

MONITORISH

XII/1 • 2010

Revija za humanistične in družbene vede

Journal for the Humanities and Social Sciences

IZDAJA:

Institutum Studiorum Humanitatis, Fakulteta za podiplomski humanistični študij, Ljubljana

PUBLISHED BY:

Institutum Studiorum Humanitatis, Ljubljana Graduate School of the Humanities

Monitor ISH

Revija za humanistične in družbene vede / *Journal for the Humanities and Social Sciences*

ISSN 1580-688X, številka vpisa v razvid medijev: 272

Revija je vključena v bazo dLib.si - Digitalna knjižnica Slovenije.

Uredniški odbor / *Editorial Board*

NADA GROŠELJ (jezikoslovje), MATEJ HRIBERŠEK (antični študiji), JANEZ JUSTIN (lingvistika), KARMEN MEDICA (socialna antropologija), JURE MIKUŽ (zgodovinska antropologija), SVETLANA SLAPŠAK (antropologija spolov), TONE SMOLEJ (imagologija), JOŽE VOGRINC (medijski študiji)

Mednarodni uredniški svet / *International Advisory Board*

ROSI BRAIDOTTI (University Utrecht), MARIA-CECILIA D'ERCOLE (Université de Paris I - Sorbonne, Pariz), MARIE-ÉLIZABETH DUCROUX (EHESS, Pariz), DAŠA DUHAČEK (Centar za ženske studije, FPN, Beograd), FRANÇOIS LISSARRAGUE (EHESS, Centre Louis Gernet, Pariz), LISA PARKS (UC Santa Barbara)

Glavna urednica / *Editor-in-Chief*

MAJA SUNČIČ

Lektor za slovenščino / *Reader for Slovene*

MILAN ŽLOF

Lektorja za angleščino / *Readers for English*

MARKO IPAVEC, NADA GROŠELJ

Oblikovanje in stavek / *Design and Typeset*

MARJAN BOŽIČ

Naslov uredništva / *Editorial Office Address*

MONITOR ISH, Knaflijev prehod 11, 1000 Ljubljana

Tel.: + 386 1 425 18 45

Založnik / *Publisher*

Institutum Studiorum Humanitatis, Fakulteta za podiplomski humanistični študij, Ljubljana / *Institutum Studiorum Humanitatis, Ljubljana Graduate School of the Humanities*

Direktorica / *Director*

ALJA BRGLEZ

Korespondenco, rokopise in recenzentske izvode knjig pošiljajte na naslov uredništva. /

Editorial correspondence, enquiries and books for review should be addressed to Editorial Office.

Revija izhaja dvakrat letno. / *The journal is published twice annually.*

Naročanje / *Ordering*

ISH, Knaflijev prehod 11, SI-1000 Ljubljana, Slovenija

Tel.: (01) 425 18 45

E-naslov / *E-mail*: maja.suncic@gmail.com

Cena posamezne številke / *Single issue price*: 6,30 EUR

Letna naročnina / *Annual Subscription*: 12,50 EUR

Naklada: 400

<http://www.ish.si/publikacije-ish/monitor-ish/>

© *Institutum Studiorum Humanitatis*, Fakulteta za podiplomski humanistični študij, Ljubljana
Revija je izšla s podporo Javne agencije za knjigo RS in Študentske organizacije Univerze v Ljubljani.

Tisk / *Printed by*

Littera picta d. o. o., Ljubljana

Kazalo / Contents

FESTIVAL RDEČE ZORE / THE RED DAWNS FESTIVAL

- TEA HVALA 7-107
The Red Dawns Festival as a Feminist-Queer Counterpublic / *Festival Rdeče zore kot feministično-kvirovska kontrajavnost*

TEHNODISPOZITIV / TECHNODISPOSITIVE

- BOJAN ANĐELKOVIĆ 111-139
Subjekt v dispozitivu tehnologije / *The Subject in the Dispositive of Technology*

- BOJAN ANĐELKOVIĆ 141-169
Kako spremeniti subjekt? Remiksiraj ga. / *How to Change the Subject? Remix it.*

FOTOBANKE / STOCK PHOTOGRAPHY

- MAJA GUTMAN 173-190
Fotobanke – arhitekti medijskih reprezentacij realnosti / *Stock Photography – Building Media Representations of “Reality”*

DIALOG Z ANTIKO / DIALOGUE WITH ANTIQUITY

- NADA GROŠELJ 193-206
Mark Tulij Ciceron, *O dolžnostih (izbor)*

FESTIVAL
RDEČE
ZORE

TEA HVALA¹

The Red Dawns Festival as a Feminist-Queer Counterpublic

Abstract: The article discusses the feminist political theory of the internal and external functions of counterpublics, juxtaposing theoretic insights with an analysis of seventeen interviews carried out with the co-organisers of the International Feminist and Queer Red Dawns Festival (*Rdeče zore* in Slovene). The theme is framed in the recent history of feminist, lesbian and queer organising in Ljubljana, as well as the contemporary current of transnational DIY grassroots feminism. Geopolitically, the discussion is set in the postsocialist frame.

Key words: counterpublic, feminism, queer theory, Red Dawns, postsocialism

UDK: 305:32

Festival Rdeče zore kot feministično-kvirovska kontrajavnost

Izvleček: Prispevek obravnava feministično politično teorijo o notranji in zunanji funkciji kontrajavnosti. Teorijo sooči z analizo sedemnajstih intervjujev z organizatorkami Mednarodnega feminističnega in kvirovskega festivala Rdeče zore. Temo postavi v kontekst nedavne zgodovine feminističnega, lezbičnega in kvirovskega organiziranja v Ljubljani, v sodobni kontekst nadnacionalnega in neodvisnega naredi-sama feminizma in v geopolitični kontekst postsocializma.

¹ Tea Hvala is an independent writer and translator. She holds BA degrees in Comparative Literature and Sociology of Culture and a MA degree in Gender Studies. E-mail: tea.hvala@gmail.com

Ključne besede: kontrajavnost, feminizem, queer teorija, Rdeče zore, postsocializem



Introduction

In the geopolitical region of former Yugoslavia, several women's, feminist and queer festivals have been organized in the last decade. Most of them were non-professional, based on the Principle of "do it yourself" (DIY), and similar to Ladyfests which have taken place predominately in Western European and North American cities since 2000. While volunteer-run, horizontally organized and non-profit festivals such as Queer Belgrade (Serbia), PitchWise (Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina), Vox Feminae (Zagreb, Croatia) and Red Dawns (Ljubljana, Slovenia) managed to survive throughout the years, the majority of other non-professional festivals ceased to exist after their first edition. Some of them took place two or three times (Girlz are Weird in Kutina, Croatia) while others, like FemFest (Skopje, Macedonia), Girl Power Fest (Koprivnica, Croatia), and Zagreb-based festivals AnarchoFemFest and FemFest took place only once. In addition, there are three professionally organized festivals in the region which present contemporary art made by women (City of Women, Ljubljana), queers (Queer Zagreb) or lesbians, gays and other sexual minorities (Gay and Lesbian Film Festival, Ljubljana).

All of these festivals differ in terms of their political views, artistic visions, program items and target audiences. In spite of those differences, the majority of the then active festivals were very supportive of Red Dawns' 2006 call for cooperation between "women's,

feminist and queer festivals in the Balkans”² In March 2007, organizers of eight DIY and professional festivals came to Ljubljana where they finally met each other in person, shared their experience, and discussed each other’s organizing strategies as well as the obstacles they face in their work. The participants stipulated that they did not wish to unite and unify their agendas, but instead wanted to make communication and collaboration between themselves easier and more effective. Whilst the meeting did result in collaborations, program exchanges, staff sharing, and some joint funding applications, the network also brought to light another important difference between the festivals, which proved to be difficult to bridge despite the organizers’ desire to do so: that of professionalization. DIY and professional festivals have different conditions as well as methods of work, and one should be careful when comparing the two. In my essay, I chose not to compare these different branches of festivals, but instead framed my research within the space occupied by DIY festivals only. In fact, due to several limitations, I decided to focus on the DIY festival with the longest tradition in the region, the festival I know best because I have been co-organizing it since 2002: International Feminist and Queer Festival Red Dawns, based in the Autonomous Cultural Centre Metelkova mesto in Ljubljana, Slovenia. However, I did stipulate the international dimension of the festival by paying attention to its co-operation with Ladyfests from Western Europe and the women’s, feminist and queer festivals of the last decade that took place in the region of the former Yugoslavia.

The latter (spatial and temporal) frame of reference remains relevant for several reasons. Firstly, these festivals exist in a geopolitical space whose political and cultural imagined community had been almost completely destroyed fifteen years ago. Secondly, there

² Red Dawns, 2007a.

have been very deliberate efforts made by the festivals to learn more about forgotten local women's and feminist histories – cultural, political, social, intellectual, artistic – in an attempt to see the possibility of drawing a women's, feminist or even queer transgenerational genealogy. Thirdly, due to the impact of “nation-state-building” discourses that encouraged historical amnesia and supported negative media representations of feminisms after 1991, contemporary DIY festivals from the region define their politics primarily in relation (and opposition) to contemporary local academic and “NGO-ized” feminisms, rather than their local activist (and often forgotten) precedents. It would be highly interesting to study the similarities and differences between the festivals from the region to see which feminist and queer agendas are advocated as forms of “new”, “third wave” or simply “their own”, contemporary feminism. Even though I was forced to narrow my focus to Red Dawns festival only, I do hope that some of the originally planned comparative aspects, essential for a more distant, but no less subjective insight into “what it is we're doing”, remains visible to the extent that the reader can draw some of her or his own conclusions about this transnational yet geopolitically-bounded feminist-queer scene.

Situating Myself, Defining the Theme

My research theme was inspired by Gayatri Spivak's claim that every resistance is bound to fail if there is no infrastructure, no community in which the act can be understood as such.³ It was also inspired by Orchid, a hardcore band from the U. S., whose members self-ironically proclaimed “When we move, it's a movement!”⁴ and

³ Spivak, 1988.

⁴ Orchid, 1999. The slogan was quoted in the introductory text to the sixth Red Dawns festival in 2005 and taken from Orchid's song *Snow Delay at the Frankfurt School*. The whole lyric (supposedly) quotes a Situationist

disbanded soon afterwards. I wondered whether the organizers of Red Dawns festival managed to create a new public space or did they believe that the impact of their work was too limited, even self-referential, to the extent that the festival can be viewed as a literally “imagined community”?⁵ To what extent did their work touch, cross paths with, and conflict with other publics as well as the mainstream media and the “official public sphere”⁶ it frames? How did the organizers deal with the fact that any feminist-queer initiative is inevitably embedded in a patriarchal and heteronormative context? And what did it mean to have the privilege of organizing a festival in a “liberated”, “temporarily occupied” or “alternative” social space like ACC Metelkova mesto?

Could Red Dawns, other DIY women’s, feminist and queer festivals from the region, as well as their European and North American allies be seen as “oppositional imagined communities”?⁷ In Chandra T. Mohanty’s reinterpretation of Benedict Anderson’s concept, the proliferation of such communities coincides with the expansion of the so-called anti-globalist protests and the popularization of queer theory. In her view, these communities were originally limited to a certain town or country, and then started to connect to other independent cultural and activist groups on both national and transnational level. Red Dawns festival can indeed be seen as an imagined local community, which has been trying to create a feminist-queer space “from below” and thus create the conditions in which opposi-

poster or graffiti seen in the streets of Paris in May 1968: “Like anywhere else, there are no coincidences, probability makes for accomplices and change creates meaning.’ When we move, it’s a movement!” Orchid replaced the last sentence (“That’s when happiness and misery take shape.”) with a self-ironic conclusion.

⁵ Anderson, 1995.

⁶ Habermas, 1991.

⁷ Mohanty, 2002.

tion is possible. Yet, I wanted to test Mohanty's theory against the lived experience of Red Dawns (co)organizers and volunteers.

I have been co-organizing Red Dawns since 2002. Because I am so immersed in the subject of my study, I decided to situate myself in accordance with the principles of the feminist standpoint theory. Initially, I wanted to write from several points of view, including that of the relatively detached theorist. The latter promised to provide me with a means of *disidentification*, with the epistemic privilege of the "outsider within".⁸ My idea was based on the premise that grammatical distinctions could help me separate the different subjectivities at play. At the same time, I felt this approach might falsely suggest that the voices in use – 'she' the theorist, 'we' the organizing collective, and 'I' the participant or witness – can "solve" the paradoxes arising from the juxtaposition of these different yet intertwined subjectivities. I eventually decided to use first person singular throughout my essay although I did let myself slip into first person plural when the sense of belonging to Red Dawns seemed to validate, rather than disavow my claims. I thought my paradoxical position should be visible and dealt with in constructive ways. Feminist historian Luisa Passerini, for example, managed to do so in her studies by observing "the multiplicity of positions" or "the pluralisation of one's own image" as "a metaphor for non-singular subjectivity".⁹ This view allowed her to be self-reflective, self-ironic, conflicting and paradoxical: it was also a way to avoid essentialist views on experience as *the* authentic and reliable source.

For my research, I interviewed seventeen women who have co-organized the tenth Red Dawns festival in 2009. The interviews were oral and qualitative; they were conducted in either Slovene or English and consisted of thirteen basic questions that were modi-

⁸ Harding, 1991; Haraway, 1997.

⁹ Passerini, 2008, 266.

fied according to each interviewee's interests and level of involvement with the festival. Since my target group of interviewees consisted only of festival organizers and volunteers, it may seem like I have excluded festival audiences from the conceptualization of Red Dawns as a public. However, my narrowed focus is justified by the specificity of grassroots events such as Red Dawns. In contrast to professionally organized festivals, DIY festivals stipulate participation and, in addition, often cannot afford to distinguish between these roles even if they wanted to due to their financial limitations. In effect, the same people often play several different roles simultaneously – including the role of the audience. The second reason for my narrowed focus is that festivals such as Red Dawns came into being exactly because the women who organize them today acted on their own need for local feminist spaces. In other words, they did it for themselves first and, in the course of years, the new public sphere was able to develop primarily because of that motivation.

I was interested in addressing two aspects of the festival. The “internal” view addressed the organizers’ experience of the festival as a temporary and public feminist-queer space where art, theory, politics and life in general can be discussed in a stimulating, emotionally and intellectually affirmative environment. The second, “external” view, addressed those aspects that made the festival intellectually, artistically and politically visible to people who were not part of the “scene”. I wondered what – if anything – made the festival’s policy and events visible to the “general public”. I asked my interviewees how they (or rather we, since the answers were often built up from our joint effort to articulate what we have been doing together for the last eleven years) understand the idea of a feminist-queer public space, whether or not the festival fits that idea, and how the festival intertwines with other initiatives within what is locally known as the “alternative scene” in Ljubljana. Moreover,

how does Red Dawns fit in with the “jigsaw puzzle of today’s multifaceted, transnational DIY grassroots feminism”¹⁰ which is often, especially in the Western Europe and in the U.S., perceived as a specific current within today’s “third wave feminism”?¹¹

I rethought my theme through Rita Felski’s and Nancy Fraser’s theorizations of feminist counterpublics. In Felski’s theory, the “internal function” is defined as “generating a gender-specific identity grounded in a consciousness of community and solidarity among women”.¹² In Fraser’s terms, women-only and feminist counterpublics function as “spaces of withdrawal or regroupment”.¹³ Felski claimed that their second and equally important function is in “seeking to convince society as a whole of the validity of feminist claims, challenging existing structures of authority through political activity and theoretical critique”.¹⁴ Nancy Fraser spoke of counterpublics as “bases and training grounds for agitational activities directed towards wider publics” and added that it is “precisely in the dialectic between these two functions that their emancipatory potential resides”.¹⁵ I was especially intrigued by Nancy Fraser’s recognition of both dimensions’ importance and their dialectic relationship since it legitimised my own presupposition that the “internal” and “external” function of the festival can be juxtaposed and discussed relationally. In relation to a specific identity developed in spaces of withdrawal or regroupment, I examined the following questions: Did the festival’s declared politics of space (re)claiming succeed – or perhaps fail – in creating a safe space where the audience and partici-

¹⁰ Halberstam, 2005, 170.

¹¹ Pilcher & Whelehan, 2004; Chidgey, Reitsamer & Zobl, 2009.

¹² Felski, 1989, 168.

¹³ Fraser, 1990, 68.

¹⁴ Felski, 1989, 168.

¹⁵ Fraser, 1990, 68.

pants could discuss feminist and queer ideas, and put them to practice through cultural forms of activism? Was that space supportive of their political preferences and their (feminist, queer, lesbian, or/and other) identities? Did the organizers develop a sense of solidarity and community in the process? In relation to wider publics, I wondered, which tactics were used by the festival to gain media attention and legitimate their claims. Which issues and tactics were eventually most visible in the official public sphere? And last but not least: Is there a sense of continuity or discontinuity with feminists who were active in the past? After all, Red Dawns festival takes place annually around March 8th, and thus celebrates and reinterprets the significance of International Women's Day.

Due to my theoretical framework, my research provides a new insight into the recent history of feminist, lesbian, queer and women's counterpublics in Ljubljana. In the past, the debates have too often revolved around the immediate effects of feminist interventions in the official public sphere. Those accounts have obscured the internal function of feminist-queer counterpublics and, so I believe, self-consciously fell into an ideological trap of measuring their own political visibility with "masculinist" measures. The latter define relevant forms of political/public participation in ways that have historically excluded (and continue to exclude) the so-called "private" and "women's" as well as "lesbian" and "queer" issues from the public sphere. Thus, my essay argues for the necessity of expanding the notions of political and public beyond those prevalent in the mainstream media and the official public sphere in Slovenia. My work is therefore a critique of hegemonic discourse and a contribution to the diversification of (counter)public feminist-queer discourses. As mentioned, I was interested in the experience of Red Dawns, that is, in what sort of opinions were formed, changed or abandoned by women who actively participated

in the process of organizing the festival. However, I was also interested to know how our experience corresponded with or perhaps challenged the existing body of knowledge on feminist and queer counterpublics. For that purpose, I began my research by studying feminist political theory on public space.

Theories of Feminist-Queer Counterpublics

In 1990, Nancy Fraser argued for the necessity of theorizing non-liberal, non-bourgeois and competing public spheres that were excluded from Jürgen Habermas's highly influential study *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere* (1962). Her argument rested on the growing body of feminist and postcolonial revisionist historiographies which, among other things, demonstrated that the members of subordinated social groups “repeatedly found it advantageous to constitute alternative publics”.¹⁶ Fraser's main point was that “subaltern counterpublics” contested the exclusionary norms of the bourgeois public sphere by elaborating alternative styles of political behaviour and alternative norms of public speech. In these parallel discursive sites, subordinated people could “invent and circulate counterdiscourses, which in turn permitted them to formulate oppositional interpretations of their identities, interests and needs”.¹⁷ Consequently they could enter official public spheres on their own terms by representing themselves.

Fraser coined the expression “subaltern counterpublics” by combining and reinterpreting two terms used by other theorists for similar purposes; “subaltern” was taken from Gayatri Spivak's well known essay *Can the Subaltern Speak?* (1988) and was, as I intend to show below, misinterpreted. “Counterpublics” was adopted from Rita Felski's study *Beyond Feminist Aesthetics* (1989). For Felski, the

¹⁶ Fraser, 1990, 67.

¹⁷ Fraser, 1990, *ibidem*.

concept of a feminist counterpublic provided a model for the analysis of diverse forms of artistic and cultural activity by women in relation to the historical emergence of an influential oppositional ideology (in the late 1960s and 1970s), which sought to challenge the existing reality of gender subordination. This model enabled the situating of debate over artistic forms in relation to the conflicting needs of different sections of the women's movement rather than "simply assigning abstract political value to particular techniques".¹⁸ Both authors emphasized that it is important to recognize a variety of tactics and spaces in which subordinated groups of people can articulate their needs and interests as political and public. In Fraser's view, these proliferations lead towards greater democracy by lessening the chance of informal exclusion.

Questioning the legitimacy and efficacy of Habermas's theorization, both authors tried to conceptualize an alternative that would allow them to study the status and effects of the women's movement "as a force for change in the public realm".¹⁹ Felski claimed that feminist as well as other oppositional forces within the society of late capitalism no longer appeal to an ideal of universality but are directed towards an affirmation of specificity in relation to gender, race, ethnicity, age, sexual preference and other axes of difference. Because of her focus on politics of recognition, Felski stipulated the multiple and heterogeneous nature of counterpublics, but also claimed that they are united by a common concern for "new forms of social and political relations in which (...) mutuality, discussion, and concern with concrete needs predominate".²⁰ By implicitly expressing her belief that counterpublics cannot form a single revolutionary movement, she criticized the leftist revolu-

¹⁸ Felski, 1989, 164.

¹⁹ Felski, 1989, *ibidem*.

²⁰ Felski, 1989, 166.

tionary rhetoric of the late 1960s, which, like the bourgeois public sphere, tended to suppress internal differences within the movement for the sake of its external efficiency.

On the other hand, when focusing on the equally heterogeneous feminist movement, Felski insisted that a common identity of all women, based on a shared experience of gender-based oppression, was not only necessary but demanded that “distinctions of class may be temporarily suspended, though not ignored within this new domain”.²¹ Supposedly, this was possible because shared experiences worked to “equalize” all participants within it. It is worth noting that for Felski, feminist counterpublics consisted of *women*, who *experienced* oppression, rather than *feminists* who *politicised* that experience through their fight against cultural values, political orders and economic systems that perpetuate oppression. She insisted that some form of appeal to collective identity and solidarity was a necessary precondition for the emergence and effectiveness of an oppositional movement since

feminist theorists who reject any notion of a unifying identity as a repressive fiction in favor of a stress on absolute difference fail to show how such diversity and fragmentation can be reconciled with goal-oriented political struggles based upon common interests.²²

Rita Felski was well aware that all feminist counterpublics inevitably have to deal with the conflicting need to affirm and at the same time criticize the idea of a unified (not necessarily essentialist) women’s collective identity. Yet, because of her reliance on politics of recognition, she failed to notice that a “unifying identity” on one hand and “absolute difference” on the other do not need to be the only available positions within feminist counterpublics.

²¹ Felski, 1989, *ibidem*.

²² Felski, 1989, 168-9.

In my essay, I largely rely on Nancy Fraser's theory since it is preoccupied with the possibility of self-representation in conditions of social inequality as viewed from both the "internal" and "external" perspective. In her opinion, the expression of conflicting views within (as well as between) political groups, which strive for political recognition, is an advantage rather than a disadvantage since the concept of a public sphere presupposes a plurality of perspectives among those who participate in it. I agree that it is less likely for the most often expressed opinion to appropriate or silence all other voices if an opposition challenges the former. I also agree that conflicts help to sustain egalitarian relations within the group and strengthen its internal function. However, I am ambivalent as to whether internal disagreements can increase the groups' external efficiency since a group can become so troubled by its inner conflicts that eventually all energy is spent on that. Often, what follows is either disintegration or further fragmentation.

Knowing how vulnerable grassroots groups can be, I argue that some form of appeal to collective identity has to prevail if a group wants to communicate with other counterpublics. In addition, there is always a disparity between a counterpublics' inner and external status; between its self-understanding as a representative forum for feminists that is usually conflictual, and the picture the group wants to give to the public. In its external function, it will have to claim unity and consensus in order to be "taken seriously" – to be able to communicate with other (counter)publics. For Fraser, this communication is vital as she claims that the public orientation of oppositional spheres allows people's participation in more than one sphere, which makes both "intercultural and interpublic discussions possible".²³ Since the concept of counterpublics assumes an orientation towards wider publics it – in the long run – also works against

²³ Fraser, 1990, 70.

separatism: no matter how limited they are in their numbers or outreach, members of counterpublics see themselves as part of a potentially wider public. That is why counterpublics, as seen by Fraser, are not separatist enclaves by definition even if they might be “involuntarily enclaved”.²⁴

In order to challenge those theories that claim democracy can function in conditions of social inequality, Fraser initially spoke of “subaltern counterpublics”. Gayatri Spivak’s terminology was seen as appropriate for discussing the conditions in which self-representation of subordinated groups was still possible. However, I do not think that Fraser’s use of the term was in accordance with Spivak’s. I suspect this is also the reason why Nancy Fraser’s newer essays no longer employ that category but speak of counterpublics only. While she claimed that subaltern counterpublics can represent themselves even if they are often “silenced, encouraged to keep their wants inchoate, and heard to say ‘yes’ when what they have said is ‘no’”,²⁵ Spivak’s view was more pessimistic. She did not claim that subalterns could ever speak on their own terms. In fact, when Spivak wrote of subaltern subjects, she did not refer to individuals, organized in groups, but to subjects who have no community, and therefore cannot speak since there is nobody to listen and nobody to recognize their acts of resistance as such. Spivak did speculate about the possibility of self-representation in a hypothetical situation in which a subaltern woman no longer needed to speak the standardized “text of female exploitation” and the manipulation of her agency by either other subalterns or feminists from hegemonic culture was no longer an option. However, in order to make that possible, the understanding of what counts as resistance would have to be radically changed and expanded. Spi-

²⁴ Fraser, 1990, 67.

²⁵ Fraser, 1990, 64.

vak's essay did not claim that this was possible in the present economic and political order.

Similarly, public participation is not merely about being able to state propositions that are "neutral" or understandable to all other (counter)publics. For Fraser, "participation means being able to speak 'in one's own voice', thereby simultaneously constructing and expressing one's cultural identity through idiom and style".²⁶ Since no public sphere is neutral or universal, in the sense that it can accommodate any kind of expression, it favours dominant, generally recognizable forms of expression. Fraser believed that counterpublics have the power to articulate an issue in their own way – or in dialogue with other counterpublics – and insist on it until it is recognized as an issue of general concern. She mentioned the example of "domestic violence" or "date rape" as terms that have entered the list of general concerns and legislature because of feminist efforts that originally started in weak counterpublics that possessed only opinion-making power. This example confirms that Fraser was indeed speaking of organized feminist and women's publics in the West, and not about women who would fit Spivak's definition of subalterns as "subjects of exploitation" who "cannot know and speak the text of female exploitation even if the absurdity of the non-representing intellectual making space for her [them] to speak is achieved".²⁷

Since my essay is preoccupied with feminist-queer organizing in Ljubljana where counterpublic organizing is possible and indeed taking place, I have refrained from using the term "subaltern" as well. I have relied more on Fraser's and Felski's idea about the necessity of proliferating forms of political expression in ways that can accommodate a plurality of subordinated groups. Specifically,

²⁶ Fraser, 1990, 69.

²⁷ Spivak, 1988, 84.

my case study of Red Dawns focuses on the tactical significance of the festival's cultural activism because the institutionalised understanding of political participation and public matters of general concern in Slovenia continues to exclude feminist, queer and lesbian issues as personal, private and apolitical. I am not interested in seeking abstract political value in specific tactical approaches but in theorizing about Red Dawns as a counterpublic space with both an internal and external function on the basis of its founders', organizers' and volunteers' experience and perception of the festival. In order to do that, I contextualize Red Dawns within the space, occupied by women's, feminist, lesbian and queer groups that have been active in Ljubljana for the last ten years. My genealogic revision of autonomous initiatives tries to discuss their internal function in relation to (the extent and limits of) their mobilizing power, that is, the ways in which they try to enter official public sphere and claim counterpublic spaces of their own.

(In)visibility of Feminist-Queer Counterpublics in Ljubljana

In her 2007 review of local non-institutional feminist history, journalist Tanja Lesničar Pučko noted that the 1980s movement was "characterized by a critical - and humorous - attitude towards the hegemonic discourse of Yugoslavian politics and aesthetics".²⁸ She also claimed that women's and feminist autonomous groups from the 1980s "established a kind of network that, to a certain extent, in this way or that, still exists and (perhaps?) still carries a latent mobilizing power, an informal potential for solidarity".²⁹ In 2002, political theorist Vlasta Jalušič claimed that "certain feminist ideas and lifestyles have become part of our everyday life" yet "today feminist groups in Slovenia can

²⁸ Lesničar Pučko, 2007, 82.

²⁹ Lesničar Pučko, 2007, 83.

be counted on the fingers of one hand”.³⁰ Four years later, journalist Valentina Plahuta Simčič in her article about contemporary “Slovene feminism” wondered whether “there are any feminists left at all”.³¹ She interviewed two of the most prominent feminist intellectuals in Slovenia, anthropologist Svetlana Slapšak and philosopher Eva D. Bahovec – and me.³² Both academics refused the presupposition about the seeming absence of feminist thought in contemporary official public sphere by claiming, similarly to Vlasta Jalušič, that feminist views have “spread throughout the social body”.³³ To support their claims, Eva D. Bahovec listed an array of associations and institutions that have incorporated feminist ideas into their work.

Feminists are present at universities, institutions; there is very lively publishing activity, with many small presses releasing feminist works (*cf, Sophia, ŠKUC’s Vizibilija, Lambda and Aleph editions, Krtina, Analecta, Studia Humanitatis...); there is *Delta* magazine; Radio Študent is doing an excellent job when it comes to feminist issues; an active part of feminist scene consists of women’s groups (SOS phones, Ključ Association); the number of cultural and artistic projects with women’s or feminist themes (festivals like City of Women and Red Dawns) is growing”.³⁴

³⁰ Jalušič, 2002, 89.

³¹ Plahuta Simčič, 2006, 15.

³² While I was invited to speak on behalf of Red Dawns festival, the context – a full page article about *Slovene* feminism published in one of the most widely read dailies (*Delo*) – positioned me as a representative voice of the “new” or “young” generation of local feminists. The article was accompanied by a photograph of several female Slovene Army soldiers jumping out of the back of a truck. By reducing our transnational feminist claims to a national context, the journalist (and/or the photo editor) depoliticised our statements and appropriated their disruptive potential for nation-state-building and militant goals.

³³ Plahuta Simčič, 2006, 15.

³⁴ Plahuta Simčič, 2006, *ibidem*.

Focusing primarily on groups formed in the 1980s and institutionalised in mid-1990s, her account did not include the full spectrum of feminist activities in Ljubljana. She did not mention (and might not be aware of) those grassroots activities that evade her implicit criteria, largely because they are politically marginalized and organized by a younger generation of activists, artists and students who, in turn, might not be aware of their local feminist predecessors and institutionalised contemporaries or are not in accord with their political strategies.

As I have demonstrated below, grassroots, autonomous or DIY groups today do exist. In fact, when the reproductive rights of women were threatened again in 2006, it became quite clear that it would be necessary to fight in more visible ways. However, the question persists: Is feminists' ability to mobilize people today really restrained to politically similar counterpublics that exist within what is jokingly known as the "liberated territory" or "alternative scene" in Ljubljana? In 2006, when feminist scholars urged that "the situation is ripe for feminist activism",³⁵ a graffiti from 1991 reappeared with renewed urgency. "Women against nation – for abortion rights!" it called, signed by the feminist symbol and a clenched fist. Another graffiti ironically remarked that in 2006, "A foetus has more rights than a woman". These actions and the less successful protests against the discrimination of lesbians, single women and women with disabilities in 2000, were the two occasions when the (limits of the) mobilizing potential of feminist initiatives in Slovenia was most visible. The protests also shed some light on the existing transgenerational feminist connections.

In a country where lesbians and gays can "register" their partnership but do not have access to the legal rights provided by the

³⁵ Plahuta Simčič, 2006, *ibidem*.

institution of marriage,³⁶ reproductive rights are granted to heterosexual women only. Already in 2000 when the newly elected conservative government attempted to implement a legislation that would make artificial insemination available only to heterosexual couples who were married or cohabiting, this serious violation of women's reproductive choices faced severe opposition from a wide array of feminist, lesbian, women's and other progressive groups. Later that year, liberally oriented political parties tried to introduce an amendment that would make medically assisted artificial insemination formally accessible to single women, lesbians and women with disabilities. However, the right-wing parliamentary parties used the opportunity of installing a public referendum about the issue. The right of single women to get artificially inseminated was put under the final decision of the voting majority in the summer of 2001 – and was rejected. To this day, artificial insemination remains inaccessible to lesbians, single women and women with disabilities in Slovenia.

Four years later, on March 8th 2005, an anonymous letter entitled “Do you remember March 8th?” claimed that the 2005 governmental proposal for positive demographic growth used hate speech and discriminatory measures. The letter criticized the Minister of Labour, Family and Social Affairs Janez Drobnič who

sent women back to the kitchen by suggesting that the recently fired female textile workers ‘who are skilled cooks and domestic labourers’ could use their skills on the labour market as well. (...)

³⁶ Hopefully, that is about to change. In July 2009, the court held that the first Registration of Same Sex Partnerships Act proposed in November 2006 was based on unequal and discriminatory standards between same sex and opposite sex couples and therefore unconstitutional. On March 2nd 2010, after intense public debates, legal complaints and protests, the revised and indiscriminatory version of the act successfully passed the first parliamentary reading and voting. However, the second reading, which began on June 30th 2010 and continued on September 1st 2010, is still going on.

Member of Parliament, Pavel Rupar, suggested that the state should lessen its financial support for safe houses because they undermine the idea of the family as a traditionally safe environment. (...) All these statements are violent and put pressure on all residents of Slovenia.

The public letter was handed out by a small activist group that staged a burlesque portrayal of patriarchal family roles in Park Zvezda and ridiculed the minister personally by calling itself the Janez Drobnič Folklore Group. On November 15th 2006, the same minister proposed a “fertility raising strategy” which, among many other discriminatory suggestions, limited access to abortion. The strategy proposed a 400 € fee for (previously free) abortion procedures, thus ensuring that abortion would become inaccessible for a large number of poor and young women. The strategy was, like the successfully opposed proposition from 1991, trying to instrumentalize women for its own “nation-building” goals. Furthermore, the new legislation used catholic discourse by equating the beginning of life with conception. Streetwise feminists responded with graffiti: “A foetus has more rights than a woman”, “Let’s abort Drobnič!”, “I’d rather be a test-tube baby than Drobnič’s child”, and a slogan which connected the discriminatory proposal about artificial insemination from 2000 with the same type of demographic policy by sarcastically offering the perfect solution: “To raise fertility – inseminate single women and lesbians”.

Already on November 17th 2006, the ad hoc Feminist Initiative in Support of Abortion Rights entered ministry bureaus early in the morning and awaited the employees with a statement objecting the proposed strategy:

The state reduces women to irrational beings who are unable to decide for themselves (...) and whose primary function is repro-

duction. (...) We strongly oppose the proposed strategy and ask how is it possible that Slovene government is systematically violating and abolishing human rights. Who is going to be next?

The activists used posters and banners to surround the bureaus and publicly expose it as a violator of women's rights. The slogans ("Women = birth machines", "Defend abortion rights - tomorrow it is going to be too late", "Yesterday migrants and Erased citizens, today Roma people and women; who is next?") placed discriminatory policies against women in the context of institutionalised violence against many other marginalized groups of people. On November 30th, the initiative co-organized the first public discussion about the proposed strategy together with the Peace Institute and Red Dawns festival. Because of increasing public pressure,³⁷ the unconstitutional strategy was eventually abandoned and the responsible Minister was forced to resign.

The first feminist street actions of the new millennium in Ljubljana were inspired by the informal network of groups and individuals that began their political activities after world-wide protests against the World Trade Organisation meeting in Seattle in 1999. In response to biased reports in Slovene media that addressed the protesters as "criminals", a group of protesters walked the streets

³⁷ Public letters demanding Minister Drobnič's immediate leave were written by The Peace Institute, an impromptu protest group of women signed as 'Outraged', another group signed as 'Concerned Citizens', autonomous Feminist Initiative, association Vita Activa, Equal Opportunity Group of the Liberal Democratic Party, the Progressive Party, academic political group Liberal Academy, The Institute for Parenthood and Family, the Non-Governmental Organizations Alliance, the Women's forum and the Deputy Group of Social Democrats, and the thirty-two intellectuals who co-authored and signed the *Public Initiative for the Formation of a Comprehensive National Strategy* (Vita Activa, 2006).

of Ljubljana in November 1999 and carried banners claiming, “We are the criminals!” The movement gained further experience with smaller actions and performances (in Interspar, a group of women activists ‘advertised’ Heidersil; a new washing powder that cleans historic stains and contains ‘adolfils’), with solidarity and group actions (for example, on the International Day of Persons with Disabilities), with constant resistance to police harassment in ACC Metelkova mesto, by participating in Prague protests and with raising attention to state violence.³⁸

In order to coordinate the network, UZI (*Urad za intervencije* or Bureau of Interventions) was founded. The bureau was a fictional organization with fictional headquarters, leadership and members; it consisted of a series of meetings where individual activists and self-organized groups learnt how to communicate and organize in anti-authoritarian ways. Women and feminists who took part in these meetings politicised gender and sexuality in relation to many other issues, including violations of women’s sexual autonomy and reproductive choices, poverty and the discriminatory labour market, invisibility of marginalized and victimized people, privatisation of public spaces and right-wing reinterpretations of recent history. They expressed their politics through relatively explicit feminist terminology and mainly used street protest as their tactic.

On March 8th 2001, *Ženska sekcija Urada za intervencije* (Women’s Section of Bureau of Interventions), consisting of two small activist groups, temporarily squatted cosmetics and women’s clothing department stores in the centre of Ljubljana. They addressed the general commercialisation of life and the repressive nature of private spaces reserved exclusively for consumption. They danced among the bewildered customers and shop assistants, and

³⁸ Zadnikar, 2004, 15.

spread out somewhat confusing flyers (depicting a Barbie doll with a mobile phone) that read:

The International Women's Day might make you worry about exactly what it is that makes you a woman. Is it your man? Your child? (...) The contents of your shopping bag? Your high heels? (...) The way you hold your cigarette? All of this is important. (It really doesn't matter.) You are important.

When security staff threatened them with police intervention, the groups continued the action in front of the stores – on public grounds. One group read the manifesto *AlieNation: The Map of Despair* written by the U.S. collective CrimethInc., demanding the creation of public spaces where “we can let our bodies and minds run free” as opposed to

control that is exerted over us automatically by the spaces we live and move in. We go through certain rituals in our lives – work, ‘leisure’, consumption, submission –because the world we live in is designed for these alone. (...) All the spaces we travel in have pre-set meanings, and all it takes to keep us going through the same motions is to keep us moving along the same paths.³⁹

The second group read excerpts from Virginia Woolf's *A Room of One's Own*. On the same day, Nada Hass (*nada* means “nothing” in Spanish and *hass* means “hatred” in German), an improvised all-women activist choir, performed at Klub Gromka in ACC Metelkova mesto. Dressed up as cleaners and housekeepers, they sang: “Let's set things straight with our past, let's wipe away the borders, let's make our relationships work and wipe away the violence!”⁴⁰ Nada Hass was also a fictional public relations personality invented in

³⁹ CrimethInc. Ex-workers' Collective, 2001.

⁴⁰ Ozmec, 2001, 14.

order to “avoid exposure of individual activists and avoid media production of ‘leaders’ (...) Nada Hass did many phone interviews but never appeared on television. Many were disturbed by Nada’s mixing of playfulness, irony and performance with political issues”.⁴¹

The oppositional knowledge listed in this metaphorical feminist-queer textbook is site-specific as it can only exist and renew itself on the streets. It cannot be transferred to another medium – the least of all into a textbook since graffiti and street actions are primarily physical and anonymous acts of resistance. Their reclaiming of public spaces has the potential of diverting attention from the violence of advertisement to unprofitable yet crucial issues. Street actions and graffiti also create the possibility of encounters in urban settings which have been, in absence of “sustainable planning”, deprived of public meeting places. Individual slogans and actions addressed specific issues, and activists sought the comfort of the night and anonymity exactly because they wanted to avoid confrontations with the law and possible confrontations with their political opponents. The undeniable and irreplaceable element of this type of street activism is the experience of physical vulnerability and exposure, which, paradoxically, gives strength to the activists. From a feminist perspective this type of exposure has additional meanings inscribed: through it, women do not only reclaim the streets but also their bodies, their knowledge and history. And they have no choice; they must be rebellious as long as they are oppressed. Or, to rephrase the point made: the actions and alliances described in this chapter, these counterpublics-in-progress, suggest that small feminist, lesbian, queer or women’s groups can come up with tactical and constructive critique. They suggest that one of the many places where we can start rethinking and practicing feminism in relation to struggles for social justice is *the street*.

⁴¹ Zadnikar, 2004, 16.

Discontinuity or Change?

The examples stated above demonstrate that feminist-queer ideas in Slovenia have indeed “spread throughout the social body”. Yet, it could be easily argued that when viewed only from the perspective of their external function feminist political initiatives are often ineffective due to their rare and provisional nature. Even though collaborations between academic, non-governmental and grassroots groups exist, they are very vulnerable because they form only in response to particular cases of discrimination or hatred and usually disband when the immediate threat is over or when specialized political groups take over the case. This defensive position is one of the reasons for feminists’ perceived political/public invisibility. However, as mentioned, the temporary and provisional nature of cooperative actions reflects other problems that are specific for feminists from postsocialist countries even though they partly coincide with problems of Western feminisms: the reluctance to identify and be recognized as feminists due to general antifeminism and the stigmatisation of feminism as a separatist and misandrist ideology; the reluctance to actively participate in collectively and voluntarily-run political, cultural and artistic non-profit projects due to the increasing value attributed to individualism and consumerism; and the general lack of solidarity, reflected also in feminist and women’s groups reluctance to seek potential allies in other counterpublics – and vice versa.

Of course, this reasoning is based on an implicit idea of how feminist organizing should be structured. Its insistence on collective organizing is reductive and hinders one’s ability to recognize individual forms of feminist-queer activism that without doubt exist. I argue that in the current political circumstance, collective and autonomous organizing makes tactical sense since it has the ability to open up new counterpublic spaces where femi-

nist issues can be discussed and strategies of action can be planned. Both Nancy Fraser's theorization of counterpublics and Mary Pratt's concept of a "contact zone"⁴² – as the site where feminists and queers can meet, interact, negotiate and cooperate – allows me to expand the notion of physical space to a discursive one; to the study of the many alliances and co-operations that can be formed between individuals and groups on a local, regional and international scale. I believe that as long as these public spaces cannot be taken for granted, the need for collective feminist action remains important. I also believe that the relative invisibility of feminist initiatives in Slovenia today is the reason why a feminist and lesbian "oppositional imagined community" with "the potential to build alliances and collaborations across divisive boundaries"⁴³ of identity in non-hierarchical ways and with the desire to resist persistent and systemic forms of domination is, at this stage, still very vulnerable and loose. In fact, the term "community" suggests the kind of permanence of activities and alliances that cannot be seen in Ljubljana. Nevertheless, the existing groups, initiatives and alliances are important agents of both continuity and change *within* the very fragmented feminist-queer map of Ljubljana.

Mohanty's political rather than essentialist definition of community recognizes the possibility of strategic and temporary cultural-political alliances that define women's, feminist and queer festivals both as physical and discursive points of convergence for people who wish to define their own forms of cultural-political participation and resistance. Writer and lesbian activist Suzana Tratnik, who collaborated with Red Dawns from 2000 to 2007 (as part of the lesbian club Monokel), claims that the festival's de-

⁴² Pratt, 1992.

⁴³ Mohanty, 1991, 196.

clared politics of space (re)claiming were, and remain, very “real” and important:

Because of Red Dawns, people started talking about feminism or, actually, feminisms again. For a long time, this was not the case, especially after Ženski center [Metelkova Women’s Center] died away. (...) Because the feminist scene from the 1980s partitioned and got specialized – some focused on violence against women, others on Women’s Studies, etc. – there were no events, no public spaces, no gatherings. And that was missing.

Yet, as other interviewees suggested, the successful creation of a counterpublic feminist-queer space is only the first step on the long way to achieve the kind of network intersections, horizontal solidarity and continuity necessary for establishing a feminist-queer counterpublic. At most, they would refer to the present state of affairs as a “local scene” limited to Ljubljana.

