodo50 and afterwards Indymedia (The Independent Media Center) were born, trying to compensate for this defi-

cit through activism and technology: ‘Don’t hate the media, be the media.’

In 2003, the blogger revolution brakes out, especially owing to Blogspot. Anyone on the Internet could (at that moment it seemed more like had to) have a blog. What followed was the crisis of journalism and information saturation. Indymedia and similar networks survived by favor of old users, the same as papers. At that time, it was no longer a problem to raise your voice, but to make a strong media impact.

Somewhere around the year 2006 more than half of the blogs were closed. It makes sense: blogs are tools for writers, not the necessity of the audience. If you have nothing to say, what is the purpose of having a blog? The concept of citizen journalism emerges: do not wait for a newspaper, say it yourself. Portals as meneame.net appear; they try to filter all the content from citizen journalism. That year WikiLeaks is born, because they know that there are secrets that cannot be put on a blog. They need a space not as closed as cryptome.org (older network for revealing secrets), where leaked materials can be analyzed and commented by ‘citizen journalists.’

Let us move on to 2008. The media realizes they can fill the news using meneame.net as a source. They even become more open to campaigns of social movements, although the text is poor and commonplace. However, an internaut is somewhere else. He already has a Facebook account and he is experimenting with Twitter. The information moves from mouth to mouth, from wall to wall, from tweet to tweet. To be informed, you just have to look at your page, and what matters is who your ‘friend’ is, or who you ‘follow.’ WikiLeaks starts publishing first important leaks and they even get the first court order to close down, which makes them famous among hacktivists from the whole world.

2010 marks the beginning of an era of open disclosure, a phenomenon based on two powers: the incapacity to impose an effective censorship in digital world and the Streisand effect. WikiLeaks knows of them and tests them. They know that Amazon is not a safe hosting, but they cannot prove it. That is why they use it, so that Amazon chooses the side. Banks are not simple intermediaries, but Switzerland defends its clients, even if they are criminals. That is why Assange’s account has to be there. He wants to see if they are going to close his account, and that is what they do. Now Switzerland is no more famous for defending its clients, but for defending criminals. The fight against this has to be twofold: on one side, hosting with political orientation (or with scrupulous respect of laws, which are also political), on the other side, hundreds of semi-domestic mirrors. The problem is that the traditional counter (alternative) media demonstrated no interest in WikiLeaks during those four years. The same goes for traditional media.

Today’s counter information means publishing something that somebody wants to hide and being able to analyze it in such a way that people can understand it. The groups do not need Indymedia to know what they are doing. Now they have blogs. Internet portals are outdated as a strategy for being noticed.

People will not read the entire cables, as they will not read the entire Sustainable Economy Act. This is no problem. If you cannot be WikiLeaks, you should be an intermediary capable of highlighting information and bringing it to people. That is the counter information of the XXI century. You either reveal information or you analyze it. WikiLeaks does not need counter information portals. It is the other way around. Nodo50, Kaos en la Red, Rebelión, LaHaine, A las Barricadas, Klinamen, Insurgente, etc, need to read the cables, put them in the context and write about them. They can no longer be a simple hub of an entire movement that neither exists nor progresses. We do not need portals, we need analysts, as well as

those who elaborate a problem without making it commonplace. Clear but profound messages. If you do not have interesting information, you are out.”

When it comes to the abundance of the immaterial goods, “information,” txarlie takes classic counter information portals out of the fighter’s kit and puts in the ability to do analysis which is complex, rather than commonplace.

5.3. Deliberate confusion

In the old communist world, the freedom of the press was a guaranteed right. In the new public-private online sphere there is not a single recognized right. Due to this vagueness the system can be attacked with its own mechanisms: going for the rights of freedom of the press in order to report each violation of these rights.

Such an ambiguous strategy cannot be successful if it claims to be against the system. There is nothing against the system in WikiLeaks, even though it is a real danger for the system. Its goal is to deepen the freedom of expression. Its program is liberal: the ideas do not matter, but the freedom to express them (even though WikiLeaks does not express ideas). Its apparatus is mainstream (Amazon, PayPal, Visa, MasterCard, Swiss bank, etc.). Its allies are big media groups (The Guardian, The New York Times, Le Monde, El País and Der Spiegel)...

The paradox of challenging the system of the old capitalist world playing by its proper rules lies in the elusive personality of Julian Assange: a character who is cool and uncool at the same time, who will pay a very high personal price for his audacity and represents everything that, according to the old logics, can only be seen as contradictory: Should we defend a guy who is facing rape charges? Can WikiLeaks demand transparency while operating in secret? Why does it ally (maybe looking for an accusation, maybe looking for protection?) with newspapers that are part of the power frame it wants to attack, and even giving them the exclusive rights to information? Should we support a centralized and personalized project that distorts decentralized and collaborative character of the Internet?

Julian Assange puts the anonymity in the first person in the fighter’s kit.[5] Anonymity - because we do not know whether he is a hero or a devil; in the first person - because he puts himself in the first plan, under the flashlights, thus protecting and hiding what is in the background.

5.4. Unfinished mechanisms

Does it make sense to risk your life to leak information, to do this “for no other reason”? To summarize what has been said: the press brought the politics to the people. Afterwards, its deregulation and concentration participated in the decline of the public space and of the democratic arena. The investigative journalism is reorganizing towards a model in which tasks are assigned to nodes that cooperate (although not necessarily coordinated) in order to bring the information to the public sphere.

We can assume that WikiLeaks is not a robot and that it analyzes which cables to publish and when. We can assume that its analyses are permeated with politics. But that politics is not explicit. WikiLeaks makes its contribution through an unfinished mechanism, which makes sense only if it is completed by other nodes in the network. Promoters of an unfinished mechanism give up the control (an odd mechanism: very personalized and centralized, at the same time giving up part of the control). It offers neutral access (the same to the left and to the right) to a rich immaterial good: the information. As the information is unfinished, different networks can find different (even opposite) meanings in the cables. WikiLeaks offers me something that I can take without jeopardizing what is mine. It makes the information rich. It contributes to the common by

giving up the control. And the more it gives up the control, the more the common is common.

Once again: is this madness? What political group would do something similar, so much political and so little explicit?

In spite of its centralism, WikiLeaks is a great contribution to the Web. It offers a model that can multiply: WikiLeaks local, WikiLeaks theme... It proves the importance of technical and professional knowledge, from journalists or mathematicians to the soldier Bradley Manning. It changes the role of the avant-garde, taking out of the fighter's kit the finished and completed discourse and the fear of losing the control.

WikiLeaks assumed the intelligence and autonomy of the nodes, which supported WikiLeaks in two ways: creating mirrors and attacking the ones who attacked it. Every solidarity, in turn, is an unfinished action that will make sense depending on the network it passes through.

6. Anonymous

On December 6, 2010, in defense of WikiLeaks, Anonymous starts Operation Payback (a cyberattack) against PostFinance and PayPal because they blocked WikiLeaks accounts. Anonymous explains that #payback is against ACTA (Anti-Counterfeiting Trade Agreement), the censorship on the Internet and copyright. WikiLeaks is neither in favor nor against cyberattacks in its defense, it states that they are the expression of one part of public opinion. On December 9, Twitter cancels the account of Anonymous and Facebook eliminates the page of Operation Payback. On December 10, Anonymous modifies their strategy to attack the companies that blocked WikiLeaks and, in the digital fight for protection of freedom of information on the Internet, decides to focus the efforts on spreading the leaks.