It seems that rather than seeking inspiration from local feminist groups of the 1980s or local feminist knowledge production of the 1990s and the last decade, the new generation of feminists tends to, among other sources, rely on do-it-yourself politics. DIY feminism is an umbrella term fusing many different types of feminism. Drawing on genealogies of punk cultures, grassroots movements, and the technologies of late capitalism, this movement meshes lifestyle politics with countercultural networking. It takes everyday acts of resistance as its focus. In her article about DIY feminist networks in Europe, Red Chidgey claims, “DIY feminism disrupts beliefs that feminism and social change are no longer on the agenda of young people”.⁴⁴ She refers to both Western and Eastern-European contexts and writes that the roots of contemporary DIY feminisms can be traced to the so-called post-feminist milieu, constituting a grass-

⁴⁴ Chidgey, 2009a.

roots, micro-political or counterpublic feminist response to consumer capitalism and state authority. “Drawing on the cultural currency of prefigurative politics – of living the change you want to see in the world”⁴⁵, or indeed on the legacy of Situationism, these ideas circulate through the “affective economies of passion, pleasure, friendships, and community-building”.⁴⁶ As Belgium zine-maker Nina Nijsten stated:

DIY feminism is about doing feminism by ourselves and making changes, however small they may seem at first sight. It means not waiting for others, for “professionals” or politicians, to make the world more women-friendly and to solve problems related to sexism.⁴⁷

In Chidgey’s view, DIY feminist actions take many forms, but commonly include producing activist media and films, squatting buildings to create counterpublic spaces, creating guerrilla or street art, holding discussion groups, facilitating workshops, moving politics into music and performance, skill-sharing, organizing street demos and protests, and exploring self-sufficiency. From my own perspective, DIY feminism allows for an even more profound proliferation of tactical approaches to re-envisioning and transforming society – one that most certainly seems ineffective and invisible when viewed exclusively from the point of view of feminist-queer counterpublics’ external function. However, by paying attention to their internal aspect, it becomes possible to speak about individual acts of resistance and the invisible day and night dreaming that expands the mental space as equally legitimate acts of resistance. All these tactics can be accommodated

⁴⁵ Chidgey, 2009a.

⁴⁶ Chidgey, 2009a.

⁴⁷ Chidgey & Zobl, 2009.

within DIY queer-feminism and its European network. As the organizers agreed, Red Dawns festival is definitely part of that transnational network. “On the international level, the network has already been weaved. The festival is great because it enabled a space, an entry point into that network”, said Daša Tepina and immediately noted the irony of the situation in which the festival is more connected internationally than locally. “On the local level, the problem remains”, she said:

We are unable to organize ourselves to the point where we could come up with a visible practice that would make sense so that we would not push ourselves back into the margins. (...) First, you need a strong base from where you can support people and projects. On the international level, the solidarity network is important. On the local level, you can of course expect solidarity from others but you cannot expect that somebody else is going to work instead of you locally. That’s the problem (...); first, you need something to root your connections in. I think it is of high importance to work on a local infrastructure, be it theory or action-orientated, in order to be able to react to different types of problems, to join certain initiatives, and generally become more visible in society.

The fact that the temporary nature of the festival is very much connected to the issue of discontinuity and the general absence of a feminist-queer counterpublic in Ljubljana, is going to be discussed in the final chapter. At this point, I want to stipulate Red Chidgey’s view that DIY feminist interventions in Europe are “often temporary or ephemeral”, where “creating autonomous zones such as festivals and gatherings are an integral part of DIY feminism”. In the same way, anti-capitalist tendencies are inherently bound up in these actions: “self/collective produced culture, politics, entertain-

ment, and work are held as ideals, and non-profit voluntary or activist labour is the movement's lifeblood".⁴⁸

In addition to DIY politics and ideals, feminist and queer counterpublics in Ljubljana have been influenced by the variety of ideas that can be found under the increasingly popular tag of "queer politics" and, as mentioned, the activist practices of creative resistance, revived by the "anti-globalisation" movements for social justice of the new millennium. And while these new feminist and queer initiatives have indeed politicised new issues and created new public spaces from below, it is worth noticing that feminists from the 1980s fought in the name of the same principles. Since the latter continue to be intellectually, artistically and politically active, the reasons for a very noticeable generational discontinuity and the general perception about feminism's invisibility today have to be sought elsewhere. In this respect, understanding "the postsocialist condition"⁴⁹ is of key importance.

I am going to focus on the postsocialist condition as experienced in Slovenia. First, I am going to analyse the rise of new conservatism in the form of ethnocentrism, right-wing historical revisionism and antifeminism. Second, I am going to discuss the institutionalisation of 1980s feminist groups, especially the introduction of Gender Studies and their effect on young feminists' perception of feminism as an academic discipline that has little or nothing to do with reality. The following chapter should demonstrate that I am not trying to judge present-day manifestations of feminism and queer politics from the perspective of past movements. My main interest is to analyse and understand the political, social and cultural changes that have characterized the postsocialist condition in Slovenia as well as contemporary and local feminist-queer responses to it.

⁴⁸ Chidgey, 2009a.

⁴⁹ Naples, 2004; Iveković, no date.

Neoconservatism and Ethnocentrism

Two decades ago, when the Berlin Wall “fell”, prophets of a new, global, postmodernist era were proclaiming the end of ideology and history. They were quite right, as intense neoconservative and neoliberal revisions of the past in “the West” and “East”⁵⁰ indeed swept away the memory of political alternatives and with it, the ability to imagine them. In the same way, the belief in the possibility of collective political resistance was largely replaced by individualism and moral apathy. “Post-communist transition”, or rather, “Western capitalism-restoration” were two faces of the same process and since “the Wall fell on both sides and not merely one”,⁵¹ neoliberalism indeed became the sole deterministic master narrative on both sides of the shifting border between East and West. It is therefore not surprising that today, despite their significantly different histories, left-wing intellectuals, activists and artists (including feminists) on “both fronts” are calling for politics of alliance and solidarity, and are looking for tactical ways to fight old ethnocentrisms, nationalisms, and racisms in their new, yet recognizable and highly gendered disguises.

As feminist theorists⁵² have argued, nationalist discourses frequently appropriate women as the symbolic bearers of national identity. While this appropriation can take (and has historically

⁵⁰ In the following chapter, I use categories “West” and “East” not in an explanatory but in a descriptive sense. I use them to denote the discursive and shifting border between “them” and “us” rather than to define a geopolitical space and border. Expressions such as “the Balkans” and “Slovenia” are similarly used to designate “the East” – unless their meaning is specified by the context. I do not use quotation marks in the text but nevertheless acknowledge the restraining difficulties that enter theory together with the discourse about “the East/West divide”.

⁵¹ Iveković, no date, 1.

⁵² Iveković, 1993; Braidotti & Griffin, 2002.

taken) many different forms, one example can be observed in both Western and Eastern European countries every time new “fertility-raising” policies are introduced as the single corrective mechanism for declining birth rates on the literally “old continent”. Various “baby-bonus” policies that have been recently introduced by governments of Germany, Russia, Italy, and Poland, to name just a few, have relied heavily on the simultaneous promotion of mothering as the most rewarding “career choice”. In this political climate even neoliberal feminists who measure women’s emancipation by their individual financial success can be seen as “progressive” even though their agenda is clearly based on the same moral and political grounds.

“Neoconservative liberal individualism” is “profoundly ethnocentric” and as such, “takes the form of contradictory and racist positions”⁵³ in which “our women” are seen as “emancipated (...), Western, Christian, mostly white and raised in the tradition of secular Enlightenment”, while “their women” are seen as “backwards” and belonging to that other world, “non-Western, non-Christian, mostly not white (...), alien to the Enlightenment tradition”.⁵⁴ Even though women from postsocialist countries, as seen through Western eyes, most often belong to the other side of the binary, their bodies in Eastern-European nationalist imaginary personify the (edge of that) same, Western and “civilized” territory. While this contradiction confirms that the East/West divide is shifting and is, as such, located in discourse rather than geopolitical space, it also shows how orientalist (or, in case of the Balkans, balkanist) discourse is mirrored in postsocialist countries of South-Eastern Europe. For example, through these countries’ strict migration policies and fertility-raising strategies which, because of their complete sep-

⁵³ Braidotti, 2005, 171.

⁵⁴ Braidotti, 2005, *ibidem*.

aration suggest that “our” women and “our” children indeed define the border between “us” and “them”. Ironically yet expectedly, in this case “they” are located on the Eastern and Southern border of South-Eastern Europe, not in the West.

The Non-Alignment Movement with its anti-colonialist and anti-racist policy on one hand and the state-socialist ideology of “brotherhood and unity” in former Yugoslavia on the other “managed to neutralize such traditional dichotomies as East/West and their nesting variants (Europe/Asia, Europe/Balkans, Christian/Muslim)”, however, “the same categories of difference turned into sharp oppositions as soon as the neutralizing framework was destroyed”.⁵⁵ Along with it, the war also destroyed multicultural communities of people that transcended these dichotomies. Local theoretical attempts to understand this drastic turn introduced “ethnicity” and “race” as descriptive categories which were previously a “no-go” area or considered unnecessary since racism in Yugoslavia was officially “defunct” – in the same way “the women’s question” was supposedly “solved”. This, in addition to the specific “colouring” of the whiteness debate in Western Europe that “obscured the intermittently flaring race relations in the European countries”⁵⁶, is the reason why in Slovenia, for example, nationalist discourse still claims that there cannot be any racism in the country since “black people don’t live here”. While the invisibility of black people is *per se* an indicator of racism, the argument becomes even more absurd and dangerous when one considers the hatred targeting the so-called non-Slovenes (Serbs, Croats, Bosnians, Montenegrins, Macedonians, and Albanians as a discursively homogeneous group or “object of projected otherness” that stands in opposition to ethnic Slovenes), Romani people, migrants from other capitalist periph-

⁵⁵ Bakić-Hayden, 1995, 931.

⁵⁶ Griffin & Braidotti, 2002, 225.

eries and people who are discriminated on the base of their religious and class affiliation, political persuasion, physical ability, and, “of course”, sexual orientation and gender identity.

I have deliberately diminished important differences that exist between both contexts even though I do not consent to “the populist conviction that the era of accelerated globalisation is not an appropriate time for stipulating distinctions between East and West”⁵⁷ – a conviction that Marina Gržinić locates primarily in post-socialist lands’ desire to “become European” by calling it “a symptom of an ideological blind spot”,⁵⁸ also known as “eurosis”. Cultural theorist Mitja Velikonja uses this term to describe new ethnocentrism that “delegitimise all alternatives to existing discourses and practices of Euro-Atlantic integration”.⁵⁹ When read in reverse, eurosis reveals that “European identity is based on ethnic, national and racial criteria, and as such, serves the legitimisation of various (violent) processes of inclusion and exclusion”.⁶⁰ I have stipulated similarities in order to suggest, as many before me have done, that the neoliberal context urges for a cross-border dialog and alliances between left-wing intellectuals, activists and artists from East and West. In this sense, the intense networking between women’s, feminist and queer festivals, collectives and associations from the region of former Yugoslavia is politically provocative *per se*.

Historical Revisionism

Post-transitional revisionist histories in Slovenia have diminished the role of antifascist struggles during WWII, erased almost five decades of Yugoslav socialism and with it, also the traces of

⁵⁷ Gržinić, 2005, 60.

⁵⁸ Gržinić, 2005, *ibidem*.

⁵⁹ Jeffs, 2007, 28.

⁶⁰ Jeffs, 2007, *ibidem*.

women's political participation and organizing in both periods. Paradoxically, these "new histories" encourage historical amnesia. They coincide with the rise of conservative morals, neoliberal market economy and right-wing politics. The latter have radically cut students', workers' and pensioners' rights and systematically discriminate against the poor, the elderly, migrants, ethnic minorities, people with disabilities and especially women belonging to those social groups.

Those who are disturbed by historical amnesia presuppose that historical consciousness is crucial for understanding (or illuminating) the present possibilities. However, knowing that histories written after 1991 often reinterpret past events in the light of historians' present political affiliations, feminist revisions should be wary. If they rely on sources that legitimate the present, "chosen"⁶¹ political order, they are in danger of advocating an ideological, rather than methodological location. While the latter understands that different locations and political views inevitably produce different interpretations of the past, and that "dialectical truth" is to be found in their conflicting intersections, the former equate history with dominant discourse in order to show that there are no imaginable alternatives to present-day *status quo*. In this discourse, "the present is a deaf echo of past cataclysms".⁶²

Anarchist organizers of protests against neo-fascism that took place on April 27th 2009 in Ljubljana managed to create a temporary and highly heterogeneous alliance of many (reportedly, around 800 people attended) exactly because they spoke about new fascism in the context of revisionist politics and governments that tolerate it. Tactically speaking, they could not have picked a better occasion.

⁶¹ Note how grammar can serve political interests. Supposedly, capitalist economy was "chosen" by citizens while the Berlin Wall "fell" all by itself.

⁶² Močnik, 2008, 52.

Until 1992, April 27th was a national holiday, commemorating the Liberation Front (the ideologically varied antifascist coalition during WWII), also known as the Day of Antifascist Struggle. In 1992, and despite protests, it was renamed to the Day of Struggle against the Occupier. Even though “the occupier” has not been defined, it was quite clear (especially because many street names related to the socialist past were being renamed at the same time) that the authorities had “overwritten” the antifascist victory with the 1991 declaration of Slovenian independence, and thus implicitly equated fascists with communists.

In 2006, a symbolic cultural action opposing falsifications of memory and history was organized by Red Dawns festival. On March 8th, the festival opened with a repertoire of revolutionary partisan songs sung by twenty-two members of the Women’s Choir of the Pensioner’s Association from Idrija. Earlier that year, the choir was banned from performing at an antifascist commemoration in Trieste (Italy) since the mayor thought that the advertisements for the event were too reminiscent of “communist propaganda”. Red Dawns’ event was a response to the mayor’s decision and an attempt at “maintaining the connection with Slovenian feminist tradition”.⁶³ The event was organized in ACC Metelkova mesto and succeeded in doing something hardly imaginable: despite Metelkova’s media-induced stigmatisation, it managed to bring together three generations of antifascists and feminists – from teenage anarchist punks and queers to the generation of their parents which participated in social movements of the 1980s and the generation of *their* parents which supported or fought within the WWII Liberation Front. The oldest people in the audience were two men who volunteered for the Popular Front in the Spanish Civil War. The emotional impact of this event was enormous as the

⁶³ Bašin, 2006, 15.

packed venue (around 300 people attended) literally embodied the historical continuity of antifascism in a time when the dominant discourse does everything in its power to silence it. It showed that autonomous cultural initiatives like Red Dawns and spaces like Metelkova can function as contact zones for counterpublics whose participation in the official public sphere is limited or – when it does happen – most often misinterpreted.

Other feminist actions have directly intervened into the official public sphere by subverting strategies used by the state for its revisionist purposes. In the night from March 8th to 9th 2007, several activist groups renamed around fifty streets in Ljubljana. Similarly to feminists who renamed streets in Zagreb, Sarajevo (both in 2006) and Kutina (2007), the anonymous alliance in Ljubljana based its action on the statistical fact that the great majority of streets are named after men – and the feminist fact that women’s history needs to be written by women since nobody else is going to do it for them. New names paid homage to The International Women’s Day, Simone de Beauvoir, women artists (Ivana Kobilica, Duša Počkaj, Ela Peroci), pop icons (Lydia Lunch, Queen Latifah), political activists (Sisters Štebi, women who fought in the Spanish Civil War), women protagonists of feminist novels and children’s literature, events from feminist history and motherhood (Street of Your and My Mum). In November 2007, a similar action was carried out in Maribor where the street-renaming intervention by Vstaja Lezbosov (Lesbian Insurrection) invented the names like Lesbian Revolution Square (nr. 69!), Lesbian Path, and Road to the Lesbian, which were left on display for several weeks. However, Path to the Lesbian Peak and Lesbian Brigades Square disappeared immediately: probably because they renamed the seats of The Roman Catholic Diocese and Archdiocese.

These symbolic actions were accompanied by other, more demanding political campaigns that reacted to an immediate threat. The

2006 feminist mobilization of many groups and individuals in support of women's reproductive rights was successful because it paralleled "nation-building" demographic policies with policies of violent inclusion of some and exclusion of other people by the Schengen regime. They claimed that both practices are legitimated by the "discursive colonization"⁶⁴ of the past. In this way, feminists succeeded in forming a varied and large coalition despite the fact that today feminism in Slovenia is not perceived as a legitimate political position.

Antifeminism

Revisionist discourse insists on the image of a "grey and boring" state feminism of the past as the only possible feminism today. Revisionism in its "antipolitical and antifeminist" form, as defined by Vlasta Jalušič, can be observed in the media reactions to all contemporary feminist claims that do not correspond to its stereotypical representation. For example, when "feminists try to disrupt, disprove or shatter (...) traditional, unified political subjects and insist on a different form of political agency that counters collectivist subjects with politics of inclusion or tries to speak (...) from an individual position"⁶⁵ – or, for that matter, also when it promotes collective action.

⁶⁴ Mohanty, 1997, 49. Chandra T. Mohanty used the term "discursive colonization" to criticize those academic discourses that "codify relationship to the Other in implicitly hierarchical terms" (50). While she addressed certain Western feminist writings about "third-world women", the point was not to reproduce "culturalist argument about ethnocentrism" but to "show how ethnocentric universalism is produced in certain analyses" (52), including those written by "third-world" scholars who observe their own culture "through Western eyes" – or by Slovene historians who equate "Slovene" history with hegemonic discourse, and inevitably "other" or "erase" those historic subjects that might question their truth. In Milica Bakić-Hayden's terms, this type of analysis is "nesting orientalisms" (Bakić-Hayden, 1995, 922).

⁶⁵ Močnik, 2000, 40.

Since antifeminist sentiments mostly target symbolic manifestations of feminist politics, such as the International Women's Day, feminist protests against revisionism have frequently called for a redefinition of meanings attached to March 8th. For example, in 2009, celebrating the 100th anniversary of the first International Women's Day, Red Dawns festival organized a discussion about its significance today. The organizers pointed out several issues that call for a reincorporation of political and economic theory – as well as demands for social justice – into contemporary feminisms:

politics of memory, (...) overlooked international engagement of women, (...) the problematic worsening of working conditions for women (part-time jobs, wage disparity, the equalization of retirement age) and some fundamental women's issues: discrimination, reproductive rights, violence, prostitution, sexist media representations, etc.⁶⁶

In short, they stipulated the need for continuity with those elements of feminism from the socialist era that are applicable to the contemporary postsocialist context.

Mainstream media discourse about feminism in Slovenia is dominated by ignorance and contempt. A 2008 survey⁶⁷ showed that “Slovene intelligentsia” – in fact, all the interviewees were popular entertainment figures – equates feminism with “femi-fascism” (Miša Molk) and “something like clericalism” (Marko Crnkovič). In the same survey, humorist Tone Fornezzi publicly attacked feminists as “unfucked women” while another interviewee, ex-model and TV host Jerca Legan said that feminists lost support because they wanted to “persuade women to abandon their femininity”. In

⁶⁶ Red Dawns, 2009a.

⁶⁷ Kavčič, 2008a.

an earlier survey,⁶⁸ none of the interviewees objected to having “homosexual neighbours” (unfortunately, they were not asked how they felt about feminist neighbours). Rather than pointing out their acceptance of queers, their statements point to the visibility of politically engaged lesbians and gays who, contrary to feminists, have spoken publicly from a lesbian or gay position long enough that homophobia became publicly unacceptable. That does not mean that today nobody supports women’s rights or criticizes structural, gender-based asymmetry. The point is that those who do it, refuse to speak from a feminist position for pragmatic reasons. Rather than fighting antifeminist prejudices openly (and risking that their position – and possibly their career – will be dismissed as soon as it is identified with feminism), they try to maintain legitimacy by supporting feminist critiques in disguise.

In 1999, Ljubljana-based festival City of Women organized a discussion about antifeminism in former Yugoslavia and other post-socialist states. Vlasta Jalušič’s explanation differed from the widely circulated opinion that women refuse to identify with feminism because of its supposed “unfemininity”, usually connected to claims about the ineffectiveness of contemporary feminist interventions in the public sphere.⁶⁹ Jalušič argued that while this is not the only

⁶⁸ Kavčič, 2008b.

⁶⁹ Lacanian philosopher Renata Salecl claimed that feminists are ineffective because a “serious movement” that would be comparable to its Western manifestations did not exist in socialism and does not exist in postsocialism. Of course, it is highly questionable whether an “effective” feminist movement existed in the West. Assuming that Salecl’s term “serious movement” refers to post-1968 feminist and lesbian movement in the West, it is possible to conclude that due to the prevalence of cultural feminism in the 1980s and feminism’s gradual institutionalization in the 1990s, a “serious” and “effective” Western feminist movement belongs to the realm of psychoanalytic desire, rather than social reality (see Salecl, 1994).

possible opinion, it is the prevailing one and as such, it should be taken into consideration in spite of all other possible interpretations. By moving the debate on antifeminism to the level of representations also in relation to the pragmatic refusal of feminist women and men to be publicly identified as such, she outlined the possibility that many intellectuals, activists and artists prefer to use negative self-presentations that allow them to speak in opposition to “what feminism supposedly represents”.⁷⁰ While feminism never was one, and it is more precise to see it as a “heterogeneity of voices”⁷¹ or a “rhizomatic network”⁷² of often contradictory ideas, united by their antiauthoritarianism and “longing for change”,⁷³ the essential question for those who want to counter “boring and grey” representations of feminism in Slovenia is: which feminisms really became obsolete? Or: which feminisms allow us to think and act in the postsocialist context?

Institutionalisation and Discursive Colonization

Lesbian activist and poet Nataša Sukič claimed that in the neoconservative setting, feminists in Slovenia were late to react to “the rise of the Church, the rise of the Right, the rise of hate speech” and the “need for normality”.⁷⁴ In Svetlana Slapšak’s words, feminism was also late to react to “an incredible wave of patriarchal sentiments and sexism”.⁷⁵ Suzana Tratnik has critiqued feminists of the 1990s for their inability to address consumerism and “pop values, pop identities (...), apolitical standpoints”⁷⁶ and when she was asked why the lesbian

⁷⁰ Močnik, 2000, 65.

⁷¹ Haraway, 1997.

⁷² Braidotti in Močnik, 2000.

⁷³ hooks, 2000.

⁷⁴ Kuhar, 2007, 11.

⁷⁵ Plahuta Simčič, 2006, 15.

⁷⁶ Kuhar, 2007, 11.

movement was not institutionalised to the same extent commented that “the state does not need professional lesbians and gays”⁷⁷. Her answer paid attention to the importance of distinguishing between lesbian and heterosexual feminist politics even when they are united by a strong alliance. This might also be the reason why the lesbian movement in Slovenia continued its work without any major interruptions in the 1990s and the reason why the new generation of politically engaged lesbians regularly frequented the “streetwise school” of activism by writing its own “graffiti textbook”,⁷⁸ rather than attending the newly introduced academic programs in Gender Studies and Gay & Lesbian Studies. In fact, “in the late nineties, when the level of homophobia in Slovenia rose and the educative tools against intolerance were entirely insufficient, a library wall in Maribor was sprayed with a graffiti asking ‘Where are all the lesbian books?’”⁷⁹

While the introduction of feminist academic curricula opened a new, formal channel for transgenerational (re)production of feminist knowledge, it also produced (in the absence of a vibrant autonomous feminist movement) a limited view on feminism as an academic discipline that has little or nothing to do with reality and is therefore of no practical use. Several of my interviewees confirmed this idea. For example, when asked in what way, if at all, her involvement with Red Dawns festival influenced her understanding of feminism, Tanja Škander replied:

I’m gonna give big credit to Red Dawns now since I really thought feminism was some sort of skeleton. Something that doesn’t want to ... something that is happening on the level of struggle for political rights and something that happens in the government, in that Office for Equal Opportunities or what’s its

⁷⁷ Kuhar, 2007, *ibidem*.

⁷⁸ Hvala, 2008, 75.

⁷⁹ Velikonja, 2004, 128.

name now ... It definitely influenced my understanding of feminism in the sense that feminism is something that lives, something with a potential, something that should be continued through other forms and as such an actual political activism that lives on the street, that is present and not necessarily written but realized through action. (...) This might sound naïve, but feminism was mostly something I read about. I was scolded as a feminist already in primary school, so feminism was not something I could apply to life. Because it was rooted in a certain form, and with Red Dawns, this palette became visible. I realized that feminism can be expressed in different ways: through music, visual arts, and political action (like renaming streets) and similar stuff. This is the biggest contribution of Red Dawns festival for me personally.

On the other hand, two volunteers, Danaja Grešak and Anja Kocman, who joined the festival organization team in 2009, confirmed that the spheres are not entirely separate. Danaja was drawn to the festival because she was “interested in feminism”. Her introduction to feminism was academic. After attending Milica Antić-Gaber’s courses at the Faculty of Arts (Sociology of Gender, Gender and Discourse), she replied to Red Dawns’ call for volunteers together with three friends who were also interested in feminism. For Anja, the decisive role was played by her interest in Gay & Lesbian Studies and her interest in techniques of cultural organization. It is interesting to note that despite her participation in Gay & Lesbian Studies, Anja said that before joining Red Dawns, she had “no clue” about feminism.

Sladana Mitrović, a visual artist and organizer with a feminist academic background, replied that even though her views were not changed by the festival, the fact that her video was shown at

the festival “demanded a certain reconsideration of my work. Like: ‘How are you going to define your themes within the frame of feminism?’ (...) By calling itself a feminist festival, Red Dawns has had a strong effect. Not only on other people, also on me.” Ana Jeréb, another co-organizer trained in feminist theory, perceives Red Dawns “as a place of practice where you can make your own views happen or discuss them further. The festival was not where the ideas came from, they came from literature,” she said in reference to feminist and queer theory. And yet, she continued, “When it came to new perspectives, new searches, Red Dawns played a vital role”.

Is it an exaggeration to claim that the predominance of British, North American and French sources used in Gender Studies departments – or, in other words, a form of discursive colonization – is producing young educated feminists who can legitimately conclude that the only available feminist genealogies are Western despite the documented and rich history of local women’s and feminist movements? Discursive colonization would most certainly not be possible or at least not as strong if local feminist history and contemporary feminist public interventions were more visible. Again, this problem is related to the “ideologically induced amnesia, the loss of historic memory due to a persistent embargo on the research and publishing about pre-war feminism in Slovenia”.⁸⁰ Lidija Radojević, one of the interviewees and herself a young researcher of political economy and feminist theory, said that most of the literature used in Gender Studies courses in Slovenia originates from the U.S. and Great Britain “because we are in transition, we are being ideologically interpolated into a new system”. Immediately afterwards, she pointed out the problem lying at the heart of this “conceptual import”:

⁸⁰ Renér, 1996, 60.

Feminism forgot about a lot of things when it focused on identity politics exclusively; it forgot about the social element that was once already there. To connect queer and feminist politics with that – that’s the essence! This is how you touch the deepest roots of chauvinism.

The prevalence of identity politics or politics of recognition in post-socialist feminist theory has also been criticized by American philosopher and critical theorist Nancy Fraser. Like Rada Iveković, she argues that “the postsocialist condition” adequately describes both the East and West since they are interrelated discursive categories and material contexts. They are connected by

an absence of any credible overarching emancipatory project despite the proliferation of fronts of struggle; a general decoupling of the cultural politics of recognition from the social politics of redistribution; and a decentering of claims for equality in the face of aggressive marketization and sharply rising material inequality.⁸¹

Fraser claims that “the turn to recognition” of cultural differences in feminism turned into “a tragic historical irony” because it appeared in the least appropriate moment: “it dovetailed all too neatly with a hegemonic neoliberalism that wants nothing more than to repress all memory of social egalitarianism”.⁸² Her call for a post-socialism that “incorporates, rather than repudiates, the best of socialism” and a radical democracy that “combine[s] the struggle for an antiessentialist multiculturalism with the struggle for social equality”⁸³ is echoed in Lidija’s statement. In the Slovene context,

⁸¹ Naples, 2004, 1103-4.

⁸² Naples, 2004, 1111.

⁸³ Naples, 2004, 1104.

the historic irony is even greater since feminist theory in the 1980s was preoccupied with social justice, yet today, instead of using this as a possible starting point for revisions and development of a feminist theory that is relevant for the present condition, that legacy has been either discarded (by academic feminism) or is used in antifeminist bashing to delegitimize contemporary feminist claims.

Over-genderization

In Biljana Kašić's words, "over-genderization"⁸⁴ is another problematic aspect of identity politics' import. She claimed that during the 1990s feminists from the South-East (scholars, grassroots activists and artists) accepted the use of "gender" as a concept and as a basic Western assumption, a convention which was never "deeply explored or examined from the inside out", and thus turned into a "free-floating signifier marking an epistemological time-lag".⁸⁵ In her view, rather than contributing to the analysis of poignant local issues, gender mainstreaming obscured them since gender politics introduced a specific set of feminist preoccupations that had little or nothing to do with the political reality of a disintegrating country on the brink of war.

A practical consequence of accepting gender-exclusive perspectives in the period of intensifying ethnic and religious conflicts – and eventually of war – were feminist analyses that failed to see the ways in which women were (re)appropriated by nationalist and religious discourses. How else could "patriotic" feminists from Croatia and Serbia claim that mass rape was an ethnically-specific genocidal tactic, used only by "the other" aggressor? In addition, "the divisions among Yugoslav feminists on the basis of national identification and/or ideological orientation affected Western in-

⁸⁴ Kašić, 2004, 484.

⁸⁵ Kašić, 2004, 480.

terpretations of gender-specific violence in Yugoslav wars”.⁸⁶ In the United States, “the representation of mass rapes in the feminist press was highly conditioned by (...) feminist debates on rape and pornography”⁸⁷ since authors like Catharine MacKinnon appropriated this context-specific debate for their own anti-porn and sex-repressive version of liberal feminism by literally claiming: “With this war, pornography emerges as a tool of genocide”.⁸⁸ Coupled with the lack of intersectional analyses, “radical feminist narratives of rape coincided with nationalist narratives of the ethnic self and other”⁸⁹ and revealed “the pervasiveness of orientalist patterns in representing the non-Western world, to which some feminist approaches remain susceptible”.⁹⁰

The 1991-95 wars reinforced the balkanist representation of former Yugoslavia as a “powder keg” where violence and “ethnic hatred” are the norm. While Western media represented the Balkans as its rediscovered “exotic” and “irrational” Other, some Western feminists represented Yugoslav feminists

as dealing with violence as a “natural” or almost an “essentialized” issue for them. As such, most invitations and demands for “expertise” or testimonies from Western feminists, in addition to financial support, were centred on issues of violence.⁹¹

Specifically, they supported local (chapters of international) NGOs and academic feminists who dealt with the issue of gender-based and ethnic violence. On the other hand, the socio-political climate surrounding ethnocentric conflicts had a profound influence on

⁸⁶ Batinić, 2001, 18.

⁸⁷ Batinić, 2001, *ibidem*.

⁸⁸ Batinić, 2001, 16.

⁸⁹ Batinić, 2001, 18.

⁹⁰ Batinić, 2001, 1.

⁹¹ Kašić, 2004, 483.

shaping women's political subjectivity and their activism, which was forced to deal with the issue of violence. Since ethnocentric appropriations of women's bodies are resurfacing in both West and East, these studies gained a relevance that goes beyond the territory of former Yugoslavia. Still, if Gender Studies students today have the impression that feminists from former Yugoslavia are studying exclusively violence and nationalism, their impression is almost correct. In fact, while it proves that discursive colonization has material consequences, it also demonstrates that such colonization is only possible if there is no discourse to counter it.

The Possibility of Transnational Dialogue

Despite asymmetrical conditions of work and power relations between academic feminists from the West and East, my sources demonstrate the continuous effort at dialogue that has been made "on both sides". For example, Lidija Radojević was surprised to find out that international solidarity has a very long history indeed. Reading Jelena Petrović's PhD dissertation (2009) about Yugoslav feminists in the interwar (1918-1941) period, she learned that

in the period of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia (...) we had an unimaginably dynamic scene - Macedonian women were petitioning for the release of Rosa Luxemburg! There were liberal, communist, Christian-socialist, even conservative feminists. That was a hundred years ago and today, nothing's left of it. That is why I think education is so fundamental. We are still sensitive to this amnesia whereas the West has been conscious about the present for quite a while now. We went through a more drastic change and we are still bothered by the fact that certain things have been forgotten, also because women here had had enormous gains that women in the West could only dream of. (...) In the 1970s, we had our own theories, our own practice, and our

own typology of feminism. We have to preserve this tradition. The West did not bring it.

Lesbian and feminist grassroots initiatives have indeed stipulated the importance of nourishing the memory of past efforts as they implicitly criticize both feminist academic and neoconservative appropriations of history. In this way, Red Dawns' intense transnational networking and educative program could be interpreted as an implicit protest against discursive colonization; as an advocacy of creative "transculturation of ideas".⁹²

Theories of unidirectional transfer of ideas (from the West to the East) are indeed challenged by the concept of transculturation, understood as a complex process of co-presence, interaction, change and circulation of feminist ideas and practices in conditions of social inequality. Elsewhere⁹³ I have compared the similarities between economic (neoliberalism, crisis) and political situations (ethnocentrism, revisionism, cultural relativism) in the East and West in order to suggest that it makes sense to address these issues relationally. I discussed examples of revisionism, antifeminism and demographic policies and suggested that feminists today cannot theorize about these links unless they accept intersectionality (as their method), demand the redistribution of wealth (as their policy) and think about ways to start some "roaring fires" (as their strategy). In Slovenia, unidirectional transfer of knowledge, coupled with appropriations of memory, have been criticized in academia. Feminist and critical theorists such as Nikolai Jeffs and Svetlana Slapšak have called for the necessity of situating local knowledge production on the "world's intellectual market" from the point of view of a "colonized subject, the non-Western subject, who has been in-

⁹² Pratt, 1992; Cerwonka, 2008.

⁹³ Hvala, 2009.

structed by Western feminisms about what feminism is and what is happening to the colonized subjects”.⁹⁴ Their claims resonate with Biljana Kašić’s hope that the recent “tendency to focus on internal socialist history from a feminist perspective” would “help not only to create theoretical explanations that link women’s benefits in the socialist period to socialist failures”⁹⁵ but would also enable a more productive dialog between feminists from the East and West. Moreover, it would help feminists recognize the commonalities between all regions that are equally peripheral to the centres of power: for start, to quote political theorist Veronica Schild, the “political dangers of forgetting this real history, and the responsibilities that intellectuals, including feminist scholars, must of necessity bear for this price of forgetting”.⁹⁶

Feminist and Queer Festival Red Dawns: A Case Study

In this chapter, I am going to discuss several aspects of Red Dawns, which need to be discussed in order to contextualize my focus on the festival as a (potential) counterpublic. The first part addresses the reasons why its founders decided to organize a women’s festival in 2000. The following part explains the festivals’ title references and relates them to the self-defined and desired aims of the organizers. Since the concept of the festival changes over the years, I pay attention to several rearticulations of Red Dawns’ general idea, most obviously represented in the change of terminology used to describe the festival. I also link the conceptual development from a “women’s” to a “feminist and queer” festival to Red Dawns’ growing international network of allies and co-workers. The ways in which this shift influenced the organizers’ understanding of Red Dawns

⁹⁴ STA, 2002.

⁹⁵ Kašić, 2004, 480.

⁹⁶ Hvala, 2007.

as a (potential) counterpublic is discussed in the chapter about ACC Metelkova mesto and its struggle for spatial justice. Internationally, the perceived political significance of the festival is discussed in relation to the characteristics of Ladyfests in Western Europe. Since the festival is embedded in the local and international context simultaneously, I discuss both frames of reference in the same chapter. The final chapter, based on excerpts taken from my interviews with Red Dawns organizers, co-organizers and volunteers discusses all issues mentioned above from the perspective of feminist political theory. Specifically, I reconsider Nancy Fraser's claim that the emancipatory potential of feminist-queer counterpublics is to be found in the dialectics of their internal and external function from the perspective of Red Dawns festival as it was experienced and perceived by my seventeen interviewees – and myself.

The Launch

According to Nataša Serec, the president of the association KUD Mreža and one of the few founding organizers still involved in Red Dawns, she and Dragana Rajković (at the time a member of lesbian-feminist group Kasandra) came up with the idea of organizing a festival after several discussions in which they

realized that in Metelkova – that was before 2000 – all key positions were occupied by girls, women (...), and we, the women in Metelkova, were working in solidarity with each other. We were prepared to work for free and were dedicated, willing to keep this place since, at the time, its fate was still very uncertain. (...) On the other hand, we noticed that when the journalists came and there was an opportunity to boast with our efforts, men appeared first, our colleagues, who were keener on this kind of exposure than we were. Ok, it was also our own fault since we never wanted to put ourselves in the forefront, like a kind of funk or

something. (...) Well, in order to abandon our invisibility we came to the idea of a festival that would give us the possibility to show and affirm our abilities as organizers, as Metelkova activists, and also as artists. This was the basic idea that got us started.

The first edition of Red Dawns involved women organizers, artists and activists from ACC Metelkova mesto even though, according to Nataša, they wanted to reach a wider audience and step out of the activist-squatter fortress of Metelkova. In her words, the basic idea was to “bring feminist issues into public space, to discuss them”. Promotional leaflets from 2000 list two more groups that were involved in the organization of the first Red Dawns: lesbian club Monokel (ŠKUC-LL) and the now defunct Women’s Centre, both located in Metelkova. Many women played several roles at once. For example, sculptress Urša Toman participated both as an artist and organizer. Similarly, Urška Merc, at the time a member of the Women’s Centre, remembers that she “simply helped” with whatever work had to be done. She adds that being part of the Women’s Centre “went hand in hand” with participating in the festival, thus suggesting that the festival was organized as a joint effort of all women in Metelkova who wanted to “abandon their invisibility”.

Jadranka Ljubičič (curator of Alkatraz Gallery, member of association KUD Mreža and another Red Dawns organizer who has been part of the team since 2000) stipulated that the “spark that gave birth to the festival” would not have happened without “the important presence of a group of lesbian activists who contributed a different kind of program to Metelkova”. She continued to say that it was difficult to create a space where women artists, activists and organizers could learn to work with each other – and deal with the conflicts arising from their first joint effort – in an environment that was politically progressive yet not necessarily supportive of their initiative:

It was crucial that the fest and the pre-fest preparations were organized by a team of people who hung out together (...). As an organizer, you developed some sort of sensitivity (...), you became more, let's put it this way, tolerant towards certain things within the team while earlier you ... you did not have this experience, you did not know how to react, how to turn it into something useful.

In other words, bringing “feminist issues into public space” presupposed the creation of a functioning collective of women organizers, activists and artists who, at least at the very beginning, were not necessarily comfortable with the idea of working in gender-specific groups due to their unpopularity. Like the City of Women festival team before it, the Red Dawns group had to counter

the fact that remained more or less hidden for long decades: that rock (and later punk) was predominantly male and that, in addition, those rockers were as sexist as the daddies they were opposing; that for women's production, being part of that culture was as hard as surviving in the mainstream culture.⁹⁷

None of my interviewees spoke directly about the reasons why they chose the festival format as the most suitable for their purposes. However, when asked what they found most memorable about the festival, the large majority spoke about festive sociability or “the great feeling”, “incredible atmosphere”, “group energy”, “a carnivalesque feeling that anything is possible” and “great conversations” that gave them “brain food” for future work, therefore indirectly confirming that they chose to organize a festival (rather than a series of discussions or workshops, for example) because it created a highly interactive public space that was supportive of their feminist

⁹⁷ Lesničar Pučko, 2007, 83.

or/and lesbian identity – and fun! Once Red Dawns' internal function was fulfilled, it also became possible to discuss, create and present feminist art, activism and theory in a public setting.

Title References

Dragana Rajković and Nataša Serec chose the title “Red Dawns” (*Rdeče zore* in Slovene) after one of their discussions about women's activism, the strategic use of political violence and the militant women's group Rote Zora from Germany. Rote Zora detonated their first bomb in 1974 at the Federal Constitutional Court in Karlsruhe the day after it confirmed the infamous “Paragraph 218” which limited access to abortion. In Rote Zora's view, state repression of women's fundamental right to self-determination demanded a radical political opposition, which they carried out through a politics of property damage. Oliver Ressler, the director of the art video *Rote Zora* (2000) shown at Red Dawns festival in 2003, interviewed Rote Zora member Corinna Kawaters who said that it was their principle to avoid injuring anyone. In Oliver Tolmein's words, they were an “armed group who, however, battled often enough with the typewriter”.⁹⁸ The group collaborated with Revolutionäre Zellen and fought against atomic, genetic and reproductive technologies, targeting companies such as Bayer, Siemens, Schering and Nixdorf as well as research institutes and the property owned by traffickers of women.

The group took its name from red-haired Zora, the penniless heroine of the youth novel *Die rote Zora und ihre Bande* (1941) where Croatian children orphaned by the war realize that they can only defy social injustice by sticking together. The novel was written by an exiled German writer of Jewish descent called Kurt Kläber under the pseudonym Kurt Held. Kurt was a political immigrant of

⁹⁸ Ressler, 2000.

the Nazi era. As a communist, he had to oblige the rule of creative silence even during his Swiss exile. After Stalin's deal with Hitler, he abandoned communism as a betrayed ideology but kept his anarchist ideals. Red-haired Zora and her company of orphaned misfits personify those very ideals. The guerrilla group Rote Zora chose this name because

it seems to be a male privilege to build gangs or to act outside the law. Yet particularly because girls and women are strangled by thousands of personal and political chains this should make us masses of 'bandits' fighting for our freedom, our dignity, and our humanity. Law and order are fundamentally against us, even if we have hardly achieved any rights and have to fight for them daily. Radical women's struggles and loyalty to the law - there is no way they go together!⁹⁹

Red Dawns festival never advocated or used political violence. However, in their explanation of the festival's name, the organizers made explicit links to both the guerrilla group and Kläber's novel. On their website, they wrote that they support Rote Zora's belief that "the struggle for women's rights is undone, that it goes hand in hand with struggles for social justice, and that we cannot be contented with reformist politics".¹⁰⁰

A literal translation of "die rote Zora" from German to English would read as "the red Zora". In Slovene, "zora" also means "dawn" ("zore" is the plural version), which is why the festival organizers chose to translate the name to English as Red Dawns, not as Red Zora. By preferring the figurative meaning to the literal translation, the festival title acquires an additional dimension, one that leaves space for those interpretations that are not connected to the already

⁹⁹ Star, 2002, 101.

¹⁰⁰ Red Dawns, 2010.

existing references.¹⁰¹ In Slovene, the festival title can be associated with a socialist (“red”) future (“dawn”) or “the promise of a better tomorrow – for everyone”.¹⁰² The imagery used to promote the festival on posters, leaflets, T-shirts and other merchandize changes between festival editions, but relies on red and black as their representative colours – colours that are traditionally associated with anarcho-syndicalism. The first Red Dawns poster from 2000 depicted three smashed kaki fruits (persimmons), and a spoon on a white round plate. The picture was taken from a bird’s-eye view and had a fluid quality similar to (menstrual) blood. The outlines of the image were reminiscent of the woman symbol that was also reproduced underneath the image, defining Red Dawns as a “festival of ♀ production”. The historicisation or retrospective conceptualisation of the first festival edition is evident from the disparity between the oral and written history of Red Dawns. When interviewed, both Jadranka Ljubičič and Nataša Serec said that the initial idea was to support “young and emerging women artists from Metelkova”. While women artists stationed in ACC Metelkova mesto could be generally described as “young” and “emerging” it would be an exaggeration to say that these artists, following the festival’s self-description, were “expressing their creativity in self-organized ways, capturing the do-it-yourself ethic of constructive rebellion against capitalist consumption of our voices”.¹⁰³ In 2000, the festival did not – and could not – include only politically challenging artists. On the con-

¹⁰¹ It is also interesting to note that *Die rote Zora und ihre Bande* was never translated to Slovene and consequently very few people in Slovenia know about it. More people know the depoliticized television series from 1979 and the 2008 film version. However, the main reference for people familiar with the history of radical left-wing activism in Germany remains the urban guerrilla group Rote Zora.

¹⁰² Red Dawns, 2003.

¹⁰³ Red Dawns, *ibidem*.

trary, Nataša Serec commented that ten years ago, women musicians and other artists were generally hard to find, “that is why we, despite our wishes, hosted women artists regardless of the concepts they stood for. We also couldn’t afford to choose artists who dealt with specific issues. The first five years were really difficult.” However, the history of the festival, written retrospectively, does capture the counterpublic aspect of the first festival edition well by claiming that Red Dawns’ declared goal was to “celebrate our lives and redefine public space in order to make it accessible for the creativity and socializing of women on our own terms: in a non-hierarchical, non-exploitative and anti-capitalistic manner”.¹⁰⁴

A History of Rearticulations

The concept of the festival has shifted over the years despite the organizer’s insistence that “this is a festival without a concept” since “concepts are expensive. And spoiled – it’s so difficult to please them”.¹⁰⁵ This half-joking statement from 2005 was explained by Red Dawns co-organizer and designer Anna Ehrlemark after the ninth festival edition in an article entitled “What’s Wrong with Red Dawns?” She began by mentioning the composer, activist and organizer Reni Hofmüller, one of Red Dawns’ 2008 guests who spoke at the presentation of the *New Feminism: Queer and Networking Conditions* anthology.

She said that we should think history (including the present) like a patchwork of mutually excluding truths. ‘Cyberfeminism simply does not exist. And yet, there is no doubt that something that could be called cyberfeminism exists.’ Festivals like ours always face the risk that some visitors and participants are going to wish to find something that would resemble a mani-

¹⁰⁴ Red Dawns, 2010.

¹⁰⁵ Red Dawns, 2005.

festo, a position which would be able to merge our efforts into a unified resolution. There is no such thing. A lot of work, time and space were given to artists, activists, theoreticians and audience members who have something to say (...) because we are convinced that they are important (...). And that's the trick: they concern you whether you like it or not. Disagreements are there to stay since any other position on our side would be forcing our interpretation to everybody else. And, of course, we don't agree with that.¹⁰⁶

And yet, Red Dawns' collectively signed introductory texts do read as manifestoes that frequently address the playfulness of festive sociability. The conceptual changes or rearticulations of the festival's general idea can be observed in those same texts; in the terminology that was used at different points in time to describe the program. The shift from a "women's" to a "feminist and queer" festival was, in Nataša Serec's view, "a natural development" related to the organizers' personal growth or the process of becoming feminists: "We did not call ourselves 'a feminist festival' until we knew what it means – and learnt how to explain to others what we mean by it. We didn't do it because that's what our scene is about – we don't have a scene". Her implicit and somewhat generalized comparison referred to

what sometimes happens with women's festivals or especially with anarcho-feminist festivals, also with Ladyfests; that since they have a scene, for example, a feminist anti-fascist scene, they always come up with the same old slogans. (...) If they would call their festivals 'feminist' – I'm not sure if they would know why they did it. But there, in larger European cities, things are different because they have strong scenes.

¹⁰⁶ Ehrlemark, 2008, 25.

Ironically, Red Dawns' conceptual development from a "women's" to a "feminist and queer" festival was encouraged by its gradual inclusion in the international network of similar initiatives in Western Europe and the region of former Yugoslavia. Another paradox is that while the organizers claimed that their festival was "marginal (...)" even though we're talking Paris and (...) even Amsterdam and Prule!",¹⁰⁷ Red Dawns' local visibility and popularity gradually grew beyond Metelkova's walls. They managed to reach a wider audience and gain recognition in Slovene independent and, surprisingly, also mainstream media, thus becoming a local reference point for contemporary art and activism from a feminist and/or queer point of view. At the same time, the statement about their supposed "marginality" has to be read in relation to the festival's professional "big sister", International Contemporary Art Festival City of Women.

Until 2006, the organizers called Red Dawns "a women's pocket festival" which supports the "creativity, work and socializing" of "female artists and activists"¹⁰⁸ who question stereotypical representations of femininity and masculinity. They insisted on promoting "women's art" and "women's organizing" until the seventh edition when Red Dawns became an "international feminist and queer festival" or "celebration" which aimed to support those artistic and activist "deviations from heteronormative 'destiny'" that oppose "every-day hatred, disrespect and exploitation of people in any neoliberal society".¹⁰⁹ The seventh festival edition of Red Dawns in 2006 was the first to use more explicit imagery. Instead of reusing the black and red image of a back trouser pocket ("pocket festival") designed by Phant&Puntza, the new graphic designer, Anna Ehrlemark, used Igor Hofbauer's drawing of a large rat biting into

¹⁰⁷ Red Dawns, 2005.

¹⁰⁸ Red Dawns, 2006.

¹⁰⁹ Red Dawns, 2007.

a Barbie doll. While the rat was adopted from ACC Metelkova mesto's logo, the Barbie doll was the first image to highlight the difference between stereotypical and desired representations of femininity, thus finally moving away from the – theoretically and practically – controversial subject of “women”. In the same way, the 2006 introductory text was the first to invite “women, men and others” to join the festival, the first to make an explicit link to the history of International Women's Day, the first to oppose “right-wing falsifications of history” and the first to make a tribute to Red Dawns' local feminist and antifascist predecessors. The same text framed their understanding of feminism and queer politics within a politics of recognition but also tried to link them to the demand for redistribution of wealth:

Red Dawns is a queer festival that dares to ignore expectations, habits, concepts and roles, which ‘fatally’ define us as either women or men (...). We urge you, our political allies, to rethink sexualities and genders in the context of your everyday fights for social justice.¹¹⁰

The introduction to the eighth festival edition in 2007 repeated this political agenda. This time, the promotional materials depicted a bird-woman-pilot flapping her wings in front of the rising sun. The image can be read as a new contribution to Red Dawns' “red thread” that can be traced at least to 2005 when the organizers self-ironically affirmed the utopian nature of their calls for “space, the possibility and the power to create the conditions worthy of (...) our imagination” by quoting “the cry of an unknown song by a band no longer in existence: ‘When we move it's a movement!’”.¹¹¹ In 2008, the introductory text was more specific, related to the program con-

¹¹⁰ Red Dawns, 2006.

¹¹¹ Red Dawns, 2005.

tent and the international feminist-queer network it became part of. The text addressed the desire to “enable connections between art and activism, activism and theory, theory and art”; the hope that practical skills and knowledge gained at the festival would continue to circulate after the festival; the hope that friendships made at Red Dawns would last; and the willingness to

poke the sores that hurt; those caused by the personified fist of patriarchal, falogocentric and heteronormative (in short, too common) violence against women, children and men who are not ‘manly enough’.¹¹²

The 2008 festival edition was supported financially by EYFA, an organization based in Amsterdam which connected Amsterdam (Eclectic Tech Carnival), Graz ([prologue]) and Ljubljana (Red Dawns) with a project entitled *Trilogy: Women Crossing Communities*. This project questioned the conditions of work for European women who advocate, employ and develop contemporary theory, art and activism as community-building practices. While the Graz-based symposium, exhibition and journal [*prologue*] *III* focused on performative strategies of resistance and Red Dawns dealt with local feminist and queer politics in art, the main concern of nomadic Eclectic Tech Carnival was women’s use and development of information technologies in art and activism. EYFA’s financial support made it possible for female cybernauts, artists, activists and theoreticians from an array of European countries to meet repeatedly and in person. As such, it provided the necessary material conditions for the development of creative transnational collaborations. Similarly, the 2008 Red Dawns program focused on different techniques of knowledge production and exchange:

¹¹² Red Dawns, 2008.

so that, when the caravan of artists, activists, and theoreticians is going to leave town, we won't be left with unforgettable memories and broken hearts alone, but with something more ... palpable. For instance, with the open code programming knowledge of the The GenderChangers collective, the auto-repair skills offered by Ksenija Glavač, the burnout prevention techniques taught by Belgrade's Women at Work, and the viewpoints of no less than sixty feminists who confront global capitalism in the book *New Feminisms: Queer and Networking Conditions*.¹¹³

Commenting on the mechanisms of exclusion that limit transnational mobility of people and free exchange of knowledge, the organizers added that

no doubt, we will also be left with another girl in love from this or that other, starless Europe. She will try hard to persuade Slovene authorities that it's not the country she fell in love with, but that she's prepared to do a lot (marry, register, whatever they want) to stay with the woman, man, the beloved and wonderful being of her choice.¹¹⁴

The ninth Red Dawns festival was a profuse event, organized by KUD Mreža and ten local co-organizing groups, assisted by two EYFA members and fifteen volunteers. The fifty workshop moderators, feminist theoreticians, historians, writers, storytellers, performers, visual artists, dancers, comedians, musicians, and other participants were joined by fifteen Trilogy artists, journalists, media activists and philosophers who made a considerable contribution to Red Dawns' program. The festival celebrated creativity and work-in-process rather than the production of objects as a motivating ap-

¹¹³ Red Dawns, *ibidem*.

¹¹⁴ Red Dawns, *ibidem*.

proach to collaborative work and active audience participation. Noha Ramadan's workshop *Body as the Site of Action* and the resulting street action were, in this sense, most memorable.¹¹⁵

Red Dawns therefore opened possibilities and offered an inclusive environment for exercising the right of women to expression, to show, perform, disseminate, and share their ideas, problems, creativity and care. Participants met each other, saw each other's work and ideas, and discussed future co-operations. The audience was exposed to new art, contemporary feminist politics and moreover, had the possibility to join the workshops, discussions, and street action. The strong feeling of solidarity was stipulated by the willingness of guests and volunteers to help each other in creating a temporary community of female artists, activists and theoreticians. On the tenth anniversary in 2009, the organizers described the festival as one that deals with "the inevitable contradictions that arise from the desire to politicize art and aestheticize politics".¹¹⁶ In ac-

¹¹⁵ "Noha spoke about the necessity of moving beyond activism based on slogans and banners as they tend to petrify subject positions instead of trying to subvert the accepted logic and *status quo*. At the workshop, Noha showed examples of actions based on what she calls 'the revolutionary need to liberate our bodies in public spaces'. She claimed that by transgressing the borders of what is perceived as acceptable behaviour, we carry the potential to recognize moments of freedom and expand them to other contexts. The subsequent street action consisted of an unusually large number of affectionate same-sex couples that kept strolling across the city centre bridge Tromostovje. Couples gradually began to exaggerate their body moves and stipulated the actions' disturbing nature by walking too slow, walking backwards, lying on the street, kissing passionately ... If the moment of freedom is really limited to your own perception, I would say that the culminating point of the action was its conclusion: the participants went to the sexist advertisement for women's underwear behind Hotel Union and took off their underwear in front of it. You have to try it sometime - the feeling is great!" (Ehrlemark, 2008, 25)

¹¹⁶ Red Dawns, 2009.

cord with their tradition of combining pragmatic calls for a festive counterpublic with a desire for structural change, the organizers invited the audience to join Red Dawns' "utopian dance on the slippery edge of a most certainly real world of binaries ..."¹¹⁷

Queering Red Dawns

What - or whom - exactly did the festival queer once it changed its title description from a "women's" to a "feminist and queer festival"? Since most of the organizers are young, left-wing, middle class, educated and ethnically Slovene straight women, this change could suggest they were trying to open up the festive space - and themselves - to a variety of other positions, most obviously lesbian and gay ones. Since Red Dawns started in 2000 as a co-operation between feminist and lesbian groups, the change - in this case - merely suggests an adjustment of terminology to the festival's reality in which lesbian and straight women (and recently, gays) cooperate with each other. Suzana Tratnik, who collaborated with Red Dawns from 2000 to 2007 as part of club Monokel, confirmed this. When asked whether she thinks the festival has lived up to its declared "queer politics", she said: "My feeling is that the festival was queer before it started calling itself that, for example, we had trans guests earlier, so I think the title 'queer' is completely appropriate. It's not like you can measure it in percentage".

While most of my interviewees recognized the fact that queer activism and theory developed within the North American gay and lesbian scene as a critical response to assimilational tendencies of conservative and liberal activists who struggled for public recognition on heteronormative terms, they also claimed that today queer politics can no longer be equated solely with the struggle for the

¹¹⁷ Red Dawns, *ibidem*.

¹¹⁸ Pišek, 2009.

recognition of lesbian, gay, bisexual, transsexual and other marginal positions on their terms. Commenting on Mojca Pišek's article¹¹⁸ about "queer (non)identity", published in a major weekly newspaper, Ana Jereb said that the article was "misleading" because it reduced the thematic scope of queer activism and theory to gender identity, thus ignoring the wider social context that could suggest that marginal gender and sexual positions are in a structurally similar position to other marginal subjectivities: "In this way, people will get the idea that queer is only about gays and lesbians. I think this equation misses the point. It's not about who you sleep with."

For Ana Jereb, queer politics are about

the opening of wild possibilities. Because the term is so wide, so undefined, and so problematic – and I'm not saying that feminism isn't like that – it offers many possibilities for our future views, different perspectives, for our self-critique: 'Why do I think this way? Let's turn it around! We *are* having a good time but ...' It is the opportunity for self-critique, for permanent self-examinations.

Due to the terms' scope, the "queering" element can be understood in several other ways. For example, as an attempt to deconstruct, explode or abolish the institution of gender. In theory, the queering of ethnically bounded women's and feminist counterpublics should enable the entry and accommodation of racialized subjects as well. When gendered, racialized and other "marked" subjects enter the official public sphere, they are highly visible. They mark it in a way that shows "that the white male body is the norm".¹¹⁹ They do not have the right to occupy that space and are often perceived as "aliens", "invaders" or "trespassers".¹²⁰ When Nirmal Puwar wrote

¹¹⁹ Puwar, 2004, 8.

¹²⁰ Puwar, 2004, 1.

about the entry of women and racialized subjects to the official public sphere, her book on political theory, *Space Invaders: Race, Gender and Bodies out of Place* (2004), clearly borrowed its title from science fiction, thus suggesting that the new terms of coexistence are by no means easy: “this is an encounter that causes disruption, necessitates negotiation and invites complicity”.¹²¹ This type of queer politics would be closer to anarcho-syndicalism than to lesbian and gay struggles for legal equality and public recognition.

In practice, the contexts in which the term “queer” commonly appears in Western Europe – and in Slovenia – suggest that queer politics have been commodified and reduced to “an inner-city clique discothèque”, as Anna Ehrlemark put it. In her view, queer is not – or shouldn’t be – only about partying even though “the mission” of Red Dawns is also “to incorporate the queer concept into the mainstream alternative culture [*laughs*], to make gay parties (...) feel more open”. For Ana Jereb, queer politics are in danger of being reduced to “the choice of clothes I’ll wear today, the things I’ll buy tomorrow (...), narrowing everything to consumption”. Lidija Radojević’s article about Red Dawns, entitled “The Universalisation of Struggle and Particular Obstacles, or Between March 8th and A Thousand Tiny Sexes”,¹²² also addresses the danger of understanding queer as an all-inclusive concept, a concept that can be stretched to accommodate the needs of everyone who thinks of themselves as queer. For her, the problem lies in the assumption that by “being queer”, you automatically become “subversive”, whereas in reality the proliferation of identity positions is, again, all too easily reduced to appearances and lifestyle. For Lidija, the introduction of a queer perspective to Red Dawns’ program is important because it “introduced a global trend and dis-

¹²¹ Puwar, 2004, *ibidem*.

¹²² Radojević, 2007.

course to a local environment where it is not known yet". She continued to explain that

'queer' doesn't have solid grounds. (...) All concepts are vague until they gain a solid foundation. Concepts can be tied to a local environment only when a scene supports them. By engaging with the concept, creating new practices, a new language – we don't know how to translate the concept because we don't have a scene. It takes time, work, and then the concept can grow by itself. Probably, it's going to be different from the American version. For now, we are copy-pasting it, because it was developed there, but once it is planted in fertile grounds ... I think it's good that Red Dawns grabbed it.

Both Jadranka Ljubičić and I have had objections to the use of the term queer in Red Dawns' title since the festival lacked program items which addresses either coalition-building between different counterpublics or other-than-female marginal subjects. Lidija replied by saying that

as a festival, you can't please everybody. You do what you are best at doing. The festival is open: it never refused to co-operate with anybody who wanted to do something or, refused co-operation if the proposal was ideologically incompatible with the festival. Red Dawns shouldn't feel bad about not offering certain items to certain cultural consumers. It is the same with 'queer': what it means here is going to be defined by those people who engage with it. Until then, we can read other people's literature.

Anna Ehrlemark agreed that

the definition of the festival is important from the pure definition point, that it says 'feminist' because that is what we aspire to. And we added 'queer' because of widening the scope (...). The

term “queer” is not so much connected to partying even if it’s such an applicable, such an extremely vague term. To me it does not only mean that we have an ambiguous sexuality – like we are sexual, not without any prefix – because that’s a way of seeing it that is only connected to sex, as in our porn program. For me it also means that you are including questions like (...) when we’re talking about all the lonely male ‘gastarbajters’ [migrant workers] in Ljubljana. (...) It is the attempt to be as inclusive as possible, in a way also to be self-critical (...), a reminder to not conceive queerness in too narrow ways.

The willingness to queer the festival’s agenda is visible from the organizers’ frequent attempts to redefine their political position. The 2009 festival introduction stipulated that “rather than defining them once and for all, Red Dawns fest still prefers to question the possible intersections between feminisms and queer politics”.¹²³ Ehrlemark commented that Red Dawns’ attempts to “mix concepts which are not mixable” is a “blasphemy” since “nothing can be both feminist and queer, both are extremely wide and contradictory concepts”. And yet, she continued, Red Dawns’ aim is “not to create false communities” but to “raise the level of understanding or debate or conflict”:

Both in the local scene and with our foreign guests, we are always having internal conflicts between concepts where it becomes so obvious that queer is not the same thing in Amsterdam or Belgrade. (...) For me, these moments were always the best moments: when the internal conflicts started coming out under controlled circumstances (...), when these idyllic feelings – ‘Oh, we are all from the same scene and we love each other!’ – start getting some cracks.

¹²³ Red Dawns, 2009.

Visual artist and Red Dawns co-organizer Slađana Mitrović aged that, for her

the point is in the debates that resulted from my participation at the festival (...). It is essential that those debates happened. You have to start positioning yourself within a defined context. I even think that reflection is worth more than the exhibition or performance itself.

For Urška Merc, another long-time Red Dawns co-organizer and web mistress, the queer dimension of the festival is important because “by introducing the term ‘queer’, the discussions about which events can be included in the festival have changed, and that is what keeps the festival going”.

The queering of Red Dawns has an additional, utopian dimension. Questions like “Are you interested in feminist struggles of the past – or those that are being fought right now? Do you think about the future? Are you interested in the predictable and ‘real’ or that which you can dream of?”¹²⁴ posed in the tenth festival introduction, speak about a different understanding of history, one that “defies repeatability or generalization and (...) welcomes the surprise of the future as it makes clear the specificities and particularities, the events, of history”.¹²⁵ This view is in direct contrast with the post-1968 tendencies in Europe where declarations about “the death of utopia” and “the death of history” have changed the meaning of utopia by increasing the feeling of its “impossibility and absurdity”.¹²⁶ In *Memory and Utopia* (2007), Luisa Passerini claims that in 1968, the “subjects of history were viewed as subjects of action and knowledge as well as subjects of

¹²⁴ Red Dawns, 2009.

¹²⁵ Grosz, 2000, 1018.

¹²⁶ Passerini, 2007, 297.

desire”.¹²⁷ In other words, they were orientated towards the future and demanded “the impossible” because they understood that “the object of desire counts less than the state of desire”.¹²⁸ Neoconservatism disqualified the very idea of a future, different from the past and the present. In this setting, utopian imagination survived in the form of “nostalgia for resistance (...), orientated towards the past rather than the future, a memory, rather than a source of hope”.¹²⁹

Comparison with Ladyfests

The first Ladyfest took place in 2000 in Olympia, WA (U.S.). It embraced a feminist agenda and labelled itself a “non-profit community-based event designed by and for women to showcase, celebrate and encourage the artistic, organizational, and political work and talents of women”.¹³⁰ It grew out of the North American riot grrrl movement of the 1990s, which was mainly centred on music. Riot grrrl bands such as Fifth Column, Bikini Kill, Bratmobile, Heavens to Betsy, The Third Sex, Sleater-Kinney and queercore bands such as Team Dresch addressed an array of feminist issues, for instance rape, domestic abuse, sexuality and female empowerment. In addition to maintaining a music scene, riot grrrl was also a subculture that became the flag-bearer of a new type of DIY feminism. Since 2000, over two hundred Ladyfest events have taken place, spanning North and South America, Europe, Asia and Australasia. The majority of local organizing teams have adopted the organizational structure and the DIY politics of the first Ladyfest: they are non-profit orientated, self-organized and self-financed. These festivals are organized by volunteers and the program of each festival edi-

¹²⁷ Passerini, 2007, 294.

¹²⁸ Passerini, 2007, 295.

¹²⁹ Passerini, 2007, 299.

¹³⁰ Chidgey, Reitsamer & Zobl, 2009, 6.

tion is agreed upon by the organizing collective. They advocate a variety of artistic and political forms of expression (workshops, dance parties, concerts, exhibitions, film screenings, discussions, and participatory activities), often deliberately refusing to separate art from politics. As such, they are “a popular vehicle for young feminists and their peers to agitate, celebrate and inform, with proceeds donated to women’s causes and groups”.¹³¹

It is interesting to note that the organizers of the first Ladyfest and the organizers of the first Red Dawns were not aware of each other’s existence, and were not necessarily inspired by the same ideas, yet the outcomes of their efforts have been very similar – despite the significant differences in political and social contexts in which they operated. In her review of the tenth Red Dawns, “an aging riot grrrl/Ladyfest veteran” from the UK, Red Chidgey, noticed “many common ideals” shared by Red Dawns and Ladyfests, especially “those emerging from the Women’s Liberation Movement of the 70s and 80s, like creating autonomous spaces which are women-led”.¹³² When describing the differences between today’s generation of feminist organizers and those who were active in the 1980s, she noticed “a much more queer, or gender fluid, understanding of sex roles and embodiments” and the embracing of “a whole host of multi-media technologies, events and performances”.¹³³ She also observed differences between Red Dawns and Ladyfests:

While Ladyfests count their ground zero as emerging from Riot Grrrl, Red Dawns embraces a cross-generational audience and legacy (...); the connection into a bigger movement of social struggle, encapsulated in memory through things like names,

¹³¹ Chidgey, Reitsamer & Zobl, 2009, *ibidem*.

¹³² Chidgey, 2009b.

¹³³ Chidgey, 2009b.

songs, images, and (...) that proud stance of supposedly old-fashioned notions like ‘solidarity’”.¹³⁴

Chidgey added that in contrast to other “third-wave-esque events” such as Ladyfest, the 2009 edition of Red Dawns “had all the fun and festiness of other queer-feminist festivals, but with none of the historical amnesia”.¹³⁵ Lidija Radojević commented: “The amnesia in the West is a hundred times bigger. The difference is that here people notice it and are still bothered by it because the cut was so drastic.”

Those Red Dawns organizers who had participated in Ladyfests in Western Europe noticed other similarities and differences. Urška Merc has lived in Amsterdam since 2006. Admitting that her criticism might result from a completely different level of involvement with Red Dawns on one hand and Ladyfest Amsterdam on the other, she claimed that

Red Dawns cannot be compared to Ladyfests even though people circulate between them. That’s because Red Dawns tried to do something that would be more than just a music-based festival (...). I often feel that there is nothing subversive happening at Ladyfests. I’ve been to several and some people were knitting, there were concerts, and that was it.

Tanja Škander, who is based in Berlin and has co-organized both Red Dawns and Lad.i.y.fest Berlin, was less critical about Ladyfests. She did say that while both festivals are interested in networking and “people who have been at Red Dawns now come to Berlin, even though they are from Holland or Croatia or Serbia”, she felt that at Red Dawns, “the people who already knew each other were more

¹³⁴ Chidgey, 2009b.

¹³⁵ Chidgey, 2009b.

willing to include newcomers in their network, to expand it". In addition, she noticed a difference in the quality of "relationships, debating culture and the level of fun you have during the organization process" which – for her – was more pleasurable at Red Dawns. When I commented that the festival preparations in Ljubljana did not include many conflicts, and that if that were the case, our "debating culture" might turn out to be disastrous, Tanja said that I might be right, yet in Ljubljana "the clash was never so strong that it would (...) actually stop us from organizing an event" just because we could not agree on a consensus.

These particular observations cannot be generalized. I mention them in order to point out the difficulty of comparing similar events, which are set in different subcultural, cultural and political contexts. In this sense, the comparison with DIY festivals from the region of former Yugoslavia would have been more appropriate. As mentioned, I refrained from doing so because I lacked the time and the resources to do it properly.

ACC Metelkova Mesto as a Counterpublic Space

In this chapter, I am going to look at seventeen years of struggle for ACC Metelkova mesto from the perspective of feminists' involvement in the process of transformation of former military barracks on Metelkova Street in Ljubljana to an autonomous cultural centre. The participation in the Network for Metelkova (1990-96) was crucial for women activists who founded Red Dawns since the network viewed non-institutional artistic production and dissemination as a relevant form of political activism – and managed to create a large and collectively run autonomous space for independent artistic and political initiatives that exists to this day. Cultural activism is especially significant in settings where an institutionalised understanding of politics – and public sphere as the site of political

participation – excludes certain issues as personal, apolitical or insignificant. With “cultural activism”, I refer to the whole repertoire of tactics that “provide a context and space for analysis and reflection”.¹³⁶ Chela Sandoval defined tactics as “the moves one makes while engaged with the opposition”.¹³⁷ In her view, they have to be informed by a strategy: “an informing ideology brought to one’s engagement with an oppressor or opposing power”.¹³⁸ For example, some of the tactics that constitute Red Dawns’ repertoire today include manifestoes, performances, the use of visual and social media, music and other girl- and queer-positive expressions, public debates and street actions. The latter have resulted from an increased awareness about the importance of “spatial justice”.¹³⁹

The concept of spatial justice gives spatial visibility to social injustice. It is not a substitute or an alternative for social justice but rather a way of looking at justice from a critical spatial perspective. Spatial justice would involve “the fair and equitable distribution in space of socially valued resources and the opportunities to use them”.¹⁴⁰ Places where this is possible are created and maintained through the “fields of care”¹⁴¹ that result from people’s emotional attachment. In the case of ACC Metelkova mesto, this care is reflected in the activists’ and artists’ cultural activism and aesthetics. It is an emotional bond, visualized in space. There is a boundary that surrounds that bond as well. Metelkova is a limited space, surrounded by a concrete wall. The wall separates the former squat, now autonomous cultural centre, from its gentrified neighbourhood

¹³⁶ Garrison, 2000, 143.

¹³⁷ Sandoval, 1991, 15.

¹³⁸ Sandoval, 1991, *ibidem*.

¹³⁹ Soja, 2009.

¹⁴⁰ Soja, 2009, 32.

¹⁴¹ Tuan, 2001.

(for example, the new Ministry of Culture resides across the street), creating an optical illusion that Metelkova is a world of its own, out of place, out of time, and out of local urban politics. Still, the bond/boundary is strong enough to serve as the base for making political claims in the name of the collective body of activists and artists from Metelkova mesto even though, for most of them, Metelkova is not a point of collective identification. In the dispersed Red Dawns group, only Jadranka Ljubičić and Nataša Serec, members who have been involved in ACC Metelkova mesto from the start (1993), consistently used the expression “mi” as in “we, the people of Metelkova” in their interview responses.

My description of the struggle for spaces in which autonomous groups can work on their own terms further stipulates the politics of spatial justice advocated by the Network for Metelkova (then) and Metelkova’s Forum (today) by tying them to sociological and feminist theories of “free spaces”. According to Francesca Polletta, the term has been applied as a “good metaphor” that has required innovative and genre-stretching definitions of free social spaces. For sociologists interested in the use rather than sole existence of free spaces, the most persistent question is whether free spaces are the precondition or the consequence of political mobilization. Polletta cut the Gordian knot by allowing both options. In her view, free spaces are “small-scale settings within a community or movement that are removed from direct control of dominant groups, are voluntarily participated in, and generate the cultural challenge that precedes or accompanies political mobilization”.¹⁴² In my research, I am interested in the ways in which Red Dawns festival organizers and volunteers today – especially those that do *not* identify as “Metelkovke” – perceive the ways in which Metelkova is being changed by the presence of a feminist-queer initiative that sees it

¹⁴² Polletta, 1999, 1.

both as an arena for the formation of feminist-queer discourse (and tactics) and an arena where that discourse can be tied to the activities of other local counterpublics.

Structuralist approaches stipulate that oppositional culture cannot have mobilizing effects without using and depending on already existing political opportunity. Bratko Bibič's account of the Network for Metelkova's struggle for public space makes a different point, arguing that in this case, the oppositional culture *created* a political opportunity that did not "automatically" follow political transformations of the late 1980s – even if it did rest on an atmosphere of joy and the belief that great innovations were possible after the collapse of the Iron Curtain in 1989. It was in that context that the "real utopia" of the Metelkova barracks conversion acquired the status of a pilot project; part of a comprehensive initiative to demilitarize both the city of Ljubljana and Slovenia. As such, the history of ACC Metelkova mesto suggests that "counterhegemonic ideas and identities come neither from outside the system nor from some free-floating oppositional consciousness, but from long standing community institutions".¹⁴³

In the case of ACC Metelkova mesto, the existence of a counterpublic space was a result of deliberate political mobilization, of tactical political struggle that was inseparable from the "cultural challenge" it presented. Philosopher, musician and composer Bratko Bibič was one of many active members of the Network for Metelkova whose operations united several hundred subjects from the heterogeneous fields of art, culture and socially engaged movements. In *Noise from Metelkova* (2003), he wrote that "artistic and (sub)cultural practices have been one of the pillars (...) and driving force of the ongoing project of the Metelkova army barracks conversion in all the stages of the process".¹⁴⁴ In his view, the artistic

¹⁴³ Polletta, 1999, 1.

¹⁴⁴ Bibič, 2003, 2.

and cultural nature of the alliance was understandable given the fact that their struggle for space, including the lack of working facilities such as art studios, was one of the crucial arenas of the struggle for “real”, not only imaginary or discursive “space for the alternatives”, representing freedom in art, culture, and politics of the 1980s in Ljubljana.

By resorting to destruction and attempting to demolish the buildings on Metelkova (which had by a previous political decision of both the town and state authorities been allocated to the Network for Metelkova), the first postsocialist municipal authorities “opted for a brutal and antagonistic advancement of their narrow/reductive ideological, political and, in terms of real-estate, speculative interests. This also forced the activists to take more radical action”.¹⁴⁵ They squatted, “rebuilt” and used the premises in ways that resisted the authorities’ abuse of power. Metelkova acquired and never quite shook off the reputation of being dangerous, because it has never been under any (in)direct control of the structures of authority and capital, and because it still strives to remain an autonomous field of urban artistic, cultural, social, counterpublic life and production.¹⁴⁶

For Red Dawns, ACC Metelkova mesto is more than a venue; it is the symbolic frame that places the festival into a certain genealogy, the history of many small lesbian, feminist, women’s and queer initiatives that preceded or coexist with it. The women’s groups that took part in the Network for Metelkova and resided in Metelkova since 1993 built on the legacy of new social movements from the

¹⁴⁵ Bibič, 2003, 4.

¹⁴⁶ Today, Metelkova consists of four large buildings which hold around fifty art studios, a graphic studio, galleries, four music venues, practice spaces, a recording studio, cafes, dance clubs, a reading room with radical literature, an anarchist info shop, a public kitchen, a queer cultural centre and a heavy-metal bar.

late 1970s and 1980s. The network intersections within Metelkova mesto were crucial for generating mobilizing identities because they provided weakly tied individuals with the access to previously unavailable ideas. The counterhegemonic nature of these ideas also enabled them to defy social conventions, including gender-based asymmetries. The fight for Metelkova provided the involved activists of both sexes with the network, skills and solidarity that helped them organize around a variety of issues. As can be observed from Jadranka's and Nataša's account, for women activists, Metelkova also provided the space for questioning the gap between their male friends and activists' egalitarian ethos and their sexist behaviour. Generally speaking, Metelkova provided both the physical and conceptual space within which activists were able to penetrate the prevailing common *nonsense* that keeps most people passive in the face of injustice – and is thus still crucial for the formation of identities and interests that precede (and empower) mobilization. The aims and organizing structure of Red Dawns are impossible to understand without this wider frame of reference. Metelkova, as a free space, provided a kind of anchor for the insistence and development of cultural challenges that exploded previously existing structural arrangements of public spaces.

I want to point out another dimension of counterpublic spaces, most often neglected by feminist accounts, which deal with identity construction, deconstruction and reconstruction. Usually, they focus on people's childhoods spent within the nuclear family, rely on psychoanalysis¹⁴⁷ and tend to see identity in ways that obscure its heterogeneity, multiplicity and use. The existence of a feminist-queer genealogy and the fact that some organizers identify with Metelkova as much as they do with the festival, could suggest that identity is also constructed intersubjectively: by choosing to be affil-

¹⁴⁷ Fraser, 1990, 47.

iated with various oppositional artistic/activist collectives and spaces. Chela Sandoval theorized about a “differential mode of consciousness” when she opposed essentialist ideas about identity formation and politics by proposing that the differential mode offers “a strategic politics wherein modernist oppositional identities become tactical poses”.¹⁴⁸ In the same way, the different meanings and values of counterpublic spaces are constantly (re)created and negotiated through their particular use. Phil Hubbard wrote that spaces are “constantly becoming, in process and unavoidably caught up in power relations”.¹⁴⁹ Like recent discussions about subjectivity in feminist philosophy, these debates suggest that the key question might not be what counterpublic spaces (and subjectivities) *are* but what they enable or *do*.

Red Dawns’ Internal and External Function

The final chapter is focused on my interviewees’ reflection on Red Dawns’ internal function and the ways in which it intersects with the festival’s public outreach. When I approached my interviewees in July 2009, I already had a working definition of both functions but I did not want to pose questions that would immediately reveal my theoretical interests and presuppositions. This is why my introductory question addressed the associations and moments most remembered by the interviewees. By far the most frequently received answer referred to sociability as the festival’s highlight. For instance, Tanja Škander spoke of the “incredible atmosphere, the great feeling, interesting people, great conversations”, Lidija Radojević talked about “a kind of carnevalesque feeling in the air; both aggressive and totally transformative (...), a feeling that everything is possible”, and Nataša Serec spoke of “a unique, abnormally

¹⁴⁸ Garrison, 2000, 147.

¹⁴⁹ Hubbard, 2005, 47.

good time” that felt like “another world” because “our energies merged in such a way that everything was heart-felt”.

Other memorable elements of Red Dawns mentioned were: the festival’s “courage in daring to cross the line” (Lidija Radojević), “the intertwining of art and politics” (Urška Merc, Slađana Mitrović, Ana Grobler), “social and political engagement” (Anja Kocman, Danaja Grešak), “increased visibility for lesbians, especially butch women, and trans people in Metelkova” (Anja Kocman, Vesna Vravnik, Suzana Tratnik), “new views on social relations and feminist issues, coming from experience rather than books” (Tanja Škander, Ana Jereb), “brain food” or “ideas for future work” (Ana Jereb) and “the international networking, the transnational character of the festival” (Anja Kocman, Danaja Grešak, Alja Bebar). The interviewees also mentioned specific events (and people) who made a lasting impression.¹⁵⁰ This short review of their answers suggests that the internal function of the festival was indeed fulfilled: Red Dawns managed to create a public space in which it is possible to generate a feminist or/and queer identity, grounded in a consciousness of community and solidarity.

My interviewees frequently associated the positive festive atmosphere with a horizontal, DIY and inclusive organizational policy that was also reflected in Red Dawns’ treatment of its guests. Festival co-organizer and member of Metelkova’s [A] Infoshop Daša Tepina was glad

that the participants are never excluded from the work process.

Red Dawns fest often creates situations in which the guests (...)

¹⁵⁰ For instance, Noha Ramadan’s workshop *Body as the Site of Action* and the collectively planned street action that followed, the 2008 street-renaming action, Liad Kantorowitz’s lecture on representations of social and political taboos in Middle-Eastern pornography, Svetlana Makarovič’s “anti-feminist” festival opening speech, Moon’s and Sacha Wittam’s performance *Easy Jet Set*, etc.

can become involved if they want to. I think it is crucial to include people in the process because that makes the festival homely and warm, and makes it easy to meet new people. (...) That is why people feel good.

Mirjana Frank, who volunteered for the first time during the tenth edition in 2009, added that contrary to professional or larger festivals where artists often leave immediately after their performance, Red Dawns guests stay for several days and in this way get the chance to get involved with the festival and learn about the circumstances in which it operates. Jasmina Jerant, Urška Merc and Lidija Radojević agreed that communication was also easier because most of the guests were accommodated in the organizers' and volunteers' flats, rather than hotels.

Daša and Mirjana spoke of the “easy-going atmosphere” as a consequence of Red Dawns' horizontal organizational structure. According to Mirjana, most festivals

always have a part of the audience and part of the organizational team who think they are I-don't-know-who, important. There's always an elite. Here, my feeling was that that isn't the case. I thought that was cool.

In Ana Jereb's opinion, the organizing group nourishes openness and actively seeks new, inexperienced volunteers who “learn by doing”: once they get acquainted with the festival, they are encouraged to take more responsibilities. Contrary to professional and NGO endeavours, Ana “never felt that this is an institution in the sense that once certain rules would be established, we'd have to stick to them even if they would no longer serve any purpose”. It was interesting to notice that volunteers who joined Red Dawns recently could not name reasons for the festival's inclusiveness and egalitar-

ian ethos. In their view, it seemed to come from “thin air” and they took it for granted. Those interviewees who participated in other – both professional and grassroots – organizational teams before joining Red Dawns agreed that this is a rare, if not exceptional, quality. From the perspective of long-time organizers whose responsibilities are significantly larger, these qualities have been reached in the course of years through a demanding process in which innovation was both necessary and actively sought. Nataša Serec said that

we invented our own approaches to design, the process of program selection, team-building, seeking and involving volunteers, and then the international aspect, which is how we now find ourselves connected to an international circle.

Jadranka Ljubičić stipulated the team’s ability to delegate responsibilities without framing the organization process in hierarchical ways. Ana Jereb, who participated in the organizational team sporadically, said that since the festival is “a changing construction, it was sometimes hard to catch up”. Yet, she added, that means that “a lot depends on your own initiative. It’s not like somebody will ‘pull your sleeve’, except when it comes to things that really have to be done and have been previously delegated to you”. Daša Tepina added that even though the festival has been happening for a long time and became fairly known in the process, it deliberately stayed non-profitable, informal and largely based on voluntary work. In her view, voluntary work is the precondition for an inclusive and horizontal structure and “a crucial concept for venues such as Metelkova”. Jasmina Jerant also appreciated the fact that “no one works because of money” but because of a “strong and deep dedication to women’s issues”. She added that “there is a lot of respect among all of the individuals in the team – respect for each other. And also, I would say, a lot of honesty and sincerity”.

In Mirjana Frank's words, Red Dawns' program and size, and its consequent marginality, remains both an advantage and disadvantage. The advantage is that

we – if I can say 'we' – don't give a fuck about pleasing the taste of the masses since the festival program targets a very specific audience; the purpose is not to chase away certain people but to focus on specific interests. Of course, the disadvantage is that the festival's influence is limited. However, others are doing that. We might not be effective but we have a certain depth, recognized by people who are interested in these issues. And they do bring their friends along ...

The negative side of refusing to professionalize the festival is that, as Ana Jereb and Nataša Serec claimed, the organizers inevitably shift from one role to the other, and while the merging of roles (you are part organizer, part member of the audience, sometimes performer or moderator) does not cause conflicts *per se*, it does mean that people who are more experienced inevitably end up being overburdened and lacking time to enjoy the festival. On the other hand, if the festival was professionalized, Ana Jereb said that she would no longer want to collaborate: "it would lose its charm; (...) if you want to separate all functions, you quickly end up having a hierarchical structure". Jadranka sees the value of the festival in its "evolution, which took a direction opposite from the usual development of festivals in Ljubljana". Red Dawns "did not buy into the pretentious wish for megalomania but (...) stayed a pocket-size festival".

Conceptual Openness

I discussed Red Dawns' conceptual openness in the chapter about its history; the many rearticulations of its politics and aims. While this approach rests on a conscious decision, not everybody in the

team agrees about its benefits. Those who do, like Slađana Mitrović, claim that contrary to other feminist art programs that are “often very strict, directed, cast in concrete”, Red Dawns is “open both thematically and politically”. She said that the festival “allows everybody to create their space of action. Sexuality and pornography” – two issues that dominated the 2009 festival program – “are in themselves very controversial and often cause quite a stir even between feminists, yet Red Dawns has shown that this kind of openness is an advantage”. In the same way, Anna Ehrlemark “doesn’t mind that the festival is not perfectly conceptualized”. However, she says,

sometimes it can be difficult to watch something that you think is really really stupid with lots of people around you who know that you are one of the organizers of this event (...) The festival is “me” while the program is “not me”. There are often things that don’t correspond to my... I mean, I don’t have a problem with it...

In this statement, Ehrlemark confirms that the open approach is something she supports even though she finds it troublesome sometimes in terms of personal and artistic taste.

The perceived openness of the festival is also a practical consequence of working on a very limited budget. The organizing team constantly reinvents its fund-raising strategies and relies on an array of sources: public money, private donations, benefit parties and merchandize sales. Having a limited budget also forces the organizers to apply the DIY ethos to a large number of festival activities and replace the lack of funding with skill sharing, knowledge exchange and material exchange of goods with their counterpublic allies. All these practices increase the participatory and egalitarian feeling within the team. Another consequence of operating on a low budget is that people within the organizational team fluctuate

and the program depends on the aesthetic and political preferences of each year's collective. For Ana Jereb, this is an advantage:

If you leave, you open space for somebody else. I really like this because this is how the festival can keep up with political changes and keep itself from closing into a type of group that 'knows how things ought to be done' or 'knows which issues are relevant'.

Ana Jereb addressed an additional advantage of openness when she spoke about the experience of being in the same space with people whose complicated gender identity can reveal a whole new world to you. She said that "you do not even have to talk to them": it is enough to observe and witness their "performance" since it goes beyond any context you knew before meeting them; "they open your horizons, your thoughts". Daša Tepina claimed that Red Dawns is "one of the best festivals in Metelkova" exactly because it creates the opportunity where you can socialize with new and very different people". Of course, the experience of difference can be shocking: there is the standard stereotypical perception of Red Dawns organizers as "lezzies" (her male friends asked Anja Kocman why she bothers to help "them"); the shock Anja herself experienced when she met "a woman with a moustache" for the first time; the discomfort heterosexual male audience members feel at a feminist-queer festival and the patronizing and ridiculing attitude to the organizers and guests that follows; even the discomfort felt by lesbians who usually don't frequent non-lesbian venues – all these examples speak about the local political importance and controversy of Red Dawns as a feminist-queer counterpublic. In fact, they suggest that these conceptually separate functions cannot be separated in practice.

A “Different” Metelkova

So far I have argued that autonomous counterspaces such as ACC Metelkova mesto are necessary for creating local and international feminist-queer network intersections available for generating mobilizing identities. I have also argued that a space which allows “withdrawal or regroupment”¹⁵¹ has to be safe: supportive of feminist, lesbian, trans, boi, butch, queer, gay and other identities of people who visited the festival. This kind of public space makes it possible to meet new people, discuss issues, articulate one’s political position in clearer ways, gain emotional support and inspiration for future work and discuss artistic or political co-operative projects. In my view, this dimension of the festival was – and remains – as important as its issue-specific and publicly visible political, artistic, educational and intellectual production, or, in Fraser’s words, its external function.

I asked my interviewees in what ways their experience of ACC Metelkova mesto changes during the festival. I wanted to see whether they perceived Red Dawns as an event organized primarily for themselves by themselves, or as an event that had the potential to open Metelkova for new collaborations and create a welcoming atmosphere for women, feminists, gender-variant people, sexual minorities and their allies. Most of my interviewees agreed that Metelkova did “feel different” during the festival. Their answers could be divided between those who spoke from an “internal” perspective of involved festival participants and those that tried to look at Red Dawns’ feminist-queer intervention from the “external” perspective of people who normally frequent Metelkova and those clubs based in Metelkova which do not participate in the festival. Urška Merc paid attention to both perspectives. From the outside, Metelkova becomes “more international and it becomes a platform for the exposure to different forms of art”. From the inside,

¹⁵¹ Fraser, 1990: 68.

Red Dawns connects several venues, meaning that it connects several groups and associations. From this point of view, the festival functions as a coalition, as an inclusive initiative, which asks what are the common interests and standpoints of different associations and individuals in Metelkova. I can imagine it also functions as a completely counterproductive force, even a separatist one, when viewed from the perspective of those groups who are there for the profit, who are apolitical or not interested in feminism.

Nataša Serec, whose work place is in Metelkova, said that during the festival she does not communicate with “people of Metelkova”. “Not that I ignore them,” she explains, “its just that I am in our ‘film’ and that is all that matters. I don’t want to hang out with them when all the foreign guests are here and they are soon going to leave”. She continued to say that she is puzzled about the way people in Metelkova perceive the festival since “they never say anything, never comment on it”. She added that she did not even know how people from those clubs, which *do* co-operate with the festival, feel about it.

The festival is limited to specific venues in Metelkova: the lesbian club Monokel, the gay club Tiffany, the galleries Alkatraz and Mizzart, the anarchist infoshop, the Youth Handicapped Deprivileged club, and the clubs Gromka and Menza pri koritu. That leaves out a number of other clubs, run by women, or by collectives of men and women. They are mostly music-orientated and have never expressed an interest in collaborating with Red Dawns. Ana Jereb feels that even the clubs that do co-operate

merely offer the space which could easily be offered to another organizer or an apolitical event. The feeling that we are doing this together because it is important (...), because it’s about ideas

and not only about having a good time, is not there. Even if Red Dawns fest is about what Metelkova is supposed to be about. When I think of the reasons why the festival started, that most of the work was done – and still is done – by women, this lack of interest bothers me. If the festival used to be a Metelkova festival, it no longer is.