6.1. Generic discourse

What program organizes the actions of Anonymous? They expose it in their famous letter: "Anonymous is not always the same group of people. [...] Anonymous is a living idea. Anonymous is an idea that can be edited, updated, remanded – changed on a whim. We are not a terrorist organization as the governments, the demagogues, and the media would have you believe. At this time, Anonymous is a consciousness focused on actively campaigning for the free flow of information... . We ask the world to support us, not for our sake, but for your own. When governments... control freedom, they control you. The Internet is one of the last bastions of the free flow of information in our evolving information society . Through the Internet, all the people of the world have access to information. When we all have access to information, we are strong. When we are strong, we possess the power to do the impossible – to make a difference, to better our world. That is why the government is moving on WikiLeaks. This is what they fear. Never forget that: they fear our power when we unite."

The message is simple: freedom of expression. Too simple?

This is how WikiLeaks defines their mission: "The broader principles on which our work is based are the defense of freedom of speech and media publishing, the improvement of our common historical record and the support of the rights of all people to create new history. We derive these principles from the Universal Declaration of Human Rights." Hacktivists define themselves as a "space to coordinate our actions on a global level, discuss strategies, share resources and synchronize movements for creation and resistance towards a free society with free technologies."

"Freedom" is a commonly used word that comes up everywhere. It is a generic key word, but maybe everything is so clear that this is enough. Different

groups do not seem to try hard to mark differences in their languages, despite the fact that they are not very similar. Each of them is unique. There are differences, but not blocs.

Is it more important what is being done than what words are used to talk about it? Is the use of generic, common words without marks (because they have all the marks) and therefore anonymous ("human rights," "everyone," "governments," "freedom of expression," "peaceful protest," "open society," "civil disobedience"...) a way to handle the crisis of words?[6]

These expressions put in the fighter's kit a few commonly used generic words, and take out words political parties identify with, using to mark differences between each other.

6.2. (Drinking) party dynamics

In their letter, Anonymous add: "Our past is not our future. We are here to fight for everyone." Indeed, their past is not their future. Anonymous comes from 4chan.org, a forum oriented towards publishing images instead of texts, a website full of freaks addicted to downloading movies, videogames, comic books, and IRC chats and was characterized by some media as the "internet hate machine", full of "hackers on steroids" and "domestic terrorists" not only for their jokes and black humor, but for their cyberattacks, as well. People gather in this bizarre and dark subculture, whose activity is on the edge of the illegal and the socially unacceptable where nothing is sacred or prohibited (except child pornography), people who, in order to defend the liberty on the Internet, need temporary changeable spaces where they can be completely anonymous. That is Anonymous.

Near the end of 2007, via a video, the Anonymous organized an attack on the networks of The Church of Scientology, because they had been trying to destroy a family that had gotten out of the sect. Why do they attack The Church of Scientology? Because, since they have no meetings, the best way to generate consensus is to use the already established social consensus thus fighting power abuse.

Anonymous is not an organization, it has no structure nor leaders. These people simply operate in their own way, from their personal connected room, even though they sometimes organize street meetings, such as the protest in Madrid during the last Goya Awards ceremony (2011). We know a lot about how to organize people when there is stability. But, what happens when a big part of the society turns into scattered individuals moving in anonymous spaces? How can we understand self-organization in that case?

One of the answers is swarming – a form of self-organization in real time: people and groups that spontaneously coordinate their actions neither giving nor receiving orders. It is an attack pattern: weak (and some stronger) scattered network units converge on the same target from multiple directions. The original goal is to keep sustained pressure. Swarm networks have to be able to unite quickly and easily towards the same goal (autonomous and intelligent nodes), and then to brake and scatter, prepared to regroup and create new pressure. It is a self-organization in real time that seems to come out of nowhere, but is recognizable since it moves more or less rhythmically.

On Indianopedia site, created by Las Indias Electrónicas,[7] a difference is made between war, paradigm of militant fight and swarming, the form of conflict typical for the new public-private sphere: multi-agent and multichannel, associated with more or less nonviolent forms of civil resistance. According to experts and commercial interpretations, key elements of a swarm are communication and information. The mobile phones and the Internet make it possible to generate networks that have almost instant contact - social net-

works as well as blogs facilitated this process enormously. Information and communication are keys to these "(drinking) party dynamics." Swarming puts high connectivity in the fighter's kit, as well as training for keeping frequent micro communications and agile action in the real time.

6.3. Self-organization in real time

For thinkers who are more philosophical or political, information and communication per se, could never cause the swarming effect without two other elements: shared horizon and exchange of events and tendencies. Shared horizon (esthetical, ethical, philosophical and/or metaphysical) allows people who do swarming to identify themselves as members of the group belonging to the same referential universe, even though they are scattered and mobile. It is something like "creation of the world".

Exchange of events and affection traces directions that are constantly changing, but when analyzed, they help orientate the activities in the shared world. Thus, the difference between self-organization in real time and big corporations that want to create a world of unique aesthetic perception and affection designed for producers and consumers, with the aim of uniting them in communities coordinated by disperse conditions of contemporary world, comes from the ability to inform and communicate, but even more so from the power of self-organization to make better worlds, richer and bigger, worlds of expansive impulses that reach out to friends they do not even know, that look for new non-instrumental relationships, and ways to strengthen the connections that may not even exist. If this is the case, it is crucial to ponder what the shared horizon is made out of. Esthetics? Ideas? Narrations? Images? Words? Anonymity? We should think about what horizons emerge from struggles and whether they could really be shared. Freedom, this generic common word, turns out to be a good shared horizon.

However, there is another question: how is a shared horizon made? For some authors (philosophers and politicians) a shared universe is built patiently and deliberately. May be, but is the transition from 4chan to Anonymous, patient and deliberate? Who did it? What avant-garde would go to 4chan (not to peep, but as real anonymous) just to see if this is happening? Someone was building the swarming 11-M patiently and deliberately? We were all doing it? How?

After all that time, it is clear that the actions of Anonymous are political: complaints, demonstrations, attacks against those who deny freedoms. It is a simple conclusion to make. However, imagine 4chan a few years ago. Who would have given, from the political perspective, a dime for that forum? In order to genuinely appreciate (not only out of interest as a place for propaganda), these drinking party dynamics, swarming, so ambiguous, dark and partly reprehensible, one should be ready to participate in a shared horizon full of undesirable friends or, as some say, monstrous alliances.

Anonymous puts (drinking) party dynamics in the fighter's kit and takes out assembly dynamics.

6.4. Monstrous alliances

On the blog rpp.com.pe[8] someone claiming to have been in Anonymous says: "The anonymous say they are fighting for freedom on the Internet, something that I support from this blog. However, I know that the real motive behind this fight is to do something 'epic,' inspired from the movies like Fight club, or V for Vendetta. I feel that the anonymous see themselves as the antiheroes of the Cyber World.