Within Menza pri koritu, the main festival venue where Nataša Serec organizes events throughout the year, she does feel the difference:

It's a completely different energy, all of a sudden, all these girls are there, and they hang out with each other. The boys are pushed aside, because for those four or five days, the girls don't find them as interesting [*laughs*]. (...) You feel the difference when this atmosphere is brutally destroyed, like this year [2009], on Friday night at the party, when girls were dancing in the middle of the dance floor and then people who didn't come to the festival started pushing in, people who came because it was Friday night. There were so many of them that the girls were pushed aside. They left for the balcony and the energy changed immediately. After that, it was like it normally is.

Similarly, Anna Ehrlemark claims that there is a difference, that Red Dawns “definitely turns the place upside down for a few days”. She attributes the difference to the fact that there are more lesbians present at venues they normally do not frequent, and to “this core group of the festival that is very supportive of each other, in the mood for dancing with each other, giving each other compliments and talking to each other”. Lidija Radojević began to define “normality” by asking: “If Metelkova is really so liberal and open as we claim it to be, why do you, at the regular parties (...), never see two

women kissing? Why do you see it exclusively during Red Dawns?” In her opinion, the festival is provocative because it points out the fact that alternative places such as Metelkova are tied into the dominant, sexist and heteronormative culture. “Metelkova is a really chauvinist place,” she said:

All these boys are so paternalistic. Because we are, to speak in quotation marks, their girlfriends, their friends, even these boys cannot step out of their chauvinism which completely dominates our culture at all levels: from the lowest (...) to the highest, academic level. Everyone falls for it, even the alternative scene, Metelkova, including our enlightened, cool friends.

When asked whether the difference she felt during the festival came from the temporary absence of chauvinism, she corrected me and replied:

No, I never said that chauvinism is absent; I said that more women and more feminists are present. Because we are in majority and the themes discussed are feminist. The chauvinism stays the same – it’s in all the jokes that come out after the second beer.

From a lesbian point of view, the festival increases the safety of those clubs in Metelkova, which are not specifically lesbian, gay or queer even though, on a declarative level, they support sexual minorities. Suzana Tratnik said that for her, as a lesbian who would normally frequent Monokel or Tiffany, Red Dawns is an opportunity to visit other venues. The festival has only recently – and deliberately – started to include program items that are interesting for a gay audience. Since the female ensemble of Red Dawns did not feel competent to organize a program *for* gays, it started to co-operate with the program coordinator of Tiffany,

Jernej Škof in 2009, and with journalist and queer film enthusiast Dare Pejić in 2010.

The festival is also an opportunity to discuss feminist and queer issues in public. Most of my interviewees attributed that to the increased presence of foreign guests who are less burdened with local and highly gendered codes of behaviour, who are there because they are interested in networking and feminist-queer politics. Jasmina Jerant and Jadranka Ljubičić paid attention to the local audience and noticed a change in its structure. Jasmina noticed “established Slovenian intellectuals, academics, journalists and even politicians” who “mostly came for the panel discussion and lectures”. Jadranka observed that, in general, the festival manages to create its own audience: artists who are part of the program, activist groups who either help with the festival or come to party, and the people they bring along because they are interested in the program. “That absolutely changes the face of Metelkova,” she says, “since there are less people who come solely because Metelkova is an open space”. Jadranka also noticed a change in the gender structure of the audience, highlighting the presence of “men who recognized a certain quality, and are no longer afraid to come to the festival, even though they know they are going to be in minority”.

The Limitations of Red Dawns

Several interviewees experience the annual festive event as a strategic mistake or limitation since it fails to provide the kind of continuity that is, as they unanimously agreed, necessary for building a counterpublic. Whether they used the paradoxical term “temporary community” (Anna Ehrlemark, Jadranka Ljubičić), the term “crossroad” or “meeting point” (Anja Bebar), “network” (Tanja Škander), “entry point” (Daša Tepina), “scene” (Lidija Radojević) or “organism” (Ana Grobler), none of the terms seemed appropriate since they only

increased the feeling that there is a lack of the kind of feminist-queer counterpublic that would be able to intervene into the official public sphere in effective or visible ways. While Tanja Škander said that “during those three or four days, some sort of community (...), a certain chemistry is created” which should not be underestimated since it makes people who “cross the limits of heteronormativity” feel “less strange” or “relatively normal”, my other interviewees were clearly frustrated by the festivals’ formal boundaries.

Nataša Serec’s estimation of the festival’s potential was perhaps the most realistic since she perceives the wish for continuity and greater impact as a “great goal that might be too ambitious”. In her view, organizing a series of monthly or even weekly events that would gradually build a permanent audience and include new people in the organization process would already be a success. Lidija agreed that

the festival’s mission – and I salute the idea of organizing regular events throughout the year, the idea of continuity – is to work here yet maintain its international connections since Ljubljana, not to mention Slovenia, definitely needs that sort of help.

For Daša, the fact that Red Dawns was more successful in maintaining transnational collaborations than it was in addressing the local community is a paradox that calls for extensive work on a local infrastructure, be it theoretical or action-orientated “in order to be able to react to different types of problems, to join certain initiatives, and become generally more visible in society”. Ana Jereb agrees that the festival has a more international than local character. Because of this, its span is limited to “circles of people who already know each other or share similar backgrounds”. Jadranka added that “both Metelkova and the festival share one basic problem: that continuity is understood as the endurance and insistence of certain

people within it, and not as the passing of knowledge and creative energy to new people”.

Contrary to Jadranka’s statement, new volunteers stipulated the fact that Red Dawns was surprisingly easy to join, suggesting that the festival team pays attention to the participatory chances of each new individual and notices the extent to which they can get involved without hierarchically prescribing their role. “If we look at temporality as the circulation of people and ideas”, Jadranka reflects, then “the term ‘temporary community’ does adequately describe Red Dawns”. In Anna’s view, work for community is rewarding regardless of how “temporary” or “permanent” the community in question is. Slađana added that Red Dawns

continues to play an important role as an explicit point of artistic, political or philosophic identification with feminist or queer perspectives. (...) If you accept this frame of reference, you have to accept the consequences since people are going to associate you with it, and in that sense, I think that continuity is of essential importance. It is a deliberate move away from universality as well as an idea that brought us together. (...) The bottom line is that these alternative spaces are developing strong and critical perspective on society. They are marginal and fabulous.”

In Slađana’s view, the internal and external function of feminist-queer counterpublics is inseparable. Urška Merc, who views the discussion from her distant yet comparable Amsterdam experience, adds that Red Dawns is as effective and visible as other counterpublic arenas since “Ljubljana lacks a wider social community. (...) Whether you consider animal rights groups or workers’ organizations, there is a lack of consciousness that in a wider context, we are all struggling for the same goal”. Similarly, Vesna Vravnik recalls that when she first got involved in “the scene”, she believed

that “marginal groups would be strong enough to beat the majority if they would join hands”. “And yet,” she added, “everyone wants to go their own way and leave their signature”. In this context, Nancy Fraser’s writing on the “absence of any credible overarching emancipatory project despite the proliferation of fronts of struggle” and “a general decoupling of the cultural politics of recognition from the social politics of redistribution”,¹⁵² as features characteristic of the postsocialist condition, most definitely rings a bell.

Conclusion

According to my interviewees, Festive sociability was the most important aspect of Red Dawns’ internal function. It was enabled by the festival’s conceptual openness, by its growing local and international network, and by its horizontal, participatory, and DIY organizational policy. In this way, Red Dawns managed to temporarily blur the distinctions between predefined social roles (audience, participant, organizer) and allowed identification with Red Dawns as a feminist-queer “temporary community” or (potential) counterpublic. The second important aspect of Red Dawns’ internal function was the generation of productive conflicts and discussions, encouraged by the issue-specific festival program and the heterogeneous structure of the audience.

The external function of Red Dawns was directed towards other local counterpublics as well as the official public sphere. The festival has reached both even though my interviewees’ desire for an even greater visibility of feminist and queer issues suggests that the annual festival format needs to be enriched with other forms of public participation which would take place on a more regular basis and possibly step outside Metelkova’s borders. In its eleven years of existence, the festival has successfully contributed to the diver-

¹⁵² Naples, 2004, 1103-4.

sification of counterpublic feminist-queer discourses and to the critique of hegemonic discourse in postsocialist Slovenia. Since the latter has already managed to exclude the majority of population from decision-making processes and reduced politics to a spectacle, emerging counterpublics such as Red Dawns are of key importance for a truly participatory, heterogeneous and just society.

Bibliography

ANDERSON, B. (1995): *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, Verso, London & New York.

BAKIĆ-HAYDEN, M. (1995): "Nesting Orientalisms: The Case of Former Yugoslavia", *Slavic Review*, 54/4, pp. 917–931.

BAŠIN, I. (2006): "Separatistični feminizem? Ne, hvala", *Dnevnik*, Ljubljana (8.3.2006).

BATINIĆ, J. (2001): "Feminism, Nationalism, and War: The 'Yugoslav Case' in Feminist Texts", *Journal of International Women's Studies*, 3/11. Online: www.bridgew.edu/SoAS/JIWS/fall01/batinic.pdf (31.1.2009)

BIBIČ, B. (2003): *The Noise From Metelkova: Ljubljana Spaces and Culture in Transitions*. Mirovni inštitut, Ljubljana.

BRAIDOTTI, R., GRIFFIN, G. (2002): "Whiteness and European Situatedness", in: *Thinking Differently. A Reader in European Women's Studies*. Edited by G. Griffin and R. Braidotti. Zed Books, London, pp. 221–236.

BRAIDOTTI, R. (2005): "A Critical Cartography of Feminist Post-postmodernism", *Australian Feminist Studies*, 20/47, pp.169–180.

CERWONKA, A. (2008): "Traveling Feminist Thought: 'Difference' and Transculturation in Central and Eastern European Feminism", *Signs*, 33/4, pp. 809–832.

- CHIDGEY, R. (2009a): "Personal and Collective Acts of Resistance: DIY Feminist Networks in Europe", *Transform! European Journal of Alternative Thinking and Political Dialogue*, 1/5. Online: [http://www.transform-network.net/nc/en/home/journal-transformeurope/display-journal-transform/browse/3/article/79/DIY-Feminist-Networks-in-Europe-Personal-and-Collective-Acts-of-Resistance.html?cHash=149ddeb57c&sword_list\[0\]=chidgey](http://www.transform-network.net/nc/en/home/journal-transformeurope/display-journal-transform/browse/3/article/79/DIY-Feminist-Networks-in-Europe-Personal-and-Collective-Acts-of-Resistance.html?cHash=149ddeb57c&sword_list[0]=chidgey) (12.4.2010).
- CHIDGEY, R. (2009b): "Red Dawns Festival: Queering Solidarity and Honoring Militant Historical Memory". Online: <http://www.grassrootsfeminism.net/cms/node/226> (12.4.2010).
- CHIDGEY, R., REITSAMER, R., ZOBL, E. (2009): "Ladyfest: Material Histories of Everyday Feminist Art Production", *n.paradoxa*, 24, pp. 5-12.
- CHIDGEY, R., ZOBL, E. (2009): "Making valuable DIY theory and herstory through zines". An Email Interview with Nina, from Belgium". Online: <http://www.grassrootsfeminism.net/cms/node/141> (12.4.2010).
- CRIMETHINC. EX-WORKERS' COLLECTIVE (2001): *Days of War, Night of Love: Crimethinc. For Beginners*. Online: <http://www.crimethinc.com/texts/days/> (11.4.2010)
- EHRLEMARK, A. (2008): "Kaj je narobe z Rdečimi zorami?", *Narobe* 1/5, March 2008, p. 25. Online at: <http://www.narobe.si/stevilka-5/rdece-zore.html> (1.4.2010)
- FELSKI, R. (1989): *Beyond Feminist Aesthetics: Feminist Literature and Social Change*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
- FRASER, N. (1985): "What's Critical about Critical Theory? The Case of Habermas and Gender", *New German Critique*, 35, pp. 97-131.
- FRASER, N. (1990): "Rethinking the Public Sphere: A Contribution to the Critique of Actually Existing Democracy", *Social Text*, 25/26, pp. 56-80.

GARRISON, E. K. (2000): "U.S. Feminism-Grrrl Style! Youth (Sub)Cultures and the Technologics of the Third Wave", *Feminist Studies*, 26/1, pp. 141-170.

GROSZ, E. (2000): "Histories of a Feminist Future", *Signs*, 25/4, pp. 1017-1021.

GRŽINIĆ, M. (2005): *Estetika kibersvijeta i učinci derealizacije*. Multimedijalni institute/Košnica - centar za komunikaciju i kulturu, Zagreb/Sarajevo. Online: http://www.zamirzine.net/IMG/pdf/estetika_kibersvijeta.pdf (16.8.2009)

HABERMAS, J. (1991): *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry Into a Category of Bourgeois Society*. The MIT Press, Cambridge, MA.

HALBERSTAM, J. (2005): *A Queer Time & Place: Transgender Bodies, Subcultural Lives*. New York University, New York.

HARAWAY, D. (1997): *Modest_Witness@Second_Millennium. FemaleMan@_Meets_Onco Mouse™: Feminism and Technoscience*. Routledge, New York.

HARDING, S. (1991): *Whose Science? Whose Knowledge?* Cornell University Press, Ithaca, NY.

HOOKS, B. (2000): *Feminism is for Everybody: Passionate Politics*. South End Press, Boston.

HUBBARD, P. (2005): "Space/Place", in: *Cultural Geography: A Critical Dictionary of Key Concepts*. Edited by D. Atkinson et. al. I.B.Tauris & Co. Ltd, London, pp. 41-48.

HVALA, T. (2007): "The Central Struggle: Interview with Veronica Schild". Online: <http://prepih.blogspot.com/2007/12/interview-with-vernica-schild.html> (12.4.2010)

HVALA, T. (2008): "Streetwise Feminism: Feminist and Lesbian Street Actions, Street Art and Graffiti in Ljubljana", *Revue Amnis*, 8, pp. 69-80.

- HVALA, T. (2009): "Postsocialist Feminisms between Two Fires", *Borec*, 61/657-661, pp. 332-358.
- IVEKOVIĆ, R. (No date): "Transitions", in: *Waldijk Tutorial*. University of Utrecht, Utrecht, pp. 1-15.
- IVEKOVIĆ, R. (1993): "Women, Nationalism and War: 'Make Love Not War'", *Hypatia*, 8/4, pp. 113-128.
- JALUŠIČ, V. (2002): *Kako smo hodile v feministično gimnazijo*. Edited by V. Jalušič. *cf., Ljubljana.
- JEFFS, N. (2007): *Zbornik postkolonialnih študij*. Edited by N. Jeffs. Krtina, Ljubljana.
- KAŠIĆ, B. (2004): "Feminist Cross-Mainstreaming within 'East-West' Mapping: A Postsocialist Perspective", *European Journal of Women's Studies*, 11, pp. 473-485.
- KAVČIČ, A. (2008a): "Moja dežela 14: Slovenske feministke", 1.9.2008. Online: <http://www.vest.si/2008/09/01/moja-dezela-014/> (12.4.2010).
- KAVČIČ, A. (2008b): "Moja dežela 6: Homoseksualci", 9.6.2008. Online: <http://www.vest.si/2008/06/09/moja-dezela-006/> (12.4.2010).
- KUHAR, R. (2007): "Prečuta noč za lezbični manifest. Intervju z Natašo Sukič in Suzano Tratnik", *Narobe* 1/4, p. 11.
- LESNIČAR PUČKO, Tanja. 2007. "Manj o tem, kaj, in bolj o tem, kako". *Borec* 639-643 (59), pp. 81-85
- MOČNIK, R. et. al. (2000): *Feminizem/mi za začetnice/ke*. *cf./ Mesto žensk, Ljubljana.
- MOČNIK, R. (2008): "Zgodovinopisje kot identitetna vednost: trije slovenski zgodovinarji o razbitju jugoslovanske federacije", *Oddogodenje zgodovine - primer Jugoslavije*. Edited by L. Centrih. *Borec*, 60/648-651. ZAK, Ljubljana, pp. 39-60.
- MOHANTY, C. T. (1997): "Under Western Eyes: Feminist Scholarship and Colonial Discourses", in: *Dangerous Liaisons. Gender, Nation and Postcolonial Perspectives*. Edited by A. McClintock, A.

- Mufti, E. Shohat. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, pp. 255-277.
- NAPLES, N. A. (2004): "To Interpret the World and to Change It: An Interview with Nancy Fraser", *Signs* 29/4, pp. 1103-1125.
- ORCHID (1999): *Dance Tonight, Revolution Tomorrow*. Ebullition Records, Goleta.
- OZMEC, S. (2001): "Osmi marec: dan, ko se pretvarjamo, da je vse v redu", *Mladina* (19.3.2001). Online: <http://www.mladina.si/te-dnik/200111/clanek/m-osmi/> (3.10.2008).
- PASSERINI, L. (2007): *Memory and Utopia*. London, Equinox Publishing.
- PASSERINI, L. (2008): *Ustna zgodovina, spol in utopija*. Ljubljana, Studia humanitatis.
- PILCHER, J., WHELEHAN, I. (2004): *50 Key Concepts in Gender Studies*. Sage, London.
- PIŠEK, M. (2009): "Ne tlači me v (o)queer!", *Dnevnikov Objektiv*, 11.7.2009. Online: http://dnevnik.si/tiskane_izdaje/objektiv/1042282499 (31.3.2010).
- PLAHUTA SIMČIČ, V. (2006): "Ne smemo se slepiti, patriarhat je povsod!", *Delo* 48/74, p. 15.
- POLLETTA, F. (1999): "'Free Spaces' in Collective Action", *Theory and Society*, 28/1, pp.1-38.
- PRATT, M. L. (1992): *Imperial Eyes: Travel Writing and Transculturation*. Routledge, London/New York.
- PUWAR, N. (2004): *Space invaders: race, gender and bodies out of place*. Berg, Oxford.
- RADOJEVIĆ, L. (2007): "Univerzalizacija boja in partikularne zapreke ali med osmim marcem in tisočerimi spoil"; *Borec* 59/639-643, pp. 87-93.
- RED DAWNS (2003). Online: <http://www.metelkova.org/rdece/arhiv/concept.php> (31.3.2010).

- RED DAWNS (2004). Online: <http://www.metelkova.org/rdece/2004/> (11.4.2010).
- RED DAWNS (2005). Online: <http://www.metelkova.org/rdece/2005/2005/english.htm> (18.3.2010).
- RED DAWNS (2006). Online: <http://www.metelkova.org/rdece/2006/> (11.4.2010)
- RED DAWNS (2007a): "Festival Network Meeting". Online: <http://rdecezure.blogspot.com/2007/02/network-of-womens-feminist-and-queer.html> (18.3.2010)
- RED DAWNS (2007b). Online: <http://www.kudmreza.org/rdece/2007/ENGLISH/index.html> (18.3.2010).
- RED DAWNS (2008). Online: http://www.kudmreza.org/rdece/2008/index_eng.html (11.4.2010).
- RED DAWNS (2009a): "Long Live March 8th, International Women's Day!". Online: http://www.kudmreza.org/rdece/artistpages/danzena_eng.html (12.4.2010).
- RED DAWNS (2009b). Online: http://www.kudmreza.org/rdece/index_eng.html (18.3.2010).
- RED DAWNS (2010). Online: http://www.rdecezure.org/?page_id=151&lang=en&l=2010 (31.3.2010).
- RENER, T. (1996): "Odpiranje prostorov? O situaciji univerzitetnih ženskih študijev", *Spol: Ž.* Edited by L. Bogovič, Z. Skušek. ISH/KUD FP, Ljubljana, pp. 58–67.
- RESSLER, O. (2000): "Rote Zora". Online: http://www.ressler.at/rote_zora/ (11.4.2010).
- SALECL, R. (1994): *The Spoils of Freedom: Psychoanalysis and Feminism after the Fall of Socialism (Feminism for Today)*. Routledge, Oxford.
- SANDOVAL, C. (1991): "U.S. Third World Feminism: The Theory and Method of Oppositional Consciousness in the Postmodern World", *Genders*, 10, pp. 1-24.

Slovenska tiskovna agencija (2002): "Izšla nova zbornika s področja feministične teorije". Online: <http://www.dnevnik.si/novice/kultura/16367> (31.1.2009).

SPIVAK, G. C. (1988): "Can the Subaltern Speak?", in: *Marxism and the interpretation of Culture*. Edited by C. Nelson, L. Grossberg. University of Illinois Press, Chicago, pp. 66-111.

SOJA, E. W. (2009): "The City and Spatial Justice", *Spatial Justice/Justice spatiale*, 1, pp. 31-38. Online: http://www.jssj.org/media/spatial_justice.pdf (15.3.2010)

STAR, D. (2002): *Quiet Rumours*. Edited by D. Star. AK Press/Dark Star, San Francisco, pp. 101-102.

TUAN, Y.-F. (2001): *Space and Place: The Perspective of Experience*. University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.

VELIKONJA, N. (2004): "Grafiti: poulično revolucionarno branje", in: *Grafitarji/Graffitiists*. Edited by L. Stepančič, B. Zrinski, Mednarodni grafični likovni center, Ljubljana, pp. 115-130.

VITA ACTIVA (2006). Online: <http://www.drustvo-vitaactiva.si/208101/253501.html> (12.4.2010)

ZADNIKAR, D. (2004): "Kronika radostnega uporništva", in: J. Holloway: *Spreminjamo svet brez boja za oblast: pomen revolucije danes*. Študentska založba, Ljubljana, pp. 201-225.

Personal Archives

Anonymous letter "Do you remember March 8th?", 8.3.2005

Public statement of the Feminist Initiative in Support of Abortion Rights. 17.11.2006.

Oral Interviews

BEBAR, Alja. In Slovene. 15. 7. 2009, Hostel Celica, Ljubljana. 2 files (15m08s, 03m25s)

EHRLEMARK, Anna. In English. 6. 7. 2009, Mizzart Gallery, ACC Metelkova mesto, Ljubljana. 2 audio files (83m53s, 17m09s)

FRANK, Mirjana. In Slovene. 14.7.2009, my place, Ljubljana. 1 file (55m46s)

GREŠAK, Danaja, Anja KOCMAN. In Slovene. 15.7.2009, Square Without Historical Memory, ACC Metelkova Mesto, Ljubljana. 1 file (42m04s)

GROBLER, Ana, Slađana MITROVIĆ. In Slovene. 20.7.2009. KUD Mreža office, ACC Metelkova Mesto, Ljubljana. 1 file (99m34s)

JERANT, Jasmina. In Slovene. 29.7.2009, via Skype. 1 audio file (48m15s). Written answers (in English). 21.8.2009. 1 file (Written_answers_jasmina_jerant_21.8.09)

JEREB, Ana. In Slovene. 14.7.2009, my place, Ljubljana. 2 files (54m34s, 14m19s)

LJUBIČIČ, Jadranka. In Slovene. 15.7.2009, KUD Mreža office, ACC Metelkova Mesto, Ljubljana. 2 files (22m40s, 63m17s)

MERC, Urška. In Slovene. 23.7.2009, via Skype. 1 file (69m25s)

RADOJEVIĆ, Lidija. In Slovene. 13.7.2009, Tabor park, Ljubljana. 3 files (43m29s, 16m58s, 17m25a)

SEREC, Nataša. In Slovene. 10.7.2009, Elf's Reading Room, ACC Metelkova mesto, Ljubljana. 1 file (80m08s)

ŠKANDER, Tanja. In Slovene. 7.7.2009, via Skype. 1 file (29m15s)

TEPINA, Daša. In Slovene. 13.7.2009, her garden, Ljubljana. 3 files (69m05s, 12m:39s, 07m19s)

TRATNIK, Suzana. In Slovene. 27.7.2009, Gallery Mizzart, ACC Metelkova Mesto, Ljubljana. 1 file (20m36s)

VRAVNIK, Vesna. In Slovene, 23.7.2009, in front of Menza pri koritu, ACC Metelkova Mesto, Ljubljana. 1 file (35m16s)

TEHNODIS-
POZITIV

BOJAN ANĐELKOVIĆ¹

Subjekt v dispozitivu tehnologije

Izveček: Tekst raziskuje problematiko odnosa med subjektom, tehnologijo in družbo, pri čemer v osnovno izhodišče postavi Foucaultev koncept dispozitiva. Koncept dispozitiva, prek katerega med drugim skušamo pokazati tudi to, da so subjekt, tehnologija in družba neločljivo povezani, podrobno obravnavamo v prvem tematskem sklopu, v tretjem razdelku pa skušamo aplicirati ta koncept na sodobne tehnologije in pokazati, da so te dispozitivi *par excellence* – vsak dispozitiv predpisuje in omogoča določene procese subjektivacije oz. natančneje, subjekt je po Agambenovi definiciji naravnost tisto, kar nastane med živimi bitji in dispozitivi.

Ključne besede: dispozitiv, subjekt, tehnologija, družba, virtualnost

UDK: 1:316.6

The Subject in the Dispositive of Technology

Abstract: Starting from Foucault's concept of The Dispositive, the text investigates the relationship between the subject, technology and society. The concept of The Dispositive, through which we seek to demonstrate (in the second section) that the subject, technology and society are inextricably linked, is discussed in detail in the first section. The third section attempts to apply the concept discussed to the concept of contemporary technologies, demonstrating that these are dispositives *par excellence*: each dispositive dictates and enables certain processes of subjectivisation. More precisely, the

¹ Mag. Bojan Anđelković je doktorand na Fakulteti za humanistične študije Koper, program Filozofija in teorija vizualne kulture, in urednik Redakcije za kulturo in humanistične vede na Radiu Študent. E-pošta: bojandjelkovic@gmail.com.

subject is, by Agamben's definition, that which is produced by the relation between living beings and dispositives.

Keywords: dispositive, subject, technology, society, virtuality



*Kar vidimo na platnu, ni živo. Živo je,
kar se godi med gledalcem in platnom.*

JEAN-LUC GODARD

Kaj je dispozitiv?

Za izraz "dispozitiv", ki izhaja iz latinskega izraza *dispositio*, navajajo francoski slovarji tri pomene. V vojaškem pomenu je to "skupek sredstev, porazdeljenih v skladu z določenim načrtom", v pravnem je "del sodbe, ki obsega odločitev, ločeno od motiva zanj", tj. del razsodbe (ali zakona), ki nekaj odloči in uredi, v tehnološkem pomenu, ki nas bo tukaj najbolj zanimal, pa je dispozitiv "način, na katerega so razporejeni deli stroja ali mehanizma; širše tudi sam mehanizem".² To, da je dispozitiv lahko tudi sam mehanizem oziroma aparat, pa Peter Klepec v svojem tekstu o vlogi pojma dispozitiva pri Foucaultu razume kot četrti pomen, ki je ključen, saj naj bi pri dispozitivu šlo "za neki aparat ali stroj v splošnem, abstraktnem, univerzalnem pomenu. Ravno v tem [...], ko obče, univerzalno naleti na samo sebe, se nahaja specifičnost dispozitiva, ki jo z enostavnim prevodom v kak drug izraz izgubimo, saj gre za obči, rodovni pojem, ki mora v celoten rod všteti tudi samega sebe."³ Zato

² Navajamo po Agamben, 2007, 19.

Agamben trdi, "da je beseda 'dispozitiv' ključni izraz misli Michela Foucaulta" oz. da so prav dispozitivi "tisto, kar znotraj Foucaulteve strategije zavzema mesto univerzalij".⁴

Po drugi strani pa je ena izmed dveh konsekvenc Foucaulteve filozofije dispozitivov po Deleuzu prav *zavrnitev univerzalij*: "Univerzalno dejansko ne pojasnjuje ničesar, ono samo bi moralo biti pojasnjeno. Eno, Vse, Resnično, objekt, subjekt niso univerzalije, temveč singularni procesi, procesi unifikacije, totalizacije, verifikacije, objektivacije, subjektivacije, ki so imanentni določenemu dispozitivu."⁵ Vsak dispozitiv ima torej – in to je za naš namen ključno – poleg svoje univerzalne, abstraktne plati tudi svojo konkretno plat, saj vedno predpostavlja neki subjekt, ki je vanj ujet. Problem subjekta in dispozitiva je tako podoben problemu kokoši in jajca: vsakemu dispozitivu ustreza en tip subjektivacije, vsak dispozitiv predpisuje tip subjekta; pa vendar dispozitiv nikoli ne obstaja pred subjektom, saj je subjekt vanj vedno vključen. Kot pravi Deleuze: *dispozitiv je imanen* procesu subjektivacije. Pri tem pravzaprav lahko govorimo o dveh subjektih. Prvega, ki ga dispozitiv predpisuje oziroma konstruira, lahko imenujemo imaginarni oziroma abstraktni, drugega pa, ki je v dispozitiv vključen, lahko imenujemo realni oziroma konkretni subjekt. "Kinematografski dispozitiv konstruira subjekt tako, da vsem v dvorani predpiše skupno imaginarno pozicijo. Vendar subjekt tudi vključuje – vselej se nanaša na konkretne posameznice in posameznike. Tak je tudi poudarek Foucaultevega koncepta dispozitivov oblasti."⁶

Agamben v omenjenem tekstu predlaga splošno delitev vsega obstoječega na dve veliki skupini: prvo skupino tvorijo živa bitja

³ Klepec, 2007, 34.

⁴ Agamben, op. cit., 15 oz. 19.

⁵ Prim. Deleuze, 2007, 9.

⁶ Zajc, 2000, 126.

(ali substance), drugo pa so dispozitivi, v katere so prva vselej ujeta. Tako široko razumevanje pojma dispozitiva pomeni, da dispozitivi niso nujno in samo veliki dispozitivi oblasti, kot so norišnice, zapori, šole, cerkve, tovarne, pravni ukrepi itn., ampak “dobesedno vse, kar ima zmožnost ujeti, usmerjati, določiti, prestregati, oblikovati, nadzorovati in zagotavljati geste, vedenja, mnenja in diskurze živih bitij”.⁷ Tako Agamben kot dispozitive navaja tudi pisalo, pisavo, literaturo, filozofijo, kmetijstvo, cigarete, plovbo, računalnike, mobilne telefone in na koncu tudi sam jezik, ki je morda najstarejši izmed vseh dispozitivov. Po tej splošni delitvi vsega obstoječega na dve veliki skupini, pa uvaja Agamben še tretjo: “Vmes med obema pa je še tretja skupina, skupina subjektov. Subjekt imenujem to, kar je rezultat razmerja med živimi bitji in dispozitivi.” Subjekt je torej rezultat, učinek dispozitivov, a je hkrati tudi njihov pogoj (saj ne bi bil mobilni telefon nikakršen dispozitiv, ampak navadna mrtva reč, če ne bi bilo subjektov, ki prek njega komunicirajo). Tako recimo “kino kot dispozitiv subjekt konstruira, a tudi vključuje [...]: subjekt je učinek in pogoj hkrati”.⁸

Vsak dispozitiv predpisuje tehniko, tehnologijo, ki jo subjekt mora obvladati, če hoče biti vključen vanjo, če hoče postati subjekt dispozitiva. Če npr. hočemo uporabljati predmete, kot sta pisalo ali puška, moramo poznati njihov namen oz. tehnike, s katerim jih lahko najbolj smiselno uporabimo – poznati moramo njihov dispozitiv. Drugače se lahko zgodi, da bomo pisali s puško v pesku, ali še hujše, da bomo s pisalom v roki tekli proti sovražnikovem rovu. V nekem smislu je dispozitiv tehnika. Pisalo ali puška nista dispozitiva, če ne poznamo tehnik njune uporabe, s katerimi se šele dispozitivi lahko konstruirajo, s katerimi nas šele dispozitivi lahko konstruirajo. Zaradi tega je tehnologija temeljni dispozitiv, saj vsaka

⁷ Glej: Agamben, op. cit., 23.

⁸ Zajc, op. cit., 125.

tehnologija predpisuje pravila za uporabo. V nekem smislu je dispozitiv pravilo, in sicer v smislu Wittgensteinovega pojma pravila: "Ključni aspekt Wittgensteinovega pojma pravila je, da pravilo je uporaba pravila: če ne znaš pravilno uporabljati pravila, ne 'dojames' samega pravila."⁹ Tehnologija kot dispozitiv: to smo mi, dokler obvladujemo pravila, navodila za njeno uporabo, spoštovanje teh pravil/navodil pa nas v nekem smislu spreminja, konstruira nas kot subjekte. Zaradi tega je Agambenu danes prav mobilni telefon dispozitiv *par excellence*.¹⁰

Vsaka tehnologija torej "predpisuje" neki dispozitiv. Pa vendar tako kot pri subjektu tudi pri tehnologiji in dispozitivu naletimo na problem kokoši in jajca. Tehnologija namreč lahko nastane samo v okviru dispozitiva, ki jo omogoča: "Foucault pokaže, kako puška kot orožje v tem smislu obstaja šele v okviru 'ustroja, katerega princip ni več gibljiva ali negibljiva masa, temveč geometrija deljivih in sestavljivih segmentov'. Tehnologija je torej družbena, preden postane tehnična." "To je Foucaulteva povezava s sodobnima zgodovinarjema: glede palice za kopanje itn. Braudel pravi, da je 'orodje posledica in ne vzrok'. Grede orožja grške pehote Detienne pravi, da je 'tehnika na neki način znotraj socialnega in mentalnega'."¹¹ V tem delu o Foucaultu sicer vse tiste strateške poteze, ki jih Deleuze kasneje podeli dispozitivu, nosi koncept diagrama. To lepo pokaže Peter Klepec, citirajoč Deleuza: "diagram je [...] karta, kartografija, ki je koekstenzivna s celotnim družbenim poljem. Diagram je abstrakten stroj [...]. Gre za skorajda nem in slep stroj, čeprav ja ta stroj tisti, ki naredi, da vidimo, in ki naredi, da govorimo [...] konec kon-

⁹ Žižek, 2005, 12.

¹⁰ Več o mobilnem telefonu kot ultimativnem dispozitivu glej: Klepec, 2008, 132-138. Za še obširnejšo predstavitev problema pa glej poglavje: "Kultura dotika in filozofija mobilnih tehnologij" v: Strehovec, 2007, 185-216.

¹¹ Deleuze, 1989, 45.

cev je vsak diagram intersocialen, v postajanju', 'diagram kot določitev celotnega razmerja sil nikoli ne izčrpa sile, ki lahko vstopa v druga razmerja in druge sestave [...]. Sila v tem smislu razpolaga s potencialom v odnosu do diagrama, v katerega je ujeta.'"¹² Klepec tam sicer ne omenja, da uvaja Deleuze koncept diagrama že pet let pred tem, namreč v svoji knjigi o Francisu Baconu; gre v bistvu za Baconov termin, ki mu je bil 'diagram' operativna množica "črt in con, neoznačevalnih in nereprezentativnih potez in lis", ki so na platnu, še preden slikar začne slikati, saj dejanje slikanja predpostavlja, "da so na platnu (kot tudi v slikarjevi glavi) že figurativne, bolj ali manj virtualne, bolj ali manj aktualne danosti". Za operacijo diagrama Bacon določi funkcijo "sugeriranja" – Deleuze pa jo, sklicujoč se na Wittgensteina in na neki Baconov navedek, natančneje označi kot funkcijo uvajanja "možnosti dejstva".¹³ In enako kot za diagram lahko rečemo tudi za dispozitiv: sestavljen je iz bolj ali manj virtualnih, bolj ali manj aktualnih danosti; je možnost dejstva, ni pa dejstvo samo.

To, da je tehnologija posledica in ne vzrok, pa v tem smislu nikakor ne pomeni, da so tehnologije nastale po nekakšnem družbenem načrtu, v skladu z nekakšnimi družbenimi pričakovanji, glede na oblike družbene organizacije itn., saj bi to pomenilo, da je tehnika ločena od družbenega. Deleuzova/Foucaulteva poanta pa je prav v tem, da sta tehnika in tehnologija globoko in primarno družbeni, celo mentalni, in da nas prav tehnike in tehnologije, ki jih "predpisujejo" dispozitivi, delajo takšne, kakršni smo. Skratka, dispozitiv je "imanentni vzrok" tehnologije.¹⁴ Vprašanje, kaj je bilo

¹² Klepec, 2008, 158–159. Za terminološko problematizacijo pojma dispozitiva glej: Klepec, 2007, 29–36. Na nekem drugem mestu Klepec (2008) postavi zanimivo tezo, da je Foucaultev koncept dispozitiva zelo blizu Lacanovemu konceptu fantazme.

¹³ Glej poglavje "Diagram" v Deleuze, 2008, 91–103.

prej, kokoš ali jajce, nima nikakršnega smisla: "Dispozitivi imajo torej za sestavine črte vidnosti, črte izjavljanja, silnice, črte subjektivacije, črte razpoke, črte rež, prelomnice, ki se vse prepletajo in zapletajo, ene druge prinašajo na dan ali jih v tem povzročajo, preko variacij ali celo mutacij ustroja."¹⁵

V tem smislu je Foucaultev koncept dispozitiva zelo blizu ti-stemu, kar Deleuze in Guattari v *Anti-Ojdipu* in *Tisoč platojev* ime-nujeta stroj oz. ustroj: "Beseda ne teče več o soočanju človeka in stroja zaradi ocenjevanja njunega soglasja, podaljškov, možnih in nemožnih medsebojnih substitucij, ampak o omogočanju njihove komunikacije, da bi se pokazalo, kako se človek spaja s strojem ali nečim drugim, kako bi konstruiral neki ustroj. Ta nekaj drugega je lahko kaka naprava, celo žival ali drugi ljudje. Vendar o stroju ne govorimo metaforično: človek *predstavlja stroj*, v trenutku ko sama celota, katere del je v jasno determiniranih pogojih, dobi takšen ka-rakter, zahvaljujoč ponovitvi. Celota človek-konj-lok formira nomad-ski vojaški ustroj. Ljudje formirajo delovni ustroj v birokratskih pogojih velikih cesarstev. Grški vojak-pešec s svojim orožjem pred-stavlja ustroj v pogojih falange." In še zadnji, za našo raziskavo klju-čni primer: "Plesalec skupaj s plesiščem predstavlja ustroj v nevarnih pogojih ljubezni in smrti."¹⁶ Lahko rečemo torej, da je di-spozitiv neke vrste "nevidni stroj" – kot Lewis Mumford imenuje ar-hetipski, delovni in vojaški "megastroj" starodavnih kraljestev, ki je

¹⁴ "Kaj tukaj pomeni imanentni vzrok? To je vzrok, ki se uresničuje v svoji po-sledici, ki se staplja s svojo posledico, ki se opaža v svoji posledici. Ali natan-čneje, imanentni vzrok je vzrok, ki ga posledica uresniči, zedini in izdvoji." Deleuze, 1989, 42.

¹⁵ Deleuze, 2007, 9. Prim. tudi: "Konceptiji, ki tehnologije obravnavata kot vzrok oz. kot posledico družbenih sprememb, sta torej napačni v samem iz-hodišču. Tehnologije postavljata zunaj družbe, s tem pa zgrešita prav tisto, kar bi radi analizirali: njihovo družbenost." (Zajc, op. cit., 46.)

¹⁶ Deleuze, Guattari, 1990b, 315-136.

po njegovem mnenju “najzgodnejši model vseh kasnejših kompleksnih strojev, čeprav se je poudarek premikal s človeških delovnih delov tega stroja na zanesljivejše mehanične elemente”.¹⁷ Zaradi tega, ker je bil narejen izključno iz človeških delovnih delov, nam opis tega megastroja lahko pomaga, da si plastično predstavljamo dispozitiv in njegov učinek: “To je bila nevidna struktura, sestavljena iz živih, vendar trdnih delov, od katerih je bila vsakemu dodeljena posebna pozornost, vloga in naloga, da bi se omogočil ogromen delovni učinek in ustvarili grandiozni načrti te velike kolektivne organizacije [...]. Ta model se je prenašal (včasih z vsemi svojimi deli, včasih kot priročno sredstvo v nuji) s pomočjo čisto ljudskih kanalov skozi kakih pet tisoč let, preden je bil preveden v materialno strukturo, ki je boljše ustrezala njegovim specifikacijam, utelešen pa je bil v vseobjemajočem institucionalnem obrazcu, ki je pokrival vse vidike življenja.”¹⁸

Pozornemu bralcu ni ušlo, da smo doslej omenili samo eno izmed dveh konsekvenc, ki ju po Deleuzu prinaša filozofija dispozitivov. Druga konsekvence, ki nas bo tukaj zlasti zanimala, je *sprememba usmeritve, ki se odvrne od Večnega, da bi pojmla novo*: “Pripadamo dispozitivom in delujemo znotraj njih. Novost nekega dispozitiva v razmerju do predhodnih bomo imenovali njegova aktualnost, naša aktualnost. Novo, to je aktualno. Aktualno ni tisto, kar smo mi, temveč prej tisto, kar postajamo, kar bomo ravnokar postali, se pravi Drugi, naše postajanje-drugi. V vsakem dispozitivu je treba razlikovati med tistim, kar smo (tistim, kar več nismo), in tistim kar bomo ravnokar postali: delež zgodovine in delež aktualnega.”¹⁹

Dispozitiv torej ni enostavno neka mrtva reč, skupek predpisov in navodil za uporabo – je neka časovna struktura, neki temporalni,

¹⁷ Mumford, 1986, 222.

¹⁸ Prav tam.

¹⁹ Deleuze, 2007, 11-12.

dinamični proces, je *dogodek*, v katerega je subjekt "ujet". Natančneje, subjekta sta najmanj dva oz. trije: tisti, ki je (tisti, ki ga več ni), in tisti, ki bo to (kmalu) postal. Ko govorimo o dispozitivih, je v tem smislu mogoče boljše, da govorimo o procesih oz. – kot predlaga Deleuze – o črtah subjektivacije, kot o subjektih: "To niso ne subjekti ne objekti, temveč režimi, ki jih je treba definirati za vidnost in za izjavljivost, z njihovimi izpeljavami, njihovimi transformacijami, njihovimi mutacijami."²⁰ To med drugim pomeni tudi, da je vsakemu dispozitivu imanentna neka zgodovinska formacija oz. zgodovinski paket instrumentalnih in interpretativnih ravnanj, ki na neki način "programira" možne procese subjektivacije. To "programiranje" se seveda ne izvaja s pomočjo nekakšnega čipa, ki se enostavno implantira neposredno v *cogito* (nismo v znanstveni fantastiki), ampak, kot je to neponovljivo jasno in nadrobno pokazal Foucault, se zgodovinski procesi discipliniranja subjekta vedno izvajajo prek telesa in skozi telo. V tem smislu je Foucaultev koncept dispozitiva neločljivo povezan z Nietzschejevim pojmom genealogije: "Telo: površina vpisovanja dogodkov (medtem ko jih govorica zaznamuje in ideje razpustijo), prostor disociacije jaza (ki mu skuša pripisati himero substancialne enotnosti), volumen v nenehnem drobljenju. Genealogija kot analiza provenience je torej v pregibu telesa in zgodovine. Pokazati mora telo, potiskano z zgodovino, in zgodovino, ki uničuje telo."²¹

Zanimivo je, da niti eden izmed nešteti avtorjev ne poveže neposredno Foucaultevega koncepta dispozitiva z Nietzschejevim pojmom genealogije. Verjetno ni naključje, da se začne Foucault zanimati za dispozitiv takrat (po letu 1970 – približno takrat, ko je nastajal njegov tekst *Nietzsche, genealogija, zgodovina*), ko svoje delo začne označevati ne kot arheologijo, ampak kot genealogijo.²² Pa ven-

²⁰ Prav tam, 6.

²¹ Foucault, 2008, 94.

dar pojem genealogije in pojem dispozitiva nikakor nista podobna na enak način, kot sta si podobna Foucaultev koncept dispozitiva ter Deleuzov in Guattarijev koncept stroja oz. ustroja. Dispozitiv v nekem smislu je stroj oziroma ustroj, je “preplet, večlinearni skupek”, “sestavljene iz črt različne narave”, ki “sledijo usmeritvam, zasnujejo procese, ki so vselej v neravnovesju”, pri čemer je “vsaka črta prelomljena, podvržena variacijam smeri, razcepljena in razvejana, podvržena derivaciji”. “Razločiti črte nekega dispozitiva v vsakem primeru pomeni narisati zemljevid, kartografirati, izmeriti neznane zemlje, to je tisto, kar on [Foucault] imenuje ‘terensko delo’.”²³ To “terensko delo”, ta “kartografija”, je delo genealoga. Če je namreč dispozitiv zapleten stroj, poln črt, vektorjev, silnic, bežiščnic, potem je genealogija znanstvena metoda, raziskovalna strategija za kartografiranje tega ustroja.