Although many think that comic books, TV shows and science fiction movies are for children, they should look closely, because in the background there

is a strong political message that calls for fighting for freedom. The anonymous are not good guys from a movie. Just like in *Fight Club*, they live their normal lives, but have another, secret life, where they fight from the shadow. They are people who fight for an ideal, but have so much fun. This is like a movie they always wanted to live in, they are much stronger now than a few years ago and, more importantly, the media is paying attention to their actions."

The entertainment industry produces comics, TV series and commercial movies whose images are adopted for fighting against that very industry! The anonymous wearing V for Vendetta masks at the Goya awards ceremony shout out slogans against the film industry![9]

Leónidas Martín Saura got interested in the subversive power of images produced by the entertainment industry:[10] movies, videos, commercials... According to Martín Saura, there are events halfway between idea/image and activism: they take an idea/image, interpret it and act consequently. In other words, they bring that idea/ image to life. In these events, the spectator is not a passive figure - he takes an image as an unfinished device and actively interprets it. He also misinterprets it, and the possibility of subversion emerges out of this "misinterpretation".

This subversion occurs as it is identified and closely completely with some cliché images offered on the market, e.g., in the films *Matrix*, *Avatar* or *V for Vendetta*. This identification makes the image/the idea possible, clichés create recognition and empathy, and exchange of affections. The use of these images attenuates the importance of the politics and transcends the classical referential marks (left and right), making them more open and inclusive, widening the shared horizon. Anonymous has undesirable friends (industry and its epic-masculine images), which converts them into undesirable (to others): too much shadiness, too much impurity, too much testosterone. Too much confusion between hooliganism, civil disobedience, "vandalism," and "riots" on the Internet.

WikiLeaks and Anonymous put in the fighter's kit the possibility of monstrous alliances (with biased and distorted press, with film industry...), which does not mean offering friendship to just anyone. Every monstrous alliance has to allow for a "misinterpretation."

6.5. The political increases

Since December 23 2010, DDoS (Distributed Denial of Service) attacks, hackers' favorite technique, are considered crime in Spain. However, Anonymous is not Spain. In addition to the question of legality, there is a question of legitimacy. Those who are against these attacks have tactical and ethical arguments: freedom of expression should not be defended by attacking someone else's freedom of expression; these attacks can provoke a bigger and worse regulation on the Internet, and, on top of all, they criminalize the causes they try to support. The point is to resolve whether these attacks are civil disobedience, "vandalism" or "riots" on the Internet.

Regarding this issue, on December 17, Richard Stallman published an article in the *Guardian*[11] that speaks in favor of the legitimacy of these actions: "The Anonymous web protests over WikiLeaks are the internet equivalent of a mass demonstration."

People are just finding a way to protest in a digital space. The internet cannot function if websites are frequently blocked by crowds, just as a city cannot function if its streets are constantly full by protesters. But before you advocate a crackdown on internet protests, consider what they are protesting: on the internet, users have no rights. As the WikiLeaks case has demonstrated, what we do online, we do on sufferance.

In the physical world, we have the right to print and sell books. Anyone trying to stop us would need to go to court. However, to set up a website we need the co-operation of a domain name company, an ISP, and often a hosting company, any of which can be pressured to cut us off. In the US, no law explicitly establishes this precarity. Rather, it is embodied in contracts that we have allowed those companies to establish as normal. It is as if we all lived in rented rooms and landlords could evict anyone at a moment's notice."

Stallman's line of argument is very clear: There are no rights or guarantees on the Internet. We are in a precarious position.. That is what the case of WikiLeaks demonstrated. If one day PayPal decides to cancel the contract with e.g. Wikipedia, we will not be able to donate money for that project anymore: we do what we do online, until they allow us to. Besides, Stallman argues that "it is a mistake to call these actions hacking (a game of intelligence and ability) or cracking (braking the security systems). These protests should not be called DDoS (Distributed denial of service) attacks, either."

In order to understand why Stallman denies that these actions are DDoS (Distributed denial of service) attacks, we would have to go into very important technical details about what exactly the anonymous do from their personal connected rooms. Richard Stallman puts in the fighter's kit precise technical knowledge and details, things essential for understanding of an action (and arguing in favor or against it) when it is conducted by technology.

6.6. Plan B

The case of WikiLeaks is like a story about how things on the Internet work in the state of emergency: As there are no rights on the Internet, we do what we do online, until they allow us to (Amazon, EveryDNS, Visa, MasterCard, PayPal..., plus the respective governments). The decisive support of a part of industry to Web 2.0 (Google, YouTube, Facebook, Twitter, etc.) has created an illusion that what we do now is guaranteed. Wrong. There are many states of emergency and more are yet to come. In a state of emergency free software and companies with political orientation (or political neutrality, which is also an orientation) increase their significance.

The debate about whether an alternative Web 2.0 should be created is revived. I think it should not, given that Web 2.0 does not operate in emergencies, but in the normality (a mix of different political, industrial and social interests, often in monstrous alliances between different forms of power and individuals pursuing personal freedom and money-making. In a normal world, an alternative Facebook makes no sense, but the Facebook as it is an unfinished mechanism, impure, with anonymity in the first person, etc.

However, having an elevator in the building and using it normally doesn't mean eliminating the staircase, which is there for emergencies (blackouts, fires...). Free software and companies with political orientation are the staircase: something we should look after and keep in shape just in case, keeping in mind that "just in case" does occur sooner or later. Egyptian government did not turn off WikiLeaks: it turned off the entire Internet! And what did the Hacktivists do? If there are phones in Egypt, they thought, there is the possibility to connect via modem (as was being done before ADSL). Mobile phones can work as modems, but one should know how. How can we show the Egyptians the way to connect via mobile phones if there is no Internet to do so? Via fax. We will send messages massively, indiscriminately to every single fax machine in Egypt. It is like throwing pamphlets, except it is via fax. So what are they going to connect to with their phones? To servers that we had specially installed and converted into Internet providers. But connections via phone have bad signal. Will it make

sense? Yes, if we use a command-line instead of a graphical interface. We will also include the instructions about chatting via a command-line interface. On chat, they will tell us what is happening. We will publish that and tell them what is happening outside. And there will be no repression? We will make the connections anonymous so there cannot be one. Hackers activists from all around the world were able to install this emergency mechanism in real time because they had four things: knowledge, resources, self-organization in real time and a shared horizon.

Hacker activists put in the fighter's kit free software, knowledge to apply it, resources to implement it, all current and future technologies, no matter how obsolete they seem, creativity in real time to change the entire shared horizon that includes everyone (in this case: all Egyptians) even if some of the "all" are undesirable. But knowledge and resource do not fall from the sky. They cost time, money and will. As a solution to their precarity, many hacker activists, started "companies" with political orientation such as guifi.net, lorea.org. oiga.me etc.

6.7. Companies with political orientation

Guifi.net is a public telecommunication network formed out of a collection of pieces of network that belong to their users. It is a privately owned and jointly managed public infrastructure established as a telecommunication operator. Guifi.net is a plan B, to have "private internet" if the Internet is to be shut down. This might never happen in Spain, but it doesn't make guifi.net any less valuable: it represents an economic model of shared property, i.e. a model in telecommunication infrastructure which accumulates a great quantity of technical, organizational, legal and operative skills that can be transferred to places where the shutting down is more probable. If you live in an attic, even if you do not fully understand why, think about contacting guifi.net and financing and installing an antenna.

Lorea.org is a self defined seedbed of social networks in a field of unified experimentation. Its goal is to create a distributed, federate and safe nodal organization. It is a militant, non-profit project that creates something like Facebook but with safe communication (encrypting to avoid monitoring) and distributed in connected seeds (each group manages its own seed on its own server, but the seeds connect to a bigger network). Lorea.org is already operative, but its development continues (not as quickly as desired due to the lack of resources). As a free and distributed software, it is like Facebook in the form of a network. Lorea.org as software and guifi.net as hardware would provide a fairly comfortable plan B if the Internet is shut down. If you are a part of a collective, think about learning how to use Lorea as a mean of inter-extern communication and offer them financial support.

Oiga.me is a platform for direct communication between people and their representatives. When an entity organizes a pressure campaign, it collects signatures and support in a closed form, "collects" signatures (power, trust) and then faces the opponent. Oiga.me wants to change this model: someone proposes a campaign, but the mechanism does not let them "mobilize" supporters or have control over the discourse, because every person will directly send the protest to opponents and write and formulate in their own words and argumentation, that is, every person will be defining the campaign on his/her own. ALabs association wants to reuse the collective experience of the hacker activism via oiga.me and offer it as a service for a direct civil participation. At this moment, the techno-social model is being defined. It remains to be seen whether the entities that organize campaigns will accept to contribute and finance this unfinished model, which offers them to give up part of the control. To what extent should oiga-me be an unfinished mechanism? How does the new public-

private sphere, being created through the connection of its personal rooms, change the model of “political campaign”? If you belong to an association think about discussing the social model for oiga.me with ALabs. What is the political value of these “companies”? How are they effectively and economically sustained by their natural networks? What (political) devastation would mean its death of depression, lack of circulation, difficulties of all kinds?

The “companies” with political orientation are not just a plan B: they produce, conserve and spread technical knowledge; they have and provide physical and symbolic resources; they abolish the division between work and fighting; they accumulate organizational and operative skills. They are a natural evolution of hacking activism that is maturing. They are a magnificent plan A.

WikiLeaks puts companies with political orientation or political neutrality in the fighter’s kit. In the case of WikiLeaks, Pirate Party Switzerland and OVH France. However, these companies are not necessarily militant. We have already mentioned monstrous alliances between different forms of power and different movements for liberalization. Every event, every exception will show who is who.

6.8. Hacktivistas

Hactivistas represent a techno-political platform for activism on the Internet that was developed in hacklabs community at a hackmeeting in 2008, right at the time when WikiLeaks published one ACTA document.

ACTA is an answer of the global industry to the “growth of forged goods and works protected by copyright hacked on the global market.” Even though ACTA has a vast span, and includes everything from forgeries of physical goods up to the distribution on the Internet and information technology, it is on the Internet that Hactivistas (and many others) see the umpteenth attack of global entertainment industry corporations on the freedom of access to immaterial goods. And they get organized to stop it. Ever since 2007, negotiations are held in secret, but it is known that the industry wants the governments to pass the ACTA law. Does a group of boys really think they can win against big global industry? Well, these boys are not stupid. They analyze the situation, interpret opponent’s plans, predict the course of events, estimate their own forces and design strategy and tactics.

What will they do? They limit the span of their fight: Spain. The government of Zapatero is weak and owes favors to the world of culture, which put it where it is (remember “No to war” protest). Spain will take over EU residency in the first half of 2010. Firstly, it is important to prevent that Spain passes the laws in favor of the entertainment industry before January 1, 2010. Secondly, it is important to prevent Spain to use its position to sneak them into EU. At that time, although a few articles published in the press are not enough to demonstrate this problem, Hactivistas are certain they had placed their strategy well. It was in December 2010, when more than 250.000 cables were published on WikiLeaks proving that the U.S. government had been pressuring the Spanish government to pass these laws in favor of the industry (one of which was lay Sinde – the Sinde law).

But, what could they do against all this? Talking about the beginnings, Hactivistas Lokese and apardo, told me: “We created a network to fight against the giants. We came up with a three-year plan. The plan was not to win; we knew we could not win. The plan was to make sure that laws, once they are passed, are already completely discredited and ready for massive civil disobedience. And we started working as if this could be done.

Today we can say that the plan was a success: the Sinde law was rejected many times and when it was passed at the end of 2010, it was completely discredited without a regulation. Minister Molina had to resign, Xmailer attacked Telecom, patadón attacked Redtel, etc.”

Naturally, all this is not only the result of Hactivistas’ actions. It is a fight of a social movement that goes from the left to the right, and vice versa, and is capable of monstrous alliances. Lokese and apardo tell me: “We had to create a strong connection with other strategic networks that were going to allow us to get further than we could have gotten on our own. We are good in communication, lobbying and organization of quick and powerful actions. However, we need interlocutors, negotiators and other kinds of social actors capable of completing other tasks. We are not people who are going to negotiate with ministers. For this, there are other players who can do this much better. And we rely on them.”

6.9. Copyleft hacktivism

Hactivistas define themselves as copyleft hacktivism. This means opening the code: with Hactivistas, everything is public and accessible. The platform is coordinated through a mailing list that literally anyone, can subscribe to. From time to time, there are reunions on IRC. There are notes from discussions and agreements on public Wiki.[12] With the help of these online resources and the work of affinity groups and some live meetings, situations are analyzed and the campaigns and actions are organized.

Their activity is ceaseless. As an example, let us mention the fake version of “If you are legal, you are legal” campaign and Xmailer against the Telecom Package. In July 2008, a tender is published in BOE (Boletín Oficial del Estado, Spanish official gazette) for the Ministry of Culture campaign against P2P, “If you are legal, you are legal”, with €1,948,000 budget. The reply of Hactivistas was Googlebombing, a method of causing a page to rank high in the Google search. They designed a replica – the webpage parallel to the real one with the content in favor of free culture. Hactivistas’ page ranked much higher than that of the Ministry of Culture. Thus, the more the Ministry promoted its slogan “If you are legal, you are legal”, the more visits there were to the page of the counter campaign defending free culture. Almost two million Euros of public money went down the drain! The popularity and credibility of the “illegals” was so big that the Ministry of Culture had to surrender and explain in the mainstream media the reason for so much hostility towards the “illegals.”

On May 6, 2009, the European Parliament was about to vote on a legislative package known as the Telecoms Package, but the civil pressure prevented that the law, which would turn the Internet into another television.

The Telecoms Package is a set of European directives that regulate electronic communications services and networks, i.e. necessary infrastructures and applications that transport signals. In 2007, the European Commission presented a proposal for their modification. What was presented as a simple and convenient homogenization of different regulations and laws of each country concerning telecommunications and Internet, was actually an alliance of three of the strongest lobbies in the world: the political lobby, telecommunications lobby and the copyright lobby, which formed the package according to their own interests aimed at destroying the neutrality online and the Internet as we know it. A neutral network is the one that allows communication from point to point regardless of the content. The neutrality online is not directly a matter of privacy or censorship (although it is finally reduced to that) but a matter of equality and opportunities. My operator of broadband access has to give me the same access regardless how much I use it, even if I use it to download P2P.