Prispevki za genealogijo tehnike/tehnologije²⁴

Ni slaba strategija, da pred tem, ko hočemo opredeliti, kaj neki pojem je, izvemo, kaj ta ni. Tako nam anonimni pisatelj škrbine “Tehnika” na slovenski Wikipediji namesto definicije tehnike ne hote ponuja nekaj različic tega, kaj naj tehnika ne bi bila. Ta zelo zabavna definicija spominja na definicije, ki smo jih vajeni v učbenikih pri predmetu narava in družba: “Tehnika je uporaba znanosti

²² O tem, da po letu 1970 Foucault svojega dela več ne označuje kot arheologijo, ampak kot genealogijo, glej: Megill, 1985, 233. V svoji genealogiji izraza dispozitiv znotraj Foucaultevega opusa najde Agamben (2007) prve sledi tega izraza ob koncu 60. let, pri čemer Foucault takrat “presenetljivo za definicijo objekta svojega raziskovanja ne uporabi izraza dispozitiv, temveč ‘positivite’, ki je etimološko blizu izrazu dispozitiv” (16–18).

²³ Vse navedbe iz: Deleuze, 2007, 5–6.

²⁴ V tem tekstu bomo obravnavali termina “tehnika” in “tehnologija” kot sinonima. Termina vsekakor nista identična, vendar za namen naše raziskave – med katero nas bosta ta termina zanimala v svojem najširšem in najglobljem pomenu, se pravi tehnika oz. tehnologija kot način eksistence subjekta –, te razlike niso bistvene; toliko več, ker nas bodo tukaj zanimale predvsem sod-

oz. – natančneje – naravoslovja in matematike za potrebe človeštva, predvsem v gospodarstvu.”²⁵

Prvič, tehnika oz. tehnologija *ni* uporaba znanosti. Iz preprostega razloga, ker tehnika in znanost nista ne v takšnem, ne v kakšnem drugem direktnem kavzalnem razmerju. Dispozitiv tehnike in dispozitiv znanosti se sicer lahko preklapljata (kot se recimo danes v tehnaznanosti), lahko sta si vzporedna, lahko se drug drugemu približujeta ali oddaljujeta (lahko si zamislimo prihodnost, v kateri bo dosegla tehnologija takšno stopnjo razvoja, da bo postala neodvisna od znanosti, kakor npr. v filmu *Matrica*), vendar nikakor nista identična in ne izhajata neposredno drug iz drugega. Če bi znanost in tehnika bila v takem vzročno-posledičnem razmerju, potem bi lahko rekli le, da je tehnika povzročila znanost in ne obratno. Človek, ki je prvi prižgal ogenj, namreč ni imel nikakršnega znanja, nikakršne znanosti o tem – ogenj je verjetno prižgal naključno. Šele potem je v tem postopku (on ali nekdo drug) uvidel logiko in je lahko iz tega nastalo védenje o prižiganju ognja, ki se je lahko prenašalo naprej. Lacan torej v nekem smislu nima prav, ko trdi, da je znanstveni diskurz “porodil vse vrste orodja in naprave”.²⁶

Spomnimo se začetka Kubrickove *Odiseje 2001*, ki se zagotovo nenaključno imenuje “Zarja človeka”. Opica, ki ne živi več v varnem obne tehnike in tehnologije, ki slonijo na softveru, pri katerem ni preveč smiselno ločevati njegovega kulturno-posredniškega aspekta (tehnologijo) od njegove inštrumentalne plati (tehnike). Prim.: “Zaslonske mobilne naprave so kot tehnologije za medčloveško komuniciranje nekaj povsem drugega od njihovih inštrumentalnih tehniških podlag, vendar pa postajamo sodobniki premikov v mišljenju, ki zahtevajo posredovanje med tema sferama, in sicer v okviru razumevanja softvera kot medija, ki omogoča približevanje tehniškega in tehnološkega in s tem novo artikulacijo, recimo s Heideggerjevimi besedami, vprašanja o tehniki.” (Strehovec, 2007, 214.) V zvezi s tem “premikom v mišljenju” napotujemo na novo knjigo Leva Manovicha (2008).

²⁵ [Http://sl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tehnika](http://sl.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tehnika). Dostopno 2. septembra 2009.

²⁶ Navajamo po: Zajc, op. cit., 70.

zaklonišču visokih krošenj dreves, saj teh ni več, ampak se je primorana skrivati v savanskih votlinah, nekega dne, išoč hrano med okostnjaki nekih mrtvih živalih, skupaj z drugimi opicami, nena doma *ugleda* kost. Kost, ki jo je že tisočkrat pred tem videla, tokrat ugleda z drugačnimi očmi. Vendar sprva še ne ve, da je to, kar je pravkar ugledala, orodje/orožje/tehnika, saj še nima nikakršnega znanja o tem in ne obstaja nikakršna znanost, ki bi ji to povedala. Vzame kost, jo obrne, povoha in potem sramežljivo udari po drugih kosteh, ki ležijo na tleh: enkrat, dvakrat, trikrat, sedemkrat. Opica se hitro uči: vsak naslednji udarec je močnejši kot prejšnji, z vsakim novim udarcem opica bolj razume tehniko uporabljanja orodja, saj je ujeta v njegov dispozitiv, ki ga ravno odkriva (ki ga je pravkar odkrila), kar jo bo spremenilo za vedno. Kar prime kost z obema rokama in polomi lobanjo velike mrtve živali – enkrat, dvakrat, trikrat, sedemkrat –, ni več opica, ampak človek. Kar človek drži v roki, pa ni več kost, ampak nož, kladivo, sekira. Orodje/orožje/tehnika je torej že tukaj, ni pa nikakršne znanosti, ki naj bi bila uporaba, in ni nikakršnega znanstvenega diskurza, ki bi jo “porodil”.²⁷

Drugič, tehnika oziroma tehnologija *ni* enostavno uporaba znanosti ali česar koli *za potrebe človeštva*. Pravkar smo ugotovili, da sta človeštvo in tehnika ustvarjena skupaj. Flusser pravi: “Dejstvo, da si odsotnosti tehnike ne moremo niti predstavljati, nas opozarja, da je ‘tehnika’ beseda, ki označuje nekaj, kar je tako tesno povezano z nami, da se od tega ne moremo distancirati. Zdi se, da se tehnika in človek vzajemno implicirata, in na to verjetno meri izraz ‘Homo faber’ (kar bi najbolje prevedli z izrazom ‘sestavljajoči človek’) [...] Z drugimi besedami, ‘tehnika’ je glagol samostalnika ‘človek’ in ‘člo-

²⁷ Razen če ne predpostavimo, da je znanstveni diskurz nastal takrat, ko je opica *ugledala* kost, oz. še pred tem, ko je *ugledala* skrivnostni črni monolit; toda bojimo se, da bi se s tem zelo približali religiozni razlagi stvarstva, kar nikakor ni naš namen.

vek' je samostalni glagola 'tehnika', in če bi hoteli oporekati, da je 'tehnika' vendar samostalni, bi lahko namesto tega rekli 'eksistirati'.²⁸ Mimogrede, Flusser je doslednejši kot Agamben, ki pravi, da je subjekt tisto, kar je rezultat razmerja med živimi bitji in dispozitivi, saj je po Flusserju lahko rezultat tega razmerja tudi sam objekt: "Šele zdaj vidimo tehniko: [...] rezultat obdelave [kamna] je z ene strani hominid in z druge obdelan kamen. Toda kaj je bilo prej? Hominid, ki ne obdeluje kamna, ni mogel biti prvi, kajti hominid je žival, ki obdeluje kamne. Prav tako to ni mogel biti neobdelan kamen, kajti kamen je vedno objekt hominida. Možen odgovor je: pred obdelavo je obstajala možnost obdelave kamnov, in iz te možnosti so se z ene strani konkretizirali kamni in z druge hominidi."²⁹

Po drugi strani pa trditev, da tehnologija obstaja zaradi potreb človeštva (se pravi družbe), implicira trditev, da je tehnologija vzrok oz. posledica družbenih sprememb. To pa tudi ne drži, ker tehnologija nikoli ni obstajala, ne obstaja in ne bo obstajala zunaj družbe.³⁰ Ne najdemo boljšega primera za to, da je tehnologija globoko družbena – in da le ta zadovoljuje potrebe človeškega subjekta, pri čemer ga v veliki meri tudi omejuje. Takšne zgled nam daje eden najostrejših kritikov tehnološkega razvoja, ameriški doktor matematike in serijski morilec, Theodore Kaczynski (bolj znan kot Unabomber) v svojem "manifestu" *Industrijska družba in njena prihodnost*.³¹ V poglavju z zanimivim naslovom "Tehnologija je močnejša družbena sila kot prizadevanje za svobodo" Kaczynski navaja primer moder-

²⁸ Flusser, 2000, 86–87

²⁹ Prav tam, 92–93.

³⁰ Več o tem prim.: Zajc, op. cit., 41–48.

³¹ Kaczynski, 1995. Theodore Kaczynski *alias* Unabomber (*UNiversity and Airline BOMber*) je med letoma 1978 in 1995 pošiljal pisma bombe po ZDA, s katerimi je v glavnem ciljalo na fakultetne profesorje in ljudi, povezane z znanostjo in tehnologijo. V pamfletu *Industrijska družba in njena prihodnost* (bolj znanem kot *Unabomberjev manifest*), ki je zaradi njegove grožnje leta 1995

nega prometa. Njegova argumentacija gre nekako takole. Človek je včasih hodil, kamor je hotel, ni se mu bilo treba ozirati na prometno regulacijo in je bil neodvisen od tehnoloških podpornih sistemov. Ko so vpeljali motorna vozila, je ta svoboda postala navidez še večja: človek je še naprej lahko hodil, kamor je hotel, če je imel avto, pa je to lahko naredil še hitreje. In vendar je uvajanje motoriziranega transporta zelo kmalu omejilo človeško svobodo gibanja: danes se mora pešec v mestu vseskozi ustavljati, da bi počakal na prometne luči, ki so bile ustvarjene predvsem zaradi regulacije avtomobilskega prometa, na vasi ni več varno hoditi po cesti itn. Še več, uporaba motoriziranega prevoza je kmalu po njegovem uvajanju prenehala biti opcija in je postala nujnost, saj je njegova vpeljava v takšni meri spremenila urbano strukturo naših mest, da danes peš ne pridemo več nikamor.³²

Ta primer je paradigmatičen, saj se lahko aplicira na vpeljavo marsikaterih nove tehnologije. Na to opozarja tudi sam Kaczynski: “Bodite pozorni na pomembno poanto, ki smo jo ilustrirali z motoriziranim transportom: Ko se nova tehnologija uvaja kot opcija, ki jo posameznik lahko sprejme ali ne, *ne ostaja* nujno opsijska. V mnogih primerih nova tehnologija spremeni družbo v tej meri, da so jo ljudje kmalu primorani uporabljati.”³³ To seveda popolnoma velja tudi za novejšo tehnologije, kot so mobilni telefon, osebni računalnik ali internet, brez katerih si povprečni posameznik iz razvitega dela sveta danes več ne more predstavljati svojega življenja. Te pa niso tukaj samo zaradi tega, da rabijo posamezniku ali človeštvu – tukaj so tudi zaradi tega, da ga nadzorujejo, nadle-

celo bil objavljen v *New York Timesu* in *Washington Postu*, je Kaczynski razjasnil svoje akcije kot upor proti moderni družbi in načinu življenja, zagovarjajoč ekstremno individualistične in anarhoprimitivistične ideje.

³² Prim. prav tam.

³³ Prav tam.

gujejo, vpisujejo, posnemajo, programirajo itn. Heidegger na začetku svojega razvpitega teksta o tehniki pravi: “[B]istvo tehnike ni prav nič tehničnega [...] Povsod ostanemo nesvobodno priklenjeni na tehniko, bodisi da jo strastno potrjujemo ali zanikamo. Najhuje pa smo izročeni tehniki, če jo obravnavamo kot nekaj nevtalnega; ta predstava, ki je danes na moč priljubljena, nas do kraja oslepi za bistvo tehnike.”³⁴

Tretjič, po vsem povedanem mogoče res nima smisla dolgoveliti o tem, da tehnika *ni* tukaj *predvsem zaradi potreb gospodarstva*, kot piše v definiciji tehnike na slovenski Wikipediji, saj si težko predstavljamo, da bi npr. palica za golf, dežnik, gramofon ali radio rabili predvsem ekonomskim potrebam. Žižek je glede tega zelo jasen: “Kar zadeva sam razvoj strojev, se je tudi treba spomniti, da so v prvem obdobju eksplozivnega razvoja avtomatov in drugih strojev (v 17. stoletju) avtomate gradili kot neuporabne izume, igračo za zabavo Gospodarjevega pogleda (na primer premikajoči se mehanični kipi v vrtovih Ludvika XIV.): šele kasneje, v 18. stoletju, so to znanje uporabili za izgradnjo strojev za produkcijo (parni in tkalni stroji).”³⁵

Navidez pobijajoč “definicijo” tehnike in govoreč o tem, kaj tehnika/tehnologija ni, smo se v bistvu ves čas trudili izpostaviti dva pomembna momenta, ki sta odločilna za razumevanje pojma tehnologije, s katerim tukaj operiramo. Prvič, tehnologijo razumemo kot neločljivo od družbe, tehnologija je družbena v najglobljem pomenu besede. In drugič, tehnologija je neločljiva od subjekta, tehnika je vedno tudi mentalna. Kot povzame Deleuze, citirajoč Detienna: “Tehnika je na neki način znotraj socialnega in mentalnega”.³⁶ Skratka, tehnologija, subjekt in družba so povezani v tolikšni meri, da niti enega izmed treh pojmov ne bomo zares razumeli,

³⁴ Heidegger, 2003, 10.

³⁵ Žižek, 2005, 152.

če ga bomo obravnavali ločeno od drugih dveh.

Da bi to plastično predstavili, se vrnimo za trenutek k opici iz Kubrickove Odiseje 2001. Kubrick je v sceni, ki smo jo opisali prej, z neprekosljivo jasnostjo pokazal, kako se človek (subjekt) in orodje (tehnologija) rojevata skupaj. Pa vendar to očitno ni bilo dovolj, saj že naslednja scena kaže, kako pravkar rojena subjekt in tehnologija avtomatično implicirata oziroma rojevata družbo. Ali obratno: družba, ki je pravkar rojena (s pojavom skrivnostnega črnega monolita?), avtomatično implicira subjekt in tehnologijo. Pri spopadu dve skupini opic pri izviru bo seveda zmagala tista, ki je relativno bolje organizirana in oborožena, se pravi, tista, ki je z iznajdbo orodja/orožja avtomatično usvojila tudi neko stopnjo primitivne družbene ureditve oz. tista, ki je s svojo stopnjo družbene ureditve uspela iznajti to orodje. Dragoceni teritorij okoli izvira je na ta način osvojen, družba se lahko "razvija" naprej. Vse dokler ne pridejo drugačni subjekti, z drugačno tehnologijo in drugačno družbeno ureditvijo. Subjekt se torej ne rojeva neposredno iz tehnologije, ampak iz načina, kako tehnologijo uporablja – ta pa je vedno družbeno posredovan. V tem je razlika med človeško živaljo in živalmi, kot so šimpanzi, delfini ali vrane, za katere je prav tako ugotovljeno, da na smiseln način uporabljajo nekatera orodja in tehnike. Samo tako je lahko delo (tehnologija) naredilo človeka (subjekt), in ne kot se kaže v luči vulgarnoevolucijske dokse poljudnega marksizma. Flusser pravi: "Tehnika je nastrojena proti delu in 'Homo faber' ni delavec, temveč nekdo, ki delo natančno opazuje. 'Homo faber' je tehnik, torej bolj delodajalec kot delojemalec. Je subjekt, ki se poskuša izmakniti delu: se izviti iz dvojne vijačnice dela v nekoliko bolj pokončno držo. Učlovečenje z izmikanjem delu, s tehniko. To je antimarksizem."³⁷

³⁶ Deleuze, 1989, 45.

Subjekt, tehnologija in družba so torej neločljivo povezani, se medsebojno implicirajo že od začetka, in tako je v vsej zgodovini človeštva: “Običajna klasifikacija zgodovine človeštva implicitno vsebuje predlagano definicijo ‘tehnike’ (‘tehnika’ je sinonim izraza ‘eksistirati’). Če govorimo npr. o ljudeh kamene, bakrene, bronaste, železne in plastične dobe, tedaj mislimo zaporedne in prepletajoče se oblike eksistence, oblike soočanja.”³⁷ Ne glede na pomanjkljivost te klasifikacije, ki jo omenja tudi sam Flusser, zgodovino človeštva mogoče res lahko najbolj nepristransko dojemamo kot zgodovino njegovih tehnologij. Pri čemer to nikakor ne pomeni, da je tehnologija nepristranska – prav nasprotno. Tako lahko do onemoglosti filozofiramo o tem, kdaj se konča srednji vek in kdaj začne renesansa – ni pa dvoma o tem, da je tiskalni stroj toliko spremenil človeško družbo, da potem nič več ni bilo tako kot prej. Še naprej potekajo neskončne razprave o tem, ali je obdobje, v katerem živimo, doba moderne, postmoderne ali nekaj tretjega – težko pa bo nekdo spodbil dejstvo, da živimo v eri digitalizacije ali v eri remiksa, kakor trdi teoretik novih medijev Lev Manovich.³⁸ Prav tako filozofi še kar naprej razpravljajo o tem, kdaj se je začelo in kdaj končalo 20. stoletje. Eni pravijo, da se 20. stoletje začne s prvo svetovno vojno in oktobrsko revolucijo in se dovrši s propadom SZ in koncem hladne vojne, drugi, da se začne leta 1917 z Leninom, svoj zenit doseže s Stalinom in Hitlerjem, konča pa se leta 1976 z Mao C Tungovo smrtjo, tretji pa izhajajo iz njegovega rezultata – 20. stoletje je stoletje zmagoslavja kapitalizma in svetovnega trga itn.⁴⁰ Kaj pa, če bi na začetek 20. stoletja postavili izumitev radia in filma s konca 19. stoletja? Mar ne bi potem svojega zenita doseglo v 70. in 80. letih

³⁷ Flusser, op. cit., 97. Za Marxova stališča glede tehnologije glej 13. poglavje prvega dela Kapitala “Mašinerija in velika industrija”, v: Marx, 1987, 339–457.

³⁸ Flusser, op. cit., 87.

³⁹ Glej: Manovich, 2005, in Manovich, 2008.

⁴⁰ Več o tem glej: Badiou, 2005, 9–21.

s televizijo in videom in bi se končalo v 90. z uvajanjem novih tehnologij, kot so osebni računalnik, mobilni telefon in internet? Ali ni takšna klasifikacija, ki ostaja precej onstran ideologije in politike, solidnejša, ali ne ustreza bolj dejanskemu stanju, kot če za mejo nekega obdobja vzamemo propad kakšnega cesarstva, vojno ali politično ureditev? Dejstvo, da so tehnologija, subjekt in družba neločljivo povezani, zelo lepo ilustrira tudi naslednja ugotovitev avstralskega strokovnjaka za robotiko in umetno inteligenco, Rodneyja Brooksa: "O svojih možganih vedno razmišljamo v terminih najnovejše tehnologije. Na neki točki so naši možgani bili parni stroji. Ko sem bil otrok, so bili telefonske mreže. Potem so postali digitalni računalniki. Verjetno zdaj obstajajo otroške knjige, ki govorijo, da so naši možgani svetovni splet. Verjetno tega še nismo pravilno razumeli."⁴¹

Za tehnologije lahko rečemo, kar Foucault po Deleuzu pravi za sile: "[Tehnologije] so v nenehnem nastajanju, obstaja nastajanje [tehnologije], ki je paralelno z zgodovino ali, natančneje, ki jo ovija, po neki nietzschejanski koncepciji."⁴² Takšna zamenjava je možna, ker je v končni fazi tehnologija sila; kot to implicitno pove naslednji citat Deleuza: "Potrebno je bilo, da biologija preskoči v molekularno biologijo, oz. da se razbito življenje zbere v genskem zapisu. Potrebno je bilo, da se razbito delo zbere in zregulira v strojih tretje generacije, kibernetičnih ter informatičnih. In katere bodo torej tiste sile, s katerimi se bodo pomerile sile v človeku? [...] Sile v človeku stopajo v odnos s silami zunanjosti, silami silicija, ki dobivajo prednost pred ogljikovimi silami, silami genskih faktorjev, ki dobivajo prednost pred organizmom, silami agramatičnosti, ki se prebijajo pred označevalcem."⁴³

⁴¹ Navajamo po: Reich, 2008, 3.

⁴² Prim. Deleuze, 1989, 89. V citatu smo besedo 'sila' zamenjali z besedo 'tehnologija'.

Tehnodispozitiv

Vrnimo se še zadnjič h Kubrickovi opici. Po spopadu pri izviru ena izmed opic – verjetno tista, ki je prva uporabila kost kot orodje – vrže kost iz roke proti nebu in že v naslednjem kadru se kost čudovito prelevi v sodobno vesoljsko ladjo. Kaj se je zgodilo med prvo uporabo orodja našega opičjega prednika in kompleksnim projektilom, izstreljenim od drugega orodja?

V prejšnjem razdelku smo na primeru vpeljave motoriziranega transporta ob koncu 19. in v začetku 20. stoletja pokazali, kako je ta postopoma močno omejil svobodo človeškega gibanja. Ta svoboda je (po francoskem teoretiku Paulu Virilioju) ob koncu 20. stoletja – v “zadnji fazi” mutacije transportnih sredstev – tudi popolnoma omejena: Virilio opiše sodobnega posameznika kot osebo, obsojeno na negibno mesto v avdiovizualnem oziroma “zadnjem vozilu”.⁴⁴ Poudarek ni več na osvajanju fizičnega prostora, ampak v nabiranju čim večjega števila informacij v realnem času, ki jih bo sodobni posameznik, paradoksalno, zamudil, če se bo odmaknil od avdiovizualnih naprav, s katerimi je okrožen v svojem teledomu in ki mu “na dlani” prinašajo “svet” v obliki informacij. Viriliojevo besedilo “Zadnje vozilo” je izšlo leta 1987, torej v času uvajanja priljubljenih simulacijskih naprav tako v vojski kot tudi v tematskih zabaviščnih parkih, vendar še pred vpljavo sodobnih zaslonskih mobilnih naprav, ki so sodobnemu posamezniku omogočile “ponovno osvajanje fizičnega prostora ob hkratnem nadzorovanju kibernetskega prostora”.⁴⁵ Viriliojevo “zadnje vozilo” je v nekem smislu torej stvar preteklosti, saj smo priče nekemu povsem drugačnemu scenariju in neki povsem drugačni situaciji, ki

⁴³ Prav tam, 135–137.

⁴⁴ Glej: Virilio, 2001. Prim. tudi poglavje “Kultura dotika in filozofija mobilnih tehnologij”, na katero se tukaj opiramo v: Strehovec, 2007, 185–217.

⁴⁵ Strehovec, 2007, 193–194.

jo Janez Strehovec imenuje mobilni oziroma nomadski kokpit: "Današnji posameznik je postavljen v nomadski kokpit, kar pomeni, da je obdan z napravami, ki mu dobavljajo podatke različnih izvorov; v njegovo sedanjost stopajo statične in gibljive podobe (na igralnih konzolah, dlančnih, mobilnih telefonih), zvoki iz MP3-predvajalnika in mobilnih telefonov, prav tako pa tudi podatki, ki ga zadenejo taktilno (podobe na majhnih LCD-zaslonih, ki agresivno segajo v uporabnikov prostor) [...]. Tudi te podobe napolnjujejo uporabnikov kokpit položaj, torej stanje, ki spominja (v smislu intenzivne interaktivnosti in kinestetičnih odgovorov) na vožnjo avtomobila."⁴⁶ Tako Strehovec kot Virilio sicer nikjer ne omenjata besede "dispozitiv", vendar je iz navedenega popolnoma jasno, da so sodobne tehnologije pri njiju razumljene naravno kot ultimativni dispozitivi, natanko v smislu, v katerem smo predstavili pojem dispozitiva v prvem poglavju. Tisto, kar Virilio imenuje "avdiovizualno vozilo", in tisto, kar Strehovec imenuje "nomadski kokpit", bomo tukaj v skladu z našo dozdajšnjo terminologijo skušali obseči z izrazom "tehnodispozitiv".

V prvem razdelku smo razložili, kaj mislimo pod izrazom "dispozitiv". Toda, na kaj merimo z izrazom "tehno"? Naj takoj povemo, da tukaj ne razumevamo tehna kot specifični žanr v elektronski glasbi, ki je nastal ob koncu 80. let 20. stoletja v Detroitu, čeprav za sam izbor tega termina ni brez pomena, da je tehno izraz, ki poleg omenjenega specifičnega žanra označuje tudi vse žanre sodobne plesne elektronske glasbe skupaj. Se pravi, da gre tudi tukaj kakor pri izrazu dispozitiv za obči, rodovni pojem, ki mora v celoten rod všteti tudi samega sebe. Očitno je izraz tehno, ki ga je pionir tehnoglasbe Juan Atkins našel pri ameriškem futurologu Alvinu Tofflerju v izrazu "techno rebels" ustrezno označil nekaj, kar je bilo skupno vsem pripadnikom tehno-kulture. Toda kaj? Ne najdemo si boljšega odgovora na to vprašanje, kot ga v

⁴⁶ Prav tam, str. 194.

svoji knjigi o tehnokulturi ponuja Janez Strehovec, ki tam prav tako ne razumeva tehna le v smislu glasbene oblike, "ampak bistveno širše, kot načelo današnjega sveta, oblikovanega v paradigmi umetnega druge generacije. Mišljeno je umetno, ki je prestopilo prag mehanskega in se usmerilo na področje kibernetškega in celo v paradigmo bio, se pravi, k življenju podobnim procesom na neorganskih nosilcih [...]. Tehno pomeni stopnjevano in pospešeno sintetičnost, umetelnost na kvadrat in širitev resničnosti v smislu njenega povečanja, nadgraditve. Z njim smo v paradigmi umetnega druge generacije [...], ob katerem se oblikuje nov tip tehnomodelirane zaznave in njen subjekt: estetski človek v paradigmi tehna."⁴⁷ V tem tekstu torej ne delamo razlike med terminoma tehnika in tehnologija.

Pod pojmom tehno torej razumemo tehnologijo v najširšem in hkrati najglobljem pomenu besede: tehno je tehnologija kot eksistenca, način bivanja subjekta, njegov "eksistencialno-tehnološki angažma v svetu".⁴⁸ Gre za razširjeni koncept tehnike, kakor se pojavlja v delih Walterja Benjamina, Martina Heideggerja ali Wilema Flusserja: "Tovrstna tehnika je – v Benjaminovi terminologiji – druga tehnika; temelji na posameznikovem distanciranju od narave, konkretno od reproduciranja naravnih oblik, v kar je bila ujeta t. i. prva tehnika. Za dosežke prve tehnike lahko rečemo, da 'kulminirajo v človeškem žrtvovanju; tisti druge tehnike pa v daljinsko usmerjenem letalu, ki ne potrebuje človeške posadke.'"⁴⁹ V tem smislu je zelo zanimiv odgovor gledališkega režiserja in avantgardnega umetnika Dragana Živadinova (ki za leto 2045 načrtuje prav izstrelitev letala brez človeške posadke)⁵⁰ na moje vprašanje, kaj pomeni veliki napis TEHNO, ki se pojavlja na koncu njegove uprizoritve

⁴⁷ Prim.: Strehovec, 1998, 17.

⁴⁸ Strehovec, 2007, 223.

⁴⁹ Prav tam, str. 299–300.

Tri elizabetinske tragedije Vladimirja Stojsavljevića.⁵¹ Živadinov razlikuje izraz “tehno” tako od grškega “techne” kot od angleškega “technology” in ga definira kot “emancipirano tehnologijo; nekaj kar bo postalo neodvisno od nas biološkega”. Tehno je zanj “naravna emancipacija”, “emancipirana entiteta, ki ima popolnoma svoje življenje”. In še: “Tehno je evolucijski proces biološkega. Da se razumemo, jaz nisem futurolog, ne govorim o tem, kaj bo, ampak o tem, kaj ima potencial.” Izraz “tehno”, ki ga tukaj uporabljamo, torej nikakor ni identičen z grškim izrazom “techne”, ki govori o tem, *kako* kaj naredimo, ampak je prej, kot pravi Živadinov, *potencial*, ki je v sami tehnologiji oziroma v spravi človeka in tehnologije. Ta potencial pa je, kot je razvidno iz zgornjega konteksta, zgodovinsko pogojen. Kot pravi Strehovec: “Tehnologija (in znanost), ki tukaj sodeluje, ni nekakšno metafizično orodje, temveč zgodovinski ‘paket’ instrumentalnih in interpretativnih ravnanj. Vprašanje, kako naprava deluje, je zato obenem vprašanje ‘komu služi’”.⁵²

Da sklenemo: z izrazom *tehno* merimo na *potencial zgodovinskega “paketa” instrumentalnih in interpretativnih ravnanj, ki jih im-*

⁵⁰ Leta 1995 je Živadinov premierno uprizoril predstavo Vladimirja Stojsavljevića *Ena proti ena* (gre v bistvu za uprizoritev Stojsavljevićeve dramske trilogije *Ljubezan in država*). Prva ponovitev je bila leta 2005, nato pa naj bi se ponavljala vsako desetletje do leta 2045. “Igralce, ki bodo medtem umrli, bodo nadomestili s simboli; leta 2045 jih bo Živadinov, zadnji še živeči član zasedbe (četudi je starejši od vseh drugih igralcev), iz Rusije lansiral v vesolje in tako sklenil predstavo v gravitaciji nič [...] Septembra 1999 je bila uprizorjena nova predstava, *Gravitacija nič Noordung*, ki je skoraj dobesedno sledila scenariju predstave, načrtovane za leto 2045. Potekala je v breztežnostnih razmerah nad Rusijo, v posebnem breztežnem letalu za kozmonavte in pomeni doslej najambicioznejšo (in najdražjo) stopnjo v razvoju Noordungovega mita, kar jih je ustvaril Živadinov.” (Monroe, 2003, 116–117.)

⁵¹ Intervju je v zvočni obliki na spletni strani Radia Študent: Anđelković, 2009.

⁵² Strehovec, 2007, 223.

plicirajo sodobne tehnologije, ki pa so dispozitivi per se. Izraz "tehnodispozitiv" je torej v nekem smislu oksimoron, čeprav nujen, da bi lahko ta dispozitiv razlikovali od številnih drugih dispozitivov. Spomnimo se, kaj pravi Deleuze glede novosti, glede aktualnosti nekega dispozitiva: "Novo, to je aktualno. Aktualno ni tisto, kar smo mi, temveč prej tisto, kar postajamo, kar bomo kmalu postali, se pravi Drugi, naše postajanje-drugi. V vsakem dispozitivu je treba razlikovati med tistim, kar smo (tistim, kar več nismo), in tistim, kar bomo kmalu postali: delež zgodovine in delež aktualnega."⁵³ Vprašanje, ki ga tukaj zastavljamo, se seveda glasi, v kakšnem smislu je trenutni tehnodispozitiv aktualen, v čem je njegova novost. Ali z drugimi besedami – kako nas ta dispozitiv spreminja kot subjekte, na kakšen način postajamo drugi?

Z vpeljevanjem tehnologij in naprav, kot so virtualna resničnost, internet, mobilni telefon, dlančnik, prenosni računalnik, GPS-navigatorski sistem, prenosni medijski predvajalnik oz. iPod, tablični računalnik oz. iPad itd., meje med aktualnim in virtualnim postajajo nestabilne. Nismo zapustili svojih teles in fizične realnosti ter se podali na brezkončna duhovna potepanja po virtualnih svetovih, kot je bilo napovedovano, ko so bile pametne tehnologije še na začetku. Prav nasprotno, virtualnost je prišla k nam, tukaj je, v dejanskem svetu, obdaja naša fizična telesa in jih spreminja. Sodobni posameznik je v nekem smislu kibernetično voden, pa čeprav se s svojim fizičnim telesom giblje po "realnem" prostoru: "Vsekakor je to gibanje, ki je bistveno opredeljeno z intervali klicev (sporočil) in odgovorov nanje. Srečujemo se z gibanjem, ki je na neki način kibernetično, kajti uporabnik kot gibalec upošteva (povratne in druge) informacije, ki jih med gibanjem sprejema od mobilnih naprav. Je dejansko krmar v tem smislu, da vsak trenutek smer poti/vožnje korigira glede na impulze iz okolja (valovi in protiveter so v njegovem primeru v živo

⁵³ Deleuze, 1990, 11–12.

prejete informacije različnih izvorov).”⁵⁴ Časi navduševanja nad virtualnim prostorom, v katerem se lahko potepamo brez identitete, zapuščajoč svoje telo nekje tam v fizičnem svetu, so torej že za nami. Vojna med našo dano, fizično resničnostjo in virtualnimi svetovi, ki jo je v 80. letih prejšnjega stoletja objavil kibernetiski platonizem (Strehovčev termin), se je končala brez zmagovalca. Siolov reklamni oglas iz leta 1998: “Svet ni eden, svetova sta dva” ne drži. Medmrežje ni več brezkončna puščava realnega za virtualne pobege računalniških navdušencev. Je del vsakdanjega življenja milijonov ljudi, ki se pogosto ne zavedajo tega, da se njihovo gibanje – tako na internetu kot v fizični realnosti – danes lahko pazljivo spremlja in evidentira. Tako recimo družbe, kot so NetGeo, kartirajo naše IP-naslove in dobivajo zemljepisne koordinate za potrebe trženja spletnih podjetij, njihovi mobilni telefoni pa omogočajo, da se lahko posameznik zemljepisno locira v katerem koli trenutku. Sedanje medmrežje torej “ni več neko podatkovno ‘čisto drugo’, ampak je vedno bolj prizemljeno in evidentirano v svoji geografski in geopolitični ‘fizikalnosti’”.⁵⁵

Najrazvpitejša Platonova alegorija je verjetno tista z začetka sedme knjige *Države*. Zaporniki so od otroštva priklenjeni z veri-

⁵⁴ Strehovec, 2007, 196.

⁵⁵ Prav tam, str. 18. Glej tudi celotno poglavje “Splet 2.0”. To pa nikakor ni zadnje poglavje v zgodbi o koncu medmrežja kot prostora brezmejnne svobode. Tendence v zvezi z digitalnimi identitetami nakazujejo, da bo moral v prihodnosti imeti vsak uporabnik medmrežja – vsekakor pa tisti, ki bo hotel opraviti kakšno finančno transakcijo – eno samo digitalno identiteto, s katero se bo moral identificirati “podobno kot z vozniškim dovoljenjem v fizičnem svetu” (http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Identity_2.0, dostopno 2. septembra 2008). Podatki o njem se bodo zbirali “podobno kot z avtom med vožnjo po avtocestnem omrežju zbiramo račune o vsaki plačani cestnini”. (Goldsmith, J., Wu, T.: *Who controls the Internet?*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 2006. Navajamo po: prav tam, str. 19.)

gami v globoki jami. Imobilizirani so vsi njihovi udi, vključno z glavami, tako da lahko ujetniki le strmijo v steno, na kateri vidijo samo sence živali, rastlin in drugih predmetov, ki pa so v bistvu sence paznikov, ki nosijo te oblike. Edina realnost, ki jo zaporniki vidijo, so torej sence oblik, ki jih nosijo pazniki. Platonov problem je: če bi se kak zapornik osvobodil in hotel na plano, bi njegove oči zaslepila svetloba velikanskega plamena, ki je za pazniki, oz. svetloba sonca, če bi mu uspelo priti iz votline, zaradi česar bi se mu realne oblike zazdele manj realne kot sence oblik, ki jih je gledal vse življenje. Tudi če bi se hotel vrniti v votlino, da bi osvobodil svoje ujete prijatelje, je zelo verjetno, da ti ne bi privolili v to, saj ga sploh ne bi razumeli, on pa ne bi več razumel njihovega sveta, ki sestoji iz iger podob na steni.

Ta Platonov mit je bil že nešteto krat interpretiran na najrazličnejše načine, najpogosteje pa, kar je tudi razumljivo, iz politične in epistemološke perspektive.⁵⁶ Udomačil se je tudi v popularni kulturi. Tako recimo filmska trilogija *Matrica* bratov Wachowski v bistvu temelji na tem mitu, saj Baudrillardov simulaker (Baudrillardova knjiga *Simulaker in simulacija* se pojavi na začetku prvega dela *Matrice*) ni nič drugega kot Platonova votlina, izpeljana do svoje končne konsekvence. Za simulaker pa je značilno, da ni degradirana kopija, prav nasprotno, simulaker ukinja razlikovanje med kopijo in originalom, tako da na koncu ni jasno, kaj je original in kaj kopija (se pravi, da ni jasno, kaj je votlina in kaj je zunaj nje). Pri čemer "realno" zunaj votline pri Baudrillardu na koncu tudi popolnoma izgine. Realnost je umorjena brez sledi: zgodil se je popoln zločin.⁵⁷ Simptomatično je, da film *Matrica* v bistvu zrcali in pervertira sliko Platonove votline, saj je človeštvo prihodnosti v filmu

⁵⁶ Mimogrede, omenja ga tudi Strehovec (2007), in sicer tako, da nekatere aspekte tega Platonovega mita aplicira na problematiko zaznavanja novomejske umetnosti; glej: 224–229.

ujeto zunaj votline – mesto Zion, kjer živijo “osvobodenci”, pa je prav v votlini. Pa vendar je ta Platonov dualizem, torej delitev na tisto, kar je v votlini, in tisto, kar je zunaj nje, precej sumljiv, kar je vedel že Nietzsche. Kot pravi Žižek v filmu *Perverzni vodnik čez film*, Neov izbor z začetka prvega dela *Matrice* med modro in rdečo pilulo, med resničnostjo in iluzijo, je v bistvu lažen izbor. Saj virtualno strukturira našo realnost tako, da bi, če bi ga odstranili iz realnosti, odstranili tudi realnost samo. Žižek predlaga tretjo pilulo. To je tista, ki nam ne bi omogočila videnja realnosti, ki je za iluzijo, ampak realnost, ki je v sami iluziji. Drugače povedano, ne gre za virtualno resničnost, ampak za resničnost virtualnega, za tisto, kar se v Lacanovem besednjaku imenuje Realno. Pri tem Žižek v iztočnici svoje knjige o Deleuzu prav slednjega opredeli kot misleca, ki je natanko na ta način filozof virtualnega.⁵⁸ Sam Deleuze pa v *Razliki in ponovitvi* tako opredeljuje odnos med virtualnim in realnim: “Virtualno ni zoperstavljeno realnemu, pač pa zgolj aktualnemu. Virtualno poseduje polno realnost kot virtualno. Za virtualno bi morali reči natanko tisto, kar je Proust dejal za stanja resonance: ‘So realna, ne da bi bila aktualna, idealna, ne da bi bila

⁵⁷ Prim. Baudrillard, 1999.

⁵⁸ Prim. Žižek, 2004, 3. S številnimi Žižkovimi izpeljavami v tej knjigi – od katerih je najbolj škandalozna vsekakor ta, da naj bi bil Deleuze nekakšen “ideolog poznega kapitalizma” (184) – se ne moremo strinjati; čeprav je bil Žižkov namen (po lastnih besedah) priti Deleuzu “od zadaj” in mu po njegovem (Deleuzovem) filozofskem receptu “narediti nezakonskega otroka”. Gre namreč za to, da Žižek tam prihaja Deleuzu “od zadaj” s Heglovim filozofskim aparatom in ne recimo “od spredaj” s Spinozovim, Bergsonovim ali Nietzschejevim, kar bi bilo veliko logičnejše in primernejše za penetriranje v Deleuzovo filozofijo. Dovolj bo, če rečemo, da je Nietzsche, brez katerega sploh ne moremo razumeti Deleuzove filozofije, v celotni knjigi omenjen samo dvakrat ali trikrat, in sicer mimogrede, kar je skoraj natanko tako, kot da bi nekdo v knjigi, ki tolmači Žižkovo teorijo, le na dveh mestih bežno omenil Lacana in enkrat Marxa.

abstraktna'; so simbolna, ne da bi bila fiktivna. Virtualno bi morali definirati kot neki strogi del realnega objekta – kot da bi objekt imel enega svojih delov v virtualnem, kot da bi bil vanj potopljen kot v objektivno dimenzijo.”⁵⁹

Pred kratkim je nemški filozof in kognitivist Thomas Metzinger v svojem delu *Biti nihče*, izhajajoč iz nevroznanosti, predlagal še eno variacijo Platonovega mita. Po tej interpretaciji v votlini pravzaprav ves čas *ni nikogar*: “Platon je imel prav – z dodatkom, da *ni nikogar* (nobenega opazujočega subjekta) v votlini. Votlina projicira SAMO SEBE (svoj celotni ustroj) na zaslon: teater senc deluje kot avtorepresentacija (modela jaza) votline. Z drugimi besedami, opazujoči subjekt je sam senca, rezultat mehanizma reprezentacije: ‘jaz’ pomeni način, kako človeški organizem izkusi samega sebe, kako se kaže samemu sebi, in NIHČE, nobena substancialna realnost, ne stoji za zastorom samoprikazovanja.”⁶⁰

Bibliografija

- AGAMBEN, G. (2007): “Kaj je dispozitiv?”, Problemi, št. 8–9.
- ANĐELKOVIĆ, B. (2007): “Tehno in subjekt”, Monitor ISH, let. 9, št. 2, 61–74.
- ANĐELKOVIĆ, B. (2009): *RKHV intervju: Dragan Živadinov* (avdio), <http://www.radiostudent.si/article.php?sid=20488>. Dostopno 23. septembra 2009.
- BADIOU, A. (2005): *Dvajseto stoletje*, Analecta, Društvo za teoretsko psihoanalizo, Ljubljana.
- BAUDRILLARD, J. (1999): *Simulaker in simulacija, Popoln zločin*, Študentska založba, Ljubljana.

⁵⁹ Navajamo po: Klepec, 2004, 88–89.

⁶⁰ Glej: Žižek, 2005, 9–10

- DELEUZE, G. (1989): *Fuko*, Izdavačka knjižarnica Zorana Stojanovića, Sremski Karlovci.
- DELEUZE, G. (1998): *Logika smisla*, Krtina, Ljubljana.
- DELEUZE, G. (2007): "Kaj je dispozitiv?", *Problemi*, št. 8–9, 5–14.
- DELEUZE, G. (2008): *Logika občutja*, Hyperion, Koper.
- DELEUZE, G., GUATTARI, F. (1990a): *Anti-Edip. Kapitalizam i šizofrenija 1*, Izdavačka knjižarnica Zorana Stojanovića, Sremski Karlovci.
- DELEUZE, G., GUATTARI, F. (1990b): "Zaključni program za želeće mašine"; dodatek v: *Anti-Edip. Kapitalizam i šizofrenija 1*, Izdavačka knjižarnica Zorana Stojanovića, Sremski Karlovci. Besedilo je bilo prvič objavljeno v časopisu *Minuit* 2. januarja 1973.
- FOUCAULT, M. (2008): "Nietzsche, genealogija, zgodovina", v: Foucault, M., *Vednost-oblast-subjekt*, Krtina, Ljubljana.
- FLUSSER, V. (2000): "Od subjekta k projektu", v: Flusser, V., *Digitalni videz*, Študentska založba, Ljubljana.
- HEIDEGGER, M. (2003): "Vprašanje po tehniki", v: Heidegger, M., *Predavanja in sestavki*, Slovenska matica, Ljubljana.
- KACZYNSKI, T. (1995): *Industrial Society and Its Future*, http://en.wikisource.org/wiki/Industrial_Society_and_Its_Future. Dostopno 13. oktobra 2009.
- KLEPEC, P. (2004): *Vznik Subjekta*, Založba ZRC in Filozofski inštitut ZRC SAZU, Ljubljana.
- KLEPEC, P. (2007): "Ob mestu in vlogi dispozitiva pri Foucaultu", *Problemi*, št. 8–9, 29–57.
- KLEPEC, P. (2008): *Dobičkonosne strasti, Kapitalizem in perverzija 1*, Društvo za teoretsko psihoanalizo, Ljubljana.
- KUBRICK, S. (1968): *Odiseja 2001* (film), Metro-Goldwyn-Mayer.
- MANOVICH, L. (2005): "Remixing and Remixability", <http://www.manovich.net>. Dostopno 21. 5. 2008.

- MANOVICH, L. (2008): *Software takes command* (Draft version: 20. 11. 2008), <http://lab.softwarestudies.com/2008/11/softbook.html>. Dostopno 16. 12. 2008.
- McLUHAN, M. (2001): *Understanding media: the extensions of man*, Routledge, London, New York.
- MEGILL, A. (1985): *Prophets of Extremity: Nietzsche, Heidegger, Foucault, Derrida*, University of California Press, Berkley/Los Angeles/London.
- MONROE, A. (2003): *Pluralni monolit, Laibach in NSK*, Maska, Ljubljana.
- MUMFORD, L. (1986): *Mit o mašini 1: Tehnika i razvoj čoveka*, Grafički zavod Hrvatske, Zagreb.
- NIETZSCHE, F. (1991): *Onstran dobrega in zlega. H genealogiji morale*, Slovenska matica, Ljubljana.
- REICH, S. (2008): "An Introduction, or My (Ambiguous) Life with Technology", v: Miller, Paul. D. aka DJ Spooky that Subliminal Kid, ur., *Sound Unbound, Sampling Digital Music and Culture*, MIT Press, Cambridge/London.
- STREHOVEC, J. (1998): *Tehnokultura - kultura tehna*, Študentska založba, Ljubljana.
- STREHOVEC, J. (2007): *Besedilo in novi mediji*, Literarno-umetniško društvo Literatura, Ljubljana.
- VIRILIO, P. (2001): "Zadnje vozilo", *Vrzeli filma in arhitekture*, Slovenska kinoteka - Imago, Ljubljana.
- ZAJC, M. (2000): *Tehnologije in družbe*, ISH - Fakulteta za podiplomski humanistični študij, Ljubljana.
- ŽIŽEK, S. (2004): *Organs without bodies: Deleuze and consequences*, Routledge, New York/London.
- ŽIŽEK, S. (2005): *Kako biti nihče*, Društvo za teoretsko psihoanalizo, Ljubljana.

BOJAN ANĐELKOVIĆ¹

Kako spremeniti subjekt? Remiksiraj ga.

Izveček: Tekst raziskuje zvezo med subjektom, tehnologijo in družbo, in sicer s paradigmo vmesnika in prek razširjenega koncepta remiksa, ki je po našem mnenju osnovni tehnični operativni mehanizem ter poglavitna estetska, kulturna in družbena paradigma našega časa. Eksplozivna širitev paradigme remiksa po vsem družbenem polju seveda korespondira s tem, kako ljudje doživljamo sami sebe, kako se počutimo v sodobnem svetu. V nekem smislu lahko torej rečemo, da remiks danes ni enostavno le osnovni operativni mehanizem sodobnih tehnologij in paradigma v samem jedru kulturnega in družbenega, ampak je na neki način tudi utelešen, in sicer kot operativni mehanizem mentalnega polja.

Ključne besede: remiks, telo brez organov, subjekt, tehnologija, nadčlovek, filozofske teorije

UDK: 1:316.7

How to Change the Subject? Remix it.

Abstract: Through the paradigm of the interface and the expanded concept of the remix, which we take to be the fundamental technical operative mechanism and the main aesthetic, cultural, and social paradigm of our time, the text investigates the relationship between the subject, technology and society. The explosive expansion of the remix paradigm throughout the social field corresponds to how we human beings experience ourselves, how we feel and think in the

¹ Mag. Bojan Anđelković je doktorand na Fakulteti za humanistične študije Koper, program Filozofija in teorija vizualne kulture, in urednik Redakcije za kulturo in humanistične vede na Radiu Študent. E-pošta: bojandjelkovic@gmail.com.

contemporary world. Arguably, the remix is not merely a basic operative mechanism of contemporary technologies, a paradigm located at the very core of the cultural and the social; indeed, it may be said to be embodied as an operative mechanism of the mental field.

Keywords: remix, body without organs, subject, technology, *Übermensch*, philosophical theories, Nietzsche-Deleuze-Foucault



*Najprej mi oblikujemo svoja orodja,
potem ona oblikujejo nas.*

MARSHAL McLUHAN

Kaj je telo (brez organov)?

Po svoji prvi monografiji *Empiricizem in subjektivnost* iz leta 1953, ki je bila posvečena Humu, Deleuze kar osem let ni objavil nič. Potem pa je leta 1962 izdal svoje briljantno zgodnje delo o Nietzscheju, ki ga iz današnje perspektive lahko razumemo kot pravi začetek Deleuzove filozofije in kot zelo pomemben preobrat v francoski filozofiji 20. stoletja. Deleuzova knjiga *Nietzsche in filozofija* je namreč prvo delo kakega francoskega filozofa, ki sistematično in koherentno obravnava Nietzschejevo filozofijo, postavljajoč vprašanja, ki bodo postala osrednja v nadaljnjih študijah o Nietzscheju in poststrukturalizmu na splošno. Najpomembnejši del te knjige, iz katerega izhajata vplivni Deleuzovi tolmačenji volje do moči in večnega vračanja, pa je vsekakor razlaga aktivnih in reaktivnih sil;

mesto bojišča teh sil pa je seveda – telo. Toda kaj je za Nietzscheja telo?

Prvo poglavje tematskega sklopa “Aktivno in reaktivno” te knjige z nazivom “Telo” začne Deleuze z ugotovitvijo, da je Spinoza odprl novo pot filozofiji s tem, ko je v svoji *Etiki* zapisal, da si sploh ne moremo predstavljati, kaj lahko naredi neko telo: “Govorimo o zavesti in duhu, nakladamo o vsem tem, ne vemo pa, česa je sposobno telo, kakšne so njegove sile in kaj pripravljajo. Nietzsche ve, da je prišel čas: ‘Nahajamo se v fazi, ko zavest postaja skromna.’”² Skratka, tako kot Freud je tudi Nietzsche mnenja, da je zavest tisto področje, ki je aficirano z zunanjim svetom; vendar je – in tu je pomembna razlika med njim in Freudom – zavest vedno zavest inferiornega v razmerju do superiornega, kateremu se podreja in v katero se inkorporira. Ne gre torej za zavest gospodarja, ampak za zavest hlapca v razmerju do gospodarja, ki mu sploh ni treba biti zavesten. In kdo je gospodar zavesti? Telo, seveda. Kaj je torej za Nietzscheja/Deleuza telo? “Ne bomo ga definirali, če rečemo, da je to polje sil, sredina, za katero se bori množstvo sil. Ker v bistvu ni ‘sredine’, ni polja sil ali bojnega polja. Ni kvantitete realnosti, vsaka realnost je že kvantiteta sile. Ni ničesar razen kvantitete sil, ki so medsebojno ‘v razmerju napetosti’. Vsaka sila je v razmerju z drugimi silami: ali si jih podreja ali je podrejena. Telo je določeno z razmerjem med dominirajočimi silami in dominiranimi silami. Vsako razmerje sil formira neko telo: kemično, biološko, družbeno, politično. Dve poljubni sili, glede na to, da sta neenaki, oblikujeta neko telo, takoj ko stopita v razmerje: telo je zaradi tega vedno plod naključja, v nietzschejanskem smislu, in se pojavlja kot ‘najbolj presenetljiva reč’, v bistvu veliko bolj presenetljivo kot zavest ali duh.”³

² Deleuze, 1999, 49. Prim.: Spinoza, 1963, 193.

³ Deleuze, 1999, 50.

Poznavalcem Deleuza seveda v tem in takšnem razumevanju telesa ne bo težko prepoznati prvega orisa koncepta “telesa brez organov”, ki ga Deleuze prvič omenja v *Logiki smisla* in ki v njegovih kasnejših delih, ki so nastala v sodelovanju s Felixom Guattarijem, pridobi status ene izmed njunih centralnih idej. Slavoj Žižek se torej moti, ko na nekem mestu pravi, da je težava z Nietzschejem morda v tem, da v svoji hvalnici telesu spregleda “absolutno zev med organskim telesom in norim, večnim ritmom gona, ki mu lahko postanejo podvrženi organi telesa, ‘parcialni objekti’”.⁴ Poanta je namreč v tem, da je Nietzschejevo telo v osnovi vedno telo brez organov. Toda kaj je telo brez organov?

Termin je prvič uporabil Antonin Artaud,⁵ Deleuze in Guattari pa ga kot enega svojih osrednjih filozofskih konceptov vpeljeta že v prvem poglavju svoje prve skupne knjige: “Telo brez organov ni priča nekega izvirnega ničā, kakor ni ostanek neke izgubljene totalitete. Predvsem pa ni projekcija; vse to nima nobene zveze z lastnim telesom ali s podobo telesa. Telo brez organov je telo brez podobe.”⁶ Lahko bi poenostavljeno rekli, da vzporedno z našim dejanskim telesom, z njegovimi navadami, gibi, afekti in tako naprej obstaja tudi njegova virtualna dimenzija – ki pravzaprav je telo brez organov. Pri tem pa moramo imeti seveda v mislih dejstvo, da se virtualnost, ko govorimo o Deleuzu, nikakor ne nanaša na neko virtualno resničnost, ampak na resničnost virtualnega. Drugače povedano, virtualnost je pri Deleuzu vedno razumljena kot potencial aktualnega – hkrati pa je tudi njegov pogoj, celo njegova osnova, kot poudarja Alain Badiou.⁷

⁴ Žižek, 1997, 49.

⁵ Glej: Artaud, 2010.

⁶ Deleuze, Guattari, 1990a, 10.

⁷ Glej poglavje “The Virtual” v: Badiou, 2000, 43–52. Prim. tudi: “The Reality of Virtual”, v: Žižek, 2004, 3–8.

Deleuze in Guattari v *Tisoč platojev* opišeta več značilnosti telesa brez organov, za naš tukajšnji namen pa je pomembno, da vemo, da telo brez organov nasprotuje trem velikim formacijam, ki nas oblikujejo, ki oblikujejo “formo človek”: organizmu, označevalcu in subjektu. In to na ta način, da jih deartikulira oziroma jih na novo artikulira v neskončnosti. Njegova osnovna operacija je eksperimentiranje: “ni označevalca, nikoli ne interpretiraj!”; njegovo osnovo gibanje je nomadizem: “nadaljuj gibanje, tudi na mestu, nikoli se ne nehaj gibati, negibno potovanje, desubjektivacija”.⁸ Treba je skratka “iztrgati zavest od subjekta, da bi iz njega naredili mesta za eksperimentiranje, iztrgati nezavedno od označevalca, da bi iz njega naredili resnično proizvodnjo: to gotovo ni nič manj težko kot iztrgati telo od organizma”.⁹ Drugače povedano (tako tudi sam Deleuze v svoji knjigi o Foucaultu): v človeku je treba osvoboditi sile, ki so v njem vklenjene; to so sile življenja, dela in jezika.¹⁰

Zdaj je že jasno, zakaj s pomočjo sodobnih tehnologij lahko naredimo popolno telo brez organov, najmočnejše orožje za boj s tremi velikimi formacijami, ki nas oblikujejo – sile v človeku se bodo namreč morale pomeriti s silami tehnologije: “Sile v človeku stopajo v odnos s silami zunanosti, silami silicija, ki dobiva prednost pred ogljikom, silami genetičnih faktorjev, ki dobivajo pred-

⁸ Deleuze, Guattari, op. cit., 159.

⁹ Prav tam, str. 160.

¹⁰ Glej poglavje “O smrti čoveka i nadčoveku”, v: Deleuze, 1989, 127-137. Rečeno z besedami samega Foucaulta: “[...] prepričan sem tudi, da je treba, če je človek – mi, bitja življenja, besede in dela [moj poudarek] – postal objekt različnih drugih znanosti, poiskati razlog, zaradi katerega se je to zgodilo, in to ne v svoji ideologiji, temveč v obstoju te politične tehnologije, ki smo jo ustvarili v svojih družbah.” Michel Foucault, “Politična tehnologija posameznikov”, v: Foucault, 2007, 153. Isto Foucaultovo besedilo v drugem prevodu z naslovom “Politična tehnologija individuumov” je dostopno tudi v: Foucault, 2008.

nost pred organizmom, silami agramatičnosti, ki dobivajo prednost pred označevalcem.¹¹

“Theatrum philosophicum”: Nietzsche-Deleuze-Foucault

Pokazali smo, kako Deleuze, izhajajoč iz Nietzschejeve filozofije, razume telo kot kombinacijo razmerja sil; telo ni enostavna fizična danost, v smislu biološkega organizma, ampak predvsem nekakšna “virtualna” razsežnost, imanentna tej fizični realnosti, okoli katere se bojuje množstvo sil. Površno branje Foucaulta bi lahko nekoga privedlo do sklepa, da Foucault razume telo drugače, saj je pri njem najti številne opise fizičnega telesa, ki ga mučijo, zapirajo, secirajo, analizirajo itn. Pa vendar ni tako. Celoten Foucaultev miselni projekt lahko v bistvu razumemo kot poskus, da se pride do vednosti o tem, kako si nekatere sile – režimi vednosti in oblasti – prisvajajo sile v telesu: “Telo: površina vpisovanja dogodkov [...], prostor disociacije jaza [...], volumen v nenehnem drobljenju. [...] [Genealogija] mora pokazati telo, potiskano z zgodovino, in zgodovino, ki uničuje telo.”¹² Povsem je razvidno, da je telo, o katerem tukaj govori Foucault, samo po eni strani konkretno, fizično telo, na katero in v katero se edino lahko vpisujejo dogodki. Po drugi strani pa je telo, ki ga mora pokazati genealoška metoda, neko povsem drugo in drugačno telo od tistega, ki ga določajo aktualni režimi vednosti in oblasti. Kot to pove plesni teoretik André Lepecki, govoreč o Foucaultevi, Derridajevi ter Deleuzovi in Guattarijevi filozofiji telesa: “Njihova filozofija namreč ni le filozofija telesa, temveč tudi filozofija, ki snuje koncepte, upoštevajoč politično preokvirjanje telesa. Njihova filozofija telesa ne razume kot samozadostne in zaprte entitete, marveč kot odprt in dinamičen sistem izmenjave, ki nenehno proizvaja oblike podrejanja in nadzora, pa tudi odpora in postaja-

¹¹ Deleuze, 1989, 136–137.

¹² Foucault, 2008, 94.

nja.”¹³ Foucault v tekstu o genealogiji tudi izrecno pove, da ga “konkretno” telo, s katerim se ukvarjajo zgodovinarji, ne zanima: “Dejanska’ zgodovina [to je genealogija] se od zgodovine zgodovinarjev razlikuje po tem, da se ne opira na nobeno stalnico: nič v človeku – *niti njegovo telo* – ni dovolj stalno, da bi razumel druge ljudi in se v njih prepoznal. [...] Zgodovina bo ‘dejanska’ toliko, kolikor bo *vpeljala diskontinuiteto v našo bit samo*. Razdelila bo naša čustva, dramatižirala naše nagone, *pomnožila naše telo* in ga obrnila proti samemu sebi [moji poudarki].”¹⁴ Foucaultovo pozno vračanje k problematiki “skrbi zase” v stari Grčiji iz tukajšnje perspektive torej lahko razumemo tudi kot epistemološki obrat od preučevanja tega in takšnega, od zgodovine uničenega telesa – k nekim drugim telesom, z drugačnimi kombinacijami sil, ki so obstajale, preden so se jih polastile in uničile sedanje zgodovinske sile. Toda kaj misli Foucault s tem, da je “dejanska” zgodovina oz. genealogija dejanska le toliko, kolikor lahko “vpelje diskontinuiteto v našo bit samo”? Kako bo to genealogija “pomnožila naše telo in ga obrnila proti samemu sebi”? (Ali Foucault res od nekdaj piše le fikcije, kot trdi na nekem mestu?)

Kako, če ne tako, da v dani red stvari, v “tisto, kar je”, vpelje neko drugo, virtualno dimenzijo. Pri čemer moramo to virtualnost razumeti natanko v deleuzovskem pomenu tega pojma, torej kot nekaj, kar se ne zoperstavlja realnemu, ampak zgolj sedanjemu. Edino tako lahko “dejanska” zgodovina vpelje diskontinuiteto v samo bit, pomnoži naše telo in ga obrne proti samemu sebi. “Tako razumljena diagnostika skozi igro razločkov ne vzpostavi konstante naše identitete. Ugotavlja, da smo mi sami razlika, da je naš um razlika diskurzov, naša zgodovina razlika med časi in naš jaz razlika med maskami.”¹⁵ Genealogija je torej “dejanska” zgodovina, ker je zgo-

¹³ Lepecki, 2009, 18.

¹⁴ Foucault, op. cit., 99.

¹⁵ Foucault, 2001, 144.

dovina virtualnega, in hkrati tudi virtualno zgodovine: preži na dogodke “tam, kjer jih najmanj pričakujemo, in v tistem, kar domnevno sploh nima zgodovine – v čustvih, ljubezni, zavesti, instinktih; *razumeti njihovo vračanje*, ne zato, da bi začrtali počasno krivuljo neke evolucije, ampak da bi znova odkrili različne prizore, v katerih so igrali različne vloge; *določiti celo točko njihovega umanjkanja, trenutek, ko jih ni bilo* [moja poudarka]”.¹⁶ Rečemo torej lahko, da je genealogija v nekem smislu vračanje, ponavljanje zgodovine, ki se ni nikoli zgodila. Genealogija vrača in preobrača zgodovino; ponavlja jo, da bi jo spremenila. To je možno, ker to, kar “ponavljanje ponavlja, ni to, kakšna je preteklost ‘zares bila’, ampak virtualnost, inherentna preteklosti in izdana od svoje pretekle aktualizacije. V tem specifičnem smislu, nastanek *novoga* spremeni samo preteklost oz. retroaktivno spremeni ne resnično preteklost – saj nismo v znanstveni fantastiki –, ampak ravnotežje med aktualnostjo in virtualnostjo preteklosti.”¹⁷ “[O]boževanje spomenikov postane paradija; spoštovanje nekdanjih kontinuitet postane sistematično razgrajevanje; kritika krivic preteklosti s pomočjo resnice, ki jo človek poseduje danes, se spremeni v destrukcijo človeka spoznanja zaradi nepravilnosti, ki je lastna volji do znanja.”¹⁸

Pa vendar to vračanje v preteklost, njeno spreobračanje oz. spreminjanje ravnotežja med aktualnostjo in virtualnostjo preteklosti ni samo sebi cilj. Preteklosti ne moremo spremeniti, ne da bi vplivali na sedanost in s tem tudi na prihodnost. “Če je Foucault velik filozof, je to zato, ker je zgodovine uporabil v korist nečesa drugega: kot pravi Nietzsche, delovati proti času, in tako delovati za čas, v prid, upam, prihajajočega časa.”¹⁹ Deleuze na koncu pravkar citira-

¹⁶ Foucault, 2008, 87.

¹⁷ Prim. Žižek, 2004, 12.

¹⁸ Foucault, op. cit., 109.

¹⁹ Deleuze, 2007, 12.

nega teksta o konceptu dispozitiva pri Foucaultu, ki po njegovi upokojitvi leta 1989 pomeni hkrati tudi njegov zadnji javni poseg, opozarja, da lahko različne črte nekega dispozitiva v končni fazi porazdelimo v dve skupini. Prvo skupino formulira Foucault v svojih velikih knjigah, ko s skrajno novimi zgodovinskimi sredstvi opredeli neke natančno določene arhive: splošno bolnišnico v 17., kliniko v 18. in zapor v 19. stoletju, subjektivnost v antični Grčiji in krščanstvu. To so črte slojev oz. črte *stratifikacije ali sedimentacije*. Vendar v teh knjigah ne najdemo skoraj nič o drugi skupini črt, ki zahtevajo povsem drug način izražanja od primerljivih črt v velikih knjigah; Foucault namreč ni podcenjeval svojih bralcev, veliko je dal tudi na slog in ni rad mešal babe in žabe. Zaradi tega lahko te druge črte, ki jih Deleuze imenuje *črte aktualizacije ali ustvarjalnosti*, najdemo le v Foucaultevih intervjujih. Prav tam in tudi v številnih drugih "stranskih" besedilih, katerih izdani obseg je danes že presegel obseg Foucaultevih uradnih knjig, bomo našli formulacije odgovorov na neko podobno in komplementarno, vendar drugačno zastavljeno serijo vprašanj. To so vprašanja, ki niso več usmerjena k preteklosti, ampak k sedanjosti oz. prihodnosti: "Kaj je danes norost, zapor, seksualnost? Kakšne nove načine subjektivacije, ki gotovo niso ne grške ne krščanske, vidimo nastajati danes?"²⁰ Drugače povedano, kako si aktualni režimi moči – vednosti in oblasti – danes lastijo naša telesa? In kakšne so možnosti pobega? Kje so razpoke v dispozitivih, kjer se odpirajo bežiščne za nove in drugačne procese subjektivacije? In kaj lahko navsezadnje pričakujemo od prihodnosti?

Temu konkretnemu in natančno definiranemu problemu v Nietzschejevi filozofiji ustreza pojem nadčloveka. Čeprav skuša slovenska lacanovska šola (in ni edina) že več let dokazati nasprotno, večina Deleuzovih in Foucaultevih konceptov in metod, posebej pa tisto

²⁰ Prim. prav tam, 13–14.

najbolj bistveno, izvira iz nietzschejanske aspiracije. Poreklo in podobnost ali neporeklo in nepodobnost posameznih konceptov in metod niti ni ključno; je pa ključno, da gre v obeh primerih za miselni razvoj, ki ima bistveno nietzschejansko logiko. To je povsem razvidno, če le bežno sledimo genealogijam njunih idej in del, zlasti če na te genealogije gledamo – če se lahko tako izrazimo – kot na virtualni del življenjskih aktualnostih njunih avtorjev.²¹ Stopili smo skratka v skrajno nietzschejansko cono večnega vračanja, v kateri ni razlike med mislijo in dogodkom – gre za eno in isto realnost, ki je hkrati dogodek misli in misel dogodka. Kot pravi Foucault glede Deleuzea: “Mišljenje mora misliti to, kar ga oblikuje, in se oblikuje iz tega, kar misli.”²² In kot pravi Deleuze glede Foucaulta: “Misliti pomeni gubati, podvajati zunaj z nekim znotraj, ki se razteza paralelno z njim.”²³ Skrivnost dolgoletnega prijateljstva in medsebojnega spoštovanja Deleuzea in Foucaulta prvenstveno torej ni v bližini in komplementarnosti njunih konceptov

²¹ Obstajajo namreč filozofski sistemi, ki jih lahko razumemo neodvisno od življenj njihovih avtorjev – takšni so filozofski sistemi večine filozofov. Da bi razumeli Kantovo *Kritiko čistega razuma*, nam tako ni treba vedeti, da se v vsem življenju Kant ni premaknil iz rodnega Königsberga ali pa da sta bila glavna družba starega Schopenhauerja kodra Atma in Butz; čeprav je tudi to lahko koristno. Nasprotno pa obstajajo filozofije – in Nietzschejeva je vsekakor najekstremnejši primer –, ki so v nekem smislu neločljive od življenja (boleznin in smrti) filozofov, ki so jih ustvarili. Tako recimo Klossowski v svoji enkratni knjigi o Nietzscheju, ki sta jo visoko cenila tako Deleuze kot Foucault, kaže, v kolikšni meri sta misel o večnem vračanju in Nietzschejeva norost neločljivo povezani (glej: Klossowski, 1997). Badiou je v svojem tekstu “Zgodovino sveta prelomiti na dvoje?” postavil tezo, da je v filozofiji dogodek notranji samemu mišljenju in da je osrednji dogodek Nietzschejeve filozofije sam Nietzsche (glej: Badiou, 2000b, 103–119). Foucaulteva in Deleuzova filozofija se seveda vsaka na svoj način navezujeta na njuni življenji in njunih filozofij nikoli ne bomo razumeli do potankosti, če ju bomo gledali ločeno od njunih dejanskih življenj in (političnih) angažmajev v svetu.

²² Foucault, 2008, 71.

²³ Deleuze, 1989, 122.

in metod (čeprav o tem ni dvoma), ampak prej v “metakonceptu” so-odvisnosti mišljenja in življenja, v smislu ustvarjalne, ontološke razsežnosti misli, ki intenzivira življenje in intervenira v *realno* z bistveno nietzschejansko potezo. Ta poteza je nietzschejanska tako po svojem poreklu kot po svojih posledicah. Ni namreč naključje, da Foucault konča svoj tekst o Deleuzu s pozivom na idejo večnega vračanja: “Nietzsche nam je prepustil misliti večno vračanje. Že skoraj eno stoletje je bila najvišja naloga filozofije misliti večno vračanje. Toda kdo bi bil dovolj predrzen, da bi rekel, da jo je mislil? [...] Tega ne smemo razumeti, kot da je vračanje forma neke vsebine, ki je razlika, temveč da se je iz vedno nomadske, vedno anarhične razlike z vedno presežnim znakom, vedno zunaj vrnitve proizvedlo bliskanje, ki bo nosilo ime Deleuze; novo mišljenje je možno; mišljenje je znova možno.”²⁴ In kako Deleuze konča svojo knjigo o Foucaultu? Kako neverjetno in nepričakovano: “Mišljenje misli lastno zgodovino (preteklost), vendar da bi se osvobodilo tistega, kar misli (sedanjost) in da bi končno lahko ‘mislilo drugačno’ (prihodnost) [...] odnosi z zunaj postavljajo pod vprašaj ugotovljene sile, ampak odnos do sebe končno kliče in proizvaja nove načine subjektivacije. Foucaultovo delo sledi drugim velikim delom, ki so spremenila tisto, kar za nas pomeni misliti.”²⁵

Res – kot pravi tista Deleuzova opomba v Foucaultevem tekstu o Deleuzu – kaj naj si mislimo o teh dveh?²⁶

How to Change the Subject? – Remix it!

Pa vendar Deleuze svoje knjige o Foucaultu v bistvu ne konča tako, saj vsebuje še zelo pomemben dodatek z naslovom “O smrti človeka

²⁴ Prim. Foucault, op. cit., 85–86.

²⁵ Prim. Deleuze, op. cit., 123.

²⁶ “Kaj si bodo mislili o naju dveh? – opomba Gillesa Deleuza” v: Foucault, op. cit., op. na str. 82. Odkod in zakaj Deleuzova opomba v Foucaultevem tekstu o Deleuzu? In kaj naj si mislimo o tem?

in o nadčloveku”,²⁷ kjer formulira naslednji Foucaultev nietzschejanski problem. Tako kot telo je tudi vsaka forma kombinacija razmerja sil.²⁸ To je splošno Foucaultovo načelo. Te sile so vedno v razmerju z zunanjimi silami. Tako nastane nova forma. Če vzamemo za primer sile v človeku (sile predstavljanja, pomnjenja, hotenja itn.), lahko rečemo, da takšne sile nujno stopajo v kompozicijo forma človek (pri tem je pomembno, da strogo razlikujemo (aktualno) formo človeka od (virtualne) forme človek). Vendar se te iste sile lahko investirajo tudi drugače, v neko drugo kombinacijo sil, v neko drugo formo. Tudi če vzamemo neko kratko obdobje, pravi Deleuze, človek ni obstajal od nekdaj in ne bo obstajal za vedno. Da bi se pojavila forma človek, je treba, da sile v človeku stopijo v razmerje z natančno določenimi silami od zunaj.

Deleuze potem opiše tri zgodovinske forme.

Prva je *klasicistična zgodovinska formacija*. Klasicistično mišljenje lahko prepoznamo po tem, na kakšen način misli neskončno. Najbolj karakteristična besedila 17. stoletja se ne različen način ukvarjajo z neskončnim: Pascal, Spinoza, Leibniz ... vsak izmed njih opisuje nekakšen red neskončnega. Skratka, sile v človeku stopajo v razmerje s silami dviganja do neskončnega. Iz česar sledi, da sile v človeku v okviru klasicistične formacije stopajo v razmerje s silami od zunaj, ki so takšne narave, da ustvarjajo *formo bog*, in ne *forme človek*. Deleuze do konca razvije teorijo o tej formaciji v svoji naslednji knjigi *Guba*,²⁹ ki je “svojevrstno nadaljevanje citirane knjige, nekakšen *Foucault 2* (tako kot je *Tisoč platojev drugi zvezek Kapitalizma in shizofrenije, Podoba-čas*

²⁷ Deleuze, op. cit. 127–137. Tukaj povzemamo ta aneks.

²⁸ Kar je tudi logično, saj je vsako telo neka forma in obratno. Prim.: “dve kakršni koli sili, glede na to, da sta neenaki, *formirata* neko telo, takoj ko stopita v razmerje” (Deleuze, 1999, 50).

²⁹ Deleuze, 2009.

drugi zvezek *Filma*)”,³⁰ *Logika občutja* pa je svojevrstno nadaljevanje *Logike smisla*.

Druga je *zgodovinska formacija 19. stoletja*. “Sprememba je v naslednjem: sile v človeku stopajo v odnos s silami končnosti. To so sile življenja, dela in jezika. Trikratni koren končnosti, iz katerega bodo nastali biologija, politična ekonomija in lingvistika.”³¹ V tem kontekstu lahko na t. i. Kantov kopernikanski preobrat gledamo kot na poskus, da se izvirno neskončno klasicistične formacije zameenjajo s “konstitutivno končnimi” zgodovinskimi formacijami 19. stoletja. Sile v človeku so torej stopile v razmerje s silami od zunaj in šele potem se je človek tega začel zavedati kot lastne končnosti. Sile v človeku so s silami zunanosti oblikovale *formo človek* (in ne več *forme bog*). Poanta Nietzschejevega slovitega vzklika “Bog je mrtev!” torej ni v tem, da ni več boga, ampak da ni več *forme boga*; pri Nietzscheju se namreč ideja boga v operaciji sinteze povezuje z idejo časa in nastajanja in zgodovine in človeka. Enako velja za Foucaultovo razglašanje smrti človeka: človek očitno ni mrtev – tisto, kar je mrtvo, je forma-Človek!³²

Tretja formacija pa je *zgodovinska formacija prihodnosti*. Ta formacija je šele v nastajanju, zato še ne moremo predvideti, kakšna bo; gre za konkreten problem, ki ga je Nietzsche imenoval “nadčlovek”.³³

³⁰ Pelko, 2004, str. 284.

³¹ Deleuze, 1989, 130.

³² Glede “smrti Boga” glej poglavje “Bog je mrtev” v: Deleuze, 1999, 181–186; glede “smrti človeka” pa glej “Zaključek” v: Foucault, 2001.

³³ Upamo, da je po vsem povedanem jasno, da Nietzschejev nadčlovek ni nikakršen izpopolnjeni človek in da ne gre za nikakršnega supermena. Čeprav prefiks “nad” napotuje na nekaj, kar naj bi bilo nad človekom, je nadčlovek v bistvu nekaj, kar je onstran človeka; Nietzsche se nikoli ni naveličal ponavljati, da je človek le most, nekaj, po čem lahko nadčlovek edino nastane. Skratka, *nadčlovek je ta nova forma, ki bo nastala, ko sile, ki oblikujejo formo človek, stopijo v razmerje z nekimi drugimi, zgodovinsko natančno določenimi silami od zunaj*.

Nietzsche je govoril: človek je zaslužnjil življenje, delo in jezik – nad-človek je tisti, ki jih bo osvobodil *v samem človeku*, v korist neke druge forme. Kot pravi Deleuze, je to problem, pri katerem se moramo zadovoljiti z zelo diskretnimi oznakami, sicer bomo zapadli v strip.³⁴ A četudi še ne moremo govoriti o novi formi, lahko detektiramo sile zunanosti, s katerimi sile v človeku stopajo v razmerje. Človek je zaslužnjil sile življenja, dela in jezika, tako da jih je s pomočjo novih znanstvenih disciplin (ki izvirajo in biologije, politične ekonomije in lingvistike) razdrobil in razbil: lingvistika humanističnega 19. stoletja se je konstituirala na razbitosti različnih jezikov kot pogoju za ‘niveliranje govora’ kot predmeta. Enako velja za biologijo, ki je nivelirala življenje, in politično ekonomijo, ki je nivelirala delo. Danes je problem seveda v tem, kako spet zbrati razbite sile v človeku. Te naloge Deleuze ne prepušča ne znanosti ne politiki ne filozofiji ne umetnosti. Sile, ki bodo lahko zbrale razbite sile v človeku in s katerimi te danes stopajo v razmerje, so sile tehnologije:

“Zdi se nam, da sta se lahko delo in življenje zbrala šele, ko sta se odlepila od ekonomije in biologije, tako kot se je jezik zbral šele, ko se je književnost ločila od lingvistike. Bilo je nujno, da biologija vskoči v molekularno biologijo oz. da se razbito življenje zbere v genetičnem kodu. Bilo je treba, da se razbito delo zbere in ponovno umesti v strojih tretje vrste, kibernetičnih in informatičnih. Katere bodo torej sile, s katerimi bodo sile v človeku stopile v razmerje? To ne bo več vzdigovanje do neskončnega niti ne bo končnost, ampak *neomejeno končno; tako pa imenujemo vsako situacijo sile, v kateri daje neko končno število dejavnikov praktično neomejeno število raznovrstnih kombinacij* [moj poudarek].”³⁵

Je v današnji družbi kakšen operativni mehanizem, ki ustreza Deleuzovi zgodovinski formaciji prihodnosti, v kateri bodo sile v člo-

³⁴ Deleuze, 1989, 135.

³⁵ Prav tam, 135-136

veku stopile v razmerje s silami neomejeno končnega? Kako danes imenujemo operacijo, v kateri neko končno število dejavnikov daje praktično neomejeno število raznovrstnih kombinacij? Ta operativni mehanizem obstaja in operacija se seveda imenuje – *remiks*.

Remiks danes seveda ni prisoten samo v glasbi, ampak (če parafraziramo Fredrica Jamesona) lahko govorimo o “ogromni ekspanziji [paradigme remiksa] po vsem družbenem polju, do točke, ko lahko rečemo, da je vse v našem življenju – od ekonomske vrednosti in moči države do praks in prav do strukture psihe same – postalo [‘remiksabilno’] v nekem izvornem, pa vendar neteoretiziranem smislu”.³⁶ Jameson v svojem klasičnem besedilu o postmodernizmu kot kulturni logiki poznega kapitalizma sicer govori o razkroju avtonomne sfere kulture, z njeno eksplozivno širitvijo po vsem družbenem polju, pa vendar smo lahko besedo “kultura” v zgornjem citatu brez problema zamenjali z besedo “remiks” zaradi tega, ker je prav remiks kulturna paradigma, ki jo danes lahko najdemo v vseh porah družbe. Po našem mnenju gre namreč za glavno estetsko in kulturno načelo našega časa, kar je tudi stališče Leva Manovicha: “Če se je Fredric Jameson nekdaj skliceval na postmodernizem kot na ‘kulturno logiko poznega kapitalizma’, lahko morda mi s terminom remiks imenujemo kulturno logiko globalnega kapitalizma.”³⁷ Morda torej ni naključje, da Deleuze piše o silah neomejeno končnega prav na polovici 80., torej tik preden se je paradigma remiksa eksplozivno razširila po vsem družbenem polju. Manovich opozarja, da so revolucijo v elektronski popglasbi s konca 80. let spremljala enaka dogajanja v okviru vizualne kulture: “Pionirsko vpeljan v glasbenih videih se je kasneje [remiks] razširil na celotno vizualno kulturo televi-

³⁶ Jameson, 2001, 59.

³⁷ Manovich, 2008, 27. Glej tudi celotno poglavje: “What comes after Remix?” (prav tam, 224–261), na katero se tukaj opiramo.

zije. Druga softverska orodja, kot sta *Photoshop* (1989) in *After Effects* (1993), so imela enak učinek na poljih grafičnega dizajna, gibljive grafike, komercialnih ilustracij in fotografije. Nekaj let zatem pa je svetovni splet redefiniral elektronski dokument kot miks drugih dokumentov. Prišla je kultura remiksa.”³⁸

Verjetno ni treba posebej pojasnjevati, zakaj pomeni svetovni splet najboljše orodje in plodna tla za najrazličnejše prakse remiksiranja. Na tem nomadskem, fleksibilnem in fluidnem teritoriju, v katerem so vse vsebine digitalizirane (se pravi, da so po definiciji modularne in remiksabilne), dokumente remiksajo elektronski dokumenti, elektronske dokumente remiksajo novi mediji, nove medije remiksajo spletne strani – spletne strani remiksajo RSS-tehnologije itd. DJ Spooky pravi: “Stavim, da bo 21. stoletje remiksalo idejo arhitekture v FTP-strežnik [...] Razmišljajte o ideji arhiva (isti koren kot beseda arhitektura), in razmišljajte o strukturi kot izmenjavi.”³⁹ Pri tem je pomembno, da številni današnji softverji “ne remiksajo le vsebine različnih medijev, ampak tudi njihove temeljne tehnike, delovne metode ter načine reprezentacije in izraza. Kinematografija, animacija, računalniška animacija, posebni učinki, grafično oblikovanje in tipografija so kot poenoteni stopili v skupno softversko okolje zato, da bi naredili novi metamedij”.⁴⁰ Za takšno vrsto remiksabilnosti je Manovich skoval izraz *globoka remiksabilnost* (“deep remixability”). Barb Dybward pa predlaga skovanko za neko drugo vrsto remiksa: “Mislim, da so trenutno najzanimivejši aspekt spleta 2.0 orodja, ki raziskujejo kontinuum med osebnim in družbenim ter orodja, ki imajo fleksibilnost in modularnost, ki omogočata *kolaborativno remiksabilnost* – transformativni proces, v katerem se lahko informacije in mediji, ki jih organiziramo, rekom-

³⁸ Prav tam, str. 236.

³⁹ Miller, 2008, 6.

⁴⁰ Prim. Manovich, 2007.

binirajo in sestavljajo tako, da ustvarijo nove oblike, koncepte, *mus-hap-e* in usluge.”⁴¹

Da bi Manovich pokazal razsežnost in razširjenost tega koncepta, navaja naslednje primere: oblikovalec modne hiše Dior John Galliano remiksa videz potepuha, jemensko tradicijo, vzhodnoevropske motive in druge izvire, ki jih zbira med svojimi dolgimi potovanji po vsem svetu (kolekcija iz leta 2004); DJ Spooky remiksa Griffithov film *Rojstvo naroda* (“*Birth of a Nation*”), ki ga preimenuje v *Preporod naroda* (“*Rebirth of a Nation*”); skupina BOOM BOOM SATELLITES iniciira tekmovanje v remiksu z namenom spojitve dveh kultur: “rafinirane tehnike AMV-entuziastov” in “umetnosti hitrega rezanja v VJ-kulturi” (2008); komentator zakona o avtorskih pravicah in spletni kulturi Lawrence Lessing je poimenoval svojo novo knjigo *Remix: Making Art and Commerce Thrive in the Hybrid Economy* (2008).⁴² Tem Manovichevim primerom lahko dodamo še naše: vplivni teoretik o novih medijih Lev Manovich je sam v svoji novi knjigi postavil tezo, da je remiks glavni operativni mehanizem ter glavna kulturna in estetska paradigma sodobne družbe (2008); Paul D. Miller alias DJ Spooky v svoji knjigi *Rhythm Science* (ki je končala na lestvici 10 najboljših knjig v letu 2004) izpostavlja “neomejeni remiks” kot ključno umetniško in politično taktiko našega časa⁴³ – in navsezadnje tudi na ta naš tekst lahko gledamo kot na remiks različnih teorij, citatov in knjig, ki so navedene na koncu v bibliografiji. Kot pravi Janez Strehovec, danes “miksanje, remiksanje, rekombiniranje in semplanje očitno niso le tehnični postopki, ki zadevajo delo didžejev in vidžejev, ampak se v sedanjosti nekonfliktno miksaajo tudi koncepti, stališča, pogledi, politični zasnutki, ideje”.⁴⁴

⁴¹ Nav. po: Manovich, 2008, 246.

⁴² Prav tam, 229–230. Za širši vpogled v koncept remiksa napotujemo na odlično spletno stran Eduarda Navasa, remixtheory.net.

⁴³ Nav. po: Manovich, 2008, 235.

V uvodniku julijske številke časopisa *Wired* iz leta 2005, ki je bila posvečena temi "Remix planet", lahko preberemo: "Od Ubila bom Billa do Gorillaz, od nakupovanja obutve Nike do računalniške igre *Pimp My Ride*, to je doba remiksa."⁴⁵ Prakse remiksa se torej danes razprostirajo onstran tehnologij in področij kulture in v prihodnosti lahko pričakujemo njihovo širitev tudi na fizično realnost: "Glede na trende nadaljnje vsesplošne kompjuterizacije in 'interneta reči', je neizogibno, da paradigma remiksa prav tako najde svojo pot v fizični prostor."⁴⁶ Skratka, remiks je danes vsepovsod, remiksabilno pa je vse: besede in reči, vsebine in operacije, misli in občutki. "Vse, kar je čvrsto, bo izpuhtelo v zrak," je govoril Marx.⁴⁷

"Kaj pride po remiksu?"

Postavlja se seveda vprašanje, v kakšni zvezi je paradigma remiksa s sedanjo kapitalistično matrico. Videli smo, da Manovich meni, da lahko s terminom remiks poimenujemo kulturno logiko globalnega kapitalizma. Vsi komentatorji Deleuza (vključno z njegovimi filozofskimi nasprotniki, kot sta Badiou ali Žižek) pa se brez razlike strinjajo glede neke Deleuzove trditve: kapitalistična deteritorializacija potrebuje neprestano reteritorializacijo. Remiks pa je operativni mehanizem *par excellence*, ki zadovoljuje obe potrebi: po eni strani deteritorializira reči in dekodira tokove, po drugi strani jih nenehno na novo kodira in reteritorializira.

Na to, da gresta kapitalizem in tehnologija z roko v roki, je pokazal že Marx, ko je zapisal, da namen kapitalistično uporabljane tehnologije ni v olajšanju človeškega dela, ampak v povečanju produkcije presežne vrednosti: "Tako kot vsak drug razvoj produktivne

⁴⁴ Strehovec, 2007, 22.

⁴⁵ Nav. po: Manovich, op. cit., 232.

⁴⁶ Prav tam, 231.

⁴⁷ Nav. po: Miller, 2008, 10.

sile dela ima mašinerija nalogo, da poceni blago in da skrajša tisti del delovnega dneva, ki ga potrebuje delavec zase, da bi se podaljšal drugi del njegovega delovnega dneva, ki ga daje kapitalistu zastonj. Mašinerija je sredstvo za produkcijo presežne vrednosti.”⁴⁸ Pa vendar to velja, kot na istem mestu pove Marx, le za “kapitalistično mašinerijo [moj poudarek]” oz. tehnologijo.⁴⁹ Mnenja smo, da sodobne softverske tehnologije, čeprav po eni strani utrjujejo kapitalistično matrico, po drugi strani omogočajo ustvarjanje čisto druge mreže, z drugačno strukturo, ki išče razpoke v obstoječem sistemu, in bežiščnice, ki omogočajo povsem nove in drugačne oblike subjektivacije. Fredric Jameson povzema bistvo Deleuzovega in Guattarijevega skupnega početja, ko pravi, da “nekako moramo povzdigniti naše misli do točke, na kateri je možno razumeti, da je kapitalizem istočasno najboljša in najslabša stvar, ki se je zgodila človeštvu”.⁵⁰ To, da je bil kapitalizem v nekem smislu nujno zlo, da bi proizvedli vse te tehnološke, družbene in želeče stroje, ki jih trenutno imamo na razpolago, je namreč tudi splošno stališče Deleuza in Guattarija, kar je med drugim privedlo Žižka do tega, da je prvega celo razglasil za “ideologa poznega kapitalizma”.⁵¹ Žižek gre v svoji knjigi o De-

⁴⁸ Marx, 1987, 339.

⁴⁹ Tako recimo Lewis Mumford opozarja, govoreč o delovnem “megastroju” egipčanskih faraonov, ki mu je uspelo zgraditi piramide – da “najstarodavnejši stroji niso vsebovali koncepcije prihranka dela: oni so bili naprave za izkoriščanje dela [...]. Namesto da osvobaja delovno silo, se je kraljevski megastroj ponašal z njenim zapiranjem in zaslužnjevanjem.” Mumford, 1986, 226.

⁵⁰ Jameson, 2001, 58.