A technical explanation about Internet neutrality exceeds the purpose of this article (even though, I repeat, the technical details are very important), but, simply put, if the Internet is no longer a neutral network, it is converted into a television.

The community of European internauts raised up

against the Telecoms Package with a clear strategy: stopping the europarlamentarians, everyone preventing their own representatives, and all of them preventing mutual representatives to accept the package and make them realize the political cost of approving that package. Hactivistas designed the software Xmailer, a small code compatible with any web that allows filling up a form and sending an email to a list of people, in this case the europarlamentarians.

Hactivistas allowed everyone to install Xmailer on their webs (something I can take without jeopardizing what is mine) which made it possible for this person to person (citizen to europarlamentarian) communication mechanism to send more than 200,000 emails from European citizens to their high representatives in the first 48 hours of the campaign. Lokese and apardo recall: “The European Parliament was telling us to stop sending them emails, and we were saying: ‘We were not sending you emails. It was not us, it was the people.’” Hactivistas sent a convincing message to the lobbies of the industry of culture, the managements and Spanish and European politicians who participated in the ransacking of public goods: “P2P is here to stay. You do not even understand the problem you are dealing with. The reality will put you in your place and the Internet caché will preserve your disgrace forever.”

This is how Hactivistas operate. All their actions are previously announced. They even communicate with the police. Everything they do is legal, public and open. They take the fear of being watched and the fear of opening the code out of the fighter’s kit, and they put in the transparency as a strategy for growth and legal hacking as strategy for avoiding repression and its consequences.

6.10 Free circulation

Hactivistas are very different from Anonymous. Hactivistas are diurnal, with revealed faces, not crossing the line of the law... Anonymous is nocturnal, with a mask, crossing the line of the law. Nevertheless, the distance between the two is not big, so some Hactivistas can enter and exit Anonymous and vice versa. No cost, no problems.

According to Juan Urrutia, one of the characteristics of distributed networks is low cost of dissidence: “In order to become your own master, you will have had to give up the directives of your group, the web you used to belong to, and hurl yourself into someone else’s web – given that, in the ontology I’m putting forward, there is never a network void. [...] TICs make it possible to generate a wide distributed network which functions autonomously but which, unlike other collective entities, makes dissidence possible at a low cost – with interesting consequences. [...] The different social identities of subgroups, being very dense, are also very close to each other: thus it is extremely easy to cross over from one subgroup to another, and come to understand other identities.”[13]

In other words, in a distributed network being a small dissident (on sale, as the author says) is paid very little, since the group has quite high tolerance level when it comes to “reintegration” after dissidence. Hactivistas and Anonymous are very different, but there is circulation between them. To compare this circulation (that allows the exchange of events and affection) to the organization of the blocks at protests: during the protest you cannot be at the same time in the blue and in the pink block. You have to choose one of them. Yes, you can be in Hactivistas and Anonymous at the same time, firstly, because the virtual world is abundant and secondly, because the meaning of “being somewhere” is changing, reducing the importance of “belonging” and increasing the importance of “appearing” (I am anonymous if I appear on the forum, the IRC, the operations.. not if

I belong to a supposed group that in reality doesn't exist).

Hacktivistas and Anonymous put the dissidence of little importance in the fighter's kit. When Juan Urrutia talks about "understanding others" and about the effect of low cost dissidence, the question that comes up is whether it is a weakness or a strength. (Who are the others? To which point do we have to understand them?)

We can cite many cases of collaboration between disagreeing sides (even opponents). Still, it never stops to surprise me every time I see Hacktivistas link on the blog of Enrique Dans, or hear Hacktivistas friends accept that there are people who are better than them in negotiating with the ministries. Shared horizons include undesirable friends who exchange events and affections.

6.11. Sinde law

At the end of 2009 the Government announced its intentions to pass the Sinde law. There is no space in this article for the analysis of this law. In short, its goal is to allow that a commission dependent on the Ministry of Culture has the power to close WebPages that according to their criteria violate the rights to intellectual property, with prior approval of the Supreme Court, chamber of Administrative Litigation. The judge authorizes, but does not investigate. If applied rigorously, this law would, imply the closedown of Google, represents a big confusion with mixed links, domains, P2P, download pages, etc. This proves that people who legislate have no idea about the problem they are dealing with. The law was criticized from every corner of the Internet.

> **This** is the law with no clear limits, since no proofs of violation are necessary in order to apply it, the possibility of causing violation (the existence of links towards copyright content, for example) is enough.

> **The law** inverts the burden of proof, since, if they close down your page, you have to start a process at the National Court (the place where they judge the terrorists and Somali pirates) so they would reopen your page.

> **The law** was too comprehensive: if "offending" contents are not in Spain (because the hosting company is in another country or the person lives abroad) then it can block the entire domain and even the entire IP in question!

The Sinde law is considered an attack on guarantees of freedom of expression, it allows closings of WebPages through administration (i.e. through a government organ) and not through court, which is a violation of a fundamental right and freedom in Spain, the freedom of expression, and a slap in the face to Spanish legal system. As if this was not enough, in December 2010 WikiLeaks published documents revealing that the law was prepared and written under strong pressure of American lobbies representing the audiovisual industry (i.e. studios and record companies). The cables showed in what way the U.S. government pressured the Spanish government and dictated a repressive agenda since 2004, demanding that the Ministry of Culture ends with freedom on the Internet in favor of the industry of entertainment.

As so many others, Hacktivistas were constantly fighting against this law. And now, once it was passed, they focused on spreading advice on how to bypass it, which is possible since the architecture of the Internet is designed to avoid control: "It doesn't matter what they try, there will always be a way to bypass it."

6.12. Self-management in layers

The politics of emancipation really likes the idea of self-management. Nevertheless, total self-management, as an ideal to strive for in today's complex world, consumes all our time and energy, and finally

collapses. If self-management occupies all our time for emancipation (something normal if we are looking for political coherency) it is of little value because it becomes impracticable. Therefore, would it be necessary to form self-management according to each situation and abandon the idea of joining together? Would the idea of emancipation allow us to combine layers of self-organization with layers of representatives? What type of horizontal approach do WikiLeaks, Anonymous, Hacktivistas have? What type of representatives?

In all the three cases there seems to be a core that takes the initiative, designs unfinished mechanisms and sets them free, giving up control, either partly or completely. In any case, these experiences do not invite to participation and implication aggressively. They design mechanisms where participation goes without saying, which is different. Maybe the role of the avant-garde in the new public-private sphere is to design and implement unfinished mechanisms so that others can decide and act. It is a way of managing that gives up control, supports undesirable friendships and believes in the intelligence and autonomy of all the nodes.

7. "The Dinner of Fear"

In the beginning of January 2011, Amador Fernández-Savater, a copyleft editor connected to free culture, gets an invitation from the Minister of Culture to attend a dinner on a Friday, January 7, together with relevant figures of the Spanish culture industry and chat about the Sinde law, downloading P2P and all that.

After the dinner, on January 12 he published what he experienced, heard and thought on one of many blogs. His conclusion is simple: "The fear is what rules, fear preserves the crisis of dominant models, the fear of people (especially young people), the fear of public rebellion, of the Web and the unknown future."