⁵¹ Glej: Žižek, 2004, 184. Če bi hoteli biti ignorantni kot Žižek v tej knjigi, bi tukaj zelo lahko izpeljali komplementarno zabavno trditev: če je namreč prav Deleuze “ideolog poznega kapitalizma”, potem je lahko prav Žižek ideolog globalnega kapitalizma! Za to se nam ne bo treba spuščati v analizo Žižkovih posameznih idej, dovolj bo, če izpostavimo dejstvo, da se je rast Žižkovih akcij na globalnem znanstvenem trgu dogajala vzporedno z dokončno zmago kapitalizma po vsem svetu. Številni filmi, v katerih se pojavlja zadnje čase, in

leuzu tako daleč, da nas seznanj s tem, kako se sploh “nimamo kaj čuditi, da je Foucault, Deleuzov Drugi, praktical *fist-fucking*”⁵² in nas takoj potem vpraša, “ali ni *fist-fucking* resnični seksualni izum enaindvajsetega stoletja, prvi model postseksualnega erotizma in užitka [...] z roko, ki prevzema vlogo falusa, avtonomni parcialni objekt *par excellence*”⁵³. Ne vemo, ali je Foucault res praktical *fist-fucking*, še manj pa, ali je svojo ali tujo roko med tem prakticalanjem doživljal kot parcialni objekt *par excellence* oz. falus ali pa mu je mogoče uspelo ustvariti telo brez organov, v katerem ni bilo videti nobenih falusov več – ne dvomimo pa o tem, da Žižek te roke ne more videti drugače kot ogromno podobo lacanovskega falusa. Sama Deleuze in Guattari glede telesa brez organov pravita naslednje: “Sploh ne gre za vprašanje fragmentiranega, razstavljenega telesa, za organe brez telesa (OBT). Telo brez organov (TBO) je prav nasprotno. Ne obstajajo organi v smislu fragmentov v relaciji z izgubljeno enotnostjo niti ne obstaja vrnitev k nediferenciranemu v zabavnost njegovih predavanj, polnih referenc iz popkulture in navadnega življenja sodobnega potrošnika, prav tako govorijo v prid temu, da bi prav Žižek lahko bil ideolog globalnega kapitalizma. Neskončno število njegovih knjig in člankov bi mogoče koga lahko navedlo na drugačno trditev – da Žižek namreč ni ideolog sedanje kapitalistične matrice, ampak industrijskega kapitalizma, saj je na videz podoben kaki fordistični tovarni, ki izdaja knjige kot po tekočem traku; vendar število njegovih in tujih idej, ki jih vseskozi reciklira in remiksa iz knjige v knjigo, niti ni tako veliko – kar kaže prav na paradigmo remiksa ter intelektualno programiranje in trženje, značilno za sedanjo stopnjo kapitalistične organizacije. Če bi torej hoteli biti ignorantski kot Žižek, bi lahko za konec rekli še to, da o tem, da je prav Žižek ideolog globalnega kapitalizma, mogoče najbolje priča dejstvo, da se dokumentarni film o njem imenuje: *Žižek!* – naziv namreč neskončno spominja na nekakšno tržno znamko, enako kot bi rekli *Panten!*, *Nike!* ali *Always!*; težko pa si predstavljam film, ki bi se imenoval recimo *Deleuze!*, ali – bog ne daj – *Husserl!* ali *Maurice Merleau-Ponty!*

⁵² Prav tam.

⁵³ Prim. prav tam.

relaciji z diferencibilno totaliteto. Obstaja samo distribucija intenzitetnih principov organov, z njihovimi pozitivnimi nedoločeni členi, znotraj kolektivitete ali mnogoterosti, v notranjosti montaže in zaradi strojnih zvez, ki obratujejo na nekem TBO.”⁵⁴ Še smešnejša je Žižkova trditev, da so sodobne igrače, kot sta avto ali letalo, ki se lahko spremenijo v človeka ali robota (*Transformers* ali *Animorph*) – popolnoma deleuzovske! Predstavljale naj bi namreč Deleuzovo in Guattarijevo “postajanje stroj”, “postajanje žival”. Dovolj je, da se spomnimo, da se poglavje iz *Tisoč platojev*, na katero se nanaša ta Žižkova opazka, imenuje: “Postajanje intenziven, postajanje žival, postajanje neopazen ...” Žižek ne pove, kako naj bi se igrače *transformers* ujemale s postajanjem intenziven ali postajanjem neopazen. Tega ne pove namenoma, ker se na nikakršen način ne ujemajo! “Želeči stroji nimajo nikakršne veze z napravami ali malimi izumi na Lapinovem razpisu in fantazmami oz. imajo, ampak v nasprotnem smislu, zaradi tega, ker so gedžeti, izumi in fantazme reziduumi želečih strojev, podrejeni specifičnim zakonom zunanjega trga kapitala ali notranjega trga psihoanalize.”⁵⁵ Deleuze in Guattari, govoreč o “*postajanju drugi*”, v bistvu ves čas govorita o telesu brez organov; telo brez organov pa – spomnimo se – ni nikakršna podoba, ampak je telo brez podobe, je le intenziteta materije = 0. Prav tako se nikoli nista naveličala govoriti, da ni pomembno, kakšen je stroj, ampak kako funkcionira; že na samem začetku *Anti-Ojdipa* lahko preberemo: “Ono funkcionira povsod, zdaj neprestano, zdaj prekinjeno. Ono diha, ono se razvema, ono je. Ono serje, ono fuka. Kakšna napaka je reči Ono. Povsod so to stroji, nikakor ne v metaforičnem pomenu: stroji strojev, z njihovimi stiki, povezavami. Stroj organ je priključen na stroj vir: prvi oddaja tok, ki ga drugi preseka. Prsi so stroj, ki proizvajajo mleko, in usta so z njimi pove-

⁵⁴ Deleuze, Guattari, 2004, 164-165.

⁵⁵ Deleuze, Guattari, 1990b, 315.

zana.”⁵⁶ Problem torej ni v podobi stroja, ampak v načinu oz. režimu njegovega delovanja: “Prava razlika med tehničnimi družbenimi stroji in želečimi stroji očitno ni v velikosti, celo ne v namenu, ampak v režimu, ki odloča o velikosti in namenu. *To so isti stroji, ampak to ni isti režim.* To sploh ne pomeni, da je aktualnemu režimu, ki tehnologijo in ekonomijo podreja politiki tlačenja, treba zoperstaviti režim, ki bi predpostavljal, da je tehnologija osvobodjena in osvobajajoča. Tehnologija predpostavlja družbene stroje in želeče stroje, druge v drugih, sama na sebi pa nima nikakršne moči, da odloči, kdo bo instanca, ki mašinizira – želja ali tlačenje želje.”⁵⁷

Poglaviti problem ni v tem, kakšne tehnološke igrače oz. kakšno tehnologijo imamo, ampak v režimu, ki določa, kako in zakaj jih/jo uporabljamo. Drugače povedano, problem ni v paradigmi remiksa kot taki, ampak v režimu, ki določa, kaj se lahko remiksa in kaj ne ter kako. Trenutno stanje stvari ni prav optimistično, saj je sedanja kapitalistična matrica zelo uspešna v krpanju lukenj in ponovni reteritorializaciji najsmelejših deteritorializacij in pobegov. Pa vendar ta možnost obstaja in je omogočena prav s tehnologijo, ki jo je proizvedel kapitalizem. Problem je seveda v tem, kako osvoboditi obstoječo ali prihodnjo tehnologijo diktature kapitala in jo obrniti proti njemu oz. odvrniti od njega. Verjamemo, da na današnji stopnji razvoja kapitalizma to ni več možno storiti od zunaj, z neko novo revolucijo, ampak le od znotraj.

Vprašanje, ki nas tukaj posebej zanima in okoli katerega ves čas krožimo kot maček okoli vrele kaše, se seveda glasi, ali lahko danes v družbi, v kateri se praktično vse remiksa, govorimo tudi o subjektu kot o nečem, kar postaja remiksabilno.

V telefonskem pogovoru z Levom Manovichem nismo zamudili priložnost, da ga povprašamo glede problematike, ki nas tukaj za-

⁵⁶ Deleuze, Guattari, 1990a, 5.

⁵⁷ Deleuze, Guattari, 1990b, 326.

nima. Na naše vprašanje, ali danes, ko vse postaja remiksabilno, lahko razmišljamo tudi o subjektu s paradigmo remiksa, je odgovoril takole: "Nekaj podobnega se seveda dogaja tudi na osebni ravni. Ne remiksamo enostavno le estetike in kulture, ampak v nekem smislu tudi zavesti. Ljudje imajo lahko recimo življenjepise, ki so vzeti iz več držav; vse države se spreminjajo zelo hitro. V nekaterih državah v razvoju, v vzhodni Evropi ali Aziji, so spremembe precej velike, tako da je sama zavest ljudi v nekem smislu postala remiksana zavest. Mislim, da učinek razširjene estetike remiksa korespondira s tem, kako ljudje doživljajo sami sebe, kako se ljudje počutijo v sodobnem svetu."⁵⁸ Jasno je torej, da remiks danes ni enostavno le operativni mehanizem posameznih tehnologij, ampak paradigma v samem jedru kulturnega in družbenega - in tudi mentalnega polja. Tehnologije namreč ne moremo ločiti ne od družbe ne od subjekta: "tehnologija je družbena, preden postane tehnična", "tehnika je na neki način znotraj socialnega in mentalnega".⁵⁹ V skladu s takšnim razumevanjem tehnologije, ki je neločljiva tako od družbe kot od subjekta, lahko izpeljemo naslednjo poanto: eksplozivna širitev dispozitiva remiksa oz. (tehniške) paradigme remiksa po vsem družbenem polju je pogojena in omogočena s hkratnim obstojem te paradigme v mentalnem polju, tj. v samem subjektu.

Rečeno z Deleuzom, sile v človeku stopajo v razmerje s silami tehnologije, s softverskimi silami remiksa, ki so sile neomejeno končnega. Manovich opozarja: "[M]edtem ko je predsoftverska modularnost vodila do repetitije in redukcije, postsoftverska modularnost lahko proizvede neskončno raznolikost [...]. Kaj torej lahko vidimo, če pogledamo na sedanost iz njene logično možne prihodnosti 'totalne remiksabilnosti' in univerzalne modularnosti?"⁶⁰ Lahko vi-

⁵⁸ Anđelković, 2008.

⁵⁹ Prim. Deleuze, 1989, 45.

⁶⁰ Manovich, 2008, 250-251.

dimo nastajanje nove forme, ki ne bo ne človeška ne tehnološka, ampak nekakšna hibridna forma, danes še nepredstavljeni remiks med tehno in bio: “To je človek, pristojen tudi za skale ali za neorgansko (tisto, kjer vlada silicij). To je človek, pristojen za bit govora (za ‘to brezoblično nemo področje brez pomena, v katerem se lahko govor osvobodi’ celo tistega, kar ima povedati). Kot je govoril Foucault, je nadčlovek precej manj kot izginotje živih ljudi in hkrati mnogo več kot sprememba nekega pojma: je napoved nove forme, ne boga ne človeka, za katero lahko le upamo, da ne bo slabša od obeh predhodnih.”⁶¹

Softver prevzema oblast

V času, ko veliko število ljudi v razvitem delu sveta velik del svojega vsakdanjika namenja aktivnostim ob računalniku ali mobilniku, nikakor ne moremo govoriti o odtujenosti človeka in tehnologije, o kateri je govoril Marx. Socialna omrežja, SMS, različne aplikacije spletne pošte, ukaza “posreduj” in “preusmeri”, poštni sezname (*mailing lists*), spletne povezave, blogi, RSS, enakovredna (*peer-to-peer*) omrežja, Firewire, Bluetooth, so le nekatera izmed orodij, ki jih navaja Manovich, “ki stimulirajo ljudi, da vlečejo informacije iz najrazličnejših virov v svoj lastni prostor, da jih remiksajo in naredijo dostopne za druge”.⁶² Govorimo torej o neskončni vrsti sodobnih komunikacijskih orodij, ki vsa omogočajo in stimulirajo postopek remiksa. Paradigma remiksa pri tem pa ne ostaja značilna le za inštrumentalni operativni mehanizem softvera, prek katerega ta komunikacija poteka, ampak remiks kot dispozitiv vpliva na to, kako kot subjekti doživljamo in dojemamo svet okoli sebe. Tako deskanje po internetu lahko razumemo kot obliko remiksa, ki jo ne izvaja le računalniški softver (prek spletnih stani, RSS, povezav itn.), ampak tudi sam uporabnik, ki spletnih

⁶¹ Deleuze, 1989, 136-137.

⁶² Prim. Manovich, 2008, 246.

strani nikakor ne bere linearno (saj to v bistvu nikoli ni bilo možno, ker so spletne strani nekakšni nikoli dokončani remiksi različnih vsebin in tehnologij, ki so narejene tako, da se lahko remiksajo naprej), temveč skače z besedila na besedilo, z besedila na video, z videa na radijsko postajo, z radijske postaje na spletno socialno omrežje oz. vse to dela hkrati – s čimer se njegova percepcija in s tem tudi njegova zavest vsekakor premika v smeri omenjene paradigme. Poleg tega lahko paradigmo remiksa danes apliciramo tudi na subjektovo doživljanje in obvladovanje fizične realnosti, ki je v mnogočem postala virtualno dirigirana; tako je npr. posameznik, ki se giblje po mestu, v nekem smislu prisiljen remiksati številne informacije, ki prihajajo tako iz fizične kot tudi iz virtualne realnosti – ki pa ni več neko podatkovno čisto drugo, ampak je realna v (deleuzovskem) dobesednem smislu, s čimer korigira svoje gibanje. “Srečujemo se z gibanjem, ki je na neki način kibernetško, kajti uporabnik kot gibalec upošteva (povratne in druge) informacije, ki jih med gibanjem sprejema od mobilnih naprav. Je dejansko krmar v tem smislu, da vsak trenutek smer poti/vožnje korigira glede na impulze iz okolja (valovi in protiveter so v njegovem primeru v živo prejete informacije različnih izvorov).”⁶³ Drugače povedano, današnji pešec ali voznik med svojim prečkanjem mesta sprejema različne informacije tako iz fizičnega kot iz virtualnega okolja, remiksa jih in skladno s tem korigira nadaljevanje svoje poti, prihajajoč tako od točke A ne do točke B, kot je prvotno načrtoval, ampak do točke C, D ali XY.

Nobena tehnologija, ko jo razumevamo prek koncepta dispoziativa, ni nekaj nevtralnega. To seveda zlasti velja za softver, ki približuje pojem tehnologije, razumljen v smislu medčloveških odnosov in načinov posredovanja odnosov, in pojem tehnike, ki označuje sredstva, prek katerih ti odnosi potekajo; kar zahteva tudi “novo artikulacijo, recimo s Heideggerjevimi besedami, vprašanja o teh-

⁶³ Prim. Strehovec, 2007, 196.

niki”.⁶⁴ Programska oprema namreč s paradigama remiksa in vmesnika diktira naš način gledanja in percipiranja ter profilira naš način mišljenja. S programsko opremo se na ta način ne približujeta samo tehniško in tehnološko, ampak se hkrati zblížujeta tudi tehno in bio, tehnologija in subjekt. Po eni strani lahko rečemo, da tehnologija s paradigmo vmesnika dobiva nekatere “človeške” lastnosti: “Vmesnik ni enostavno odslikovalec tehnologije/sveta, ampak naprava, ki ve, pozna in interpretira. Tisto, kar zna in pozna, je sam jezik, ki ga dekodira in interpretira tako, da ga posameznik razume. Svet skozi tehnologijo je namreč svet, ki ni več dostopen samo človeški zaznavi, ampak obsega področja, ki jih lahko percipirajo predvsem in samo stroji za gledanje, poslušanje (in dotikanje), in njihova opažanja so pogosto v oblikah, namenjenih strojnemu dekodiranju, branju in interpretiranju.”⁶⁵ Po drugi strani pa subjekt danes lahko razumemo prav s paradigmo vmesnika: “zavest (zavedanje) ni stvar notranjosti, temveč ‘vmesnika’, površinskega stika med notranjostjo in zunanostjo. To zapleteno razmerje med Notranjostjo in Zunanostjo dejansko spodkoplje standardno pojmovanje kartezijskega subjekta kot *res cognitae* (misleče substance): otipljivo postane dejstvo, da subjekt ravno NI substanca.”⁶⁶ Podobno poanto kot Žižek izpostavi tudi Amelia Jones, govoreč o “posthumanih, razpršenih subjektih” v okviru sodobnih (tehno)umetniških praks: “visokotehnološki mediji delujejo prek vmesnikov, ki zaznamujejo umetniško delo kot mesto izmenjave med subjekti, kot mesto združevanja subjektov in objektov, kot lokus, kjer se *intersubjektiviteta* obrne v to, kar je Vivian Sobchak poimenovala *interobjektiviteta* – in obratno”.⁶⁷ Nekako tako torej, kot se glasi naslov zadnje Manovicheve knjige: *Softver prevzema oblast*.

⁶⁴ Prim. prav tam, 214.

⁶⁵ Prav tam, 222.

⁶⁶ Žižek, 2005, 126–127.

⁶⁷ Jones, 2002, 283.

Bibliografija

- ANĐELKOVIĆ, B. (2007): "Tehno in subjekt", *Monitor ISH*, let. 9, št. 2, 61-74.
- ANĐELKOVIĆ, B. (2008): *Pogovorni večerni termin z Levom Manovichem* (avdio), enourni telefonski intervju, ki sem ga opravil 2. septembra 2008 in je bil predvajan na Radiu Študent 2. oktobra 2008, <http://www.radiostudent.si/article.php?sid=16456>. Dostopno 21. maja 2009.
- ARTAUD, A (2010): *Pesme-teksti*, Mladinska knjiga, Ljubljana.
- BADIOU, A. (2000a): *Deleuze: The Clamor of Being*, The University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis/London.
- BADIOU, A. (2000b): "Zgodovino sveta prelomiti na dvoje?", *Filozofski vestnik* 3/2000.
- DELEUZE, G. (1989): *Fuko*, Izdavačka knjižarnica Zorana Stojanovića, Sremski Karlovci.
- DELEUZE, G. (2007): "Kaj je dispozitiv?", *Problemi*, št. 8-9, Ljubljana.
- DELEUZE, G. (1999): *Niče i filozofija*, Plato, Beograd.
- DELEUZE, G. (2009): *Guba*, Študentska založba, Ljubljana.
- DELEUZE, G., GUATTARI, F. (1990a): *Anti-Edip. Kapitalizam i šizofrenija 1*, Izdavačka knjižarnica Zorana Stojanovića, Sremski Karlovci.
- DELEUZE, G., GUATTARI, F. (1990b): "Zaključni program za želeće mašine"; dodatek v: *Anti-Edip. Kapitalizam i šizofrenija 1*, Izdavačka knjižarnica Zorana Stojanovića, Sremski Karlovci. Tekst je bil prvič objavljen v časopisu *Minuit* 2. januarja 1973.
- DELEUZE, G., GUATTARI, F. (2004): *A Thousand Plateaus, Capitalism and Schizophrenia 2*, Continuum, London/New York, 2004.
- FOUCAULT, M. (2001): *Arheologija vednosti*, *Studia humanitatis*, Ljubljana.
- FOUCAULT, M. (2007): *Življenje in prakse svobode*, Založba ZRC in Filozofski inštitut ZRC SAZU, Ljubljana.

- FOUCAULT, M. (2008): *Vednost-oblast-subjekt*, Krtina, Ljubljana.
- JONES, A. (2002): *Body art: uprizarjanje subjekta*, Maska in Študentska založba, Ljubljana.
- HEIDEGGER, M. (2003): "Vprašanje po tehniki", v: Heidegger, M., *Predavanja in sestavki*, Slovenska matica, Ljubljana.
- JAMESON, F. (2001): *Postmodernizem*, Društvo za teoretsko psihoanalizo, zbirka Analecta, Ljubljana.
- KLOSSOWSKI (1997): *Nietzsche and the vicious circle*, Athlone Press, London.
- LEPECKI, A. (2009): *Izčrpavajoči ples: uprizarjanje in politika giba*, Mestno gledališče ljubljansko, Ljubljana.
- MANOVICH, L. (2007): "After Effects of Velvet Revolution. PART 2", <http://www.manovich.net/DOCS/>. Dostopno 15. februar. 2010.
- MANOVICH, L. (2008): *Software takes command* (Draft version, 20. 11. 2008), <http://lab.softwarestudies.com/2008/11/softbook.html>. Dostopno 16. 12. 2008.
- MARX, K. (1987): *Kapital. Kritika politične ekonomije. I. knjiga*, druga izdaja, Cankarjeva založba, Ljubljana.
- MILLER, P. D., aka DJ Spooky that Subliminal Kid (2008): "In Through the Out Door: Sampling and the Creative Act", v: Miller, P. D., aka DJ Spooky that Subliminal Kid, ur., *Sound Unbound, Sampling Digital Music and Culture*, MIT Press, Cambridge/London.
- MUMFORD, L. (1986): *Mit o mašini 1: Tehnika i razvoj čoveka*, Grafički zavod Hrvatske, Zagreb.
- NIETZSCHE, F. (1991): *Onstran dobrega in zlega. H genealogiji morale*, Slovenska matica, Ljubljana.
- NIETZSCHE, F. (1991b): *Volja do moči*, Slovenska matica, Ljubljana.
- NIETZSCHE, F. (1991b): *Tako je govoril Zaratustra*, Slovenska matica, Ljubljana.
- PELKO, S. (2004): "Analyser Deleuzement", v: Gilles Deleuze, *Podoba-gibanje*, Studia humanitatis, Ljubljana.

REMIXTHEORY.NET

SPINOZA, B. de (1963): *Etika*, Slovenska matica, Ljubljana.

STREHOVEC, J. (2007): *Besedilo in novi mediji*, Literarno-umetniško društvo Literatura, Ljubljana.

ŽIŽEK, S. (1997): *Kuga fantazem*, Društvo za teoretsko psihoanalizo, Ljubljana.

ŽIŽEK, S. (2004): *Organs without bodies: Deleuze and consequences*, Routledge, New York/London.

ŽIŽEK, S. (2005): *Kako biti nihče*, Društvo za teoretsko psihoanalizo, Ljubljana.

FOTOBANKE

MAJA GUTMAN¹

Fotobanke – arhitekti medijskih reprezentacij “realnosti”

Izvleček: Moderna predstava o svetu je vizualna predstava. Živimo v dobi popkulture, kjer med vsemi teksti najbolj dominira podoba (*image*). Danes ima skoraj vsak dogodek, pojem, odnos ali stanje svojo vizualno podobo. Ljubezen, spolnost, kariera, partnerstvo, prosti čas imajo podobe, po večini idealizirane, ki jih uporabljajo mediji, ko komunicirajo z bralci. Živimo v dobi potrošništva podob. Percipiramo jih vsak dan, najsi gre za cestne plakate, letake, spletne strani, tudi za revije in časopise (še posebej trendovske revije za življenjski slog). Kako so fotografije umeščene v tekst, kaj sporočajo, kako na nas vplivajo in zakaj gradijo našo predstavo o svetu? Zdi se, da fotografijo le vidimo, vendar jo dejansko konzumiramo; ne razmišljamo pa, kako na nas deluje. V naši razpravi se bomo nekoliko distancirali od širšega pojma podobe in se omejili na t. i. fotobanke. To so obsežne zbirke fotografij, ki predvsem po oglaševanju, tisku in spletu ponujajo vizualno predstavo o svetu, s čimer diktirajo podobo medijev in oblikujejo predstave bralcev.

Ključne besede: fotobanke, vizualno, strukturalizem, retorika fotografije, spektakel, estetika, fabrikacija, medijske reprezentacije.

UDK: 77.026:165.75

Stock Photography – Building Media Representations of “Reality”

Abstract: The contemporary perception of the world is visual. We live in an age of popular culture, where the image dominates

¹ Maja Gutman je svetovalka na agenciji Pristop in doktorandka na *Institutum Studiorum Humanitatis*, Fakulteti za podiplomski humanistični študij v Ljubljani, smer medijski študiji. E-naslov: gutman.maja@gmail.com.

all other content and where almost every event, concept, relationship or state has its own visual image. Love, sexual relations, career, partnership, free time – all have images, mostly idealised ones, which are used by the media in communication with their public. We live in an age of image consumerism. These images are perceived on a daily basis, be it on billboards, pamphlets, internet pages, or in magazines and newspapers (especially lifestyle magazines). How are photographs inserted into the text, what is their message, how do they influence us and why do they build our perception of the world? We believe that we only see a photograph, when we are in fact consuming it, never asking ourselves about its impact on us. The present paper distances itself from the broader concept of the image, focusing instead on the so-called ‘stock photography’. The latter consists of extensive photograph collections, which offer visual representations of the world through advertising, the press and the internet, thus dictating the image adopted by the media and shaping the readers’ perceptions.

Key words: stock photography, visuality, structuralism, photography rhetoric, spectacle, aesthetics, fabrication, media representations



Iz reprezentacije v produkt

“Spektakel je *kapital*, ki se akumulira do takšne mere, da postane podoba.”²

Podoba (*image*) je zlasti v času rojstva fotografije pomenila najnatančnejšo reprezentacijo realnosti. Ravno ta značilnost in njena

² Debord, 1999, 39.

relativno enostavna reprodukcija je slikarstvo postavila na stranski tir in fotografija je s svojo dialektiko tlakovala novo pot. Danes je natančnost reprezentacije realnosti zgolj ena izmed značilnosti fotografije, pravzaprav ne preveč izpostavljena. Fotografija se je v manj kot 200 letih svojega obstoja izvila iz reprezentacije resničnosti in začela oblikovati svojo lastno realnost, ki je fabricirana; je konstrukt ideala, estetike, pogleda, ideologij, razmerij moči. Njena medbesedilnost obsega teoretska polja, v katera posegajo semiotika, psihoanaliza, strukturalizem, feminizem, kvirovske teorije. Iz vsega tega lahko hitro sklepamo, da je v današnji družbi slikovna pismenost pravzaprav nujna.

V svojem delu *Media Analysis Techniques* Arthur Asa Berger definira podobo (*image*) kot “zbirko znakov in simbolov – ki jih najdemo v fotografiji, v filmskem kadru, v filmskem ali televizijskem posnetku, tiskanem oglasu, ali navsezadnje kjerkoli. Podoba ima lahko mentalno ali fizično predstavo. Podobe imajo na ljudi lahko močne učinke, obstajajo pa nekatere podobe, ki so zgodovinskega pomena.”³ Rogoff, ki se ukvarja z vse bolj pojavnim poljem znotraj medijskih študij, vizualno kulturo, umešča podobe še nekoliko širše: “Podobe vsebujejo informacije, omogočajo užitek (*pleasure*) ali neugodje (*displeasure*), vplivajo na stil, določajo potrošnjo in posredujejo pri poziciji moči. Koga vidimo in koga ne; to je privilegij znotraj režima spektakla; kateri zgodovinski vidiki zares krožijo v obliki vizualnih reprezentacij in kateri ne; čigave in kakšne fantazije hranijo vizualne podobe?”⁴

Baudrillard vidi v podobah čisto odsotnost realnosti, ko pravi: “Ne gre več za vprašanje imitacije ali duplikacije, niti parodije”⁵, torej sploh ne gre za to, da bi dvomili o eksistenci same simulacije ali o

³ Berger, 2005, 223.

⁴ Rogoff, 1998, 15.

⁵ Baudrillard, 1994, 3.

njenem kvaziposnemanju realnosti. Sukcesivne faze podobe (v našem primeru fotobanke) so po Baudrillardu odsev profane realnosti, maskiranje in denaturaliziranje profane realnosti, maskiranje in *odsotnost* profane realnosti ter ugotovitev, da podoba nima nikakršne povezave s katero koli realnostjo – je sama svoj čisti simulaker.⁶

Kako pa je z doživljanjem podobe, fotografije? Na tem mestu si bomo nekoliko vehementno izposodili teorijo aparata francoskega filmskega teoretika Christiana Metza, saj predpostavljamo, da nekatere predpostavke iz njegove filmske teorije, natančnejše psihoanalitičnega pristopa do filma, veljajo tudi pri branju fotografije. Po Metz u gledalec doživlja strast pri sami percepciji, kar poimenuje kot skopofilijo, znano kot ugodje gledanja. Tu se Metz obrača na Freuda, ki ugotavlja, da vizualni vtisi najintenzivneje vzburijo libido. Tudi Brian L. Ott in Robert L. Mack v svojem delu *Critical media studies - An Introduction* pravita, da vizualno neposredno spodbuja željo: “Enostavno osredotočanje naše pozornosti na določeno stvar, ki jo konzumiramo vizualno, jo torej vežemo s pogledom, aktivira v nas nezavedno željo in užitke.”⁷ Mirzoeff poišče razloge za vizualno okupacijo v sami biološki značilnosti človekovega vidnega zaznavanja, saj ima po zadnjih ocenah “mrežnica 100 milijonov živčnih celic, ki so sposobne v eni sekundi obdelati 10 milijard operacij.”⁸

Vizualno je torej neposredno; njegovo sporočilo je konzumirano z enim samim pogledom, je hitro, jasno, deluje na zavedni in nezavedni ravni in je predvsem učinkovito. Vizualno je konstrukt, ki je že zgrajen, medtem ko branje teksta zahteva lastno domišljijo, gradnje lastnega sveta na podlagi bolj ali manj podrobnega opisa. Poskušali bi se izogniti standardni opazki, da je branje teksta (branje

⁶ Baudrillard, 1994, 6.

⁷ Ott, L., in Mack, L., 2010, 161.

⁸ Mirzoeff, 1998, 5.

knjige) aktivno branje in branje podob (gledanje filma) pasivno branje, čeprav na tem mestu lahko trdimo, da je percepcija vizualnega bistveno bolj vezana na aktiviranje želje po konkretnem (po konkretni izkušnji, konkretnem produktu, konkretni osebi), medtem ko recimo branje knjige spodbudi delovanje domišljije, ki ne išče zadovoljitve v materialnih stvareh, temveč se veže na lik v dani situaciji, njegov značaj ipd. Kaj lahko sklepamo iz te ugotovitve? Vizualno sproži intenzivnejše doživljanje prej kakor branje klasičnega teksta, ali drugače – zdi se, da so fotografije spektakularnejše od črk.

“V družbi spektakla so posamezniki fascinirani nad spektaklom znotraj obstoja množične potrošnje, ki jih navdihuje do te mere, da si pridobijo še več produktov. Vzpon podobe v dominantni kulturi je povzročil, da je spektakel postal *kapital* do te mere kopičenja, da je postal podoba.”⁹ Iz Debordovega opazovanja torej lahko sklepamo, da smo danes vajeni najprej kupiti podobo in šele nato *njen* produkt (podoba je torej na neki način produkt). Kupujemo predvsem z očmi. Prizor v filmu *Prosti pad* (*Falling Down*, 1993) ponuja lep primer klasičnega kupovanja fotografije na osnovi podobe. William ‘D-Fens’ Foster (Michael Douglas) vstopi v restavracijo s hitro prehrano, da bi si naročil zajtrk. Pri pregledu (ne branju) menija se mu pogled ustavi na fotografiji dvojnega sočnega *Whammy burgerja* s sirom. Ko dobi naročeno, ga udari realnost. Hamburger je bistveno manjši kot njegova reprezentacija na fotografiji (torej ne gre za reprezentacijo), počuti se ogoljufanega. Hamburger je realen, William pa razočaran, zato reče osebjem in gostom: “Vidite, o tem vam govorim. Obrni se. Vidiš fotografijo, veš kaj mislim? Okrogel je, sočen (*op. avt. hamburger*), debel je 7 centimetrov in pol. Zdaj ... (*odvije dejanski hamburger*) pogledajte si to nesrečno stisnjeno stvar! Mi lahko nekdo pove, kaj je narobe s to *sliko*?”¹⁰ William je namreč

⁹ Debord, 2006, 32.

¹⁰ Spletni naslov: <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=hM8qT9Xop5k>.

kupil podobo in plačal produkt. Njegova percepcija hamburgerja ni bila lažna – bila je zgrajena na podlagi fotografije, ki mu je predstavljala hamburger. Resonanca te podobe v realnosti pa je bila lažna. William se je kot vsi potrošniki ukvarjal s podobo hamburgerja in ne s samim, dejanskim hamburgerjem. Kako torej razumeti podobe? Ali če se navežemo neposredno na našo tematiko: kakšna je razlika med Williamovo izkušnjo in primerom fotobank? Fotobanke so simulakri, so kopije brez originala, “maskirajo odsotnost osnovne resničnosti,”¹¹ medtem ko ima Williamov hamburger s fotografije še vedno original (kakršen koli v realnosti že je). Zaradi tega je poznavanje vizualnega pomembno. Teoretik vizualne kulture Mirzoeff opozarja na resnost vizualnega, ko pravi: “Vizualna kultura je bila videna kot odklon od resnega proučevanja tekstov in zgodovine. Danes pa je center kulturne in zgodovinske spremembe /.../. Vizualna kultura ni le del vašega vsakodnevnega življenja, ampak je vaše vsakodnevno življenje.”¹²

Mimo fabrikacije le še s pomočjo intuicije

Leta 2003 je ameriška pevka Jewel, trikratna dobitnica gremija, posnela videospot¹³ za svoj singel *Intuition*, v katerem se, vsaj navidezno, posmehuje kultu zvezdnitva. Toda skozi poučno zasnovano režijo in montažo spota je ameriška pevka le želela prikazati produkcijo glamurja. Video je montiran iz amaterskih posnetkov, ki so oropani intenzivnih, svetlečih barv (in se posledično navezujejo na večno sporno kakovost domačih videov), ki se v nekaterih pozicijah znotraj sekvence s pomočjo dodatnih efektov spremenijo v visoko-

¹¹ Mirzoeff, 1998, 28.

¹² Mirzoeff, 1998, 3.

¹³ Video je režiral Marc Klasfeld, ki je režiral preko 200 glasbenih videov, sicer pa je poznan tudi kot scenarist in režiser visokoprodukcijskih tv-oglasov za gigante, kot so Nike, NFL, NBA, Motorola, Reebok, Cartoon Network, Hummer.

produkcijsko in zato veliko bolj gledljivo sliko, na kateri Jewel ni več kot dekle iz soseske, temveč dobi vse attribute popikone. Rečeno drugače, Jewel nam v svojem videu pokaže razliko med amaterskim posnetkom in profesionalno produkcijo, nam pa video dejansko pove nekaj več: da je fabrikacija realnosti tisto, kar dela popkulturo tako všečno, in da je branje amaterskih posnetkov povsem drugačno (vsakdanje, nezanimivo) kot branje vrhunskih montaž (sproža željo po zvezdništvu, produktih, po lepem), ki ponujajo drugačno sliko sveta – bolj estetsko, zapeljivejšo, predvsem pa bistveno privlačnejšo. V tem primeru produkcija deluje kot tovarna sanj, kjer je s posebnimi učinki pričarano vzdušje imaginarnega, sanjskega, lepšega. S primerno obdelavo fotografij in tekstov mediji pravzaprav *ustvarijo* vzdušje – s procesom branja bralec razvija svoj imaginarni svet, svet fantazij, kamor vstopa predvsem s pomočjo estetsko obdelanih tematik, ki sprožajo željo. V svojem besedilu zato Jewel opisuje postmoderno zmedo, ki nastaja pri pojmovanju vrednot, in predlaga, da sledimo intuiciji.

Video, ki smo ga izbrali, se navezuje na našo razpravo o medijskih prezentacijah, natančneje o fotografijah, ki predstavljajo bralcu sodobno sliko o svetu. Zgornji primer je povezan z zvezdništvom, s šovom, ki že sam po sebi kreira v bralcu realnost, ki sicer obstaja, vendar zunaj njegovega sveta. Lahko pa jo *vidi*. Njegove (navsezadnje naše) predstave so osnovane na medijski produkciji podob (*images*); te gradijo drugo realnost – gradijo *spektakel*.



SLIKA 1: JEWEL, POSNETA Z AMATERSKO KAMERO, TIK PREDEN SE ODŽEJA.
VIR: [HTTP://WWW.YOUTUBE.COM/WATCH?V=8lH1EWCECO&OB=AV2E](http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8lH1EWCECO&OB=AV2E).



SLIKA 2: JEWEL SREDI PITJA OSVEŽILNE PIJAČE. SLIKA POSTANE
VISOKORESOLUCIJSKA, OSVETLITEV INTENZIVNEJŠA IN BARVE TER KONTRASTI
IZRAZITEJŠI, KAR DELUJE NA BRALCA BISTVENO PREPRIČLJIVEJE IN SUGESTIVNEJE.

Čeprav se bomo le delno dotaknili percepcije fotografije z vidika bralca, moramo na tem mestu vseeno opozoriti na pomembno razliko, ki je opazna ob primerjavi zgoraj prikazanih fotografij. Razlika, ki nastaja med branjem prve in druge, je namreč razlika v sami predstavi, ki jo fotografiji ponujata, pa čeprav je dekle isto

in okolje, v katerem je bila posneta druga fotografija, identično prvemu. Branje prve fotografije je lahko reportažno, posnetek je klasičen primerek doma narejenega videa, ki je običajno namenjen družinski uporabi. Jewel je na njem videti kot vsako drugo dekle. Druga slika ima iste označevalce (Jewel, osvežilni napitek, park), a je označenec povsem drugačen. Pomen druge fotografije postane *sugeriran*. Pitje osvežilne pijače nenadoma ni več osnovna fiziološka potreba, temveč *kultno dejanje*, Jewel pa postane osrednja protagonistka, nabita s seksualno energijo, ki jo lahko poteši le tako, da popije izbrano pijačo. Sugerirani pomen druge fotografije je rezultat vrhunske tehnike (svetlobe, barv, montaže, kadriranja). Posledično sproža tudi povsem druge občutke – intenzivnejše, estetske, prebudi se želja. Izkušnja gledanja postane del *užitka*.

Foto banke – arhitekti medijskih reprezentacij “realnosti”

Videospot glasbenice Jewel se navezuje tudi na funkcijo same fotografije, ki ima – zlasti v tiskanih medijih – pomembno mesto, saj fotografija običajno nosi krovno sporočilo besedila. Fotografije v trendovskih tiskanih medijih za življenjski slog zavzemajo poglobilni del komunikacije z bralcem. Zanimivo je to, da njihovo komuniciranje postaja centralno tudi, kadar fotografija ni poglobilni del poročanja, kot je recimo reportaža. Vse bolj je namreč opaziti trend uporabe fotografij iz fotobank. Uredništva jih uporabljajo pri splošnih tematikah, ki ne potrebujejo konkretne oz. eksplicitne vizualne podlage, ko se torej pojavi potreba po fotografijah, ki delujejo ilustrativno, asociativno. Te fotografije vizualizirajo predvsem teme o spolnosti, zdravju, športu, karieri. Kje je vir teh podob, zakaj njihova produkcija omogoča tako razširjeno rabo in kakšna je njihova retorika? Kako te vizualne simulacije, ki po večini predstavljajo svet okoli nas, delujejo na našo realnost in zakaj gradijo, spreminjajo in

idealizirajo naše predstave o družbenih pojavih? Vse to bomo poskušali pojasniti na podlagi analize fotografij fotobanke *Thinkstockphotos*.

Fotografije iz fotobank (prevod v grobem pomeni "fotografije na zalogo") bomo v našem tekstu prevajali kot foto banke, v točno določenih primerih pa kot *stock* fotografije. Gre za obsežno zbirko fotografij, ki so primerne za uporabo v medijih in oglaševanju. Z razvojem spleta sta njegovi uporabnost in uporaba narasli, saj je odkup pravic za uporabo neprimerno nižji od domače produkcije medija, ki si običajno z vse nižjimi uredniškimi proračuni ne more privoščiti večje lastne produkcije. Večina fotografij je narejena za vnaprejšnjo uporabo, kar pomeni, da uredništva izbirajo med že ponujenimi fotografijami na posamezno temo. Tako lahko v fotobankah najdemo npr. celotno serijo obraznih izrazov, situacij, razpoloženj, pa tudi vseh možnih vrst predmetov, oseb, njihovih vlog ipd. Produkcija fotografij je namreč zasnovana tako, da odjemalcu ponuja najširši spekter uporabe. Tako so fotobanke primerne za uredniške vsebine, advertoriale in same oglase, saj so fotografije "čiste", kar pomeni, da ponujajo čim sterilnejšo prezentacijo realnosti, pojmov, oseb itd. v čim več življenjskih okoliščinah.

Večina fotobank ima dobro razvite iskalnike, kar pomeni, da ob natančni zahtevi po vrsti fotografije najdemo čim ustrežnejšo fotografijo. Izjemno nizek strošek odkupa pravic za objavo fotografij je eden izmed glavnih razlogov, da medijske hiše postajajo vse večji odjemalci tovrstnih produktov, pri čemer se redkokatera medijska hiša zaveda, še bolj pa končni uporabnik, tj. bralec, da sam medij ni tisti, ki tovrstne podobe proizvaja, temveč jih le v predelani različici (glede na svoje potrebe) posreduje. Med prvimi fotobankami je vsekakor treba omeniti dva današnja giganta *Getty Images* in *Corbis*, vendar je v zadnjih letih zaradi digitalizacije fotoopreme in enostavne distribucije fotografij na spletu na trg vstopilo še mnogo drugih

fotobank, ki po nizkih cenah ponujajo odkup fotografij, kot je na primer *Thinkstockphotos*.¹⁴

Urednikovanje veleva, da je izbor fotografij bistvenega pomena pri produkciji t. i. *lifestyle* revij, katerih osnova je, če lahko tako rečemo, kakovostna fotografija in kakovostna postavitve strani. Na tej točki bi težko rekli, da fotografije prevladujejo nad tiskano besedo, toda njihove moči nikakor ne gre podcenjevati. Ker bralec najprej “bere” fotografijo in se praviloma šele na podlagi te odloča, ali bo sledil besedilu, sta izbor in postavitve fotografije včasih pomembnejša kot samo oblikovanje besedila. Na tem mestu se bomo vzdržali komentarjev o podhranjenosti pisane besede v današnjih trendovskih tiskanih in spletnih medijih za življenjski slog, zato tu le poudarjamo, da fotografija sproži bodisi zanimanje za celotno vsebino ali pa popolno ignoranco, če je izbor neposrečen ali nepremišljen – zaradi neustrezne fotografije na naslovnici je lahko ogrožena branost celotne revije.

Funkcije fotografije iz fotobank

“V areni podob se delec podobe poveže s sekvenco filma in kotiček cestnega plakata ali izložbenega okna, mimo katerega gremo, že producira novo zgodbo, ki je sestavljena tako iz naših izkušenj kot iz naše podzavesti.”¹⁵

Da branje fotografij ni le pasivno vpijanje informacij, vemo že dlje časa. Tudi informativna vrednost ni dovolj, kar je še posebej vidno pri trendovskih revijah za življenjski slog, ki s fotografijami želijo preseči vrednost, ki si jo kot najmočnejši atribut lasti ravno

¹⁴ Za potrebe našega članka smo uporabili vse bolj priljubljeno fotobanko med slovenskimi tiskanimi mediji, *Thinkstockphotos.com*, kjer smo za 299 € na mesec dobili pravice za odkup do 25 visokoresolucijskih fotografij dnevno.

¹⁵ Rogoff, 1998, 16.

dokumentarna fotografija. Fotografija, za katero stoji produkcija, iz zove torej več kot le informativno noto. Ugotavljamo, da ima fotografija iz fotobanke naslednje konotacijske funkcije, ki *strateško* usmerjajo bralca, da si ustvari “pravo” predstavo o izbranem pojmu. Te funkcije so: *stereotipiziranje, spodbujanje fantazije, možnost identifikacije, zabava in estetski užitek.*

Stereotipiziranje se pojavi kot obvezna koda, s katero množici pojavov in pojmov bralec pripisuje pomene, pri čemer se zaveda, da niso nujno resnični. Fotobanke so pravi izvor vizualnih stereotipov (znanstveniki so npr. največkrat prikazani v belih haljah in v družbi epruвет, kar neposredno napeljuje na to, da družboslovec ne more biti znanstvenik). Spodbujanje fantazije je rezultat razmeroma kakovostne produkcije fotografij, ki hitro izgubijo noto vsakdanjosti, postanejo dovršene, nevsakdanje estetske. Možnost identifikacije je vidna iz izbranih fotografij, prilagojenih populaciji bralcev (če je medij namenjen mladim belcem, potem bo v banki poiskal “približke” bralcev, ki se bodo s fotografijami (posledično tematiko, posledično s samim medijem) zlahka identificirali. Zabava in estetski užitek sta običajno funkciji tovrstnih fotografij, ki se na vso moč trudijo prikazati tudi najneprijetnejše življenjske situacije kot netragične (navedimo dva primera estetizacije neprijetnih življenjskih situacij: beseda “ločitev” je ponazorjena v obliki dveh razrezanih polovic poročne torte, “prometna nesreča” pa kot lutka, ki jo običajno uporabljajo v avtomobilski industriji pri trkovnih preizkusih). Tradicionalno pojem estetike pripada lepoti same umetnosti, vendar postaja s poplavo popkulture tovrstno pojmovanje zastarelo. Estetika je danes eden poglavitnih gradnikov sporočil, saj univerzalni vzorci skladnosti, barvne harmonije in proporcev pri bralcu spodbujajo estetsko izkušnjo, pa če se je ta zaveda ali ne. Ne glede na to, da estetiko v medijih retorične šole bolj ali manj spregledujejo, danes na področju medijev težko govorimo o tem, da je okus

stvar posameznika. Estetske norme niso le podane, ampak so pravzaprav zapovedane. Pri tem se ne navezujemo le na najklasičnejše estetske norme, ki se nanašajo na telo (moško in žensko), temveč na norme, ki jih uokvirjajo tehnike pri sami produkciji fotografij in njihovi umestitvi v širši kontekst samega medija.

Metodologija analize

Do zdaj smo lahko že ugotovili, da imajo fotografije iz fotobanke kar nekaj značilnosti, ki so podobne fotografijam z oglasov, saj njihova osrednja funkcija ni reprezentativnost, temveč sugeriranje. Zato predlagamo metodologijo analize, ki bo temeljila na semiotiki, saj lahko takšno fotografijo ravno zaradi njene aplikativnosti tako na uredniške kot oglaševalske vsebine analiziramo podobno, kot je Barthes v svojem eseju analiziral Panzanijev oglas. Morda se zdi, da se oglaševanju namerno izogibamo, vendar velja na tem mestu poudariti, da fotografije *Thinkstocka* pravzaprav učinkujejo kot en sam velik oglas za življenje nasploh. Te fotografije imajo podoben učinek kot oglasne fotografije. Dejansko je njihov prehod iz vsebin v oglase in obratno precej odprt.¹⁶ Zato lahko zanje toliko lažje vzamemo de Saussurjevo terminologijo iz splošnih načel jezikoslovja. Označenci so namreč pri fotobankah formirani vnaprej, v skladu z iskalnimi nizi, kar povprečnemu bralcu zagotavlja optimalno prepoznavnost sporočila, vendar le, če je medij sposoben te fotografije ustrezno umestiti v samo besedilo. V iskalni niz *Thinkstocka* vtipkamo preprost pojem – označenec, kot je “kariera” (*career*). Iskalnik nam ponudi fotografije z bolj ali manj močno konotacijo. Poglejmo dva primera in jih analizirajmo z Barthesovim znakovnim sistemom.

¹⁶ Uporabniki so tako mediji kot oglaševalske agencije.



SLIKA 3: "POSLOVNEŽI GLEDAJO NA PLOČNIKU LEŽEČEGA ČLOVEKA, PTIČJA PERSPEKTIVA" (*Business people looking down at man lying on pavement, elevated view*). ENA IZMED UPODOBITEV POJMA "KARIERA". FOTOGRAF: MICHAEL BLANN. VIR: THINKSTOCKPHOTOS.COM.¹⁷

Denotacija: poslovna obleka, aktovka, črni zloščeni čevlji, sodelavci, nevpadljivo delovno okolje, ki je obarvano v sivo. Konotacija: Kariera te lahko uniči. Padel si pred svojimi sodelavci (pred notranjo konkurenco). Podlegel si, zgrudil si se pod težo kariernih pritiskov. Postal si žrtev stresa. Fotografija naturalizira kulturno ideološko prakso, ki pravi, da preveč dela človeka pokonča. Fotografija je koda za prekomerno udejstvovanje na kariernem področju. Bralca neposredno usmeri na posledice, ki jih pusti kariera.

Sedaj pa fotografijo primerjajmo še s funkcijami fotografije iz fotobank, ki smo jih omenili. S fotografijo se lahko *identificira* vsak, ki

¹⁷ Da bi bili pri izboru čim objektivnejši, smo kot prvi primer izbrali prvo fotografijo v nizu ponujenih fotografij, ki izhajajo iz ključne besede "kariera". Glede na podatek (na voljo 8802 strani na temo "kariera") sklepamo, da banka ponuja okoli 880.200 fotografij na iskano temo.

je vsaj enkrat doživel močan stres na delovnem področju (*burn out*). Fotografija predstavlja tudi najbolj *stereotipno* posledico, ki izhaja iz pregorevanja na delovnem mestu – v simboličnem pomenu prej ali slej *padeš*. Da je učinek padca še večji, je pogled kamere dvignjen, s čimer se doseže efekt majhnosti človeka. Za tiste, ki premorejo malce samoironije, je fotografija nedvomno tudi *zabavna*, hkrati pa že denotacija da vedeti, da *imidž* v karieri umre zadnji – črno, nevpadljivo obleko, čiste zloščene čevlje in aktovko nosiš ne glede na to, ali si uspešen ali ne. *Estetskega užitka* fotografije ne daje njen pomen, temveč njena kompozicija, barvna uravnanost in navsezadnje enotni *styling* prisotnih (črne obleke v kombinaciji z belo srajco), vključno z žrtvijo, saj ne glede na situacijo deluje ubrano.

Poglejmo drugi primer, pri katerem smo pod iskalni niz vnesli pojem “vadba” (*exercise*).



SLIKA 4: ŽENSKA MED IZVAJANJEM JOGE (*Woman doing yoga*): EDEN IZMED NAJPOGOSTEJŠIH ZADETKOV, KO GRE ZA UPODABLJANJE POJMA “VADBA”.
VIR: THINKSTOCKPHOTOS.COM.

Ocean, mivka in sonce sugerirajo, da je vadba najučinkovitejša na prostem. Jogistka je v prvem planu, kar govori bralcu, da je vadba *individualna*. Barvna usklajenost oblačil z barvo morja in neba sporoča, da je z vadbo dosežena *harmonija*. Poza in zaprt pogled, usmerjen v nebo – vadba ni le telesna, temveč duhovna. Kot zanimivost omenimo še to, da iskalnik pod pojmom “vadba” ponudi največ zadetkov, ki prikazujejo vadbo joge, kar pomeni, da je joga trenutno prevladujoči upodobitveni sistem za pojem “vadba”. Joga je sodoben stereotip za vadbo. Tudi ta fotografija ima večino funkcij fotografije iz fotobank – njeno sporočilo je jasno, navedimo jih kar po funkcijah, ki smo jih definirali že na začetku: Jogistka je *stereotipen* prikaz vadbe, njena vadba ob oceanu *spodbuja fantazijo* o pobegu na skrivni kotiček sredi neokrnjene narave, njena podoba omogoča *identifikacijo* vsaki belki, stari 25–40 let, ki se zaveda, da je del njenega *imidža* tudi skrb zase in za svoje telo. Celotna poza ob gledanju vzbuja *estetski užitek*.

Potrebujemo sploh še reprezentacije?

Na tem mestu se samo po sebi pojavi vprašanje o tem, ali bralec sploh še premore kritično distanco do resničnosti oz. avtentičnosti omenjenih podob oz. fotografij iz fotobank. Zdi se namreč, da se zaveda sproduciranega konstrukta in fotografije več ne dojema kot dokaza o resničnosti, temveč kot polje, kjer počiva imaginarno, polje, ki aktivira njegovo fantazijo, in navsezadnje polje, ki mu ponuja referenco o videzu in mu odstira polja želja. Reprezentacije bralec več ne pogaša, in čeprav medijem očita neresničnost (nerealno prikazovanje), konzumira vse variante spektakla. Zato se lomijo kopja na t. i. spornosti retuše oz. retuširanja modelov, produktov, navsezadnje retuširanja vsakdanjega življenja. Belting na primer pravi, da je bila “fotografija nekoč *vera icon* moderne dobe”.¹⁸ Danes

¹⁸ Belting, 2004, 228.

je seveda drugače; fotografija nima več indeksalnega znaka, temveč je njen predznak postal *image*. Ne tekmuje več z realnostjo, ampak gradi po Baudrillardu hiperrealnost. Je čista simulacija. Belting nadalje ugotavlja, da se fotografija po svojem nastanku preneha ukvarjati s prikazovanjem resničnosti:

“Toda ‘razsežni svet tam zunaj’ je v teku moderne dobe postal vse bolj sumljiv in negotov. Domišljija se ni ukvarjala z resnico zunanosti. Zato kmalu sploh ni bilo več pomembno, ali je mogoče svet fotografirati. Stara tehnika je zastarela šele, ko je postal njen motiv dvomljiv. Fotografija ne kaže več, kakšen svet je, temveč kakšen je bil, ko so še verjeli, da se ga lahko polastijo s fotografijo. Moderni pogled se raje zazre v imaginarno in v virtualni svet, ki ga realni svet le ovira.”¹⁹

Tako Belting ugotavlja tudi, da izguba reference izhaja iz nas samih, ko pravi, da “danes raje sanjamo o breztelesnih svetovih”.²⁰ To seveda neizbežno vodi v ontološko razpravo o tem, ali morda vseeno zunanji svet deluje na fotografijo kot motiv ali fotografija dejansko tvori (dograjuje) zunanji svet.

Vizualna percepcija sveta je odvisna od informacij, ki jih dobimo iz okolja. V tem prispevku smo želeli pokazati, da imajo na videz povsem ilustrativne fotografije močno sporočilno vrednost, ki presega klasično reportažno vrednost fotografij. Kajti če je reportažna fotografija včasih rabila mediju in bralcu kot dokaz o resničnosti dogodka (torej o realnosti), je fotografija iz fotobank nekaj povsem drugega: predstavlja vrednote, estetske norme, družbene mite. Navsezadnje te fotografije utrjujejo koncept dokse – simbolizirajo namreč družbene konvencije, predstavljajo “stvari, kot so”. Bodisi v vsebini *glossy* revij, bodisi na cestnih plakatih ali na spletu. Bolj ko

¹⁹ Prav tam.

²⁰ Prav tam.

so razširjene, manj se sprašujemo o njihovi ideologiji. Pa vendar naj bo ta kratki pregled namig za manjšo distanco do prevladujočih predstav ali pa morda celo motiv za poglobljeno analizo v prihodnje.

Bibliografija

- BARTHES, R. (1987): *Image, Music, Text*, Fontana Press, London.
- BAUDRILLARD, J. (1994): *Simulacra and Simulation*, The University of Michigan press.
- BELTING, H. (2004): *Antropologija podobe. Osnutki znanosti o podobi*, Studia Humanitatis, Ljubljana.
- BERGER, A. A. (2005): *Media Analysis Techniques*, 3. izd., Sage Publications, Inc., London.
- DEBORD, G. (2006): *The Society of Spectacle*, Zone Books, New York.
- JACKSON, L. (2000): *Literature, Psychoanalysis and the New Science of Mind*, Longman.
- MIRZOEFF, N., ur. (1998): *An Introduction to Visual Culture Reader*, Routledge, London.
- OTT, B. L., in MACK, R. L. (2010): *Critical Media Studies, an Introduction*, Wiley-Blackwell.
- ROGOFF, I. (1998): "Studying Visual Culture", v: Mirzoeff, N., ur., *Visual Culture Reader*, Routledge, London.
- SAUSSURE, F. DE (1997): *Predavanja iz splošnega jezikoslovja*, Studia Humanitatis, Ljubljana.

Spletni viri

- <http://www.thinkstockphotos.com/>
- http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Stock_photography
- <http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=8Ilh1ewceco&ob=av2e>

DIALOG
Z ANTIKO

Mark Tulij Ciceron: *O dolžnostih* (izbor)²

Stari Rimljani so dajali praktični aplikaciji filozofije prednost pred spekulacijo, zato je bila zanje najprivlačnejša veja te vede etika ali npravna filozofija, ki je učila, kakšno ravnanje vodi k uspehu in sreči. Prav na konec Ciceronovega ustvarjanja sodi etična razprava *O dolžnostih* (*De officiis*), ki je z izjemo nekaterih govorov proti Marku Antoniju (*Filipike - Philippicae*) njegov poslednji prispevek h književnosti. Gre za razpravo o osnovnih načelih moralne dolžnosti s praktičnimi smernicami, kako ravnati, spisano v obliki dolgega pisma avtorjevemu sinu Marku, tedaj študentu v Atenah. Sestavljajo jo tri knjige: v prvi in drugi knjigi, ki govorita o 'častnem' ali moralno dobrem in o vprašanju koristnosti, avtor tesno sledi grškemu stoiku Panajtiju z Rodosa, medtem ko je v sklepni knjigi o reševanju možnih konfliktov med tem, kar je moralno pravilno in kar je dozdnevno koristno, mnogo samostojnejši. Kot v drugih filozofskih spisih torej tudi tokrat črpa argumente predvsem iz grških virov, vendar jih razvija po svoje ter osvetljuje z zgledi iz zakladnice lastnih izkušenj in razgledanosti; z množico zgledov iz rimske zgodovine hoče tematiko približati rimski miselnosti in jo osmisliti za svoje sodobnike.

Delo je imelo izjemen vpliv na razvoj evropske misli: zgovoren je že podatek, da najdemo v svetovnih knjižnicah kar 700 srednjeveških rokopisnih kopij tega dela, kar ga po razširjenosti uvršča na drugo

¹ Dr. Nada Grošelj je samostojna prevajalka. E-naslov: nada-marija.groselj@guest.arnes.si.

² Prevod je pripravljen po izdaji: Walter Miller: *Cicero: De Officiis, Cicero in twenty-eight volumes*, Vol. 21, dvojezično, prevod in opombe, London / Cambridge, Mass., 1968. Celotno delo bo izšlo pri Študentski založbi v letu 2011.

mesto med antičnimi spisi. V srednjem veku je postalo temeljna moralna avtoriteta in spodbudilo tako številne komentarje kot tudi nastanek pomembnih novih filozofskih razprav. Renesansa ga je ustoličila kot eno najpomembnejših besedil za pouk moralne vzgoje v šolah; še na prehodu iz 18. v 19. stoletje so k diplomi na univerzi v Cambridgeu sodile disputacije, v katerih so se kandidati pogosto navezovali na moralne dileme, obravnavane v Ciceronovi razpravi.

Naš izbor prinaša odlomke iz vseh treh knjig. Odlomek iz prve naniza nekaj splošnih napotkov o pravilnem ravnanju in bontonu, sklene pa se z zanimivim vpogledom v rimsko hierarhijo poklicev. Odlomka iz druge in tretje pa se lotita tem, ki so še danes aktualne – problemov, ki so od nekdaj spremljali denacionalizacijo, in različnih pravnih vprašanj.

Iz prve knjige

[40,144] V ravnanju se moramo torej držati takega reda, da se bo, kakor v značajnem govoru, tudi v našem življenju vse skladalo in ujemalo med seboj; sramotno in zelo narobe je, če se pri resnem predmetu šalimo kot na gostiji ali načenjamo frivolne teme. Dobro je povedal Perikles; ko si je delil poveljstvo s pesnikom Sofoklom, sta se sestala zaradi skupne dolžnosti, tedaj pa je po naključju prišel mimo čeden fant. Sofokles je dejal: “O, kakšen lep fant, Perikles!” “Ne, Sofokles, poveljniku se spodobi, da ne kroti le rok, ampak tudi oči.” Toda ko bi bil Sofokles izrekel iste besede na pregledu atletov, si ne bi zaslužil opomina. Tako zelo pomembna sta pravi kraj in čas. Če bi, denimo, človek, ki ga čaka pravda, na poti ali na sprehodu tuhtal sam pri sebi ali zatopljeno razmišljal o čem drugem, ga nihče ne bi grajal, če pa bi počel isto na gostiji, bi napravil vtis neolikanca, ker se ne bi znal vesti priložnosti primerno.

[40,145] Hude kršitve olike, kot je prepevanje na forumu ali kakšna druga velika neumnost, same bodejo v oči, zato ne zahtevajo posebnih

opominov in predpisov. Pač pa se moramo skrbno izogibati na videz malenkostnim prekrškom, ki jih marsikdo niti ne opazi. Če plunka ali piščal zazveni le malo razglašeno, poznavalec to vselej opazi, prav tako pa moramo paziti, da ne zaškriplje kaj v našem življenju – in še dosti bolj, ker je uglašenost v dejanjih pomembnejša in boljša od uglašenosti v zvokih.

Kakor zaznajo ušesa glasbenikov pri plunki najmanjši odtenek, [41,146] bomo tudi mi, če hočemo biti ostrooki in skrbni opazovalci napak, pogosto veliko razbrali že iz malenkosti. Iz pogleda, iz spuščanja ali mrščenja obrvi, iz otožnosti, veselosti, smeha, govorjenja, molčečnosti, zvišanega ali znižanega glasu in podobnega bomo zlahka presodili, katera od teh kretenj je primerna, katera pa v nasprotju z dolžnostjo in naravo. Ni odveč iz ravnanja drugih presoditi, kakšna je posamezna kretnja in kaj pomeni, tako da se ji bomo sami izognili, če je v njej kaj nečastnega; iz tega ali onega razloga namreč napake prej opazimo pri drugih kot pri sebi. Pri pouku zato najlaže napredujejo tisti učenci, ki jih učitelji popravljajo z oponašanjem njihovih napak.

Kadar omahujemo pri izbiri med več vrstami dolžnosti, ni na- [41,147] robe, če pokličemo na pomoč učene ali izkušene ljudi ter jih povprašamo, kaj menijo o sleherni od njih. Večina se namreč v svojem mnenju nagiblje tja, kamor jih usmerja njihova narava; pri teh ne smemo biti pozorni le, kaj kdo svetuje, ampak tudi, kaj kdo misli in zakaj. Saj vsak slikar, kipar in celo pesnik postavi svoje delo na ogled javnosti, da bi lahko popravil nekaj, kar bi poželo splošno kritiko; vsak skuša dognati, sam pri sebi in s pomočjo drugih, kaj je napravil narobe. Prav tako se moramo ravnati po mnenju drugih tudi mi ter marsikaj storiti, opustiti, spremeniti in popraviti.

Glede dejanj, ki se godijo po uveljavljenih šegah in državnih [41,148] uredbah, ni kaj predpisovati; te so predpisi že same po sebi. Če sta Sokrat ali Aristip storila ali izjavila kaj v nasprotju s šegami in na-

vadami svojega mesta, si nihče ne sme zmotno domišljati, da je isto dovoljeno tudi njemu, kajti to svoboščino sta dosegla z velikimi in božanskimi vrlinami. Kiniški nauk pa je treba v celoti črtati, ker nasprotuje spoštljivi obzirnosti, brez katere nič ne more biti niti pravilno niti častno.

[41,149] Ljudi, ki slovijo po častnih in velikih delih, domoljube in tiste, ki so državi izkazali ali ji še izkazujejo usluge, moramo spoštovati in častiti, kakor bi bili nosilci kakega civilnega ali vojaškega dostojanstva. Prav tako moramo visoko ceniti starost, dajati prednost državnim uradnikom in razlikovati med državljanom in tujcem, pa tudi med tuji samimi glede na to, ali so prišli po zasebnih ali službenih opravkih. Skratka, da se ne spuščam v posameznosti: vesoljno zvezo in bratstvo vsega človeškega rodu moramo gojiti, varovati in ohranjati.

[42,150] O tem, katere obrti in poklice moramo šteti za plemenite in katere za nizkotne, so me poučili takole. Kot prvi so nezaželeni tisti poklici, s katerimi si nakopljemo mržnjo ljudi, denimo poklic carinikov in oderuhov. Neplemeniti in nizkotni so tudi poklici vseh plačancev, ki jih ne najemamo zaradi veščin, temveč za golo fizično delo; pri njih je plačilo sólo ara za sužnost. Za nizkotne moramo šteti tudi vse, ki kupujejo blago od trgovcev in ga takoj preprodajajo, saj ne bi ničesar zaslužili, ko ne bi izdatno lagali, lažnivost pa je najsrამotnejša stvar na svetu. Prav tako se ukvarjajo z nizkotno veščino vsi rokodelci, ker delavnica ne more imeti v sebi ničesar plemenitega. Na najslabšem glasu pa so tiste obrti, ki strežejo čutnim užitek:

trgovci z ribami in slaščičarji,
mesarji, kuharji in ribiči
in perutninarji,³

³ Iz Terencijeve komedije *Evnuh*, 2. dejanje, 2. prizor, v. 256. Slov. prevod: Kajetan Gantar: *Publij Terencij Afričan: Evnuh*, prevod, spremna beseda in opombe, Maribor, 1987, 23.

kot pravi Terencij; k njim pridaj, če hočeš, še trgovce z mazili, plesalce in ves glumaški zbor.

Po drugi strani so tiste umetnosti, ki zahtevajo večjo izvedenost [42,151] ali prinašajo izjemno korist – na primer zdravilstvo, stavbarstvo, pouk častivrednih ved –, častne za ljudi, katerih stanu pristojijo. Trgovina mora, nasprotno, veljati za nizkotno, če je drobna; če pa je velika in obsežna, če uvaža na kupe blaga z vseh koncev sveta in jih brez goljufig razpečava na številna območja, je ne gre preveč grajati. Še več, če se trgovec nasiti – ali, bolje, zadovolji – z dobičkom ter s svojim imetjem vred krene iz pristanišča na deželo, kakor je tolikokrat krenil v prav to pristanišče z odprtega morja, ga lahko povsem zaslužno hvalimo. Od vseh pridobitnih dejavnosti pa je najboljše, najplodovitejše, najprijetnejše in svobodnjaka najdostojnejše opravilo kmetovanje; o tem sem dovolj povedal že v *Katonu starejšem*,⁴ zato boš v njem našel vse, kar sodi k temu vprašanju.

Iz druge knjige

Po drugi strani pa upravičeno uživa hvalo Arat iz Sikiona. Potem ko [23,81] so imeli njegovo mesto že petdeset let v oblasti tirani, je odpotoval iz Argov v Sikion, skrivaj vstopil v mesto in ga zavzel. V nepričakovanem napadu je ugnal tirana Nikokla, poklical nazaj šeststo izgnancev, ki so bili nekoč največji bogataši v mestu, in s svojim prihodom osvobodil državo. Opazil pa je velike težave v zvezi z imetjem in posestjo. Po eni strani se mu je zdelo nadvse krivično, da bi ljudje, ki jih je bil sam poklical iz izgnanstva, zdaj živeli v pomanjkanju, ker so se njihovega imetja medtem že polastili drugi. Po drugi strani pa se mu tudi posegati v petdesetletno posest ni zdelo preveč pošteno, ker je v tako dolgem času že mnogo posestev povsem zakonito menjalo lastnika z dedovanjem, nakupom ali doto. Zato je presodil, da jih zdajšnjim lastnikom ne sme odvzeti, ravno tako pa prejšnjih ne

⁴ *Katon starejši o starosti (Cato Maior de senectute)*, razdelki 51 s. s.

[23,82] sme pustiti brez zadoščenja. Sklenivši, da za ureditev položaja potrebuje denar, je oznanil, da namerava odpotovati v Aleksandrijo, in ukazal, naj do njegove vrnitve vse ostane kakor prej, sam pa se je urno podal k svojemu gostinskemu prijatelju Ptolomaju, ki je tedaj vladal kot drugi kralj po ustanovitvi Aleksandrije. Ko je pojasnil, da bi rad osvobodil domovino, in mu predstavil položaj, je kot ugleden mož zlahka dosegel, da ga je bogati kralj podprl z veliko denarno vsoto. Z njo se je vrnil v Sikion, pritegnil za svetovalce petnajst prvakov ter z njihovo pomočjo raziskal primere obojih – tistih, ki so zdaj sedeli na tujem imetju, in onih, ki so imetje izgubili. S cenitvijo premoženja mu je uspelo nekatere prepričati, naj raje sprejmejo denar in se umaknejo s posesti, druge pa, da se jim bolj izplača vzeti veliko odškodnino kakor dobiti nazaj svojo lastnino. Tako so se vsi razšli v lepi slogi brez najmanjše pritožbe.

[23,83] Res velik mož, vreden, da bi se rodil v naši državi! Tako se ravna s sodržavljeni, ne pa, da sredi foruma zapičimo v tla kopje, kot smo videli že dvakrat, in prepustimo njihovo imetje klicarju na dražbi! Nasprotno pa je ta Grk, kot se je spodobilo modremu in odličnemu možu, menil, da mora poskrbeti za vse. In prav to je najvišja razumnost in modrost dobrega državljana: da ne razdvaja pravic sodržavljanov, temveč jih vse združuje pod isto pravičnostjo. “Naj živijo zastonj na tuji posesti.”⁵ Kako to? Tako da bom jaz kupil, zidal, čuval in imel stroške, ti pa boš užival mojo lastnino proti moji volji? Je mar kaj drugega, če enemu vzameš, kar je njegovo, drugemu pa podariš,

[23,84] kar je tuje? Kaj drugega pomeni odpis dolgov, kakor da si z mojim denarjem kupiš posestvo ti in ga zdaj imaš, jaz pa denarja nimam?

Iz tretje knjige

[12,49] Naj torej velja, da sramotno dejanje nikoli ni koristno, niti če z njim dosežeš nekaj, kar imaš za koristno; že sama misel, da bi bilo koris-

⁵ Ciceron domnevno citira enega od Cezarjevih odlokov.

tno kaj sramotnega, je pogubna. Toda kot sem dejal, se pogosto do- [12,50]
gaja, da korist po vsem videzu nasprotuje častnosti, zato je treba
skrbno paziti, ali ji res nasprotuje ali pa ju je moč združiti. V to vrsto
sodijo naslednja vprašanja. Vzemimo, da pošten mož pripelje iz
Aleksandrije na Rodos velik tovor žita v času, ko pri Rodošanih vla-
dajo pomanjkanje, lakota in velika draginja. Če ve, da je iz Aleksan-
drije izplulo več trgovcev, in če je med plovbo videl njihove ladje,
otovorjene z žitom, kako plujejo proti Rodosu, naj Rodošanom to
pove ali naj molči in jim proda svoje žito po čim višji ceni? V mislih
imam modrega in poštenega moža; zanima me, kako bi razmišljal
in preudarjal nekdo, ki Rodošanom ne bi prikrival resnice, ko bi imel
to za sramotno, vendar ni prepričan, ali je res sramotno.

V takih primerih ima Diogen iz Babilonije,⁶ velik in ugleden [12,51]
stoik, praviloma eno mnenje, njegov učenec Antipater, izredno pro-
doren mislec, pa drugo. Po Antipatrovem mnenju je treba razkriti
vse, tako da kupcu ne ostane skrita niti trohica tega, kar ve prodaj-
alec. Po Diogenovem mnenju pa je prodajalec dolžan opozoriti na
hibe zgolj toliko, kolikor zahteva civilno pravo, sicer pa poslovati
brez zahrbtnosti in – ker je pač prodajalec – blago čim bolje prodati.
“Blago sem pripeljal, postavil na ogled in ga prodajam – po nič višji
ceni kot ostali, morda celo po nižji, ker je zdaj večja ponudba. Komu
se tu godi krivica?”

Na drugi strani se zasliši Antipatrov argument: “Kaj govoriš? [12,52]
Tvoja dolžnost je skrbeti za dobrobit soljudi in služiti človeški
družbi; pogoji, pod katerimi si bil rojen, in načela tvoje narave, ki
jim moraš poslušno slediti, so, da bodi tvoja korist skupna korist in

⁶ Diogen iz Babilonije (ok. 230–150/140 pr. Kr.) je bil Zenonov naslednik na čelu stoiške šole v Atenah, najbolj znan po tem, da je l. 155 pr. Kr. prišel v Rim kot diplomatski atenski odposlanec skupaj z akademikom Karneadom in peripatetikom Kritolajem. Nasledil ga je njegov učenec Antipater iz Tarza (2. stol. pr. Kr.), ki je učil Panajtija.

obratno; pri tem pa boš ljudem prikrival, kolikšna ugodnost in izobilje se jim bližata?”

Diogen bo morda odgovoril takole: “Prikrivati je eno, molčati pa drugo; zdajle ti ničesar ne prikrivam, če ti ne povem, kakšna je narava bogov ali kaj je najvišje dobro, pa čeprav bi ti bilo to spoznanje v večjo korist kot novica, da je pšenici padla cena. Vendar ti nisem dolžan povedati vsega, kar bi bilo zate koristno slišati.”

[12,53] “Pa še kako si dolžan,” bo dejal Antipater, “če imaš le pred očmi, da so ljudje po naravi povezani v skupnost.”

“Saj imam,” bo odvrnil oni, “ampak mar v tej skupnosti ni zasebne lastnine? Tedaj sploh ne bi smeli ničesar prodati, temveč zgolj podariti.”

[13,53] Kot vidiš, v vsej razpravi nihče ne reče: “Sramotno gor ali dol, meni pride prav in zato bom naredil!” Ne: ena stran trdi, da je dejanje koristno, ne da bi bilo sramotno, druga pa, da je prepovedano prav zato, ker je sramotno.

[13,54] Vzemimo, da pošten mož prodaja hišo zaradi nekaterih hib, za katere ve sam, drugi pa ne – morda je nezdrava, pa velja za zdravo, morda ni znano, da se v vseh spalnicah pojavljajo kače, morda je slabo zgrajena in se utegne vsak hip porušiti, vendar tega ne ve nihče razen lastnika. Moje vprašanje se glasi: če prodajalec kupcem tega ne bi povedal in bi prodal hišo za mnogo višjo ceno, kot bi mogel pričakovati, mar bi ravnal krivično ali nepošteno?

[13,55] “Seveda,” pravi Antipater; “kaj drugega pa naj bo ‘zablodelemu ne pokazati poti’, kar se v Atenah kaznuje z javno osramotitvijo, če ne to, da pustiš kupca, naj se prenagli in si po pomoti nakoplje veliko izgubo? Še celo slabše je, kot če komu ne pokažeš prave poti, saj ga nalašč zavedeš.”

Diogen ugovarja: “Mar te je prisilil k nakupu, če te ni niti spodbujal? On je ponudil naprodaj nekaj, kar mu ni bilo pogodu, ti pa si kupil nekaj, kar ti je bilo pogodu. Ljudem se ne šteje za goljufijo niti,

če oglašajo svojo vilo kot dobro in dobro zgrajeno, čeprav ni ne eno ne drugo; še toliko manj pa, če je sploh ne pohvalijo. Če lahko kupec uporabi lastno presojo, kako naj ga prodajalec oslepari? Če ni treba jamčiti niti za vse izrečene trditve, mar je po tvojem treba jamčiti celo za neizrečene? Je še kakšna večja neumnost, kot da prodajalec razklada o hibah tega, kar prodaja? In kaj bi bil hujši nesmisel, kot če bi klicar po lastnikovem naročilu oznanjal: "Prodajam nezdravo hišo?"

V nekaterih dvomljivih primerih, skratka, se ena stran poteguje [13,56] za častnost, druga pa prikazuje koristnost v taki luči, da ne bi bilo zgolj častno napraviti, kar se zdi koristno, ampak celo sramotno, če tega *ne* bi napravil. Prav to je razvpito nesoglasje med koristnim in častnim, ki se po vsem videzu tolikokrat pojavlja. Vendar moram o gornjih primerih tudi rzsoditi, saj ju nisem predstavil zgolj zato, da bi postavil vprašanje, ampak da bi poiskal rešitev. Torej: po [13,57] mojem mnenju niti trgovec z žitom niti prodajalec hiše ne bi smel ničesar prikriti niti Rodošanom niti svojim kupcem. Prikrivanje ni to, da nekaj zamolčiš, ampak da nekaj veš, pa zaradi lastnega dobička nočeš, da bi izvedeli tudi ljudje, ki bi jim to koristilo. Le kdo ne sprevidi, kakšne baže je to prikrivanje in kakšen človek bi posegel po njem? Prav gotovo ne odkrit, iskren, plemenit, pravičen, pošten mož, temveč prej premeten, potuhnjen, pregnan, sleparski, lokav, zvijačen star lisjak in lopov. No, ali si ni nekoristno naprtiti vseh teh in še drugih zmerljivk?

Če si torej zaslužijo grajo že ljudje, ki kaj zamolčijo, kako naj so- [14,58] dimo šele o tistih, ki se izrecno zlažejo? Rimski vitez Gaj Kanij, dokaj duhovit in izobražen človek, jo je nekoč mahnil v Sirakuze, ne po opravkih, ampak, kot je sam pripovedoval, na oddih. Večkrat je govoril, da bi rad kupil majhen nasad, kamor bi lahko vabil prijatelje in se zabaval brez vsiljivcev. Ko se je to razvedelo, mu je neki Pitij, ki se je v Sirakuzah ukvarjal z bančništvom, sporočil, da ima nasade, ki sicer niso naprodaj, vendar jih Kanij lahko uporablja kot svoje, če

želi; obenem ga je za naslednji dan povabil v nasade na večerjo. Kanij je obljubil, da pride. Nato je Pitij, ki je kot bankir užival veljavo pri vseh stanovih, sklical k sebi ribiče, jih zaprosil, naj naslednjega dne ribarijo pred njegovimi nasadi, in povedal, kaj hoče od njih. Ob dogovorjeni uri je prišel Kanij na večerjo. Pitij je imel pripravljeno bogato gostijo, pred njunimi očmi pa se je kar gnetlo čolnov; vsak ribič posebej je prinesel svoj ulov in vrgel ribe Pitiju pred noge.

[14,59] Tedaj Kanij vpraša: “Povej no, Pitij, kaj je to – toliko rib, toliko čolnov?”

Oni odvrne: “Nič čudnega! Na tem mestu so vse ribe, kar jih je v Sirakuzah, tu je vir sveže vode; tile ne bi mogli pogrešiti moje vile.”

V Kaniju se vname strast in od Pitija zahteva, naj mu nasade proda. Ta se sprva brani, toda Kanij, da ne bomo predolgi, doseže svoje. Neučakan in bogat, kakor je, kupi nasade za ceno, ki jo postavi Pitij, za povrh pa še opremo; svoje ime vpiše v poslovno knjigo in sklene posel. Naslednjega dne povabi prijatelje, sam pa pride malce prezgodaj. O čolnih ne duha ne sluha! Zato pobara najbližjega soseda, ali imajo ribiči praznik, da ni nobenega na spregled.

“Ne da bi vedel,” odvrne sosed, “ampak tukaj ponavadi nihče ne ribari. Zato sem se včeraj čudil, kaj neki se je zgodilo.”

[14,60] Kaniju zavre kri; toda kaj bi? Takrat moj kolega in prijatelj Gaj Akvilij⁷ še ni bil uvedel pravnih obrazcev proti goljufiji. Kadar so ga vpraševali, kaj pomeni ‘goljufija’ v teh obrazcih, je odgovarjal: “Kadar hliniš eno, delaš pa drugo.” Imenitno povedano, kot se spodobi strokovnjaku za opredelitve! Torej so Pitij in vsi drugi, ki delajo eno, hlinijo pa drugo, verolomni, nepošteni in lokavi; iz tega sledi, da nobeno njihovo dejanje ne more biti koristno, ker je omadeževano s toliko hibami.

⁷ Gaj Akvilij Gal je bil Ciceronov so-pretor. Kot eden vrhovnih rimskih sodnikov je vnesel v svoj edikt – in tako tudi v rimsko pravo – pomembne izboljšave v boju proti goljufijam.

Če je Akvilijeva opredelitev pravilna, moramo odpraviti pretvarjanje in prikrivanje na vseh področjih vsakdanjega življenja. Poštenjak torej ne bo niti hlinil niti prikril ničesar, da bi kaj kupil ali prodal po ugodnejši ceni. Vrhu tega je bila 'goljufija' kazniva že po starih zakonih, na primer zloraba varuštva po *Zakonih dvanajstih plošč* in sleparjenje mladoletnih oseb po Pletorijevem zakonu,⁸ pa tudi brez zakonov, v sodnih obravnavah, pri katerih se doda izraz EX FIDE BONA ("po načelu dobre vere in poštenja"). Pri ostalih obravnavah se najbolj odlikujeta naslednja izraza: pri razsojanju o vrnitvi dote MELIUS AEQUIUS ("kot bo najbolje in najpravičneje"), pri tožbi za vrnitev zastavljene lastnine pa UT INTER BONOS BENE AGIER ("kakor se med poštenjaki posluje pošteno"). Kako torej? Ali je pri ravnanju, "kot bo najbolje in najpravičneje", prostor za kakršno koli goljufijo? Ali je pri določilu "kakor se med poštenjaki posluje pošteno" mogoče ukreniti kaj goljufivega in lokavega? Goljufija je v pretvarjanju, kot pravi Akvilij. Torej moramo iz sklepanja poslov odpraviti sleherno nepoštenost; prodajalec ne bo pripeljal navideznega kupca, ki bi s svojimi ponudbami višal ceno, kupec pa ne takega, ki bi jo z nizkimi ponudbami držal pri tleh. Če se bo treba izjasniti o ceni, jo bosta oba navedla zgolj enkrat. Ko je Kvint Scvola, Publijev sin, hotel slišati dokončno ceno posestva, ki ga je kupal, in jo je prodajalec imenoval, je odvrnil, da ga sam ceni više, in navrgel še sto tisoč sestercijev. Njegovemu dejanju nihče ne odreka poštenja, pač pa trdijo, da ni bilo modro – kot če bi nekaj prodal ceneje, kot bi lahko. Tu se torej kaže tista pogubna predstava, po kateri veljajo za poštene nekateri, za modre pa drugi; pod njenim vplivom je Enij zapisal: "Zaman je moder, kdor si sam ne zna po-

⁸ Pletorijev zakon (192 pr. Kr.) je prvi potegnil ločnico med mladoletnimi (do 25. leta) in polnoletnimi osebami. Za goljufijo, izvršeno nad mladoletnikom, je določil visoko globo in javno osramotitev, pa tudi razveljavil vse pogodbe, ki bi jih utegnili skleniti mladoletniki brez privoljenja uradnega varuha.

magati.”⁹ To seveda povsem drži, ko bi se le mogla z Enijem zediniti, kaj pomeni ‘pomagati’.

[15,63] Kot vidim, Panajtijev učenec Hekaton z Rodosa v knjigah o dolžnostih, ki jih je posvetil Kvintu Tuberonu, pravi takole: “Moder človek naj sicer ne stori ničesar v nasprotju s šegami, zakoni in uredbami, vendar naj obenem skrbi za svoje premoženje. Saj si ne želimo biti bogati zgolj zaradi sebe, ampak zaradi otrok, sorodnikov, prijateljev, najbolj pa države. Premoženje posameznikov je namreč bogastvo države.” Njemu Scevolovo dejanje, ki sem ga omenil malo prej, nikakor ne bi moglo biti po volji, saj pravi, da se bo pri iskanju dobička izognil zgolj tistemu, kar je prepovedano. Tak človek si ne zasluži niti posebne hvale niti hvaležnosti.

[15,64] Toda če sta tako pretvarjanje kot prikrivanje ‘goljufija’, je hudo malo poslov, pri katerih ne bi bilo nič te ‘goljufije’, in če je ‘poštenjak’ nekdo, ki pomaga, komur more, in nikomur ne škoduje, bomo takega ‘poštenjaka’ zelo težko našli.

Skratka, grešiti nikoli ni koristno, ker je vselej sramotno; ker pa je vselej častno, da je človek pošten, je poštenje vselej koristno.

[16,65] Zakon o nepremičninah v našem civilnem pravu določa, da mora prodajalec pri prodaji povedati za vse hibe, za katere ve. Po *Zakoni dvanajestih plošč* bi bilo sicer dovolj, da plača odškodnino zgolj za hibe, ki jih izrecno navede, medtem ko za tiste, ki jih izrecno zanika, odšteje dvojno globo. Toda pravni strokovnjaki so določili kazneni tudi za zamolčanje; za vsakršno pomanjkljivost pri nepremičnini – tako so sklenili –, ki jo prodajalec pozna, vendar je ne navede poimensko,

[16,66] mora plačati odškodnino. Ko so hoteli avgurji¹⁰ z utrdbe¹¹ opazovati

⁹ Iz Enijeve tragedije *Medeja*.

¹⁰ Avgur je bil v Rimu vedeževalski svečenik, ki je opazoval let, oglašanje in zobanje ptic ter iz teh znamenj razbiral, ali bogovi odobravajo nameravano dejanje ali ne.

¹¹ ‘Utrdba’ (*Arx*) se je imenoval severni vrh Kapitolijskega griča; drugi, južnejši vrh je bil Kapitol.

ptičji let, so ukazali Tiberiju Klavdiju Centumalu, ki je imel hišo na griču Celiju, naj poruši dele, ki jim s svojo višino zastirajo razgled. Klavdij je, ne bodi len, ponudil hišo naprodaj [in jo prodal]; kupil jo je Publij Kalpurnij Lanarij. Ta je dobil od avgurjev isti razglas. Štrleče dele je porušil, toda ko je zvedel, da je ponudil Klavdij hišo naprodaj že po tem, ko so mu avgurji ukazali te dele podreti, ga je prignal pred razsodnika,¹² QUICQUID SIBI DARE FACERE OPORTERET EX FIDE BONA – “kar koli mu že mora [toženec] dati ali storiti po načelu dobre vere in poštenja”. Razsodbo je izrekel Mark Katon, oče našega Katona¹³ (kot namreč druge imenujemo po očetih, moramo tega, ki je rodil tako bleščečo luč, imenovati po sinu) – skratka, mož je kot sodnik oznanil: “Ker je pri prodaji vedel za ta ukaz, vendar zanj ni povedal, mora kupcu povrniti škodo.”

Tako je vpeljal načelo, po katerem sodi k dobri veri tudi, da [16,67] prodajalec obvesti kupca o vsaki pomanjkljivosti, za katero ve. Če je razsodil prav, ne bi ravnal prav niti naš trgovec z žitom niti prodajalec nezdrave hiše, ko bi molčal. Vseh primerov, kjer lahko pride do zamolčanja, sicer ni mogoče zajeti v civilno pravo, toda pri tistih, ki so vendarle našli pot vanj, se sodniki skrbno držijo zakona. Najin sorodnik Mark Marij Gratidijan je prodal Gaju Sergiju Orati isto hišo, ki jo je pred nekaj leti sam kupil od njega. Hiša je bila obremenjena s služnostjo, toda Marij pri prodaji tega ni povedal. Stvar je prišla na sodišče. Orato je zastopal Kras, Gratidijana pa Antonij. Kras se je zavzemal za črko zakona, češ: “za hibo, ki jo je vede zamolčal, mora prodajalec plačati odškodnino”, Antonij pa za načelo pravičnosti: “ta hiba Sergiju ni bila neznana (saj je prej sam prodal isto hišo), zato ni bilo treba nobenih besed;

¹² Razsodnik (*arbiter*) ni bil nastavljen po zakonu, ampak sta ga v starejši dobi izbrali sprti stranki, pozneje pa pretor. Razsojal je po svoji vesti in poštenju, sodnik (*iudex*) pa po pisanih zakonih.

¹³ Tj. Katona Utičana.

pa tudi prevaran ni bil, saj je vedel, v kakšnem pravnem položaju je njegov nakup”.

[16,68] Čemu ti pripovedujem vse to? Ker ti hočem dopovedati, da naši predniki niso odobravalı zvitorepcev.

Obvestilo avtorjem

Prispevke in drugo korespondenco pošiljajte na naslov uredništva. Uredništvo ne sprejema prispevkov, ki so bili že objavljeni ali so istočasno poslani v objavo drugam. Nenaročenih rokopisov ne vračamo.

Izdajatelj revije se glede urejanja avtorskih razmerij ravna po veljavnem Zakonu o avtorskih in sorodnih pravicah. Za avtorsko delo, poslano za objavo v reviji, vse moralne avtorske pravice pripadajo avtorju, vse materialne avtorske pravice pa avtor prenese na izdajatelja. Avtor dovoljuje objavo svojega dela na spletni strani revije.

Prispevki naj bodo poslani v tiskopisu in na disketi, CD-ROM-u ali po e-pošti, pisani v programu Microsoft Word. Besedilu naj bo priložen izvleček v slovenščini in angleščini (do 10 vrstic) in do 5 ključnih besed (v slovenščini in angleščini).

Prispevki naj ne presegajo 1 avtorske pole (30.000 znakov s presledki) vključno z vsemi opombami. Prispevki naj bodo razdeljeni na razdelke, ki so opremljeni z mednaslovi. V besedilu dosledno uporabljajte dvojne narekovaje pri navajanju naslovov člankov, citiranih besedah, tehničnih izrazih ipd., razen pri citatih znotraj citatov. Naslove knjig, periodike in tuje besede (npr. *a priori*, *oikos*, *kairos* ipd.) je treba pisati *ležeče*.

Opombe in reference se tiskajo kot opombe pod črto. V besedilu naj bodo opombe označene z dvignjenimi indeksi. V besedilu se sproti v opombi označujejo samo avtor, letnica oziroma avtor, letnica, številka strani. Popoln, po abecednem redu urejen bibliografski opis citiranih virov mora biti priložen na koncu poslanega prispevka. Citiranje v bibliografiji naj sledi spodnjemu zgledu:

1. Praprotnik, T. (2003): *Skupnost, identiteta in komunikacija v virtualnih skupnostih*, Ljubljana, ISH.
2. Slapšak, S. (2004): "Težavna dediščina ali študij antike kot tekoče zrcalo", v: Sunčič, M., Senegačnik, B., ur., *Antika za tretje tisočletje*, Založba ZRC, Agora, Ljubljana, 19-31.
3. Faraone, C. A. (1990): "Aphrodite's Kestos and Apples for Atalanta: Aphrodisiacs in Early Greek Myth and Ritual", *Phoenix*, 44, 219-243.

Vsi prispevki bodo poslani v kolegialno recenzijo. Avtorjem bomo poslali korekture, ki jih je treba pregledane vrniti v uredništvo v petih dneh.