The post named The Dinner of Fear (my reunion with Minister González Sinde)[14] reaches an extraordinary popularity: hundreds of comments, links, forwards, tweets, retweets, transmissions, shares... and many discussions and conversations via email and face-to-face, and even a reply of the Minister in El País a few days later. What was it that caused the success of this post and crossed ideological borders, found the common point of people with different political and apolitical views and multiple social profiles, and caused enormous confidence and belief in the genuineness of a personal story. Amador Fernández-Savater, talking about this matter, presents some key things: "Before I wrote the post I had many fears. Particularly, because I know there are friends who would ask me to make a weapon to fight the Sinde law - the war they devoted their body and soul to (by the way, this is one of few wars where I see people devoting body and soul).

However, I had to write something I would be personally satisfied with and what I could take up the responsibility for. The accusation model does not satisfy me because it is the opposite of the new sensibility (in criticism) that I explore along with others since May 11- which, among many other things means: speaking as anybody else, somebody else, being able to speak to anyone and with anyone; avoiding direct criticism as much as possible; speaking for yourself, not hiding behind 'we,' not taking up superior position, but rather looking for a shared problem (shared even, with the opponent - if possible). I wrote the text respecting this guidelines, which is where the ambiguity effect comes from. When I showed my friends the draft, they told me: 'It is not clear where you are, who you are with, who you are against and who you are supporting.' That is what I thought as well, but for me it was important to estimate whether this ambiguity is a weakness or a strength. So what caused the

success is a paradox: it is an ambiguous position, but firm and determined.

My friends, who were more involved in this war, told me the text lacked precision. It lacked an edge. It floated up in the air. It did not unmask anybody. It forgot to reveal what those people were doing at the dinner. It did not shout. But I believe the accusation model is dangerously close to propaganda. And I thought: let us believe in the intelligence of the people! Let us not fight propaganda with propaganda, because propaganda per se is stultifying (regardless of its cause). Let us not think the public is a herd that should be egged on. Let us not underestimate their ability to unravel and actively interpret a context.

So the 'moderate' tone of the text was not there to save my life, but because I believe only that kind of discourse is really close to reality. But this is not easy to see. I was the first to have doubts. I was not sure. I just had a 'feeling.'

Since then, I have been wondering what is a critical discourse today. Daniel Blanchard explains wonderfully that a critical discourse is the one that is 'able to attract, capture and amplify countless scattered voices,' which occurs when it is moved by an echo of the movement appearing in the real world, i.e. when it comes from and is formed in analogy with a crisis of the reality.' After publishing the post, initially disappointed friends noticed with absolute enthusiasm the way the text was bursting in all directions. What seemed like 'less' (critical) was 'more' in the end. What seemed less loud, was more effective. We should rethink and reinvent the way we respond to the crisis in the reality."

This author's valuation is not entirely accepted in his networks of confidence. Fernández-Savater puts the emphasis on sharing the problem with the opponent, that in this case is the fear: the industry fears losing the privileges and everyone fears (even the authors) financial and job insecurity. But other friends think that what made so many people identify with this post is not so much the shared problem but a clear division between "them" and "us" portrayed in the image of a bunker: they are scared inside the bunker and one is outside diffused in something we "all" are part of.

In any case, the Dinner of Fear takes out of the fighter's kit the accusation model that only convinces the already convinced, and puts in the truthfulness that comes from speaking in one's own name (in the first person) and opens up one "we" that everybody can belong to.

8. Political complexity

The Dinner of Fear closes the itinerary of selected experiences. It shows that the Internet is not only a medium for new types of groups (Anonymous, Hacktivistas) nor just a communication channel (WikiLeaks). The Internet is an organization per se, unitarian (like the old trade unions) and maybe even political?

The complexity of the Internet is not just a technical matter: its complexity is political. The Web alone, recursively, is at the same time the context and the situation, it is a battlefield and the organization aimed at transforming context in favor of more freedoms (as old and new economic rights).

The Internet has already changed the architecture of reality, and each architecture is politics. The Web is ungovernable, it is made out of intelligent and autonomous nodes. It is from the interconnection of these nodes that a new public-private sphere emerges, where by being just present (publishing a post, commenting on it, tweeting, retweeting, forwarding, sharing...) But why political? It is the dream of "participation" raised to maximum power, where that "participation" alone is ungovernable and not representable. This means it doesn't exactly work according to the rules of old capitalist democracies. It means that the fighter's kit (tools, skills and experience) is changing and so is the role of the avant-garde. Any instrumental

use of the Internet is already doomed. The nodes do not forgive to whoever denies their intelligence and turns them into spectators of the new television, even if this television tunes in to a radical accusation channel. In the old days, it was possible to make good pamphlets not knowing how the copy machine works, but this is now impossible, since the pamphlet and the copy machine are (recursively) the same thing. The fighter's kit should be reinforced with new knowledge as political as literacy classes that the anarcho-syndicalists used to organize for workers. Techno-politics. Except that we do not study and learn the Internet. It is practiced, with others, in a network. And it is thought upon through practice.

The Internet is being done, undone and redone in real time in a swirl of loops and counter loops. The market, the industry, governments... spend days thinking about and working on the Internet, same as WikiLeaks, Anonymous, Hacktivistas and others (in many different and even opposing ideas of equality and freedom) are doing it and redoing it fighting from a new public-private sphere for socialization of immaterial goods and access to the new abundance.

Doing and thinking. As the blackout in Egypt showed, no technology is disposable, no matter how obsolete it seems, and can be useful again if it is reconnected to an unfinished mechanism that makes sense in a shared horizon, same as the old fighter's kit with tools, skills and experience that are not being used but are not disposable, awaiting for more important and better alliances to reinvent their use. In other words, the point is not to get lost in the fascination with new technology, but to ask a (crucial) question, what struggle it is meant for and what should be the role of a vanguard when (only) the logic of the old capitalist world no longer applies.

Translated from Spanish into English by Miljana Stojanović

FOOTNOTES

[1] Of course, production and distribution of the immaterial goods consume energy and other material resources. Nevertheless, energy and the material side of the Internet are not the current topic, maybe because, for the time being, material side is much more interesting.

[2] ZAFRA, R. Un cuarto propio conectado. Fórcola Ediciones, Madrid, 2010.

[3] DE UGARTE, D. El poder de las redes. El Cobre ediciones, Madrid, 2007

[4] Le Monde Diplomatique, February 2011

[5] Anonymity in the first person is a concept elaborated in the magazine Espai en Blanc, no 5-6: La fuerza del anonimato (The force of anonymity) (<http://www.espaienblanc.net/Revista-de-Espai-en-Blanc-no-5-6-.html>). See also «La Web 2.0 y el anonimato en primera persona» (Web 2.0 and anonymity in the first person) (<http://www.barcelonametropolis.cat/es/page.asp?id=23&ui=420>).

[6] What some call the end of ideologies is a word crisis where we all use the same terms for opposite problems. Daniel Blanchard, an old member of Socialisme ou Barbarie, used the expression "word crisis" as a key to understand the relation between critical discourse and reality. In 2009, Espai en Blanc organized a seminar that dealt with this problem (<http://www.espaienblanc.net/Materiales-del-seminario-Crisis-de.html>).

[7] <http://lasindias.net/indianopedia>

[8] <http://blogs.rpp.com.pe/technovida/2010/12/09/%C2%BFquienes-son-los-anonymous-mis-experiencias-en-4char/>

[9] <http://www.unalinasobreelmar.net/2011/02/14/paisaje-sonoro-de-anonymous-en-logsoya/>

[10] <http://www.unalinasobreelmar.net/2010/11/16/?nos-hacemos/>

[11] <http://acuarelalibros.blogspot.com/2010/12/anonymous-protestas-contr-a-el-gran.html>

[12] <http://hacktivistas.net/>

[13] URRUTIA, J. «Lógicas, ontología y disidencia de y en la blogosfera» ("Logics, ontology and dissidence of and in the blogosphere"), preface of the book by David de Ugarte El poder de las redes (Power of the networks) (El Cobre ediciones, Madrid, 2007).

[14] <http://acuarelalibros.blogspot.com/2011/01/la-cena-del-miedo-mi-reunion-con-la.html>

BIOGRAFIE SARADNIKA / CONTRIBUTORS' BIOGRAPHIES

Gabriele Dietze – doktorka filozofije, nemačka naučnica, predaje na univerzitetu, teoretičarka roda, esejista i autor.

Gabriele Dietze – PhD in Philosophy, is a German scientist, teaching at the university, gender theorist, essayist and author.

Tatjana Greif – doktorka arheologije, lezbejska aktivistkinja, publicistkinja, urednica ŠKUC – Vizibilija i Časopisa za kritiku nauke, Ljubljana.

Tatjana Greif – holds a PhD in archaeology. She is a lesbian activist, publicist, editor of ŠKUC – Vizibilija and the Journal for Critique of Science, Ljubljana.

Marina Gržinić – umetnica i profesor na Akademiji likovne umetnosti u Beču. Radi i na Filozofskom institutu ZRC SAZU (Znanstveni i istraživački centar Slovenačke akademije nauka i umetnosti) u Ljubljani, Slovenija.

Marina Gržinić – is an artist and Professor at the Academy of Fine Arts in Vienna. She also works at the Institute of Philosophy ZRC SAZU at the Slovenian Academy of Fine Arts in Ljubljana, Slovenia.

Njideka Stephanie Iroh – umetnica izgovorene reči/pesnikinja, koja trenutno studira i radi u Beču. Članica Istraživačke grupe o crnačkoj istoriji i sadašnjosti Austrije i samoorganizacije „Pamoja” – Pokret mlade Afričke dijaspore u Austriji. Njeni radni procesi uključuju osnaživanje crnca sa fokusom na mlade u kontekstu otpora i dekolonizacije.

Njideka Stephanie Iroh – a spoken word artist/poetess, currently studying and working in Vienna. Member of the Research Group on Black Austrian History and Presence and the self-organization "Pamoja" – Movement of Young African Diaspora in Austria. Her work processes involve Black empowerment focusing on youth in the context of resistance and decolonization.

Araba Evelyn Johnston-Arthur – završila Afričke studije i Studije rasizma i migracija u Legonu (Gana), Beču i Londonu. Diplomirala je 2004. godine radom o formiranju Mavarskog naroda u kontekstu epistemološkog nasilja i traumatske prirode neokolonijalnog iskustva moderne afričke dijaspore u Austriji. Bila je koosnivač „Pamoja” organizacije 1996. godine, i od tada je aktivna u Crnom pokretu u Austriji.

Araba Evelyn Johnston-Arthur – studied African studies and Racism and Migration Studies, Legon (Ghana), Vienna and London. She graduated in 2004 with her work on the construction of the "Moors" in the context of epistemic violence and the traumatic nature of neo-colonial experience in modern African Diaspora in Austria. In 1996 she was co-founder of "Pamoja" and has since been active in the Black Movement in Austria.

Tjaša Kancler – advokat, umetnica i član grupe „Enmedio”. Gostujući profesor i doktorandica na Odelu dizajna i slike na Fakultetu likovnih umetnosti Univerziteta u Barseloni, Španija.

Tjaša Kancler – is a lawyer, artist and member of the Enmedio group. She is Associated Professor and PhD candidate at the Department of Design and Image, Faculty of Fine Arts, University of Barcelona, Spain.

Klub Zwei (Simone Bader i Jo Schmeiser) –

S. Bader – rođena u Štutgartu, Nemačka. Predaje na Akademiji likovnih umetnosti u Beču. J. Šmajser – rođena u Gracu, Austrija. Radi kao freelance grafički dizajner. Njih dve su 1992. godine osnovale Klub Dvojka u okviru kog su napravile internacionalne projekte koji se bave društveno-političkim temama.

Klub Zwei (Simone Bader and Jo Schmeiser) – S. Bader was born in Stuttgart, Germany, and teaches at the Academy of Fine Arts in Vienna. J. Schmeiser was born in Graz, Austria, and works as a freelance graphic designer. In 1992 they created Klub Zwei, with which they have made interdisciplinary projects dealing with sociopolitical issues.

Jorge Luis Marzo – istoričar umetnosti, kustos, pisac i profesor.

Jorge Luis Marzo – is an art historian, curator, writer and professor.

Margarita Padilla – IT inženjer i nekadašnja direktorka magazina Mundo Linux, Španija. Jedna je od malobrojnih žena koje mogu da stvore i održavaju sisteme. Naučila je GNU/Linux i društvenu i političku upotrebu novih tehnologija u skvotiranim društvenim centrima. Nešto što nije mogla da nauči na fakultetu. Zajedno sa drugim hakerima osnovala je Sindominio.net.

Margarita Padilla – IT engineer and former director of the magazine Mundo Linux, Spain. Padilla is one of that small minority of women who can create and maintain systems. She learnt GNU/Linux and social and political uses of new technology in squatted social centers. Something she wasn't taught at university. Together with other hackers she founded Sindominio.net.

Mitja Perinčič – diplomirao na Pedagoškom fakultetu (Likovna pedagogija) u Ljubljani. Trenutno je kandidat za master studije na postdiplomskim studijama na Akademiji likovnih umetnosti i dizajna u Ljubljani. Predaje u Zavodu za gluve u Ljubljani.

Mitja Perinčič – graduated from The Faculty of Education (Art Pedagogy) in Ljubljana. He is currently an MA candidate at the postgraduate study at The Academy of Fine Arts and Design, Ljubljana. He teaches at The Ljubljana School for the Deaf.

Jovita Pristovšek – stekla master na Akademiji likovnih umetnosti i dizajna u Ljubljani, doktorandica na postdiplomskom programu Interkulturalnih studija – Komparativne studije ideja i kulture na Univerzitetu u Novoj Gorici, Slovenija.

Jovita Pristovšek – holds a MA in fine arts from The Academy of Fine Arts and Design, Ljubljana and is PhD candidate at the Post-graduate program Intercultural Studies – Comparative Studies of Ideas and Cultures at the University of Nova Gorica, Slovenia.

Zvonka T Simčič – multimedijalna umetnica i producentkinja. Osnivač CCC instituta, Slovenija, ustanovljenog 2001. godine.

Zvonka T Simčič – is a multimedia artist and producer. She is a founder of the CCC Institute, Slovenia, established in 2001.

Aina Šmid – umetnica, nekadašnja urednica slovenačkog magazina posvećenog dizajnu Ambient. Završila je istoriju umetnosti u Ljubljani, Slovenija.

Aina Šmid – is an artist and former editor of the Slovenian design magazine Ambient. She studied art history in Ljubljana, Slovenia.

Šefik Tatlić – teoretičar iz Sarajeva, doktorand na Filozofskom fakultetu, Odsek sociologija, Univerzitet u Zagrebu.

Šefik Tatlić – is a theorist from Sarajevo, doctoral candidate at the Faculty of Sociology, University of Zagreb, Croatia.

Nataša Velikonja – sociološkinja, pesnikinja i lezbejska aktivistkinja. Živi i radi u Ljubljani.

Nataša Velikonja – is a sociologist, poetess and lesbian activist. She lives and works in Ljubljana.

Marina Vishmidt – književnica iz Londona, koja se uglavnom bavi umetnošću i politikom rada i apstrakcije, trenutno završava doktorske studije na fakultetu Kvin Meri, Univerzitet u Londonu.

Marina Vishmidt – is a London-based writer who deals mainly with art, and the politics of work and abstraction, currently doing a PhD at Queen Mary, University of London.

Jasmina Založnik – stekla bačelor diplomu na studijama kulture i pedagogije. Kandidat je za master studije na postdiplomskom programu Interkulturalnih studija – Komparativne studije ideja i kulture na Univerzitetu u Novoj Gorici, Slovenija.

Jasmina Založnik – holds a BA in cultural studies and pedagogy. She is a MA candidate at the Post-graduate program Intercultural Studies – Comparative Studies of Ideas and Cultures at the University of Nova Gorica, Slovenia.

SADRŽAJ/ CONTENTS

1.

UVOD/ INTRODUCTION

Marina Gržinić

ANALIZA RASIZMA/ ANALYSIS OF RACISM

Araba Evelyn Johnston-Arthur

LEZBEJSKI BAR /LESBIAN BAR

Nataša Velikonja

ANALIZA ANTISEMITIZMA/ ANALYSIS OF ANTI-SEMITISM

Klub Zwei (Simone Bader i/and Jo Schmeiser)

QUEER Tatjana Greif

ANALIZA KOLONIJALNOSTI/ ANALYSIS OF COLONIALITY

Njideka Stephanie Iroh

ANALIZA ISTORIJE/ ANALYSIS OF HISTORY

Marina Gržinić, Aina Šmid,
Zvonka T Simčič

ANALIZA POLITIKE/ ANALYSIS OF POLITICS

Araba Evelyn Johnston-Arthur

ANALIZA PROTESTA/ ANALYSIS OF PROTESTS

Tjaša Kancler, Jorge Luis Marzo

ANALIZA SAVREMENE UMETNOSTI/ ANALYSIS OF CONTEMPORARY ART

Jasmina Založnik

ANALIZA KAPITALIZMA/ ANALYSIS OF CAPITALISM

Margarita Padilla

2.

ANALIZA RAZVLAŠĆIVANJA/ ANALYSIS OF DISPOSSESSION

Jovita Pristovšek

ANALIZA TEORIJE/ ANALYSIS OF THEORY

Marina Gržinić, Šefik Tatlić

ANALIZA RADA/ ANALYSIS OF LABOUR

Marina Vishmidt

ANALIZA RODA/ ANALYSIS OF GENDER

Gabriele Dietze

DE-ARTIKULACIJA

Platforma 0 za teoriju, umetnost, proteste i politiku/
Platform 0 for theory, arts, protests and politics.

DE-ARTIKULACIJA je platforma onih koji se angažuju u njoj/ DE-ARTIKULACIJA is a platform by all those engaging with it.

UREDNIK/EDITOR: Marina Gržinić

SARADNICI/CONTRIBUTORS

Gabriele Dietze
Tatjana Greif
Marina Gržinić
Njideka Stephanie Iroh
Araba Evelyn Johnston-Arthur
Tjaša Kancler
Klub Zwei (Simone Bader i/and Jo Schmeiser)
Jorge Luis Marzo
Margarita Padilla
Mitja Perinčič
Jovita Pristovšek
Zvonka T Simčič
Aina Šmid
Šefik Tatlić
Nataša Velikonja
Marina Vishmidt
Jasmina Založnik

Izdanje na srpskom i engleskom/Serbian/English edition.

PREVODI/TRANSLATIONS

Sa slovenačkog na engleski/Slovenian into English:
Marina Gržinić, Tanja Passoni, Lili Anamarija No

Sa nemačkog na srpski/ German into Serbian:
Nemanja Vlajković

Sa španskog na srpski/Spanish into Serbian:
Miljana Stojanović

Sa španskog na engleski/Spanish into English:
Miljana Stojanović

Sa engleskog na srpski/English into Serbian:
Dragana Govedarica Kostopoulos,
Miloš Dimitrijević, Jelena Maksimović,
Miljana Stojanović

Sa srpskog na engleski/Serbian into English:
Dragana Govedarica Kostopoulos

LEKTURA/LANGUAGE EDITING

Lektura i korektura engleskog jezika/Proof-reading
English: Dragana Govedarica Kostopoulos,
Jelenka Srečković

Tekstovi su urednički izabrani i svi prevodi pregledani od strane/ Texts editorially selected and all translations reviewed by Marina Gržinić.

DIZAJN/ DESIGNED BY

Marina Gržinić i/and Zvonka T Simčič

PRELOM/ PAGE LAYOUT BY

Zvonka T Simčič

Tiraž/Print run: 300

Štampa/Printed: Passage group, Miloša Obrenovića 12, Pančevo.

Septembar 2012/September 2012

Kulturni centar Pančevo podržao je realizaciju ovog projekta u okviru vizuelnog segmenta 15. Bijenala umetnosti DE/RE/KONSTRUKCIJA: prostor, vreme, sećanje, Pančevo, Srbija.

Cultural center Pančevo supported the production of this project within the visual segment of 15th Biennial of Art: DE/RE/CONSTRUCTION: space, time, memories in Pančevo, Serbia.

Selektori vizuelnog programa Bijenala/Selectors of the biennale visual segment:

Nikola Dedić, Aneta Stojnić

Koordinacija/Coordinators:

Snežana Čuruvija, Mirjana Kamenko



Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike
CC BY-NC-SA

Dozvoljava se korišćenje u nekomercijalne svrhe ovog dela i mogućih izvedenih dela, čija distribucija mora imati istu licencu kao što je ona koja uređuje originalno delo.

This license lets others remix, tweak, and build upon your work non-commercially, as long as they credit you and license their new creations under the identical terms.

Adresa/Address:

De-artikulacija
CCC,
Masarykova 24,
SI - 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia

Kontakt/Contact:

crosscommunitycreation@gmail.com

Online dostup/Online access:

<http://bijenaleumetnosti.rs/2012/download/De-Artikulacija.pdf>



KULTURNI
CENTAR
PANČEVA

de/re/konstrukcija:

prostor/vreme/sećanje

de/re/construction:

space/time/memories



15.
BIJENALE
UMETNOSTI



15th
BIENNIAL
OF ART

